

59

ANGLICAN CHURCH  
OF CANADA



GENERAL SYNOD  
ARCHIVES

Church House

Toronto

C 106  
N59

# CONSIDERATIONS

ON THE

REVISED EDITION

OF THE

# NEW TESTAMENT

IN PART DELIVERED AT A CONFERENCE OF CLERGY  
THE DIOCESE OF MONTREAL, ASSEMBLED  
IN NOVEMBER, 1881,

BY

Rev. Canon R. W. NORMAN, M.A., D.C.L.,

VICE-CHANCELLOR OF THE UNIVERSITY OF BISHOP'S COLLEGE,  
LENNOXVILLE.

---

Montreal :

THE GAZETTE PRINTING COMPANY.

1881.

ANGLICAN CHURCH OF CANADA  
GENERAL SYNOD, ARCHIVES

FF  
N 59

# CONSIDERATIONS

ON THE

REVISED EDITION

OF THE

# NEW TESTAMENT

IN PART DELIVERED AT A CONFERENCE OF CLERGY OF  
THE DIOCESE OF MONTREAL, ASSEMBLED  
IN NOVEMBER, 1881,

BY

Rev. Canon R. W. NORMAN, M.A., D.C.L.,

VICE-CHANCELLOR OF THE UNIVERSITY OF BISHOP'S COLLEGE,  
LENNOXVILLE.

---

**Montreal :**

**THE GAZETTE PRINTING COMPANY.**

**1881.**




## PREFACE.

---

At the request of a few friends I undertook some months ago to add one more to the many written opinions upon the Revised Edition of the New Testament. I have devoted some time to the work, albeit the results of that work seem scanty. I have, of course, consulted all accessible authorities, but have devoted the greater part of my time to the careful study and comparison of the various texts which I possess. Since these sheets have been in the printers' hands I have seen a notice of an article in the *Quarterly Review*, the perusal of which all scholars on this side of the Atlantic will await with eagerness. I have also read with much interest an able article in the "*American Church Review*," for October, from the accomplished pen of Bishop Doane. This reached me too late to be of service. I can only remark that I cannot agree with the article taken as a whole. It seems difficult for critics to take an impartial survey of this great question. For any scholar to say of the New Edition "the great mass of changes is either unimportant, valueless, unmeaning, or unjust," is to me almost inconceivable.

Revision must have come. There have been indications of it for the last quarter of a century. The only thing to be done was to pray and labour that the movement should be guided aright. I may add that a portion of this pamphlet was read as a paper at a Diocesan Clerical Conference recently held in Montreal. The subject given me was "Inspiration and Revision." I have made no subsequent changes, and the opening sentences of the pamphlet refer, as the reader will observe, to both these heads. I have endeavoured to be comprehensive in my estimate of this great work, and have striven to avoid both blind prejudice on the one hand, and servile adhesion to mere verbal fidelity, on the other. I must leave the result to the verdict of the Christian public.

## REVISED NEW TESTAMENT.



THE subject before us is so large, and my time is of necessity so limited, that, in order not to be utterly superficial, I can only attempt to enlarge on one head, touching the other very lightly in a few preliminary remarks.

The truth of the Inspiration of Holy Writ underlies, of course, the whole question, and imparts to it paramount importance. And yet the Church at large has never exactly defined the meaning conveyed and the extent covered by the term "Inspiration" (a). This very abstention not only need not be regretted, but may be due to the wisdom of God's guiding Providence. For the Almighty, while revealing to us that the Scriptures are His Word, has not communicated to us any precise and specific account of the mode in which the work of Inspiration was effected. Any theory concerning it, any speculation as to its working, can be only a human deduction which cannot be laid down as an article of faith. In the Nicene Creed we are taught to profess that the Holy Ghost spake by the Prophets. To use the words of Dr. Lee (b). "This confession not only defines the Inspiration of the sacred writers to be the act of the Holy Ghost, but it also lays down as a fundamental doctrine of Christianity, that both the Old and New Testament have proceeded from the same source, and are alike Divine. That to this latter truth the Article of the Creed chiefly refers, admits of no doubt." The whole Bible is placed in our hands as the Word of God; we have no tests given us beyond the general consent and acceptance of the Chris-

---

(a) There is a secondary sense of the word "Inspiration," which is intended when the term is used in some of our Collects, and the hymn *Veni Creator*. (b) See *Inspiration of Holy Scripture*, pp 74-75.



tian Church, whereby to determine what is Divine and what is not, and it would be perilous for us to invent any such tests for ourselves.

It is the original Scripture that has been certified to be Divine, and of that original we may assuredly predicate *plenary Inspiration*, and that to alter one word and even one letter would be presumptuous and profane. But whether the Holy Spirit watched over every word, whether He guided the writer's pen with or without his inner consciousness, on this we are not minutely informed, and where no precise revelation has been granted, we have no right to dogmatize. We may aver that the sacred writers were not so much passive instruments in the hands of the Holy Ghost, as inspired penmen who, while they were guided aright and protected from error, were yet permitted to clothe the facts and truths which they were empowered to teach, with illustrations and imagery drawn from their own minds, their country, their occupations. The human element in Scripture possesses a special interest of its own, and should never be overlooked in our study of God's Word. But we have never been told that translations of Scripture are Divine.

The Sacred Writings are subject to erroneous transcription, and therefore it is not only lawful but incumbent on us to scrutinize most carefully the MSS. of Scripture, with a view to detect any interpolation by the hands of copyists. \* And this brings us naturally to the second head, viz:—Revision. Was this necessary or desirable? We may thankfully at once admit that (to use another's words) "if our own cherished and admirable English version be in some points defective, it never will lead us into any falsehood, though it may lead us short of the whole truth." But I conceive that thoughtful and observant men will answer the above question in the affirmative. Our venerable Authorized Version had been the

---

\* Trench on Authorised Version, p. 7.

target at which all sorts of sharpshooters had discharged their missiles. Romanists had spoken of it with contemptuous obloquy, because it certainly fails to support their modern and erroneous peculiarities. Almost the only noble and memorable exception to those aspersions, as far as I am aware, is to be found in the writings of Dr. Newman.\*

He says, "certain masters of composition, as Shakspeare, Milton and Pope, the writers of the Protestant Bible and Prayer Book, have been the making of the English language. How real a creation, how *sui generis* is the style of Shakspeare or of the Protestant Bible or Prayer-Book! Even were the subject matter without meaning, though in truth the style cannot really be abstracted from the sense, still the style would, on that supposition, remain as perfect and original a work as Euclid's Elements or a Symphony of Beethoven. And like music, it has seized upon the public mind; and the literature of England is no longer a mere letter, printed in books, and shut up in libraries, but it is a living voice, which has gone forth in its expressions and its sentiments into the world of men, which daily thrills upon our ears and syllables our thoughts, which speaks to us through our correspondents, and dictates when we put pen to paper." This passage is melodious with the old ring. It is the praise of one, who is himself a master of style, who is ever independent in thought and candid in expression, and who cannot help contrasting the vigour, freedom and poetry of our Authorized Version with the stilted classicisms of the Rheims and Douay versions.

Freethinkers have done their best to magnify any inaccuracies in the Authorized Version, either Old or New Testament, and by obtruding such portions, the authenticity of which is at least doubtful, have tried to shake the authority of the whole. It has been declared that the

---

\* Lectures on University Subjects, pp. 90 and 91.

New Testament contains direct contradictions which impair its authority, and even divines have been led to concede the possibility of such contradictions. I do not for a moment admit the existence of such contradictions in the original. But such allegations have to be met. Simple people, strong in faith, but not profound in erudition, began to feel that the very foundations of their religious belief were slipping away. They naturally said, "if our English Bible, the treasure-house of comfort to so many pious souls, is not to be trusted, where are we to look for religious knowledge, and what are we to consider as the revealed Word of God?" Also, scholars, in their anxiety to give the most strictly accurate rendering of Hebrew or Greek, as the case may be, and animated perchance by a semi-unconscious impulse to display their own learning, were wont in the course of their sermons to change, I will not always say to improve upon the English text.

Thus, to allay fear and quell anxiety, it was desirable that the work of revision should be undertaken as promptly, and accomplished as expeditiously as the magnitude of the task and the solemn responsibility connected with it would admit of.

As far back as 1857 a new English version of St. John's Gospel was published in England. It was the work of five clergymen, all eminent for their scholarship. This publication, as far as it went, should have satisfied Christian people that, in the case of a revised edition, the doctrines of the faith, dear to all alike, learned or unlearned, need not be affected, and that the only change would be in the direction of greater critical accuracy. Mr. Conybeare's rendering of St. Paul's Epistles, and Bishop Ellicott's translations of the same, and Dean Alford's version stand deservedly high. Bishop Wordsworth's Greek text is perhaps the best, certainly one of the best that we possess. Many other versions might be cited, and without undervaluing, or giving the first place

to any one, it seemed manifest that the work of thorough revision had yet to be accomplished.

We have also received the first instalment of a work of great value, viz. the four Gospels, a new translation, with copious references, notes, dissertations, and analytical harmony by the Rev. J. B. McClellan. It is a monument of patient and learned labour, the result of fifteen years study. May the author be spared to complete his work.

Then again, the time seemed ripe for such an undertaking. The translators of our Authorized Version laboured under considerable difficulties. Books were scarce, the age was not a critical one, and the text which they adopted was specially defective in its version of the Apocalypse. The translators of King James' Bible had but a scanty supply of the three main sources of material for constructing a Greek text, viz: Greek MSS. ancient versions in various languages, and commentaries of the Fathers. Beza's edition of 1598 was the groundwork of the Authorized translation of the Apocalypse. Erasmus, the first editor after the invention of printing, had only one MS. of the Apocalypse, and that an imperfect one. Since his time about a hundred MSS. of the Apocalypse have been collected, some very ancient, as e.g. A., the Alexandrine, 4th century; Aleph., the Sinaitic, 4th century; the Basilian, (which only contains the Apocalypse) 6th century. A. contains the New Testament nearly complete; Aleph. contains the New Testament complete, deducting errors of omission; B. (Vaticanus) has many omissions, notably that of the Apocalypse, and the Basilian is appended as a supplement in Mai's edition of Codex B.; C., Palimpsest of Ephraim, latter part of 5th century. The above are the most ancient Greek MSS. known to exist. All have been discovered since the publication of the Authorized Version. Also the general advance in critical scholarship during this century seemed to afford a very favourable opportunity for the commencement of so deeply important an undertaking.

Then again, as to the composition of the body of revisers. It is well known that the compilers of King James' Bible were all members of the Anglican Church. This version has been lovingly accepted by all Protestant bodies. The Church herself adopted it for public reading in Divine Service, although as a matter of fact the version has never received any formal Ecclesiastical or even Civil sanction. It may, nevertheless, be said to have been sanctioned by implication, when at the last revision of the Prayer Book in 1662, the Epistles and Gospels were taken from it. Previously they had been taken from the version called the Bishops' Bible. The Psalms and Canticles as we have them still, are from an older version, Cranmer's Bible. This was the first Bible appointed to be set up in churches. It must be remembered that the Prayer Book of 1662 carries with it the greatest possible weight of authority. It was adopted by both houses of convocation of both Provinces, and was sanctioned by both houses of Parliament. The Genevan is perhaps the most original of the versions published since the Reformation. The majority, in the main follow Tyndal, who has been called the Prince of Translators. The Authorized Version was simply put forward by the authority of the King and accepted by the church. "Tempora mutantur." It was no doubt wise (in order to make the revised edition a national work and to enlist the sympathies of all Christian people) to invite the co-operation of Protestant bodies generally. We could hardly expect them to accept an altered form of the Scriptures, unless they were permitted to have a share in the preparation. Some may regret the presence on the committee of a Unitarian member. In the rendering of Scripture, and especially the Scriptures of the New Testament, something more than mere sound scholarship should be looked for. There should be a moral and spiritual as well as a critical faculty. Also one who examines the living Word, as a surgeon dissects an inanimate corpse, and one who places the inspired record on a level with any other book, though

I do not apply this to Mr. Vance Smith, can hardly be said to possess all the necessary qualifications, be his intellectual eminence what it may. However, a single member, though very influential in himself, would not be likely to overbalance the opinion, or change the decision of the majority, who, being orthodox believers, would not lightly accept any translation that would jeopardize the Christian Faith. At the same time the comprehensiveness which so conspicuously marked the selection of the committee, would satisfy the public mind that no spirit of narrow ecclesiasticism would be the ruling motive of their decisions. Some, myself among the number, might in the abstract have preferred that the original text of the Authorized Version should have remained untouched, and that emendations should have been inserted, as marginal or foot notes. It is a most delicate and almost perilous task to alter even minutely those hallowed sentences, precious to our forefathers and to ourselves, bound up with moments of joy, with seasons of weariness and sorrow, and that have proved helpful to many struggling souls in time of temptation. We cannot but respect the prejudices of those who feared the result of the most faithful revision as a tampering with holy things.

But the plan which I should have preferred would have increased the size of the volume and the cost of publication, which last it was specially desirable to keep as low as possible.

It is no small praise to say of the Revised Edition that it preserves so happily the archaic character which belongs to the treasured Authorized Version. To quote Archbishop Trench: "It is good that the phraseology of Scripture should not be exactly that of our common life; should be removed from the vulgarities, and even the familiarities of this." The attempts to modernize the English Bible would, if accepted, have been disastrous, and would have shattered much of the reverence that now surrounds it. Any one can see this for themselves by consulting Har-

wood, Wemyss, Purver and Symonds. Their repulsiveness in some cases, almost amounts to blasphemy. Patrick also tried to improve on Scripture, of whom Macaulay wittily remarks that "whoever could have made it better no one could have made it longer." But, nevertheless, once more to quote Archbishop Trench, "the more deeply we are persuaded of the inspiration of Holy Scripture, the more intolerant we shall be of any lets and hindrances to the arriving at a perfect understanding of that which the mouth of God has spoken."

The work, from which the above passages were taken, was published in 1858. It is, like all the productions of its learned author, scholarly and interesting, and it is as appropriate now as at the time of its first appearance. The Archbishop, then Dean of Westminster, foresaw and foretold the dangers attending revision, and with great clearness set forth the excellencies and blemishes of the Authorized Version. No man was more competent to speak upon the structure of the English tongue, past and present, and the revisers appear to have followed in his footsteps and to have profited by his suggestions.

The widespread interest which the Revised Edition has aroused in countries where English is the vernacular tongue is most remarkable.

While philosophy, so called, has been striving to sap the authority of revelation, while unbelief has been carping at it, while pseudo-criticism has been attempting to discover errors in it, while even some of the household of faith have been casting stones at it, still the announcement of the approaching publication of this long looked for version attracted throngs to stores and shops. It was the greatest literary excitement of the time. People flocked with as much avidity to procure a copy of the written Word, as if the Scriptures had been hitherto a sealed book to them. This eagerness recalled the days of the Reformation. Supplies were soon exhausted, and it is said that the proprietors of one newspaper in Chicago in the

Western States had the whole book transmitted to them by telegraph, for publication in their newspaper. Their agent in New York arranged this as soon as the copies of the Revised Edition arrived from England. Thus residents in Chicago could read the Revised New Testament in the newspaper before the bound copies could be purchased in their city. There is something repugnant to a sense of reverence to see the Scriptures in the columns of a newspaper. But this fact speaks volumes. It is far from probable that shrewd business men would embark in so costly and hazardous an enterprise, unless they believed that the enormous circulation of their journal would in part reimburse them for the outlay. It is surely gratifying to know that the Scriptures have so strong a hold upon the hearts and interest of the people.

We have been inundated with criticisms of the results of this great and important undertaking. As it seems to me, the verdict of many, whether in the way of praise or blame, has been prematurely hasty. We should consider how serious and solemn was the work, how great the responsibility attaching to this effort to improve on the beloved and venerated Authorized Version, by supplying a translation still more accurate of what was hoped to be a still more faithful reproduction of the Original, than the *Textus Receptus*.

These distinguished Scholars and Divines had devoted the prayers, thought and labour of eleven years to the carrying on of the work. Was it then respectful to them, and worthy of the subject, to pronounce a decision which must have been arrived at after a very superficial and hurried comparison of the two Versions? Yet some critics disposed of the matter in fewer hours than the Revisers employed of years in completing their task.

As a preliminary to the study of the Revised Version, everyone should peruse with careful attention the long and exhaustive Preface. It is very able, and its tone and temper are that of men who duly weighed the gravity of



the work assigned to them. We therein read that to construct a fresh Greek Text, did not in the opinion of the revisers lie within their province.\* We nevertheless possess two Greek copies representing the Version agreed to by the Committee, one published in Cambridge, and the other at Oxford. Armed with this and with the two English Versions, we can apply ourselves to the task of comparative criticism.

The Oxford edition contains the alterations in the text, and has the displaced readings at the foot of each page.

The Cambridge pursues the opposite plan, although its arrangement is more complicated. The text represents as far as possible the Authorized Version, and the changes adopted are placed at the foot of the page.

Archdeacon Palmer edited the Oxford volume, and the well-known name of Dr. Scrivener signs the Preface of the Cambridge edition.

The Greek Text as revised by those two distinguished scholars, Drs. Westcott and Hort, is by some preferred even to that adopted by the Revisers. From this opinion I beg leave to differ. Their version follows almost without deviation the text of Codices Aleph and B.

A student will at once observe that the accepted text excludes or alters several familiar passages.† On these I have entered into detail in Appendix A and B. Reserving any expression of opinion as to the relative value of the Greek Versions, I would gladly say that in the vast majority of cases in which the Textus Receptus is in agreement with the text adopted by the Revisers, the version of the latter is the more accurate of the two. This in itself is a great gain, and to an English reader,

---

\*It did not fall within our province to construct a continuous and complete Greek Text.—See Preface, p. 12.

†Matt. 1 c., 25 v.; 11 c., 19 v.; 19 c., 17 v.; Mark 3 c. 29 v.; 7 c., 19 v.; Luke 1 c. 28 v.; 9 c., 54 and 55 v.; 11 c., 2 v.; 16 c., 9 v.; 23 c., 15 v.; 24 c., 17 v.; John 5 c., 3 and 4 v.; Acts 10 c., 30 v.; 18 c., 21 v.; 26 c., 28 and 29 v.; 1 John 5 c., 7 v.; etc., etc. Also the last 12 verses in St. Mark, and the incident of the woman in adultery in John 8 c., are printed distinct from the context.—(See Appendix A.)

many obscure passages have been cleared up by the patience, combined with the admirable scholarship, of the Revising Committee. Their corrections may be said to fall under seven heads. I.—Greater precision in the translation of tenses, especially the Greek aorist and perfect. II.—The frequent insertion of the definite article, the importance of which on the score of correct rendering can in some places hardly be exaggerated, and in which respect the older translators were very lax. III.—The expunging of words, the current meaning of which is no longer the same as that which existed in the reign of James I., and substitution of a more correct equivalent. IV.—The retaining, as a rule, one English equivalent for a frequently recurring Greek word. This was the very opposite of the principle adopted by the older translators. They deliberately and almost invariably avoided uniformity in the rendering of a frequently recurring Greek word. This itself is unfortunate, because the repetition of a word is important, but it is a graver error to employ for one Greek word an English word that strictly represents another Greek word. This is of frequent occurrence. The very richness and variety of their version was enhanced and in a great measure brought about by the use of various English equivalents for one Greek term. The Revised Edition in this respect has gained (and a most valuable gain it is) in point and accuracy where it may have lost in variety of diction. V.—The Revisers have bestowed great care upon the translation of the Hellenistic genitive, itself a Hebraism, and which has generally been paraphrased and weakened in the Authorized Version, through the employment in its stead of an adjective. VI.—Every reader will notice that the Greek prepositions have received most careful attention at the hands of the Revisers, and that the gain in the way of clearness and depth of significance has been enormous. VII.—Very great pains have been taken to give as nearly as possible (due allowance being made for differ-

ence of idiom) the exact English meaning of every word. When we are dealing with a book which claims Divine authority, I need not insist on the maintenance of such a principle.

I propose now to give one or two illustrations of each of these features. The difficulty lies in the selection, for there is an *embarras de richesse* in every case. As regards No. I, in Luke 24 c., 37 v., instead of "supposed that they had seen a spirit," the Revisers have "supposed that they beheld a spirit," for the Saviour stood before them. Rev. 2 c., 4 v., "didst leave" for "hast left." Rev. 2 c., 13 v., "didst not deny" for "hast not denied." Rev. 3 c., 4 v., "did not defile" for "have not defiled." John 17 c., 3 v., "thou didst send" instead of "thou hast sent;" and 17 c., 12 v., "which thou hast given me" instead of "thou gavest me." To any thoughtful reader, especially to a scholar, these changes are an improvement.

II.—With reference to this head, I quote two instances out of many,—2 Thess. 2 c., 3 v., where "the falling away" or final apostasy is much more forcible than "a falling away;" and 1 Tim. 2 c., 15 v., where "the childbearing" *i. e.* the Incarnation, gives wonderful and suggestive teaching.

III.—On this head I give two instances,—Matt. 6 c., 25 v., and elsewhere, "be anxious for" instead of "take thought for," and "trade with" for "occupy," Luke 19 c., 13 v.

IV.—The rendering *εὐθεὶας* almost, if not quite uniformly by "straightway," (*a*) *λαλῆ εἶναι* by "speak," *ἀρχιτερτίκλιτος*, by "ruler of feast" in both cases, *πάρουκος* by "sojourner," *δίκαιος* generally by "righteous" instead of "just," *διαθήκη* generally by "covenant."

V.—Titus 2 c., 13 v., the "appearing of glory of our Great God" for "glorious appearing." Phil. 3 c., 21 v., "body of our humiliation" for "vile body." 2 Peter,

---

(a) It is translated "immediately" in Luke 21 c., 9 v., and to this no one would object.

2 c., 15 v., "children of cursing" for "cursed children."

VI.—1 Tim. 2 c., 15 v., "through the childbearing" instead of "in childbearing." Matt. 23 c., 24 v., "strain out the gnat" for "at a gnat." "Baptize into" for "baptize in."

VII.—Luke 2 c., 3 v., "enrolment" for "taxing." John 5 c., 35 v., "lamp" for "light." "One flock" for "one fold," John 10 c., end of 16 v.

The question must naturally suggest itself.—Will the Revised Edition ultimately supplant the Authorized Version? Will this be the edition read in Churches and in homes at times of family prayer, private meditation, and ministrations to the sick and the sorrowing? I can scarcely think so. We must however remember that the Bible Society intend to circulate the Revised Edition, and that it is reported that the Methodist Body have approved it. I have heard also that the Unitarian congregation in Montreal have introduced it. No one, of course, anticipates an immediate universal change. The Old Version could not be so quickly and easily displaced. Nevertheless, the English reader will derive immense help from the use of the New Edition. It will serve as a commentary, a book of reference, an interpreter in cases of difficulty, and very many will thankfully so use it, resting assured that it is in the main a more critically accurate translation than the Authorized Version. But I conceive that we have not yet done with the work of Revision. Our next stage will be the reception of the New Version of the Old Testament. When the whole Bible revised is in our hands, it will be for Christians throughout the world to agree as to whether for public, devotional, and general use, the new is preferable to the old. The practical consensus of Protestant Christendom is needed before such a decision could be arrived at. I cannot but think that some further revision will be found necessary, either in the direction of increased fidelity to the original, or possibly in a return in some cases to the

older version. Whatever defects the old translators suffered from, either from partial lack of critical knowledge, or from paucity of MSS., they possessed one great merit, and one which is universally acknowledged, *i. e.* they were absolute masters of the English tongue. Their translation has all the swing and freedom of an original, and the rhythm of their sentences is generally most melodious and poetical. What can be more perfect than the account in St. Luke of the appearance of the Angels to the Shepherds, or again, the Sermon on the Mount, or the Parables, especially those of the Good Samaritan, and the Prodigal Son, or the discourses in St. John, beginning with the 14th Chapter, or the interview (related by St. John) of the Saviour with Mary Magdalene after the Resurrection? There is nothing in the English language more grand and stately than the opening of the Epistle to the Hebrews, or more exquisitely beautiful than Hebrews, 11th chap., and 1 Thess. 4th chap., 13th to 18th verses; and Revelation, 18th chap., which describes the lamentations over Babylon. But citations would be endless. The Revised Version is certainly inferior in smoothness and musical cadence. It is in fact in some places rough and almost clumsy. At times too the changes are needless. The meaning is untouched, and the translation, though following more exactly the Greek order, has a harsh sound. Thus in Matt. 26th c., 22 and 25 v., "Lord, is it I?" and "Master, is it I?" are altered to the less felicitous, "Is it I, Lord?" and "Is it I, Rabbi?" Nothing is gained by the change. The meaning is identical, while the ear is a little offended by the alteration in a very familiar and touching passage. Again in Matt. 22 c., 9 v., the translation "partings of the highways" is uncouth, and would convey little meaning to many. The word *διεξόδους* might be left out or rendered more intelligibly "outlets."

Again, although the word "*ἀφθάρσια*" may be strictly translated "uncorruptness," yet the passage Ephes. 6 c., 34 v.

“ Grace be with all men that love our Lord Jesus Christ in uncorruptness ” sounds very rugged, and would not be very intelligible to the ordinary reader. The old translation is far smoother, more easy to understand, and would be quite near enough to the original for all practical purposes. This runs “ that love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity.”

I regret that the revisers have retained the translation “ stood ” in the account of St. Paul’s conversion, in Acts 9 c., 7 v. ; 22 c., 9 v. ; 26 c., 14 v. ; *ἵσταμαι* means to remain motionless or fixed in any position, whether erect or recumbent.

It is said of Saul, in the Septuagint Version of 1 Sam. 28 c., 20 v., *ἔπεσεν ἑστηκῶς ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν* i.e. “ He fell and remained prone upon the earth.” Again, the word *ἀκούω* when followed by the accusative means to hear thoroughly, when followed by the genitive, it signifies to hear in part, to hear the sound of a human voice, but not to distinguish the words spoken.

St. Luke displays his usual minute accuracy by saying, Acts 9 c., 4 v., that St. Paul heard the Divine Voice and therefore the words that were uttered, while his followers did not hear the words (Acts 22 c., 9 v.) In these instances the accusative case is employed. On the other hand in Acts 9 c., 7 v. the attendants are said to have heard the voice (genitive case) i.e. they heard a sound, but distinguished no words. This delicate and important distinction is thus lost, both in the Authorized and Revised Versions, and to the unlearned reader St. Luke seems to contradict himself, because in one place he is made to say, that the company at Damascus were all fallen to the earth, and in another that they all stood, and again in one place that they did not, and in another that they did, hear the Lord’s voice.

Again, in St. John 7 c., 8 v., we read that our Lord said, “ I go not up to this feast,” nevertheless he afterwards went, but secretly. I believe that the preponderance of

authority is in favour of *οὐκ* "not," rather than of *οὐπω* "not yet," and hence our Saviour appears to say one thing and do another. The very idea is painful to every reverent mind, however fully we may be assured that there is an explanation for such apparent inconsistency. But the difficulty disappears when we recollect that the verb *ἀντιβαίω* generally means "to make a journey in a public procession." The Jews expected our Lord to do this, and purposed to kill Him, if they detected Him as a member of any of the caravans going up to the Paschal Feast. He therefore refused to do this in company with His followers, who were nearly as well known as Himself, and whose presence would have aided his detection and capture. He did not court danger, but later, secretly, perhaps in disguise, He went up to the Holy City. It would have been better in this case to have transposed the words in the text and the margin, in accordance with the advice of the American Committee. Again, *πιστεύω*, "I believe," seems very often to have had a technical meaning in the New Testament, after the Gospels, and to mean to "profess publicly belief in the Lord." This specially is true of the aorist. Thus *πιστεύσας* would appear to mean one who has made a public declaration of faith in Christ. The concomitant act of Baptism would be indicated by the preposition *εἰς*, into, which our Lord Himself used when he gave the commission to the Apostles. "To believe in God" would probably be expressed by the verb followed by *εἰπί*, that is to rest on God as the foundation of one's faith. The revisers have failed to mark this important distinction, and this is a loss to the English reader.

Simon Magus did not believe in Christ. (Acts 8 c., 9 v.) He, we may presume, had no saving belief, but was struck by the Apostles' miracles, and hence made a public statement of faith. On this profession he was baptized, though he seems to have been entirely devoid of real inward faith. Much valuable truth is rendered ambiguous, and the prac-

tice of the early Christians obscured by this lack of precision in some instances. *cf.*, Acts *passim*, Rom. 13 c., 11 v. ; Ephes. 1 c., 13 v.

Again, in St. John (1 Ep. 3 c., 9 v.) where the Authorized Version runs : "whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin," the Revised Edition has "whosoever is begotten of God," etc. This change is a very slight improvement, and does not remove the great difficulty inherent in the passage as translated. The word is *γεγεννημένος* not *γεννηθείς*. It must mean "whosoever having received the spiritual birth, the Seed of the Holy Spirit implanted in him and retaining it, he does not commit sin, because he has not forfeited grace." Again, *πνεῦμα* Spirit, with the article, means of course the third person of the Trinity. The noun without the article appears to mean the gift of the Spirit in man. Thus *πνεῦμα ἁγίων* in Acts 10 c., 1, 2, 3 vv., probably signifies "holy inspiration." The disciples were asked whether they had received this gift when they professed their belief. Their reply was that they did not as much as hear that there was any holy inspiration (to be had). They could not be ignorant of the Holy Spirit. Hence the query "unto what then were you baptized," and the answer "unto John's baptism," which, as we know from the Bible itself, conveyed no spiritual gift. This distinction throws light on the obscure statement in St. John, 7 c., 39 v. In both English versions we read "the Holy Ghost was not yet *given*, because Jesus was not yet glorified. It should be noticed that there is no article with the word *πνεῦμα*. The Holy Spirit of course existed, but His special gift was not yet granted, not being vouchsafed till the day of Pentecost and subsequent to the Lord's ascent in glory.

Perhaps the two corrections which are most signally valuable, and for which English-speaking Christians should be most grateful for, are as follows : first, the substitution of Hades for Hell, in several places, especially in Luke 16 c., 23 v. ; Acts 2 c., 31 v., and Rev. 20 c., 13 14 vv. It would occupy a very long space to demonstrate fully the



mischievous error into which the popular signification of the word Hell, originally a very fairly correct rendering of Hades, has imported into the ideas of ordinary Christians. Hades in the New Testament is the state of the departed, unseen by us, as the term Hades signifies—Geenna is the Greek word for the place of torment—Hell in the modern sense. The second most conspicuous improvement is “living creature” for “beast” in Rev. 4 c., and in other places. All confusion between these counterparts of the Cherubim in Ezekiel, symbols perchance of the four Evangelists, and the two mysterious and awful Beasts in the latter part of the Apocalypse is thus for ever done away.

Upon the changes in the Lord's Prayer in St. Matthew there may be conflicting opinions. “Deliver us from the evil one” is doubtless the more correct translation. Satan is the source of all evil in this world; nevertheless, in a secondary sense, we apply the word to all which to our earthly eyes brings on men misfortune and sorrow. Against this, too, we have a right to pray, but must leave the issue to God. I very much doubt whether the change will ever supplant the earlier form in our Prayer Book and books of private devotion. The Doxology, though very ancient, was most probably added after Apostolic days. It was therefore right to exclude it, but that exclusion need not preclude its use in public service and private or family prayer. I think the alteration “bring us not into temptation” is entirely uncalled for. It is scarcely, if at all, nearer the original word *εἰσενέγκης* than “lead;” the change, unless imperatively required, seems like a rude profanation of a most sacred time-hallowed formula endeared by devotional associations that extend almost from the cradle to the tomb. St. Luke's version is painfully mutilated in the text. The words of institution are somewhat altered, especially in St. Paul's version (I Cor. 11 c. 24 v.) Any change, even any modifications in phraseology so infinitely solemn, is almost repulsive. But the adoption of the Revised edition

would not necessitate any change however small in the office of the Holy Communion.

There are few easier tasks than to find defects in any human performance, especially that which has employed many hands and minds. If I call attention to any deficiencies or blemishes, it is in a spirit the very antipodes of fault-finding. My remarks are only the result of personal investigation, and are penned under a sense of personal humbleness and deep respect for those whose work I am examining. The Revisers may be on the whole acquitted of the charge of having ridden a hobby to the death in any case, and this very fact may bring on them at the hands of some critics the charge of inconsistency. But while I laud highly their precise translation, where admissible, of the perfect, aorist and imperfect, I think they should have held their hands in the following instance: "Freely ye received, freely give." (Matt. 10 c., 8 v.) The aorist here has practically the force of the perfect. God's gifts are not all given once for all. Not only does their effect abide with us, but some are being constantly showered upon us. This very fact is meant to inspire gratitude to the giver, and a desire to emulate His bounty by assisting others. The imperative "give" is also in the present tense, not the aorist, and hence the charity of men should be a principle always at work, and not an isolated act. This consideration furnishes an additional reason for adhering to the rendering in the Authorised Version. It was also surely unnecessary to insert (Acts 4 c., 27 v.) "peoples of Israel" just because the Greek word was in the plural. The idea meant to be conveyed was the composite character of the Ancient race. Again, I fail to see the reason for the retention of the obsolete expression "went about," in Acts 19 c., 29 v., when it is rightly replaced by "seeking," as in Acts 21 c., 31 v., and 26 c., 21 v. The Greek verbs are different, but "went about" is inapplicable to both. The first should be "took in hand" or "undertook," or "attempted." It must surely be by inadvertence that "we" should be translated

“a man” in John 3 c., 4 and 5 vv. This blemish in the Old Version, a blemish which many of us regret, inasmuch as it has for ages been used as an argument against Infant Baptism, is retained in the Revised Edition. “Any one,” an expression of general application, should be substituted.

John 23 c., 24 v., “leaning back, as he was,” is far inferior to “lying on.”

Acts 15 c., 23 v., “the elder brethren” is on more grounds than one objectionable.

Gal. 4 c., 15 v., “gratulation” is a word foreign to Scripture usage.

Ephes. 5 c., 30 v.—The curtailment of this verse is to be deprecated.

2 Tim., 3 c., 16 v.—“Every Scripture inspired of God,” etc., is open to grave objection, and in no way defensible, as far as I can see, on critical grounds.

It is questionable whether the technical word *σπειρα* as in John 18 c. 3 v., and Acts 10 c. 1 v. should have been translated “band” as in the Authorized Version. But “cohort” is in the margin, and that word reveals the treacherous plans of Judas and the Priests, and their influence, most likely through Pilate, on the Roman Garrison. The swords must have been borne by the Roman soldiers, the staves or clubs by the multitude. The *ὄπλα* “weapons” denote the armour of the disciplined soldier, and the lanterns and torches were carried by troops when engaged on a night expedition. It is well to observe that St. Matthew, describing the betrayal, says of Judas 27 c., 49 v. *κατεφίλησεν αὐτόν, ἰ. ε.*, “he kissed him tenderly,” an awful aggravation of the crime. The Revised Edition has “kissed him much.” Again, in the latter chapter, Acts 10 c., 33 v., the majority of the English readers are probably unaware that the words “thou hast well done” are equivalent to “thou art welcome.” This might have been printed as a marginal note. Also, it is unfortunate that “beckon with the hand” is used in Acts 12 c.,

17 v., and 21 c., 40 v. It conveys a wrong impression. The Greek word means a downward movement to produce silence, a different gesture from our meaning of the word "beckon."

Once more, the mysterious words of our Lord on the Cross: "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" seem inadequately translated by the English rendering.

Beautiful and instructive are the lessons which have been drawn from this most unfathomable of our Lord's last words. But our business is to know what exactly, at such a moment, the Redeemer of men said. To begin with, *iva τι* means, "unto what purpose or object didst thou," etc. Then the tense of the verb is the aorist. The expression would seem to be "To what end didst Thou leave me here behind among—(sinners—enemies.)—The words were a fulfilment of prophecy, an exact quotation from the Septuagint, and while they ask a question, are, as it were, a laying before the Father the object of the scheme for man's redemption. No desertion is necessarily implied, but rather the permitting a loved Son to be left among persecutors, without Divine interposition. Again, in St. Matt. 26 c., 51 v., we find in both English versions that Peter "stretched out his hand, and drew his sword, and struck a servant," etc. The original runs thus: "Εκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα ἀπέσπασε τὴν μάχαιραν κ.τ.λ.

Now, to stretch out the hand is not the action used for drawing a sword. Indeed the very opposite gesture would be employed. Also, the verb would scarcely signify "drew the sword out of the scabbard," but rather "snatched it away from some one." It is quite conceivable that when the detachment of the soldiers apprehended the Saviour, they at the same time disarmed His followers. Again, St. John, in his narrative of the Passion, supplies us with some deeply interesting incidents not related by the others. From him we learn that Christ was with the eleven in a walled or enclosed grove, for this is the mean-

ing of *χωρίον*, in which was the garden, *κήπος*. From this He emerged as the multitude drew near. To His calm and dignified question, "whom seek ye?" they replied "Jesus the Nazarene," the last word instinct with contempt. When he said "I am he," they went backwards and fell to the ground. Why this prostration and awe? No one, as far as I know, has ever explained this most striking and involuntary homage, except the Rev. Dr. Sewell, in his very suggestive book "The Microscope of the New Testament." To that book I am very much indebted for valuable assistance, and for endorsation of many opinions of my own, formed previous to its publication. Our Saviour on this occasion said *Εγώ εἰμι*, which can mean "I am," in other words, the solemn and dread assertion of Deity. This would explain their falling to the ground, moved by fear and perhaps by horror. We all know the sentiments, which at other times excited the minds of Jewish hearers, *cf.*, Exodus 3 c., 3 v.; Mark 14 c., 62 v.; John 1 c., 18 v.; 3 c., 13 v.; 4 c., 26 v.; 8 c., 30, 58, 59 vv. Perhaps the Saviour used the words with special emphasis to deter them at the last moment from their impious design. When nothing befel them, and after a repetition of question and answer, Christ used the words in their more ordinary signification, the panic seems to have passed away, and he was captured by his enemies. I am at a loss to understand the reasons for the retention of the word "rehearse." The signification of the term has changed as far as general use is concerned, and yet the Revisers have employed it for two different words. The word "appoint" is also made to do duty for more than one word, and is used in Acts 14 c., 2 3 vv., when "ordained" as in A. V. *i. e.*, in the ecclesiastical sense, would have been more correct.

The Revisers generally retain the older form "entreat," as in I Thess. 2 c., 2 v., "shamefully entreated," and use "intreat" in the sense of "beseech," etc. I cannot but think that it would have been better to substitute "treat" for the former of the two significations. It is so

used in one place, (Acts 27 c., 3 v.) and might have been advantageously used in all.

The marginal notes in the Revised Edition are of great service. They serve to explain two difficult passages (St. John 16 c., 23 and 26 vv.) on the proper rendering of which hangs at least one important truth. The scholar will find the two different words *ἰτρέω* and *ἐρωτάω* (both of which have been unwisely translated in both versions by the one word "ask,") well explained in Trench, "Greek Synonyms," pp. 164, 168. Also, it would have been desirable if a note had been inserted explaining in Acts 28 c., 28 v., and I. Tim. 5 c., 3 v., and 17 v., that the word "honour" means something more substantial than mere esteem, but rather the token of such a sentiment in the shape of a stipend or provision. The expression "for to do a thing" is now a provincialism; it is only as a rule to be met with among persons of deficient education, and would be corrected as indifferent Grammar in any English School. It has an awkward sound, and I rather lament therefore that the Revisers have retained it at all, especially as in two cases, (Luke 4 c., 16 v., Acts 4 c., 28 v.) they have struck it out. Our Bibles should be models in everything. The archaism, "which" not always used in the Revised Version, is not open to the same objection, for it is rarely heard, and its occurrence in the Lord's Prayer interposes an objection to its removal from the text. But we should not forget that a living language must change with time, and the utmost legitimate veneration for a time-honoured translation ought not to compel the retention of words not current among educated people, and which in addition would be noticed as mistakes in any other work.

It would have been well if the Revisers had pointed out that in Heb. 9 c., 3 4 v., the term "wherein," the relative pronoun, probably refers to the remoter antecedent "Tabernacle" and not "Ark." This is a feature of Hebrew and of Hellenistic Greek.

The same idiom is noticeable in Acts 11 c., 17 v., where

the words "who believed" relate to the former antecedent *them*, as indeed the Greek text proves to any scholar.

Similarly in 1 Pet., 2c., 13 14 vv. the word "him" in the 14 v. refers back in all probability to "Lord" and not to King, therein agreeing with the teaching of Rom. 13 c., 1 v. We might also have wished that the words (John 1 c., 18 v.) "No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared Him"—words so pregnant with important truth, should have been unfolded in a marginal note. The *ὁ ὢν* connected with the "I am" signifies surely "existing from eternity by Divine Power," and "which is" seems a very inadequate rendering. Again, in 2 Tim. 1 c., 10 v. the Authorized Version is followed, as far as the verb goes, by the revisers, and St. Paul is made to say that Christ "brought life and immortality to life through the Gospel," as if there had been no revelation of a future to the saints of old. But the verb means "made more plain," "threw a brighter light upon" the future life. This is exactly what Christianity did, but the old fathers did not look merely for transitory promises. (See John 1 c., 19 v., I. Cor. 4 c., 5 v.) for the same verb, and the 7th Art. Ch. of England.

St. Matt. 20 c., 23 v. The Revised is here an improvement upon the Authorized Version, but it is not quite correct. It should run "is not mine to give but to those for whom it has been prepared," etc.

It should be noticed that in the account of the burial and resurrection of our Lord, the Revisers have translated *μνημεῖον* (in St. Luke *μνήμα*) by tomb, and *τάφος* by sepulchre, where the old translators were not equally particular. The latter would perhaps mean the absolute fabric with its doors, the former the whole excavation, including the enclosure. Both *μνημεῖον* and *μνήμα* originally signify a memorial, or place of a memorial. The Jews when (John 11 c., 31 v.) they said that Mary was going into the *μνημεῖον* of

Lazarus, to weep there, did not mean that she was going into the tomb, but to the enclosure outside it.

One of the most important words in the New Testament is *τελέω*, to bring to a successful conclusion. The nearest English equivalent is most likely "accomplish." It is a matter of regret that in perhaps the most important instance in which the word occurs, viz., when our Lord on the Cross said *τετέλεσται*, the Revisers should have retained the word "finish," which is capable of being misunderstood. Again, I regret that since a revision was inevitable, the Revisers should have made no change in Acts 13 c., 48 v. There, as in the Authorized Version, we find that "as many as were ordained to eternal life believed." Perhaps this rendering was influenced by the Vulgate, as was the case in the cognate text, Acts 2 c., 42 v. The English Authorized Version in both passages seems to favour Calvinism, but is faulty in both cases. The Revisers have corrected the earlier error but retain the later. This last means "They who ranged themselves on the side of eternal life professed their faith."

The Vulgate should receive the honour paid to antiquity. It is the most ancient Latin Version. It existed before St. Jerome's time, and the old Testament was translated from the Septuagint by an unknown author. Jerome made a new version from the Hebrew, and the old version with Jerome's emendations is now accepted by the Church of Rome. The Vulgate of the New Testament is of high authority, and both combined have Papal authority. It is still remarkable that, in the case of two important texts, our translators should have been in the case of every version, influenced, to all appearance, by a Latin Bible, the authority of which they did not recognize, and have been drawn away from the meaning of the original Greek. The revisers, as we have seen, have made one correction, but have left the other unchanged.

As the foregoing remarks have partaken of an adversely critical character, it may be asked on what I base my



opinion that the New Version is superior to the Old. I would reply that I have, at the conclusion of this pamphlet, inserted some, at all events, of the instances in which that superiority is manifested. It would have been impossible to quote anything like the whole, and it will be found that the excellencies of the revised edition far outnumber its defects. If I may be allowed to express an opinion, I think this superiority is most manifest in the Acts of the Apostles, and particularly in the 27th chapter of that most precious book, which narrates St. Paul's voyage. The Epistle to the Philippians is also admirably done, while portions of St. John's Epistles are rather clumsily translated. The Gospels as a whole, as revised, are worthy of great praise. The greatest amount of changes is to be found in the Epistles, and while the vast majority of these are gains in the way of accuracy, that gain is sometimes purchased at the cost of smoothness. This is especially noticeable in the opening of the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Epistles of St. Peter. Again, the paragraph form will be a great help towards the due understanding of the way in which the several parts of a book hang together. The coherence of St. Paul's arguments, and the unity amidst intricacies of his Epistles, can never be realised, if his writings are read according to the chapter and verse plan. Moreover, the insertion of the Hebrew instead of the Greek form of Old Testament names is an improvement, especially because it reminds the reader of the connection of the two dispensations, and that the one leads to the other. Also the printing the quotations from the Old Testament in a detached and rhythmical form is very wise. The attention of a reader is thereby at once arrested, and he gains some little insight into the structure of Hebrew poetry.

It has been claimed by some Jews and Unitarians that the Revised Version weakens the cause of so-called orthodox Christianity. Their assertions are based on the idea that Codex Aleph and B possess such

overwhelming authority that all versions must conform to one or both of them. I have endeavoured though briefly, to show how unwarrantable is this presumption, and that although these ancient MSS. possess much value, they are not without serious defects. Christians need not be disheartened at the exclusion of the Three Heavenly Witnesses in 1 John 5 c., 7 v. They are not found in Codices A. B. G. K. nor in the Cursive MSS., nor in the best editions of the Ancient Versions, nor in the Greek and Latin Fathers of the first four centuries. The evidence against them is well nigh overwhelming, but the Ante-Nicene Fathers confuted Arianism without the help of this passage, and the doctrine of the Trinity is abundantly proved by other parts of Scripture, especially by the Baptismal Commission (Matt. 28 c., 19 v.)

Also, admitting, simply for the sake of argument, the alleged uncertainty as to the last 12 verses of St. Mark, the truth of the Resurrection is clearly established by the Gospels and New Testament generally. But these verses were received by the Ancient Roman Church, for which the Gospel was written, and the great mass of MSS. contain them.

To lose the narrative of Christ's interview with the woman taken in adultery would be a loss, but though in all probability it was not written by St. John, and did not form part of his Gospel, it is probably a true and beautiful incident, which has come down to us from the primitive Christians. It ought not to be considered, in the strict sense, a part of Canonical Scripture.

I have before me an extract from the "Jewish World," which dwells on the injury which the Revised Edition is likely to inflict on ordinary Christian people. The motive of the writer is probably plain, viz: to undermine the faith. But however strong our belief may be in the infallibility of the original Scriptures, is that to prevent our revising a translation? I never read a more flagrant instance of the logical fallacy entitled "petitio principii."

No human work however can claim perfection, and the revisers are far from asserting such a claim for the result of their labours. It is not impossible, as I have stated above, that before long another revision may be set on foot. If I am correct, it may be that this new movement may be retrogressive in character. In some few instances, at all events, the Revised is inferior to the Authorized Version, and it may be truly said of such that the old is better. As an instance that further revision may be needed I venture to draw attention to the following defects. The word *φρόνιμος* is, translated "wise" as if it were synonymous with *σοφός*. It should be "prudent." The idea of wisdom is connected with goodness in Scripture. Wisdom is an attribute of God, but prudence may be conjoined with moral evil. The Apostles were told to be *φρόνιμοι* "prudent," not "wise as serpents," (Matt. 10 c., 16 v.) Again, the five Virgins were "prudent," but the Revisers use the word "wise." In this instance prudence was very akin to wisdom. But in the parable of the unrighteous Steward he is said to have acted "wisely," whereas it should be "prudently," *φρονίμως*. Then *ἅπτομαι* is translated "touch" except in Col. 2 c., 21 v., where it is rightly rendered "handle," and thereby the order in the earlier version is exactly reversed. Trench pointed this out long ago in his Synonyms, and it would have been desirable to use "grasp" or "cling to" or "take hold of" in every instance where *ἅπτομαι* occurs. This would lend increased vividness to John 20 c., 17 v. Also it is a pity that "repent" is retained, as a translation of *μεταμελήθεις* in Matt. 27c., 3 v. Judas did not repent. He felt remorse and sorrow, but not repentance. True repentance would have brought him to God, and for that needful quality the Greek word is always *μετάνοια* i.e. change of mind. In Matt. 9 c., 36 v., instead of "scattered," we should insert "prostrate" or "lying down." In Matt. 14 c., 8 v., it is said of the daughter of Herodias being "put forward by her mother." This is not strong enough. It should

be "urged forward." In Luke 14 c., 7 v., the proper rendering of the imperfect "were choosing" is far more forcible than "chose." In Acts 10 c., 12 v., the Greek means "all the four-footed beasts of the earth," and we have no right to weaken or change the words. In Acts 17 c., 23 v., the Revised "in ignorance" is better, because more courteous than "ignorantly," but "unknowingly" would be better still, and would preserve the important and most happy connexion with the previous word "unknown." This prevalent feature in the structure of the New Testament has generally been recognized by the revisers. Gal. 1 c., 18 v., the Revised "visit" is superior to the "see" of the A. V., but it fails to attain the meaning of the original. I should prefer "enquire of." Everyone will miss the beautiful verse Acts 8 c., 37 v., but I fear that it is rightly omitted, though the evidence is very conflicting. I cannot say the same of the words "without a cause," Matt. 5 c., 22 v. These words should have been retained. Also, though the remark may seem heretical, I think it possible that the Textus Receptus may in some respects compare favourably with the text adopted, I believe, on a vote by the Revisers. With all possible respect for so illustrious a body of men, it is well known that some were strongly biassed in favour of the Codices Aleph and B. These are the two most ancient MSS. known to scholars. They belong to the 4th Century. But they do not by any means agree. Dean Burgon asserts, in his pamphlet on the last twelve verses of St. Mark, that it would be easier to find two consecutive verses in which they differ than two consecutive verses in which they agree. Dr. Scrivener tells us, that Codex B. leaves out words or whole clauses no less than 2556 times. Tischendorf, on the authority of Codex Aleph, expunges these most important words "The Son of God," in Mark 1 c. 1 v. Also, there are versions, in other tongues, still more ancient than these two renowned MSS., and thus, if antiquity be the sole

ground of authority, these must yield the palm. Then again, in the Commentaries of the early Fathers there are to be found lengthy citations from versions earlier in date than either the Sinaitic or the Vatican MSS. But as a matter of fact, since the original MSS. of the New Testament are lost to us, and the earlier copies have shared the same fate, antiquity is not by any means the only criterion. Moreover, although the Textus Receptus may be based on manuscripts of later date than the tenth century, yet, as Tischendorf admits, a text almost identical had been in use in the Byzantine Church at a much earlier period. Also, since the original MSS. of the Holy Gospels are lost to us, and the very early copies have perished, we must believe, with Bentley, that the real text does not lie in any MSS. or edition, but is dispersed in them all. Hence the full work of collation is as yet incomplete. The Authorized Version was itself a revision of former versions, and its very existence concedes the principle. Its long hold on the hearts of men is due to its almost incomparable beauty, while every generation that passes away has, by the power of association, strengthened its influence. The practical religious life of English speaking Christians all over the world is mainly due to the Authorized Version. To a great mass of people it is itself the inspired Word of God. And, in so far as it is an adequate and faithful rendering of the original, this idea is correct, since inspiration lingers in the case of any language in that translation, which is a true representation of God's original message. While therefore this knowledge should teach the utmost caution to any and all revisers, it should fill our hearts with a longing desire to possess as nearly as possible the exact original, and should dispose us to accept cheerfully any changes in phraseology, however dear and familiar, which more truthfully represent the words of inspiration. St. Augustine lays down as a rule that the versions preserved in the most careful churches should possess the greatest authority, and it is an

admitted canon of criticism that no reading is to be accepted which violates the context and the sense. This canon would dispose of the passage (Matt. 19 c., 7 v.) as altered by the Revisers, (in accordance with Codex Aleph. and B.) "Why askest thou me concerning that which is good?" This is not only uncouth, but places the Evangelist in direct opposition with Mark (10 c., 18 v.) where we have "why callest thou me good?" This very divergence is strongly condemnatory of the reading.

It is possible that material enough exists for the compilation of as perfect a Greek text as can ever be attained. But the task will be a lengthy one. It will require the most delicate care, the most judicial caution, the most indomitable industry, the greatest skill in balancing evidence, the most entire freedom of bias, combined with the most accurate scholarship. I might mention still higher and more spiritual qualities which should find their place in those who apply themselves to the high and holy task of deciding, as far as human intelligence can ascertain, what was the original of God's revealed Word.\* Committees are very useful institutions, but given the one man possessing the qualifications I have alluded to, and I should in preference give my adhesion to the result of his labours rather than to those of a Committee. As at present advised, I am not inclined to receive the readings of the Revisers, as necessarily all that can be desired in every particular, where they are at variance with the Textus Receptus. If therefore a perfect version of the original has yet to be prepared, perfect, that is as far as human toil, skill and patience can accomplish, it is obvious that at present Revision must be regarded if not as tentative, certainly as provisional. The preparation of such a text cannot be a *πάρεργον*, a work carried on at intervals amid engrossing pastoral, Diocesan or professional labours. It

---

\* See Bp. Ellicott's preface to his Commentary on the Ep. to the Galatians p. 16, "what the world calls *Theological* Sense, but which devout thinkers recognize as the assisting grace of God."

must be the sacred work of a life, an offering of love and devotion to the Holy Spirit, who spake by the Prophets, a sacrifice of every faculty, spiritual, mental, physical, to the examination of the Sacred text. Any one who undertakes it must labour as the Scribes of old, thankful to consecrate his whole life and energy to such a task, and to carry it on till it be accomplished, or till he be called hence. Till such a man, or men, are raised up, or at all events till the great work is consummated, let us accept with gratitude the Revised Version as a most valuable contribution to our knowledge of Scripture, and pray that God's blessing may rest on those who, in the midst of arduous duties, have found time to aid others to arrive at the whole truth, and the words of eternal life.

## APPENDIX A.

## SAMPLES OF IMPORTANT CHANGES OR OMISSIONS IN REVISERS' TEXT.

- Matt. 1 c. 25 v. "a son," instead of "first-born son."  
 Omission of Doxology in Matt. 6 c. 13 v.
- Matt. 11 c. 19 v. "her works," instead of "her children."  
 " 14 c. 30 v. "boisterous," omitted.  
 " 17 c. 20 v. "little faith," instead of "unbelief."  
 " 17 c. 21 v. Omitted entirely.  
 " 19 c. 17 v. "why askest thou me concerning that which is good?" for  
 "why callest thou me good?"
- Mark 7 c. 4 v. "tables," omitted.  
 " 7 c. 19 v. "this he said making all meats clean," for "purging all  
 meats."  
 " 9 c. 23 v. "believe," omitted.  
 " 9 c. 29 v. "fasting," omitted.
- Luke 1 c. 28 v. "blessed art thou among women," omitted.  
 " 6 c. 1 v. "a Sabbath," instead of "second-first."  
 " 9 c. 10 v. "into a desert place belonging to," omitted.  
 " 9 c. 35 v. "my chosen," for "my beloved."  
 " 9 c. 54 v. "even as Elias did," omitted.  
 " 9 c. 55 v. "ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of," omitted.  
 " 16 c. 9 v. "when it shall fail," for "when ye fail."  
 " 22 c. 68 v. "nor let me go," omitted.  
 " 23 c. 15 v. "he sent him back unto us," for "I sent you to him."  
 " 24 c. 17 v. "they stood still, looking sad," for "as ye walk and are  
 sad."
- John 5 c. 3 and 4 vv. Mention of the angel and moving of the water, omitted.  
 " 9 c. 4 v. "we," for "I must work," etc.
- Acts 18 c. 21 v. "I must by all means keep this feast that cometh in Jeru-  
 salem," omitted.
- 1 Cor. 6 c. 20 v. "and in your spirit, which are God's," omitted.  
 Gal. 3 c. 1 v. "that ye should not obey the truth," omitted.  
 1 Tim. 6 c. 5 v. "from such withhold thyself," omitted.  
 Rev. 22 c. 14 v. "wash their robes," for "do his commandments."
- Wordsworth prefers the latter, which is the reading of most MSS.



## APPENDIX B.

## SELECTIONS FROM THE REVISED EDITION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT, WHICH ARE SAMPLES OF IMPROVEMENT IN THE WAY OF INCREASED ACCURACY.

	R. V.	A. V.
<b>Matt.</b> 2 c. 16 v. and elsewhere.	Borders.	Coasts.
" 3 c. 7 v. and elsewhere.	Offspring.	Generation.
" 5 c. 21 v.	To them of old time.	By them, etc.
" 5 c. 29 v. and elsewhere.	To stumble.	(a) Offend.
" 6 c. 19 v.	Consume.	Corrupt.
" 6 c. 25 v. and elsewhere.	Be not anxious.	(b) Take no thought.
" 9 c. 9 v. and elsewhere.	Place of toll.	Receipt of custom.
" 12 c. 23 v.	Is this the son.	Is not this.
" 12 c. 29 v. and elsewhere.	The strong man.	A strong man.
" 13 c. 3 v. and elsewhere.	The sower.	A sower.
" 14 c. 26 v. and elsewhere.	Apparition.	Spirit.
" 17 c. 25 v.	Spake first.	Prevented.
" 21 c. 13 v. and elsewhere, notably 26 c. 53 v. and 27 c. 38 v.	Robbers.	Thieves.
" 21 c. 19 v.	Immediately.	(c) Presently.
" 21 c. 41 v.	Miserable.	Wicked.
" 22 c. 2 v. and elsewhere.	Marriage feast.	Marriage.
" 23 c. 24 v.	Strain out.	Strain at.
" 26 c. 50 v.	(d) Friend, do that for which thou art come.	Wherefore art thou come.
" 28 c. 4 v.	Watchers.	Keepers.
<b>Mark</b> 1 c. 4 v. and elsewhere.	Unto remission of sins.	For the remission, etc.
" 1 c. 10 v.	Rent asunder.	Opened.
" 1 c. 11 v. and elsewhere.	Out of the heavens.	From heaven.

(a) It should be observed that the word "offend" in the A. V. is used as the translation for *three* distinct Greek words, viz., to sin, to stumble, and to cause to stumble, as in Acts 25 c. 8 v., James 2 c. 10 v. and above.

(b) "Thought" in the same Version is employed for *eight* different Greek words, too numerous to quote.

(c) "Presently" does duty for two different ideas, viz., Pl 2 c. 23 v. and above.

(d) The word translated "friend" is companion. The same word is used in Matt. 20 c. 13 v., and Matt. 22 c. 12 v. Cf Julius Cæsar, Act 4, sc. 3. It has not of necessity a good meaning.

	<i>R. V.</i>	<i>A. V.</i>
Mark 1 c. 22 v. and elsewhere.	Teaching.	Doctrine.
" 2 c. 18 v.	Were fasting.	Used to fast.
" 2 c. 21 v.	Undressed.	New.
" 2 c. 22 v. and elsewhere.	Wine skins.	Bottles.
" 3 c. 18 v. and elsewhere.	Canaan.	Canaanite.
" 4 c. 1 v. and elsewhere.	Boat ( <i>a</i> )	Ship.
" 4 c. 21 v. and elsewhere.	Lamp ( <i>b</i> )	Candle.
" 6 c. 20 v.	Kept him safe.	Observed him.
" 8 c. 33 v.	Mindest not.	Savourest.
" 12 c. 26 v.	In the place.	In the bush.
" 14 c. 12 v.	Sacrificed the Pass- over.	Killed.
" 14 c. 54 v.	Officers.	Servants.
" 14 c. 65 v.	( <i>c</i> ) Received him.	Did strike him.
" 16 c. 2 v.	Sun was risen.	The rising of the sun.
" 16 c. 14 v.	Was manifested.	Appeared.
" 16 c. 16 v. and in some other places.	Condemned.	Damned.
Luke 1 c. 1 v.	Draw up a narrative.	Set forth in order a declaration.
" 1 c. 1 v.	Fulfilled.	Surely believed.
" 1 c. 19 v.	Was sent.	Am sent.
" 1 c. 22 v.	Making signs.	Beckoned.
" 1 c. 59 v.	Were calling.	Called.
" 1 c. 63 v.	Tablet.	Table.
" 2 c. 3 v.	Enrolment.	Taxing.
" 4 c. 20 v.	Attendant.	Minister.
" 5 c. 18 v.	On a bed.	In a bed.
" 5 c. 27 v.	Forsook.	Left.
" 13 c. 2 v.	They suffered.	Suffered.
" 16 c. 23 v. and elsewhere.	Hades.	Hell.
" 17 c. 17 v.	Were not the ten cleansed?	Were there not ten cleansed?
" 18 c. 7 v.	Long suffering over them.	Bear long with them.
" 19 c. 13 v.	Trade.	Occupy.
" 19 c. 14 v.	Ambassage.	Message.
" 20 c. 18 v.	Scatter him as dust.	Grind him to powder.
" 1 c. 9 c.	Immediately.	By and by.
" 22 c. 37 v.	Hath fulfilment.	Have an end.
" 23 c. 42 v.	In thy kingdom.	Into thy kingdom.

(*a*) Often *the* boat, implying one in general use.

(*b*) *λυχνός* in Greek.

(*c*) A forcible expression, indicating striking from side to side

	R. V.	A. V.
Luke 24 c. 12 v.	Cloths.	Clothes.
" 24 c. 25 v.	Believe in all.	Believe all.
" 22 c. 20 v.	The new covenant in my blood, even that which is poured out.	The New Testamant, etc., which is shed.
John 1 c. 5 v.	Apprehended.	Comprehended.
" 1 c. 14 v.	Became flesh.	Was made flesh.
" 1 c. 42 v.	Looked upon.	Beheld.
" 2 c. 8 v.	Ruler of the feast.	Governor, etc.
" 3 c. 10 v.	The teacher.	A master.
" 3 c. 19 v.	The darkness—the light.	Darkness—light.
" 3 c. 36 v. and elsewhere.	Obeyeth not.	Believeth not.
" 4 c. 6 v.	By the well.	On the well.
" 4 c. 29 v.	Can this be.	Is not this.
" 5 c. 35 v.	Lamp.	Light.
" 6 c. 10 v.	People (a).	Men.
" 7 c. 20 v. and elsewhere.	Seek.	Go about.
" 7 c. 35 v. and elsewhere.	Dispersion (b).	Dispersed.
" 10 c. 17 v.	One flock (c).	One fold.
" 11 c. 11 v.	Is fallen asleep.	Sleepeth.
" 12 c. 6 v.	Took away.	Bare.
" 12 c. 13 v.	The branches of the palm trees.	Branches of palm trees.
" 13 c. 10 v.	Is bathed (d).	Is washed.
" 21 c. 16 v. and at 1 Peter 5 c. 2 v. (e).	Tend.	Feed.
" 21 c. 20 v.	At the supper.	At supper.
Acts 1 c. 13 v.	The upper chamber.	An upper chamber.
" 1 c. 23 v.	Put forward.	Appoint.
" 2 c. 6 v.	This sound was heard.	This was noised abroad.
" 2 c. 42 v.	The breaking of bread and the prayer.	Breaking of bread and in prayer.
" 2 c. 46 v.	At home.	From house to house.

(a) The Greek word is *ἀνθρώπους* i.e., human beings, including men, women and children. There were probably 20,000 people present.

(b) A technical word.

(c) The word "fold" in the A. V. stands for two distinct Greek words.

(d) The tense is the perfect. The Greek word for "wash" denotes a partial operation.

(e) A beautiful instance of the apostle's living memory.

	<i>R. V.</i>	<i>A. V.</i>
Acts 2 c. 47 v.	(a) Those that were being saved.*	Such as should be saved.
" 3 c. 1 v.	Were going up.	Went up.
" 3 c. 8 v.	(b) Began to walk.	Walked.
" 5 c. 17 v.	Jealousy (c).	Indignation.
" 5 c. 42 v. and elsewhere.	Jesus as the Christ.	Jesus Christ.
" 7 c. 16 v.	Hamor in Shechem.	Emmor, the father of Sychem.
" 7 c. 29 v. and elsewhere.	Sojourner.	Stranger.
" 7 c. 38 v. and elsewhere.	Living.	Lively.
" 7 c. 44 v.	(d) Testimony.	Witness.
" 7 c. 53 v.	As it was ordained by angels.	Ry the disposition of angels.
" 12 c. 4 v.	Passover.	Easter.
" 12 c. 6 v.	Was about to bring.	Would have brought.
" 12 c. 6 v.	Guards.	Keepers.
" 13 c. 5 v.	Attendant.	Minister.
" 13 c. 7 v. and elsewhere.	Proconsul.	Deputy.
" 13 c. 7 v.	Man of understanding.	Prudent.
" 16 c. 23 v.	Beat them with rods.	Beat them.
" 16 c. 25 v.	Were listening.	Heard.
" 17 c. 23 v.	An unknown god.	The unknown god.
" 17 c. 30 v.	Overlooked.	Winked at.
" 19 c. 31 v.	Chief officers.	Chief.
" 19 c. 35 v.	Temple-keeper.	Worshipper.
" 19 c. 37 v.	Robbers of temples.	Robbers of churches.
" 19 c. 38 v.	The courts are open.	The law is open.
" 19 c. 39 v.	The regular assembly.	A lawful assembly.
" 20 c. 9 v.	Third story.	Third loft.
" 21 c. 3 v.	Come in sight of.	Discovered.
" 21 c. 13 v.	What do ye, weeping, etc.	What mean ye to weep.
" 21 c. 15 v.	Baggage.	(e) Carriages.
" 21 c. 16 v.	Early disciple.	Old disciple.

(a) *i.e.*, Those in the way of salvation. \*The tense in the original is the only one which could not possibly mean "Such as should be saved." It is the present participle, and no idea of impeccability is implied.

(b) A common use of the imperfect tense.

(c) The same word is rendered "envy" in Rom. 13 c. 13 v.

(d) "Testimony" is better, as recalling Old Test phraseology.

(e) This word, in common with "occupy," "coasts," and some others, has drifted from its former meaning. It is found in 1 Sam. 17 c. 20 v., and in other places of the Old Text with the signification of "baggage."

	<i>R. V.</i>	<i>A. V.</i>
Acts 21 c. 25 v.	What is strangled.	Strangled.
" 22 c. 25 v.	Tied him up with.	Bound him with.
" 22 c. 28 v.	Citizenship.	Freedom.
" 22 c. 28 v.	Roman-born.	Free-born.
" 23 c. 15 v.	Judge of his case more exactly.	Inquire more per- fectly concerning him.
" 23 c. 35 v.	Hear thy cause.	Hear thee.
" 23 c. 35 v.	Palace.	Judgment hall.
" 24 c. 6 v.	Assayed.	Hath gone about.
" 24 c. 19 v.	Make accusation.	Object.
" 24 c. 27 v.	Was succeeded by Festus.	Festus came into Felix's room.
" 25 c. 24 v.	Made suit to.	Dealt with.
" 26 c. 10 v.	Vote.	Voice.
" 26 c. 11 v.	Strove to make them blaspheme (a).	Compelled them to etc.
" 26 c. 14 v.	The goad.	The pricks.
" 26 c. 28 v.	With but little per- suasion (b).	Almost thou persuad- est me.
" 27 c. 3 v.	Treated (c).	Entreated.
" 27 c. 7 v.	We are come with dif- ficulty.	Scarce were come.
" 27 c. 16 v.	Were able with diffi- culty to secure the boat.	Had much work to come by the boat.
" 27 c. 17 v.	Lowered the gear.	Strake sail.
" 27 c. 21 v.	Gotten this injury.	Gained this harm.
" 27 c. 33 v. and elsewhere.	Take food.	Take meat.
" 27 c. 40 v.	Casting off the anch- ors, they left them in the sea, * * hoisting up the foresail.	When they had taken up the anchors they committed themselves unto the sea, and hoist- ed up the mainsail.
" 28 c. 2 v.	Barbarians.	Barbarous people.
" 28 c. 10 v.	Put on board.	Laded us, etc.
Rom. 1 c. 28 v. and elsewhere.	Not fitting.	Not convenient.
" 1 c. 32 v.	Consent with them.	Have pleasure in them.
" 2 c. 23 v. and elsewhere.	Gloriest in.	Makest thy boast of.

(a) The imperfect implying a continuous effort.

(b) This might be rendered "in a short time."

(c) Why was this emendation not generally introduced? The Greek word is rendered "entreat" in 1 Thess. 2 c. 2 v. and elsewhere.

	<i>R. V.</i>	<i>A. V.</i>
Rom. 3 c. 25 v.	Passing over.	Remission.
" 4 c. 6 v. and elsewhere.	Reckoneth.	Imputeth.
" 5 c. 15 v.	The many ( <i>a</i> ).	Many.
" 5 c. 20 v.	Came in beside ( <i>b</i> ).	Entered.
" 6 c. 23 v.	In Jesus Christ.	Through Jesus Christ
" 8 c. 19, 20, 21 vs. and elsewhere except Gal. 6 c. 15 v.	Liberty of the glory.	Glorious liberty.
" 12 c. 8 v.	Creation.	Creature.
" 12 c. 12 v.	Liberality.	Simplicity.
" 12 c. 17 v.	Stedfastly.	Instant.
" 13 c. 13 v.	Honourable.	Honest.
" 14 c. 22 v.	Jealousy.	Envyng.
" 16 c. 9 v.	Approveth.	Alloweth.
" 16 c. 18 v.	Urbanus.	Urbane.
" 16 c. 23 v.	Innocent ( <i>c</i> ).	Simple.
1 Cor. 3 c. 16 v.	Treasurer.	Chamberlain.
" 3 c. 16 v.	A temple.	The temple.
" 4 c. 4 v.	Destroyeth ( <i>d</i> ).	Defileth.
" 5 c. 1 v.	Against myself.	By myself.
" 7 c. 26 v.	Actually.	Commonly.
" 9 c. 5 v.	As he is.	So to be.
" 9 c. 25 v. and elsewhere.	A wife that is a believer ( <i>e</i> ).	A sister, a wife.
" 10 c. 13 v.	Striveth in the games.	Striveth for the mastery.
" 11 c. 2 v.	The way to escape.	A way.
" 11 c. 10 v. and elsewhere.	Hold fast the traditions.	Keep the ordinances.
" 11 c. 20 v.	Authority.	Power.
" 11 c. 25 v. and elsewhere.	It is not possible.	This is not to, etc.
" 11 c. 29 v. and in 34 v.	New covenant.	New Testament.
" 13 c. 1 v. and elsewhere.	Judgment.	Damnation.
" 13 c. 1 v.	Love.	Charity.
" 13 c. 12 v.	Clanging.	Tinkling.
" 14 c. 27 v.	In a mirror.	Through a glass.
" 15 c. 31 v.	In turn.	By course.
	Glorying in you.	Your rejoicing.

(*a*) The Greek is practically equivalent to "all." The *A. V.* probably borrowed its faulty translation from the edition of Beza. I need not enlarge upon the importance of the change.

(*b*) As it were by a side door.

(*c*) Translated harmless in Matt. 10 c. 16 v.

(*d*) The verbs are the same, and the revision is an improvement, as exhibiting the principle of divine retaliation.

(*e*) The words may mean a sister-woman, a believer, that is, who would minister to the apostle's wants.

	R. V.	A. V.
2 Cor. 1 c. 17 v.	Fickleness.	Lightness.
“ 1 c. 23 v. and elsewhere.	Witness.	Record.
“ 2 c. 1 v.	Sorrow.	Heaviness.
“ 2 c. 14 v.	Leadeth us in triumph.	Causeth us to triumph.
“ 3 c. 7 v. and elsewhere.	Passing away.	Was to be done away.
“ 3 c. 18 v.	Reflecting as a mirror.	(a) Beholding as in a glass.
“ 7 c. 10 v.	Which bringeth no regret.	Not to be repented of.
“ 8 c. 3 v.	Of their own accord.	Of themselves.
“ 8 c. 8 v.	Through the earnestness of others.	By occasion of the forwardness of others.
“ 11 c. 14 v.	Fashioneth himself.	Is transformed.
“ 12 c. 18 v.	Exhorted.	Desired.
“ 13 c. 10 v.	Not for casting down.	To destruction.
Gal. 1 c. 6 v.	Different (b).	Another.
“ 2 c. 11 v.	Stood condemned.	Was to be blamed.
“ 4 c. 2 v.	Guardians and stewards.	Tutors and governors.
“ 4 c. 9 v.	Rudiments.	Elements.
“ 5 c. 24 v.	Passions.	Affections.
Ephes. 2 c. 21 v.	Each several building.	All the building.
“ 3 c. 6 v.	Fellow-members of the body.	Of the same body.
“ 3 c. 9 v.	Dispensation. (c)	Fellowship.
“ 4 c. 3 v.	Giving diligence.	Endeavoring.
“ 4 c. 12 v. and elsewhere.	Building up.	Edifying.
“ 4 c. 24 v.	Holiness of truth.	True holiness.
“ 5 c. 13 v.	Everything that is made manifest is light.	Doth make manifest, etc.
“ 6 c. 12 v.	Heavenly places.	High places.

There are very many changes in the Revised Version of this epistle. Some of them appear hardly necessary. (a) The translation in the A. V. is admissible.

(b) *ἕτερον* is strictly here a second, and *ἄλλο* different. St. Paul expresses his surprise at his converts transferring their allegiance to a second gospel, perhaps that taught by the 12, which was not in essence different from his own. The translation in the A. V. of the epistle to the Ephesians is admirable, and that of the Revised edition no very marked improvement.

(c) Evidently a different reading, *κοινωνία* in one case, *οικονομία* in the other.

	<i>R. V.</i>	<i>A. V.</i>
Phil. 1 c. 8 v. and elsewhere.	Tender mercies.	Bowels.
" 1 c. 12 v.	Progress.	Furtherance.
" 1 c. 13 v.	Prætorian guard.	Palace.
" 2 c. 7 v.	Emptied himself.	Made himself of no reputation.
" 2 c. 9 v.	The name above every name.	A name, etc.
" 3 c. 11 v.	Resurrection from the dead.	Of the dead.
" 3 c. 12 v.	Press on.	Follow after.
" 3 c. 14 v.	The goal.	The mark.
" 3 c. 20 v.	Citizenship.	Conversation.
" 3 c. 21 v.	Body of our humiliation.	(a) Vile body.
" 4 c. 5 v.	Forbearance.	Moderation.
Col. 1 c. 11 v.	Might of his glory.	Glorious power.
" 2 c. 21 v.	Handle not, nor taste, nor touch.	Touch not, taste not handle not.
" 2 c. 23 v.	Not of any value against the indulgence of the flesh.	Not in any honour to the satisfying of the flesh.
" 4 c. 10 v.	Cousin.	Sister's son.
1 Thess. 4 c. 2 v. and elsewhere.	Charge.	Commandments.
" 4 c. 13 v.	That are fallen asleep.	Which sleep.
" 4 c. 15 v.	Precede.	Prevent.
" 5 c. 14 v.	Faint-hearted.	Feeble-minded.
" 5 c. 22 v.	Every form of evil.	All appearance, etc.
2 Thess. 2 c. 3 v.	The falling away.	A falling away.
" 2 c. 4 v.	Against all.	Above all.
" 2 c. 4 v.	Setting himself forth as God.	Shewing himself that he is God.
" 2 c. 7 v.	Mystery of lawlessness.	Mystery of iniquity.
" 2 c. 7 v.	One that restraineth.	Letteth.
" 2 c. 10 v.	Them that are perishing.	Perish.
" 3 c. 5 v.	Patience of Christ.	Patient waiting for Christ.

The Revised Version of the epistle to the Philippians is most excellent and instructive. (a) The present force of the word "vile" is stronger than it was some time back.

In the Revised Version the difficult 2nd chapter of 2nd Thessalonians becomes less obscure to the English reader.



	<i>R. V.</i>	<i>A. V.</i>
1 Tim. 1 c. 12 v.	Appointing me to his service.	Putting me into the ministry.
“ 1 c. 19 v.	Having thrust from them.	Having put away.
“ 2 c. 9 v.	Shamefastness.	Shamefacedness.
“ 2 c. 14 v. and elsewhere.	Beguiled ( <i>a</i> ).	Deceived.
“ 2 c. 1 v.	Through the child-bearing.	In child-bearing.
“ 3 c. 11 v.	Women ( <i>b</i> ).	Wives.
“ 3 c. 13 v.	Standing.	Degree.
“ 4 c. 15 v.	Be diligent.	Meditate.
“ 4 c. 15 v.	Progress.	Profiting.
“ 5 c. 1 v.	Exhort.	Entreat.
“ 5 c. 4 v.	Grandchildren.	Nephews.
“ 6 c. 5 v.	Godliness is a way of gain.	Gain is godliness.
“ 6 c. 12 v.	The good confession.	A good profession.
“ 6 c. 19 v.	Which is life in deed.	Eternal life.
2 Tim. 2 c. 4 v.	Soldier on service.	No man that warreth.
“ 2 c. 15 v.	Handling aright. ( <i>c</i> )	Rightly dividing.
“ 3 c. 1 v.	Grievous.	Perilous.
“ 4 c. 14 v.	Will render to him.	The Lord reward, etc
“ 4 c. 15 v.	Withstood.	Hath withstood.
“ 4 c. 16 v.	At my first defence no one took my part.	First answer no one stood with me.
Titus 1 c. 5 v. and elsewhere.	Appoint.	Ordain.
“ 1 c. 12 v.	Idle gluttons.	Slow bellies.
“ 2 c. 13 v.	Appearing of the glory.	Glorious appearing.
“ 2 c. 14 v., and at Peter 1 ep. 2 c. 9 v.	People of his own possession.	( <i>d</i> ) Peculiar people.
“ 3 c. 6 v.	Poured out upon us.	Shed on us.

The word “creature” in 4 c. 4 v. is *κτίσμα*, not *κτίσις*, as in Rom. 8 c, *passim*.

(*a*) The use of this word connects the passage with the history of the Fall.

(*b*) Some have supposed that these were deaconesses, and there is authority for the idea. The word applies either to such, or to women in general. It is very improbable that deacons’ wives are alluded to. The omission of any precepts for the guidance of the wives of presbyters or bishops would be incomprehensible in that case.

(*c*) The original means literally cutting in a straight line.

(*d*) The word “peculiar” has lost, except in legal phraseology, this particular signification.

	<i>R. V.</i>	<i>A. V.</i>
Titus 3 c. 11 v.	Perverted.	Subverted.
Philemon 7 v., and elsewhere in this epistle.	Hearts.	Bowels.
“ 9 v.	Befitting.	(a) Convenient.
Heb. 2 c. 1 v.	Haply drift away from them.	At any time let them slip.
“ 2 c. 10 v.	Author.	Captain.
“ 4 c. 6 v. and elsewhere.	Disobedience.	Unbelief.
“ 4 c. 8 v.	Joshua (b).	Jesus.
“ 4 c. 9 v.	Sabbath rest (c).	Rest.
“ 5 c. 11 v.	Hard of interpretation.	Hard to be uttered.
“ 5 c. 12 v.	Solid food.	Strong meat.
“ 7 c. 3 v. and elsewhere.	Genealogy.	Descent.
“ 9 c. 1 v.	Of this world.	Worldly.
“ 9 c. 2 v.	Holy place (d).	Sanctuary.
“ 9 c. 3 v.	Holy of holies (e).	Holiest of all.
“ 9 c. 6 v.	Continually.	Always.
“ 9 c. 11 v.	Creation.	Building.
“ 9 c. 22 v. and elsewhere.	Apart from.	Without.
“ 10 c. 38 v.	He (f).	Any man.
“ 9 c. 25 v.	With blood not his own.	Blood of others.
“ 11 c. 10 v.	The city which hath the foundations.	A city—foundations.
“ 11 c. 19 v. and elsewhere.	Parable.	Figure.
“ 11 c. 23 v.	Goodly. (g)	Proper.
“ 12 c. 14 v.	Sanctification.	Holiness.
“ 12 c. 23 v.	Enrolled.	Written.
“ 13 c. 4 v.	Let marriage be had in honour.	Marriage is honorable.
“ 13 c. 7 v.	Issue of their life.	End of their conversation.
“ 13 c. 17 v.	In behalf of.	For.
James 1 c. 11 v.	The scorching wind.	A burning heat.

(a) The word “convenient” in modern English no longer means fitting or seemly, cf. the exhortation in the Confirmation service.

(b) An important correction.

(c) *ἀνάπαυσις* is the ordinary Greek for rest. Here the word is *σαββατισμος*, which links together the two covenants.

(d) and (e) are particularly instructive in this book, which throws such light on the Mosaic ritual.

(f) A very important correction.

(g) Compare Acts 7 c. where the same word *ἀστειος* is used of Moses, and is rendered in both Versions “exceeding fair.” Compare also Exod. 2 c. 2 v. in the Septuagint.

	R. V.	A. V.
James 1 c. 12 v.	Hath been approved.	Is tried.
" 1 c. 15 v.	When it is full-grown.	When it is finished.
" 1 c. 17 v.	Perfect boon (a).	Perfect gift.
" 1 c. 17 v.	Shadow that is cast by turning.	Shadow of turning.
" 1 c. 18 v.	Brought us forth. (b)	Begat he us.
" 1 c. 21 v.	Overflowing of wickedness.	Superfluity of naughtiness.
" 1 c. 21 v.	Implanted word.	Engrafted word.
" 2 c. 10 v.	Is become guilty.	Is guilty.
" 2 c. 17 v.	Dead in itself.	Dead being alone.
" 2 c. 19 v.	God is one.	There is one God.
" 2 c. 26 v. and elsewhere.	Apart from works.	Without works.
" 3 c. 4 v.	Steersman.	Governor.
" 3 c. 5 v.	How much wood.	How great a matter.
" 3 c. 17 v.	Variance.	Partiality.
" 5 c. 3 v.	Rusted.	Cankered.
" 5 c. 9 v. and elsewhere.	Murmur.	Grudge.
1 Peter 1 c. 7 v. and elsewhere.	Proof.	Trial.
" 1 c. 15 v. and elsewhere.	Living.	Conversation.
" 2 c. 1 v. and elsewhere.	Wickedness.	Malice (c).
" 2 c. 2 v.	Spiritual milk without guile.	Sincere milk, etc.
" 2 c. 12 v.	Seemly.	Honest.
" 2 c. 16 v.	Cloke of wickedness.	Cloke of Maliciousness.
" 2 c. 16 v.	Bondservants.	Servants.
" 2 c. 19 v.	Acceptable.	Thankworthy.
" 3 c. 1 v. and elsewhere.	Behaviour.	Conversation.
" 3 c. 6 v.	Put in fear by any terror.	Afraid with any amazement.
" 3 c. 21 v.	Interrogation.	Answer.
" 4 c. 14 v.	Blessed.	Happy,
" 5 c. 3 v.	Lording it over the charge.	Lords over God's heritage.
2 Peter 2 c. 1 v. and elsewhere.	Destructive.	Damnable.
" 2 c. 2 v.	Lascivious.	Pernicious.

(a) The words in Greek are different, viz., *δόσις* and *δώρημα*. The A. V. translates both by "gift."

(b) A perfectly different word from the Greek for "begat."

There are many changes in the Revised text of the epistle of St. James, and for the most part they are improvements. (c) *Malitia*, malice, originally meant what we broadly call evil or wickedness. Hence the legal maxim, "*Malitia supplet etatem*."

	<i>R. V.</i>	<i>A. V.</i>
2 Peter 2 c. 12 v. and elsewhere.	Creatures without reason, born mere animals.	Natural brute beasts.
“ 2 c. 15 v.	Children of cursing.	Cursed children.
1 John 3 c. 9 v.	His seed abideth in him.	Remaineth.
“ 5 c. 16 v.	Not concerning this do I say that he should make request ( <i>a</i> ).	I do not say that he shall pray for it.
2 John 9 v.	Goeth onward.	Transgresseth.
“ 10 v.	Greeting.	God speed.
3 John 8 v.	Welcome.	Receive.
Jude 3 v.	I was constrained.	It was needful.
“ 3 v.	Once for all.	Once.
“ 6 v.	Principality.	First estate.
“ 12 v.	Hidden rocks.	Spots.
“ 12 v.	Love-feasts.	Feasts of charity.
“ 12 v.	Autumn trees without fruit.	Trees whose fruit withereth.
“ 15 v. and elsewhere.	Convict.	Convince.
Rev. 1 c. 18 v.	The keys of death and Hades.	The keys of Hell and of death.
“ 2 c. 3 v.	Grown weary.	Fainted.
“ 2 c. 4 v.	Didst leave.	Hast left.
“ 2 c. 13 v.	Satan's throne.	Satan's seat.
“ 2 c. 13 v.	Didst not deny.	Hast not denied.
“ 3 c. 4 v.	Did not defile.	Have not defiled.
“ 3 c. 17 v.	The wretched one.	Wretched.
“ 4 c. 6 v. and elsewhere.	Living creatures ( <i>b</i> ).	Beasts.
“ 5 c. 8 v. and elsewhere.	Bowls ( <i>c</i> ).	Vials.
“ 5 c. 10 v.	Kingdom.	Kings.
“ 7 c. 15 v.	Spread his tabernacle over them.	Dwell among them.
“ 8 c. 10 v.	Torch.	Lamp.
“ 8 c. 13 v.	An eagle.	An angel.
“ 9 c. 1 v. and elsewhere.	The pit of the abyss. ( <i>d</i> )	Bottomless pit.

There are less important alterations in the case of the epistles of St. John than in the rest of the Catholic epistles. In the two epistles of St. Peter they are numerous. (*a*) It is doubtful whether the word should not be “make enquiry.” The word may signify “request.”

(*b*) One of the most valuable of alterations. It prevents any possible confusion between these *ἄνα* and the *θηρίον*, the mystical beast later on.

(*c*) An important correction, and a connecting link between the ritual of the Old Covenant and the imagery of the Apocalypse.

(*d*) Compare St. Luke 8 c. 31 v.

	<i>R. V.</i>	<i>A. V.</i>
Rev. 11 c. 9 v.	Peoples.	People.
" 11 c. 11 v.	Breath.	Spirit.
" 12 c. 1 v.	Sign.	Wonder.
" 12 c. 3 v.	Diadems.	Crowns.
" 12 c. 9 v.	Cast down.	Cast out.
" 12 c. 11 v.	Because of.	By.
" 16 c. 12 v.	From the sun rising.	Of the east.
" 17 c. 8 v.	Is about to come up.	Shall ascend.
" 18 c. 1 v. and elsewhere in the N. T.	Authority.	Power.
" 18 c. 2 v.	Hold.	Cage.
" 18 c. 17 v.	Made desolate.	Come to nought.
" 18 c. 23 v. and elsewhere.	Lamp.	Candle.
" 19 c. 13 v.	Sprinkled with.	Dipped in.
" 21 c. 14 v.	On them.	In them.

## APPENDIX C.

## SOME DEFECTS IN AUTHORIZED VERSION WHICH ARE NOT PREVIOUSLY ALLUDED TO.

- Matt. 9 c. 36 v. "fainted," for "were distressed,"  
 " 10 c. 10 v.  
 and elsewhere. "srip," for "wallet."  
 " 11 c. 23 v. "which art exalted," for "shalt thou be exalted unto Heaven."  
 Mark 4 c. 40 v. "how is it that ye have no faith," for "have ye not yet faith."  
 John 7 c. 8 v. "I go not up yet unto this feast," for "I go not up."  
 1 John 5 c. 7 v. The insertion of the three heavenly witnesses.

## INACCURACY.

Mercurius for Hermes, Jupiter for Zeus, Acts, 14 c., 12 v; in money, as penny, farthing; in measure, as firkin, etc.

## LOSS OF FORCE BY ERRONEOUS ORDER.

- Matt. 14 c. 8 v. "give me here John Baptist's head in a charger," for "give me here in a dish the head of John the Baptist."  
 Mark 4 c. 38 v. "he was in the hinder part of the ship asleep on a pillow," for "he himself was at the stern on the cushion asleep."  
 John 14 c. 11 v. "believe me for the very works sake," instead of "for the very works sake believe me."

## APPENDIX D.

## TRANSLATIONS IN THE REVISED EDITION THAT APPEAR OPEN TO CRITICISM.

The chapters and verses simply are cited in the case of those passages that have been previously noticed, and those that have an alternate reading in the margin are not as a rule alluded to.

In Mark 2 c. 26 v. the Authorized Version reads, "In the days of Abiathar the high priest." The revisers have changed this to, "When Abiathar was high priest." Much obscurity and uncertainty surrounds the passage, but with all respect to the committee I must beg leave to maintain that their translation is critically inferior to that of the older version. The Greek is Ἐπὶ Ἀβιάθαρ ἀρχιερέως, i. e., "In the time of Abiathar who was (afterwards) high priest." The revisers' rendering, as all scholars would agree, would require strictly Ἐπὶ ἀρχιερέως Ἀβιάθαρ. The word δίκαιος is for the most part correctly translated "righteous," except in Titus 1 c. 8 v. and Heb. 12 c. 23 v., where the old word "just," is adhered to. It should, however, be remembered that δίκαιος in Hellenistic Greek means "one whom the judge pronounces innocent," one, in fact, whom he pardons. An important truth is thus suggested. In classical Greek δίκαιος signifies "one who is just by his own merits."

Ναός in Matt. 27 c. 5 v. is translated, and correctly, "sanctuary," but this word, carefully distinguished from ἱερόν in the New Testament, is in Rev. 3 c. 12 v., translated "temple." The former is the sacred portion of the building, the latter the fabric and enclosure. The ναός in Matt. 27 c. 5 v. was probably the court of the priests."

Luke 4 c. 13 v. "For a season." This should be "until" or "as far as" a time or season when the temptation was renewed.

Luke 9 c. 17 v. The rhythm of this passage is rather rough.

Luke 12 c. 58 v. "Hale." This word is practically obsolete. A better substitute would have been "drag," or "drag away," here and in Acts 8 c. 3 v. (See corrections of American committee).

Luke 13 c. 1 to 16 vv. Ὡσαύτως is rather stronger than ὁμοίως; yet the revisers have rendered it by what is now the weaker adverb, viz., "likewise."

Luke 22 c. 68 v. "Question" would be better than "ask," as the sense would be plainer.

John 2 c. 4 v. "What have I," etc., conveys stronger reproof than the words warrant. "What is there in common betwixt me and thee," should have appeared in the margin, 13 c., 25 v.

John 3 c. 27 v., 5 c. 10 v., 7 c. 39 v., 9 c. 14 v. Not very good English.

John 16 c. 26 v. The alternate reading in the margin is considerably better than the text. The verb does not mean to "pray," but to "request," as one equal of another.

John 18 c. 36 v. "Not of this world." The preposition *ἐκ* is in the original. "Out of," or "from," is more correct. The Lord's Kingdom did not originate from this world. A marginal note is needed.

John 19 c. 28 v. The Authorized Version is here superior, in my opinion, to the Revised, for "Finished" is a very imperfect rendering for *τετέλεσται*. The same may be said in a greater degree for "It is finished," as in v. 30, as I have observed previously. In this defect the two versions agree, and to the reader's loss.

John 20 c. 25 v. "Put" is too weak a word for *βάλω*. - True it is that the same verb is used to describe the action of the finger and the hand, but unless "thrust" is used for both, the translation in the authorized version is to be preferred.

Acts 1 c. 11 v. "Looking" is inferior to "gazing up into," though more rigidly correct.

Acts 2 c. 1 v. "In one place" is incorrect. It should be "the same place," i. e., the upper room.

Acts 2 c. 3 v. "Parting asunder" is only one degree better than "cloven." Why not "distributed among them"?

Acts 5 c. 1 v. "Kept back." The verb is "middle," and the words "for himself" are rather needed.

Acts 7 c. 6 v., 8 c. 13 and 27 vv., 9 c. 7 and 29 vv., 12 c. 17 v., 13 c. 48 v., 14 c. 5 and 23 vv., 15 c. 5 v., 17 c. 22 v., 19 c. 2, 24 and 35 vv., and 21 c. 40 v. "Artemis" ought to be in the text, as "Diana" is incorrect, 15 c., 13 v.

Acts 21 c. 40 v. The word "language" means strictly "dialect," i. e., Aramaic.

Acts 22 c. 5 v., 28 c. 10 v., Rom. 11 c. 11 v., 13 c. 7 v., 16 c. 1 v. "Servant" should be "Deaconess," Ephes. 3 c. 30 v.

Gal. 6 c. 16 v., 4 c. 15 v., Eph. 6 c. 27 v., Phil. 2 c. 6 v. "Prize" is less accurate and intelligible than "robbery," the reading of the A. V.

1 Thess. 2 c. 2 v., 1 Tim. 5 c. 3 v., Heb. 12 c. 23 v., James 1 c. 6 v. "Wave" is preferable to "surge," 2 Tim. 3 c. 16.

1 John 4 c. 7 v., 5 c. 1 v., Rev. 1 c. 12 v. "Lampstands," as in margin, is more correct than "candlesticks."

Rev. 4 c. 5 v. For "lamps" read "torches," as in Matt. 25 c. 1 v.

Rev. 14 c. 15 and 18 vv. "Send forth" is inferior to "throw," or "thrust."

Rev. 15 c. 1 v. "Finished" is very unsatisfactory. The Authorized Version "filled up" is better.



## APPENDIX E.

SPECIMENS OF READINGS IN THE REVISED EDITION DIFFERING FROM THE TEXTUS RECEPTUS TO WHICH NO ALLUSION IS MADE BY WAY OF MARGINAL REFERENCE.

Mark 7 c. 19 v., 9 c. 23 v., Luke 1 c. 37 v., John 2 c. 17 v., 3 c. 25 v., Acts 18 c. 5 v., Rom. 7 c. 18 v., 9 c. 28 v., 1 Cor. 12 c. 15 v., 15 c. 29 and 47 vv., Gal. 3 c. 1 v., Ephes. 3 c. 9 v., 5 c. 9 v., 6 c. 19 v., Heb. 9. c. 17 v., 12 c. 7 v., James 3 c. 12 v., 1 Peter 4 c. 7 v., 5 c. 12 v., Rev. 2 c. 17 v., 5 c. 10 v., 5 c. 14 v., 14 c. 1 v.

Many of these are approved by Bishop Wordsworth.

It would be wearisome to all parties for me to enter minutely into the question of punctuation. I therefore will content myself with drawing attention to a few instances in which the text is affected by a change in this respect, sanctioned by the revisers: 1 Cor. 15 c. 22 v., 2 Cor. 12 c. 15 v., Titus 3 c. 8-9 vv., Heb. 12 c. 4-5 vv., Rev. 9 c. 10 v., 12 c. last verse, and 13 c. 1 v.

## APPENDIX F.

The readings preferred by the American committee are to be found at the end of the volume, and deserve attentive perusal. Some also have a place in the body of the book, as marginal notes, but the latter can never to an ordinary reader rank with the text, and most readers would pass by such notes without heed. Some few of the readings preferred by the American committee would seem to be improvements, but as a whole the revisers appear to have done right in rejecting them. The Americans are inclined needlessly to modernize the language of Scripture and of the Liturgy. Nevertheless, I more than agree with them that the text and margin should have changed places in Acts 17 c. 22 v. For St. Paul to have begun his oration at the Areopagus by telling his cultivated auditory that they were "somewhat superstitious," would have been a very unlikely way to obtain a hearing. Moreover such a mode of address would have been totally unlike his ordinary procedure, which was, if possible, to find some common ground of agreement, or at all events, to adopt a conciliatory tone. He most likely told his hearers that they were "very religious," and in my opinion "too superstitious," or "very superstitious," shou'd be erased altogether.

The following renderings by the American committee appear changes for the better :

John 8 c. 58 v. "Abraham was born," for "Abraham was."

Rom. 6 c. 7 v. "Released," or "set free," for "justified."

1 Cor. 11 c. 19 v. "Factions" in margin for "heresies."

1 Cor. 14 c. 3 v. "Exhortation" is better than "comfort."

1 Cor. 15 c. 33 v. In the quotation from Menander, "morals" is preferable to "manners," as the latter word has lost its nobler meaning since the days when it could truly be said that "Manners makyth man."

1 Thess. 4 c. 12 v. "Becomingly" is better than "honestly."

Heb. 11 c. 1 v. "Conviction" is preferable to "proving."

In these and other alterations preferred by the American committee, the reader will of course judge for himself.

