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## PREFACE.

In venturing to offer these suggestions of modifications in the Revised Version of the New Testament, I am far from claiming to possess all the helps which were at the command of members of the Revision Committee. Years ago I should have offered to the Christian public Suggested Emendations of the authorized English Version of the New Testament, in the same spirit and on a similar plan with those which I offered on the Old Testament, ${ }^{1}$ had it not been for the question of the Greek text. For an original investigation of that question I had not, and could not expect to have, either the time or the requisite helps. Like most of my brethren in the ministry at home and abroad, I must be content in the main with the general consensus of those who have both. It is matter of thankfulness that that consensus approaches as nearly as it does to unanimity.

I trust also that it will not be imagined that I desire to pull to pieces the work of the Revision Committees. It would take far more space than these suggestions occupy to mention the places in which, in my judgment, they have greatly
${ }^{1}$ Published by W. F. Draper in 1873, under the very kind editorial superintendence of Prof. J. H. Thayer of the Andover Theological Seminary, Secretary of the N. T. Company of American Revisers.
improved the common version, removing many inaccuracies, infelicities, and inconsistencies. To say that they have not in all cases succeeded in avoiding inaccuracy, infelicity, or incousistency is simply to say that their work is the work of fallible men. But though all are fallible, jet "in the multitude of counsellors there is safety."

In view of the many criticisms of their work already given to the public, I presume that a majority of the Revisers on both sides of the Atlantic are satisfied that their version needs to be retouched before it can be accepted (as I trust it will ultimately be) as the common version of all English speaking Christians. This may well be, as has been suggested by several of the reviewers, at the time of the publication of the Revised Version of the Old Testament; for there are hundreds of passages so nearly, if not absolutely, the same in the New Testament as in the Old, that they certainly should be compared, and the two renderings harmonized.

One suggestion I will venture to offer imprimis, that in a re-examination of their published version the Revision Committees should put the general care of the work into the hands of a sub-committee of at least three men, who should devote their whole time to it as long as it is in progress. Such a committee would be able to render available all the aid offered from without, to watch over the thorough consistency and harmony of the different parts of the version, and to report to the general committees the changes needed to secure these objects. Devoting their whole time and energy to it, they would be far more likely to keep in mind the great variety of points, often minute, which demand attention in the progress of such a work, than ten times as many men of equal ability who are earnestly devoting six sevenths of their time to other duties.

I have not attempted to give all the suggestions which have occurred to me, nor to carry them through in their application to all passages similar to those noted. To do this would be almost to do over the entire work of the Revision Committees.

It will be seen that in a large number of these suggestions I propose a return to the Authorized Version. This is not in all cases because I think "the old is better," but often because the new and the old seem to me equal in their fitness to express the thought of the original, and in such cases, having regard to the place which the phraseology of the old version has in our religious literature, it seems to me that it should not be disturbed.

One of the most delicate points in translating the Scriptares, is the rendering of words which have no single and uniform representation in our language. For example, $\psi v \chi \eta$ must in Matt. $10: 28$ be rendered soul; but in Matt. 2:20, 6:25, Luke 14:26, John $10: 11$, etc., we must render it life. As to the question whether we are justified in giving the one rendering in Matt. $16: 25$, and the other in vs. 26, see my note on the latter verse.

Another point of delicacy and difficulty is the use of the article. The Revisers were of course perfectly aware that the definite article is often used in Greek in cases where our idiom does not require or even permit it ; and yet in a number of places they have imitated the Greek construction in this respect, as it seems to me, to the detriment of the rendering. E.g. in Rom. 5:7 I appreciate the argument for introducing the article in rendering $\tau 0 \hat{v}$ ả $\gamma$ a $\theta o \hat{v}$, viz. that $\delta<\kappa \alpha i o v ~ j u s t ~$ before is without it; and yet in my judgment it mars the sense ; for $\dot{o}$ a ${ }^{2}$ a月ós is not here the good man generically, but
a single good man. The force of the article I take to be such a man as is ảzaOós, good or beneficient, and this idea is better expressed in English by the indefinite than by the definite article. So in the several times repeated phrase, "There shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth," I see no gain in inserting the definite article either once or twice. If the object of the Revisers in introducing it was to remove the ambiguity of the word there, this might have been done by repeating it, thus, "There shall there be weeping (or wailing) and gnashing of teeth," with less impression of change on the part of the reader.

Another point requiring special care and discrimination is the rendering of prepositions. That the revisers have given much care to it, and have corrected many faulty renderings of the A.V. every thoughtful reader of their work will gratefully acknowledge. Yet I think it will appear that they have sometimes pushed uniformity in the rendering of prepositions and other particles too far. For remarks on $\epsilon$ 's and $\dot{\epsilon} v$, see note on Matt. 28:19. Ov̉v they have rendered therefore in cases where it does not seem to mark logical sequence, but only sequence of time. So John 20:21 and 21:5. We employ so and so then with something of the same latitude; but to employ therefore in that way seems harsh. ' $\mathrm{E} \pi{ }^{\prime}{ }^{\alpha} \lambda \eta \theta \epsilon$ cias is uniformly rendered of a truth, thus excluding the meaning in truth, which the expression naturally bears when connected with teaching, as in Mark 12:14, Luke 20:21. Truly would have covered both meanings, and its use would in my opinion have presented an example of justifiable ambiguity in a translation, because the rendering would be capable of the same shades of meaning as the original.

A considerable number of the cases in which I feel con-
strained to dissent from the results reached by the revisers arise from the use of the tenses of verbs. It is undoubtedly the duty of a translator to bring out as clearly as possible in his translation the differences of meaning expressed by the use of different tenses in his original. But he must also make allowance for the different range of meaning which the same tense may have in different languages. The English phrase, "I wrote you from Paris," will be differently rendered in Greek, and in many other languages, according as it is intended to mean, I wrote once, or I wrote repeatedly. So the Greek Aorist is used in a variety of ways, which must be expressed in English by the use of different tenses. It will, I presume, be generally conceded that in John 20:2, 13, the revisers have done well in retaining an English Perfect in place of the Greek Aorist, "They have taken away the Lord, ... and we know not where they have laid him." So in Matt. $25: 20$, "I have gained." The relation of the events referred to in these passages to the time when the statements were made is so close as to justify the use of the Perfect in English to represent the Aorist in Greek. For similar instances in which the R.V. rightly employs the English Perfect to render the Greek Aorist, see Matt. 11:27, Mark 5: 35, 1 Cor. $4: 8$. With equal justice they might have kept the Perfect of the A.V. in Luke $10: 40$, where they have taken pains to give us a tense corresponding to the Greek Aorist, "Lord, dost thou not care that my sister did leave me to serve alone?" Seeing the words in question describe a state of things still existing when Martha was addressing our Lord, English idiom justifies (l might even say, requires) the use of a Perfect, and so I would retain the old rendering, "Lord, dost thou not care that my sister hath left me to serve alone?"

A striking instance of the use of the Greek Aorist instead of a Perfect, is found in John 13:31, N $\hat{v} v \dot{\epsilon}^{\prime} \delta o \xi^{\prime} \dot{\sigma} \sigma \theta \eta$, where the revisers have correctly retained the rendering, "Now is the Son of man glorified," and yet, as though their literary conscience were a little uneasy at the concession, they put in the margin, Or, was.

The Modern Greek verb can scarcely be said to possess a Perfect tense, and substitutes the Aorist almost everywhere for the old Perfect; and a tendency to this usage is manifest in the Greek of the New Testament.

In Matt. 14:3 and Mark 6:17, the R.V. has Pluperfects for Aorists, had laid hold, had sent, had married ; and rightly, because these expressions relate to events which had taken place before the time immediately contemplated in the narrative.

Probably one reason why the Aorist was employed to do the service of the Perfect was that the Perfect itself, perhaps partly under the influence of Latin usage, had come to be used somewhat loosely. In Rev. 18:3 we have $\pi \epsilon ́ \pi \omega \kappa \epsilon$, a Perfect, preceded and followed by Aorists, and the following Aorists referring to the same time with the Perfect. So in Rev. 7:14 we have $\epsilon i \rho \eta \kappa \alpha$ preceded by $\dot{\alpha} \pi \epsilon \kappa \rho i \theta \eta$ and followed by $\epsilon \boldsymbol{i} \pi \epsilon$, and all relating to the same conversation; so that the revisers seem to me to have quite needlessly gone out of their way io render, "I say," and to note in the margin that the Greek is "I have said."

The attempt to preserve a Present tense in English wherever a historical Present appears in the original seems to me unnecessary, and sometimes quite unfortunate. We have indeed in English a use of the Present in relation to past events; but it is either colloquial and unsuited to the dignity
of a serious book (as, says he, says she, or even says $I$ ), or rhetorical and designed for specially vivid presentation of the thought. But in the New Testament we meet a use of the Present resembling neither of these (though doubtless derived from the colloquial usage), but simply a loose use of the Present for the past tense ; e.g. in John 2:9, " when the ruler of the feast tasted... and knew not... he calleth the bridegroom and saith ..." I would render, called and said. I am persuaded that we overlook this anomaly simply because the forms calleth and saith are antique and comparatively unfamiliar, and so we easily let them pass as equivalent to called and said. Let the reader try the experiment of substituting in the above passage the modern forms, calls and says, reading them in connection with the preceding verbs. Faithfulness in a translator does not require him to imitate grammatical anomalies.

The principle of preserving a uniform rendering of the same Greek or Hebrew word when used in the same sense, seems to me to require more limitation than the revisers have given it. I would apply this principle strictly to the names of plants, animals, precious stones, articles of clothing, or furniture, parts and appurtenances of the tabernacle and temple, feasts, sacrifices, offices and orders of men, coins, ${ }^{1}$ weights and measures,
${ }^{1}$ In respect to the names of Roman coins, seeing we have mite for $\lambda \epsilon \pi \tau o ́ \nu$ and farthing for $\kappa o \delta \rho \alpha{ }^{2} \nu \tau \eta s$ (both of them names of similar import with the Greek terms), I should be inclined to use penny for $\dot{\alpha} \sigma \sigma \dot{\alpha} \rho ı o \nu$ (equal to four кобра́ $\nu \tau \alpha \iota$ ), and perhaps shilling for $\delta \eta \nu \alpha ́ p ı o \nu$. The greatest objection to denarius is the awkwardness of the plural, denarii. At any rate, I would not leave, as the R.V. has done, one term to represent both $\dot{\alpha} \sigma \sigma \alpha \alpha^{\prime} \iota \nu$ and $\kappa o \delta \rho \alpha{ }^{2} \nu \tau \eta s$; neither should I like to use both denarius and shilling for $\delta \eta \nu \alpha \alpha^{p} \iota \nu$, as suggested by the American Company of revisers. In regard to the names for measures, see note on Luke $16: 6,7$.
and similar classes of specific terms ; but when we come to abstract nouns, or to verbs, adjectives and particles, some liberty should be used, not merely representing distinct meanings of the same term by different English words, but also employing different terms to represent the same idea, according as they harmonize best with the context.

I heartily concur in the suggestion of the American Committee to substitute in all cases who or that for which when used of persons, are for be in the Present Indicative, linow and knew for wot and wist, and drag for hale, which is only an old spelling of haul.

In like manner, for birds or fowls of the heaven I would substitute birds or fowls of the air; for the phrases, from hence, from thence, from henceforth, I would use simply hence, thence, and henceforth ; for none other, no other, and for the which simply which. I would take away the $s$ from whiles and add it to alway; would write had become for were become, before for afore, drove for drave, and evening for even and eventide. I would avoid entirely as misleading the rendering of $\sigma \kappa \alpha \nu \delta \alpha \lambda i \zeta \omega$ by offend, which the R.V. retains in Matt. 13: 57, and Mark 14:27. We have in English no verb exhibiting precisely the same shade of meaning with $\sigma \kappa \alpha \nu \delta \alpha \lambda i \zeta \omega$. To stumble, as an active verb, comes nearest to it, being capable of signifying to lead into error or sin, and to give occasion for misapprehension of one's motives or conduct. See note on Matt. 17 : 27. In reference to the phrase, God forbid, see note on Rom. 3: 4.

A word respecting the use of brackets, which the R.V. has employed, I believe, in only a single instance, viz. in the passage from John $7: 53$ to $8: 11$. There are not a few cases in which the testimony of the best authorities is divided, and
sometimes so evenly balanced that readings which appear in the text of some critical editions of the Greek New Testament, in others are relegated to the margin. In some such instances words have been dropped by the R.V. from the text, which are nearly or quite as well supported as others which have been retained. In such cases it seems to me the wiser and safer course to retain them in the text, inclosed in brackets. I would bracket also a few readings which the R.V. has kept in the text. A few instances I have pointed out in these pages, but not by any means all in which I should like to see this done.

I have made but few suggestions respecting the marginal readings. Quite a number of those in the R.V. seem to me superfluous, and some of them misleading. E.g. at Col. 3:22 (and elsewhere) we find on "servants" a marginal note, Gr. bondservants, and on "masters" another Gr. lords. Now סov̂̀os has in Greek as wide a range of meaning as servant in English, while master and sir, in their proper connections, are as legitimate renderings of кúpıos as lord. In Col. 4:5, the rendering of the text redeeming the time seems to me closer to the original than the marginal reading, given as a literal rendering of the Greek, buying up the opportunity. In 2 Tim.
 the margin we are told that the Greek is through. Now though through may be regarded as the primary and by the secondary signification of $\delta \iota \alpha$ with a Genitive, still both are legitimate renderings. Witness the phrases, "he spake by parables," and "we walk by faith." In Luke 2: $29 \Delta \epsilon \in \sigma \pi о \tau \alpha$ is rightly rendered Lord, and then we are told in the margin that the Greek is Master. In Acts 4:24, again the text has Lord and the margin, Or, Master. In Rev. 6:10 the render-
ing is Master. Both $\Delta_{\epsilon \sigma \pi o ́ \tau \eta s}$ and Kípos are used of God, as supreme Lord, and of men as sustaining the relation of master, and in the former case I should retain the rendering Lord, and in the latter master for both, without any marginal note.

## SUGGESTED MODIFICATIONS.

## MATTHEW.

revised version, 1881.
2:1 wise men ... came
2:7 learned of them carefully
2:8 search out
$2: 13,19$, etc. appeareth
$2: 16$ was mocked of
2:16 carefully learned
3:3 Make ye ready
$3: 9$ to our father
$3: 10$ is the axe laid unto
3:15 suffereth
4:5 taketh ... and he set
4:8 taketh... sheweth
4:9 and he said
4: 24 devils
$5: 22$ in danger of (ter.)
う): 25 whiles

SUGGESTIONS. there came wise men =A.v. ${ }^{1}$
inquired of them particularly ${ }^{2}$
examine
appeared ${ }^{3}$
had been mocked by
particularly inquired
Prepare ye $=$ a.v.
as our father
the axe lieth at
suffered
took ... and set
took ... shewed
and said
demons ${ }^{4}$
(marg. Gr.amenable or liable to) while
${ }^{1}$ I should attach no importance to connecting $\dot{a} \pi \grave{o}$ ảvaro $\lambda \hat{\omega} \nu$
 the A. V. is essentially identical with that of the Greek.
${ }^{2}$ The root of the verb here used signifies rather accuracy than care.
${ }^{3}$ It seems to me to accord better with the idiom of our present language not to imitate the historic Present.
${ }^{\text {\& }}$ And so wherever $\delta a i \mu \omega \nu$ or $\delta a \iota \mu o ́ \nu t o v ~ o c c u r s . ~$

REVISED VERSION.
$5: 41$ compel
$5: 48$ Ye therefore shall be
6:1 righteousness
$6: 1$ of them
$6: 6$ thine inner chamber
$6: 19$ doth consume
$6: 25$ the food... the raiment
6:31 wherewithal
7:9 a loaf
8: 12 sons
$8: 12$ the weeping
8:20 heaven
9:5 whether
10:4 C'ananaean
$10: 24,25$ master
10:24 lord
11:2 the Christ

SUGGESTIONS
impress ${ }^{1}$
Be ye therefore $=$ A.v ${ }^{2}$
good deeds ${ }^{3}$
by them
thy closet $=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{v}$.
consume
food . . . raiment
wherewith
bread
children $=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{v}$.
weeping ${ }^{4}$
air
which
Canaite
teacher ${ }^{5}$
master
Christ $=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{v} \cdot{ }^{6}$
${ }^{1}$ To hint that it is done by authority.
${ }^{2}$ A Future with an Imperative meaning. Our language bears the same construction, but not so freely as Hebraistic Greek.
${ }^{3}$ Equivalent here to alms, only a more general term, followed by one more specific. The Syriac renders both by a term which in Hebrew signified righteousness, but in the still living Syriac and Arabic signifies alms.
${ }^{4}$ The use of the article in Greek by no means necessitates its use in English. See Preface.
${ }^{5}$ So everywhere for $\delta \iota \delta$ áбкалоs.
${ }^{6}$ John sends to inquire whether Jesus is the Christ. 'The term should therefore, as it seems to me, be regarded as belonging to the stand-point of the writer (heard of the marvellous works of Jesus), not from that of John (heard of works which seem as if they must be those of the Christ).

REVISED VERSION.
11:4 Go your way
11:7 to behold
$11: 14$ which is to come
$12: 1,3$ an hungred
12: 50 he
13: 14 unto them
$13: 52$ made a disciple to
14:8 put forward
$14: 8$ etc. charger
$14: 13$ from thence
14:16 have no need to
14: 20 baskets
$15: 9$ as their doctrines

16:2, 3 heaven
$16: 3$ but ye cannot...

BUGGESTIONB.
Go $=$ A.v.
to see $=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{v}$.
who was to come
hungry ${ }^{1}$
the same $=$ A.v. ${ }^{2}$
in them =A.v.
instructed in regard to
set on
platter
thence
need not $=$ a.v.
panniers ${ }^{3}$
as doctrines (or for doctrines = ı.v.)
sky
and can ye not...?
${ }^{1}$ And so wherever the expression occurs.
${ }^{2}$ It seems to me harsh to use he here as a common gender pronoun relating to sister and mother as well as to brother. That might be employed instead of the same ; or the pronoun might be omitted altogether without injuring the sense, whosoever being the subject of $i s$.
${ }^{3}$ Or hampers. See chap. $15: 37$ and $16: 9,10$. In the latter passage there is a clearly marked distinction between the pannier, a large firm basket, two of which with their contents constitute a load for a horse or ass, and the small flexible basket ordinarily used for marketing, etc. The former usually holds several times as much as the latter. The duty of a translator can hardly be said to be done by giving the reader in the margin the information that the word used in the original of $v .9$ is different from that in $v .10$, while both are translated alike.

REVISED VERSION.
16:26 forfeit his life
16:26 for his life
17: 6 face
17:22 abode
$17: 25$ spake first to him
17 : 25 the kings of the earth, from whom do they
17 : 27 cause them to stumble

18:28 pence
$19: 5,6$ twain
19:22 he was one that had

## SUGGESTIONS.

lose his soul
for his soul = A.v. ${ }^{1}$
faces
were going about
met him ${ }^{2}$
from whom do the kings of the earth
should scandalize them (or cause them to find fault) ${ }^{3}$
denarii (or shillings) ${ }^{4}$
two
he had = A.v.
${ }^{1}$ I justify the A. V. in rendering $\psi v \chi \eta$ life, in v. 25 , and soul in v. 26. Greek idiom employs $\psi v \chi \chi^{\prime}$ for both ideas. The life saved by deserting Christ's service, or lost by faithful adherence to his cause is the present mortal life. That lost by him who would save this by deserting Christ, or found by him who for Christ's sake loses this, is immortal life. I am persuaded that $\psi v \chi \eta$ in v. 26 designates the latter, and therefore in conformity with the idiom of our language would render it (as in many cases it must be rendered) soul. I prefer lose to forfeit, because $\zeta_{\eta \mu i \alpha}$ in the sense of loss is the correlative of кє́ $\rho \delta o s$, gain, in the usual language of commerce.
${ }^{2}$ Neither of these renderings conveys fully the force of the original. "Confronted him," would come nearer to it, but would perhaps be too modern.
${ }^{3}$ I understand our Saviour's language to mean, lest we should give them occasion to regard us as doing wrong. In the following chapter the same verb signifies, as elsewhere, to cause to do wrong.
${ }^{4}$ In reference to the mode of rendering the Greek names of coins, see Preface.

REVISED VERSION.
$19: 30$ many shall be last that are first; and first that are last.
20: 14 Take up
$20: 14$ it is my will
$21: 4$ is come to pass
21:29 I will not
21:29 repented himself
21:31 whether of the twain
21:32 repent yourselves
$23: 23$ anise
23:23 but these
23:37 killeth ... stoneth
23: 37 unto her
24:8 travail
24:23 or, Here
24:36 neither the Son
$25: 6$ there is a cry
$26: 15$ weighed unto him

26:18 I keep

SUGGESTIONS.
many that are first shall be iast, and the last first. $=$ A.v. in Mark. ${ }^{1}$

Take
I wish
came to pass
I do not wish to go ${ }^{2}$
repented $=\mathbf{A} . \mathrm{v}$.
which of the two
repent
dill
these $=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{\nabla}$.
killest ... stonest $^{3}$
unto thee ${ }^{3}$
sorrows $=$ A.v. (or pangs)
or there =A.v.
(Put in margin.)
there was a cry
covenanted with him for =A.v. (or agreed with him for)
I will keep $=$ A.v. ${ }^{4}$
${ }^{1}$ Compare Mark $10: 31$. As Matthew and Mark are reporting an identical utterance, it does not appear to me that the insertion or omission of oi should demand any difference of rendering.
${ }^{2}$ "I will not" is stronger than $O^{*} \theta^{\prime} \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \omega$.
${ }^{3}$ I would use the second person here on account of the Vocative preceding, and for consistency with the remainder of the verse. We are not bound to imitate grammatical anomalies, if they do not affect the sense.
${ }^{4}$ A perfectly legitimate use of the Greek Present for a Future, which we sometimes imitate, but which here seems forced.

REVISED VERSION.
$26: 25$ Thou hast said.
$26: 28$ unto remission 26:32 am raised up
26:64 Thou hast said:
$26: 73$ bewrayeth thee
27:5 into the sanctuary
$27: 21$ Whether of the twain
27: 38 Then are
27:43 trusteth
27:63 I rise
27: 66 the guard being with them
$28: 1$ late on the sabbath

SUGGESTIONE.
It is. (marg. Gr. Thou hast said.) ${ }^{1}$
for the remission $=\mathrm{A} \cdot \mathrm{v} .{ }^{2}$
am risen $=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{v} .{ }^{3}$
I am: (marg. Gr. Thou hast said.) ${ }^{1}$
betrayeth thee (or maketh thee manifest)
in the temple $=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{v}$.
Which of the two
Then were $=$ A.v. ${ }^{4}$
hath put his trust
I shall rise
and setting the guard ${ }^{5}$
at the end of the sabbath
${ }^{1}$ I am persuaded that we should give up the literal rendering of this phrase. I have often found it a source of confusion or of positive misunderstanding. So $27: 12$, etc.
${ }^{2}$ The alteration here introduced by the revisers gives not a shadow of difference in the meaning; and the idea of a uniform rendering of prepositions seems to me chimerical.
${ }^{3}$ As retained in the Revision, chap. 28:7. Comp. Matt. 17:7; John $13: 4$, etc., where a strictly Passive sense is inadmissible.
${ }^{4}$ The rendering "Then are" seems to me to do positive violence to English idiom. The substitution of robbers for thieves in this verse was a necessary change from the A.V.
${ }^{5}$ I understand $\mu \in \tau \grave{\alpha} \tau \hat{\eta} \varsigma$ кov $\sigma \tau \omega \delta i a s$ to mean, not that the guards went with them and took part in what they did, but that the chief priests, etc., made the sepulchre secure by sealing the stone together with (the setting of) the guard.

REVIBED VERSION.
$28: 4$ the watchers did quake $28: 5$ which hath been crucified
$28: 14$ rid you of care
$28: 19$ into the name
28:20 commanded
sugaestions.
the guards trembled who was crucified
secure you = A.v. in the name $=$ A.v. ${ }^{1}$ have commanded $=$ A.v.

## MARK.

1:8 baptized
1:9 of John
have baptized $=\mathrm{A} \cdot \mathrm{v}^{2}{ }^{2}$
by John
${ }^{1}$ Notwithstanding (perhaps I should rather say withstanding) the array of authority in favor of this change, I am inclined to abide by the old version. Baptized into Christ (Rom. 6:3; Gal. 3:27), is intelligible, and natural; for we speak also of being in Christ. But can we speak of being in his name? The preposition cis, which in later times utterly supplanted $\dot{\epsilon} v$, had evidently begun to do this in the age of the New Testament. Witness cis oîkóv é $\sigma \tau \iota$, Mark 2:1; єis tìv
 and numerous other passages. John baptized $\dot{\epsilon} v \tau \hat{̣}$ 'Iop $\delta a ́ v \eta \eta$, Matt. $3: 6$, and єis тòv 'Iop $\delta a ́ v \eta \nu$, Mark 1:9. So in the phrase, Go in peace, the Greek is sometimes єis cip $\eta$ и́ $\eta \nu$ and sometimes є̇v єipウ́vm. So also baptism is said, as here and elsewhere, to be

 in the same sense. That sense, I am persuaded, is well expressed by our old established phrase in the name.
${ }^{2}$ This suggestion is not of great importance ; but the use of a Perfect to represent the Aorist here is justified on the ground that what John says (not once only but repeatedly, ${ }^{\prime} \mu \eta \dot{\eta} \rho v \sigma \sigma \epsilon$ $\lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \omega \nu)$, relates to what he had all along been and still was doing.

REVISED VERSION.
1:23 straightway
1:26 tearing
1:43 sent him out
2:26 when Abiather was high priest
4:1 is gathered
4:8 thirtyfold, and sixtyfold, and a hundredfold.
4:12 turn again, and it should be forgiven them
4:20 And those are they that were sown upon the good ground; such as hear
4:20 thirtyfold, and sixtyfold, and a hundredfold
5 : 13 choked
$5: 27$ the things
$5: 30$ that the power proceeding from him had gone forth
$6: 20^{2}$
6:43 basketfuls
$6: 45$ he himself sendeth

7:1 And there are gathered together
${ }^{1}$ Whether the $\tau \alpha \dot{\alpha}$ be read or not.
${ }^{2} \mathrm{I}$ should hesitate to alter the rendering of the A.V. At least I would exchange the text and margin of the R.V. The interpretation of $\sigma v v \epsilon \tau \eta{ }^{\prime} \rho \epsilon \iota$ is open to some doubt.

REVISED VERSION.
$7: 7$ as their doctrines
7:19 This he said making all meats clean ${ }^{1}$
$7: 26$ by race
$7: 31$ through Sidon
8:19 baskets
$8: 36$ forfeit his life
8:37 life,
9:3 glistering
$9: 11$ The scribes say
$9: 17$ brought
9:20 tare
$9: 26$ torn
9:28 We could not
9:35 minister
$9: 49$ (end)
10:39 withal

SUGGESTIONS.
as doctrines (or for doctrines $=$ А.v.)
by birth (see notes on Acts $4: 36$ and $18: 24$. )
by way of Sidon
panniers ${ }^{2}$
lose his soul ${ }^{3}$
soul ${ }^{3}$
glittering
How say the scribes ....?
have brought = A.v.
convulsed
convulsed
Why could not we =a.v.
servant $=$ A. v .
(add) [and every sacrifice shall be salted with salt] ${ }^{4}$
with (as in v. 38)
${ }^{1}$ Whichever reading be here adopted, the addition of This he said seems to me forced and unjustifiable. On the whole I would leave the verse as it stands in the A. V., admitting with most interpreters the existence here of a grammatical anomaly.
${ }^{2}$ See note on Matt. 14:20.
${ }^{3}$ See note on Matt. 16:26.
${ }^{4}$ The Syriac version contains this clause, as do also the Latin Vulgate, the Ethiopic, Arabic, and Slavic versions. Besides this, the transition to the thought of v. 50 , "salt is good," etc., is easy with this clause, but seems harsh without it.

REVISED VERSION.
11:3 send him back hither
12:14 of a truth
12:19 behind him
12:21 behind him
12:31 none other
13:8 travail
13: 14 he ought not,
13:29 he is nigh
14:1 the unleavened bread
14: 10 he that was one
14: 27 offended:

14:72 how
15: 8 went up and began
16:11 of her
16:11 disbelieved
16:16 disbelieveth
sUGGESTIONS.
send him hither = A.v. ${ }^{1}$ truly (or in truth)
(omit)
(omit)
no other
sorrows $=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{v}$.
it ought not $=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{v} .{ }^{2}$
it is nigh
of unleavened bread ${ }^{3}$
who was one
stumbled [because of me this night]: ${ }^{4}$
$(\mathrm{omit})=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{v}$.
(marg. Or crying aloud began)
by her
believed not = A.v.
believeth not =A.v.

## LUKE.

1:1 those matters which have those things which are firmly been fulfilled
1:7 well stricken
1:19 was sent believed
advanced (so v. 18)
$a \mathrm{~m}$ sent $=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{v}$.
${ }^{1}$ Perhaps putting "back" or "again" in the margin.
${ }^{2}$ The mss. are divided. It seems to me easier to consider $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \eta \kappa о ́ \tau \alpha$ the error of a copyist than $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \omega$ s a correction.
${ }^{3}$ Usage requires the before Passover, but not before unleavened bread. For was in the beginning of this verse, I should prefer was to be.
${ }^{4}$ In respect to $\sigma \kappa \alpha \nu \delta \alpha \lambda i \zeta \omega$, see Preface and Matt. 17:27 note.

REVISED VERSION.
$1: 24$ these days
1:28 And he came in, etc.

SUGGESTIONB.
those days $=$ a.v.
(Keep the whole verse as in the A.v., only bracketing the words "the angel" and "blessed art thou among women.")
$1: 35$ that which is to be the holy child which shall be born shall be called holy, the Son of God.

1:37 For no word from God For with God nothing is imshall be void of power.
1 : 39 these days
1:42 lifted up her voice with a loud cry,
1:76 make ready
1:78 shall visit
2:2 This was the first enrolment made
2:5 to enrol himself

2: 17 concerning born of thee shall be called the Son of God. (nearly =a.v.) possible. ${ }^{1}$
those days = A.v.
spake out with a loud voice, = A.v.
prepare $=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{V}$.
hath visited = A.v.
This first enrolment was made ${ }^{2}$
to be enrolled (or to have himself enrolled)
(omit)
${ }^{1}$ Or, can be impossible. The whole construction of the verse is Hebraistic ; the use of the Future, of $\pi \hat{\alpha} \nu$ with a negative, and of $\rho \hat{\eta} \mu \alpha$. For the last compare Luke $2: 15$; Acts $5: 32$, etc.
${ }^{2}$ I would propose this change whether the $\dot{\eta}$ be regarded as genuine or not, because the rendering of the Revised Version seems to imply that more than one enrolment took place in the days of Quirinius (or Quirinus).

REVISED VERSICN.
2:32 for revelation to the Gentiles

2:33 were marvelling
3:4 Make ye ready
3:7 of him
3:13 extort
3:14 exact anything wrongfully
3:15 haply he were the he were the Christ or not Christ

3:18 therefore preached he good tidings unto the people
4:4 answered unto him
4:38 holden
4:44 was preaching

SUGGESTIONS.
to enlighten the Gentiles (marg. Gr. for a revelation of the Gentiles)
marvelled = A.v.
Prepare ye=A.v.
by him
exact $=\mathbf{A} . \mathrm{v}$.
accuse any one falsely

$$
=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{v}
$$

also preached he unto the people
answered him, saying ${ }^{1}$
taken $=$ A.v. ${ }^{2}$
preached =A.v. ${ }^{3}$
${ }^{1}$ At the close of the verse add a marginal note, Some ancient copies add, but by every word of God.
${ }^{2}$ Taken was doubtless rejected because understood to indicate the commencement of the fever; but if it had commenced, its continuance is implied. Holden seems not in accordance with English idiom. If we must be strictly literal, we might say that she was under the power of a great (or high) fever.
${ }^{3}$ We cannot insist on always using the compound form of the Imperfect tense. The simple form is also frequentative. "While at Paris I wrote you every week." It would be awkward to say "I was writing," unless with the implication that something else was going on at the same time. "Was standing" in the following verse ( $5: 1$ ) I would justify, because it describes a state of things existing when something about to be recorded took place.

REVISED VERSION.
$5: 6$ had this done
7 : 10 whole
7 : 19 the Lord
7 : 24 to behold
7 : 28 but little
$7: 29,30$
$8: 14$ they are choked
8:33 choked
8: 42 a dying
8:45 Peter said, and they that were with him,
9:11 welcomed
9:25 lose or forfeit his own self
9:39 teareth
$9: 42$ tare him grievously
9:54 (end)
9:55 (end)

SUGGESTIONS.
had done this
well (or in health)
Jesus (at least in the margin)
to see $=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{v}^{1}{ }^{1}$
least $=$ A.v. (comp. $9: 48$.
(Put in parenthesis.)
are choked
strangled (or drowned)
dying
Peter and they that were with him said, = A.v.
received = A.v.
destroy or lose himself ${ }^{2}$
convulseth
convulsed him violently ${ }^{3}$
(add) [even as Elijah did.]
(add) [and said, Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of ; for the Son of man came not to destroy men's lives, but to save them.]
birds of the air $=A . v .{ }^{4}$
${ }^{1}$ To behold can hardly be considered $=\theta \varepsilon \alpha ́ \sigma \alpha \sigma \theta a \iota$. Colloquially we should say to look at ; but this would hardly be accepted as fitting the style of a scripture translation.
${ }^{2}$ See note on Matt. $16: 26$.
${ }^{3}$ The word him need not be printed in italics, since Greek idiom does not require the repetition of the pronoun.
${ }^{4}$ So $13: 19$, and wherever the phrase occurs.

REVISED VERSION.
10: 19 authority
$10: 40$ came up to him
10:40 did leave
11: 52 took
12: 18 corn
12: 23 the food
12:23 the raiment
12:33 draweth near
12:58 hale
$13: 14,16$ day of the sabbath
14: 10 glory
$15: 1$ for to hear
16:6 measures

16:7 measures

SUGGESTIONS.
power $=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{v}^{1}{ }^{1}$
came to $\operatorname{him}=\mathbf{A} . \mathrm{v}$.
hath left = a.v.
have taken =A.v. ${ }^{2}$
fruits (or produce) ${ }^{8}$
food
raiment $=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{v}$.
approacheth $=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{V}$.
drag
sabbath day $=$ a.v.
honor
to hear
baths ${ }^{4}$ (with marg. explanations.)
cors ${ }^{4}$ (with marg. explanations.)
${ }^{1}$ Authority is not what is here given, but the ability to tread upon serpents, etc., without suffering harm. If it be considered important to avoid rendering c’ $\xi o v \sigma i ́ a \nu ~ a n d ~ \delta u ́ v a \mu \iota v ~ b y ~$ the same term, the latter might be rendered might.
${ }^{2}$ Jesus is describing their present state and character.
${ }^{3}$ The term is not limited to grains, but comprises all the fruits of the earth.
${ }^{4}$ The same term is used in the A.v. and is retained in the Revised Version to render choenix, seah, bath, and cor, the seah being about six times the choenix, the bath equal to three seahs, and the cor to ten baths. Surely this confusion should be avoided, even at the expense of introducing the foreign name of the measures, with explanations in the margin, especially as bath and cor (as well as ephah, log, and hin) are used in the A.V. of the Old Testament. Measure might, perhaps, be allowed to stand for the seah, as being the one most commonly used.
revised version.
16:8 sons (bis)
$16: 8$ of the light
16:14 lovers of money
16:16 entereth violently
$16: 31$ if one rise
17:6 have faith
17: 6 would say
17:6 would have obeyed
$18: 15$ their babes
18:28 our own
19:1 called by name Zacchaeus
19: 14 ambassage
$19: 14$ will not that this man reign

19: 26 shall be taken away from him
$19: 30$ in the which
19:44 dash thee to the ground
20 : 20 rule
$20: 21$ of a truth

## sUgeestions.

children $=$ A.v. ${ }^{1}$
of light $=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{v}$.
covetous $=$ A.v.
presseth $=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{v}$.
though one should rise
had faith = A.v.
might say $=$ a.v.
would obey ${ }^{2}$
babes
what we had (or our homes)
named Zacchaeus = a.v.
embassy
do not wish to have this man reign (or do not wish that this man should reign)
shall be taken away
in which
lay thee even with the ground
$=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{V}$.
power $=$ A..${ }^{.}{ }^{8}$
truly
${ }^{1}$ As in Acts 13 : 26, R.V.
${ }^{2}$ The suggested renderings in this verse seem demanded by the concinnity of the passage. "If ye have faith ... it would have obeyed you," seems inconsistent with English idiom.
${ }^{8}$ The closest rendering of ${ }^{\alpha} \rho \chi \chi \dot{\eta}$ here would be authority; but as ${ }^{\prime} \dot{\xi}$ ovoia follows, we must seek the nearest synonyme, and as such power seems better than rule.

REVISED VERSION.
20:34 sons
20:36 sons (bis)
22:5 covenanted
22:27 whether
$22: 36$ he that hath none, let him sell his cloke, and buy a sword.
22:37 hath fulfilment

22: 70 Ye say that I am.

23:3 Thou sayest.
23:7 in these days
24:11 disbelieved them

SUGGESTIONS.
children ${ }^{1}$
children
(perhaps) agreed
which
let him that hath no sword sell his garment, and buy one.
is about to be accomplished (marg. Gr. hath an end)
I am. (marg. Gr. Ye say that I am.)
I am. (marg. Gr. Thou sayest.)
in those days
believed them not $=\mathbf{A} . \mathrm{v}$.

## JOHN.

1:9 There was the true light That was the true light=A.v. ${ }^{2}$
$1: 12$ the right
1:15 beareth ... crieth
1: 49 King
power =a.v.
bare . . . cried = A.v.
the King =A. v. (so the Syriac.)
${ }^{1}$ үацíбкогтає refers to daughters. That viós is used in a wider sense than our word son is manifest from the occurrence of such a phrase as viòv ä’ $\rho \rho \in \in \alpha, \operatorname{Rev} .12: 5$; also from the use of vioi to designate a people, as vioi 'I $\sigma \rho \alpha \eta$ ' ; also figuratively vioì 'A $\beta \rho \alpha \alpha \alpha^{\mu}$, Gal. $3: 7$.
${ }^{2}$ Tò $\phi \hat{\omega}$ s may well be regarded as the subject of $\hat{\eta} v$. "The light (of which I speak) was the true light," etc.

REVISED VERSION.
1:50 underneath
$1: 51$ the heaven
3:8 voice
$4: 6$ Jacob's well was there.

4:10 knewest
4: 12 sons
4:54 sign
$5: 13$ wist
$5: 26$ gave he
$5: 27$ he gave
5: 29 ill
$5: 39 \mathrm{Ye}$ search
7:6 alway
$8: 52$ is dead
$8: 53$ which is dead
8:53 are dead

## SUGGESTIONS.

under $=$ a.v. ${ }^{1}$
heaven $=$ A.v. ${ }^{1}$
sound $=$ A.v.
there was there a well of Jacob.
hadst known
children = a.v.
miracle $=$ A...$^{2}$
knew
hath he given = a.v.
hath given = A.v.
evil $=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{v}$.
Search $=$ A.v. ${ }^{3}$
always = A.v.
died
who died
died

1 "Underneath the fig-tree" signifies precisely the same as "under the fig-tree," and therefore I should retain the old rendering. The imitation of a tautological expression in the original does not seem a sufficient motive for a change.
${ }^{2}$ It seems to me unsuitable to use the word sign except where something is expressed or implied of which it is a sign ; whereas $\sigma \eta \mu \epsilon \hat{\imath} \nu$ has the more general sense of miracle. Even in $10: 41$ and $11: 47$ I should prefer miracle and miracles.
${ }^{3}$ Here, as in $14: 1$, I attach great weight to the rendering of the Syriac version, made only a few years later than the time of John's writing, and by people who used both languages familiarly. In both these passages that version uses an unambiguous Imperative.

REVIBED VERSION. 9:4 We must work

9:9 Others
10:16 they shall become

12:1 Jesus therefore
12:3 Mary therefore
12:9 The common people
12:13 the branches of the palm
12: 18 sign
12:22 Andrew cometh, and Philip, and they tell Jesus
12:36 sons
12:36 he departed
12: 40 he hardened
12: 43 glory (bis)

12: 48, 49 spake

SUGGESTIONR.
I must work = A.v. (marg. Many ancient authorities have We must work)
Some = A.v.
there shall be (or there shall come to be)
Then Jesus = A.v.

## Then Mary

A great multitude ${ }^{1}$
branches of palm $=\mathbf{A} . \nabla$.
miracle $=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{v}$.
Andrew and Philip came and told Jesus ${ }^{2}$
children = A.v.
departed = A.v.
hardened $=$ A.v. ${ }^{3}$
praise $=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{v}$. (or glory which $i s)$
have spoken ${ }^{4}$
${ }^{1}{ }_{o}$ o ${ }^{\circ} \chi \lambda$ dos $\pi 0 \lambda$ v́s is an inadmissable form, and must be regarded as the mistake of a copyist. We must read either
 authority.
${ }^{2}$ We surely are not bound to make our English grotesque for the sake of imitating the construction of the Greek.
${ }^{8}$ I do not believe that any difference in the relation of time was intended by the use here of an Aorist after a Perfect tense.
${ }^{4}$ Because the reference is to all our Saviour's utterances up to the time then present.

REVISED VERSION.
SUGGESTIONS.
13:3 came forth ... and had come forth ... and was
goeth
13:18 my bread
13:26 for whom I shall dip the sop, and give it him

13:27 That thou doest
14:1 ye believe in God $14: 14$ ask me

14: 28 have rejoiced
14:30 I will no more speak much with you
15: 2 cleanseth
$15: 11$ be fulfilled

15: 19 chose
$16: 4$ their hour
going
bread with me. $=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{v}$.
to whom I shall give the sop (or morsel) when I have dipped it = A.v. ${ }^{1}$
What thou doest
believe in God ${ }^{2}$
ask $=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{v} \cdot$ (Putting ask me in marg.)
rejoice $=$ A.v. ${ }^{3}$
Hereafter I will not talk much with you =A.v.
(Add in marg. i.e. pruneth)
be full = a.v. $\quad$ (or become full) (So $16: 24$ )
have chosen $=$ A.v. ${ }^{4}$
the time $=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{v}$.
${ }^{1}$ If morsel be preferred to sop in this verse it would be also in verses 27 and 30 .
${ }^{2}$ See note on $5: 39$.
${ }^{3}$ The revisers have, perhaps, made this slight change from the old version in order to exhibit a difference of tense in the two clauses, If ye loved me and ye would rejoice, corresponding to a difference of tense in the Greek. We might render either If ye loved me ye would rejoice, or, If ye had loved me ye would have rejoiced. The former seems preferable here, because the reference is to the joy which they ought to feel in the immediate prospect of his going to the Father. Comp. 4 : 10.
${ }^{4}$ Because of the immediately preceding Present tense.

REVISED VERSION.
16:4 remember them, how that I told you
17:2 that whatsoever thou hast given him, to them he should give eternal life.
17: 4 glorified
17:8 reccived... knew ... believed
$17: 17$ in the truth
17: 19 in truth
17: 23 perfected into one
17:24 that which thou hast given me, I will that, where I am, they also may be with me;
18:10 Now
18:21 these know the things which I said.

SUGGESTIONS.
remember that I told you of them $=$ A.v. ${ }^{1}$
that he should give eternal life to as many as thou hast given $\mathrm{him}=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{v} .{ }^{2}$
have glorified = a.v.
have received ... have known $\ldots$. . have believed $=$ A.v. ${ }^{3}$
through the truth ${ }^{4}$ through truth made perfect in one $=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{v}^{5}{ }^{5}$ I will that they also whom thou hast given me be with me where I am, = A.v. ${ }^{6}$
(omit) $=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{v} .{ }^{7}$
they know what I said. = A.v.
${ }^{1}$ Ad sensum.
${ }^{2}$ See note on Matt. 23:37.
${ }^{8}$ Because they still retain what they received, know what they knew, and believe what they believed.
${ }^{4}{ }^{3} \mathrm{E} v$ instrumental $=$ º in Hebrew.
${ }^{5}$ The old rendering gives the idea of advancing to the condition of oneness, and this is all that the new one aims to give.
${ }^{6}$ Compare 17 : 2.
${ }^{7}$ Why add an expletive?

REVISED VERSION.
$18: 28$ palace (bis) 18: 37 Thou sayest that I am a king.
19: 19 there was written
$19: 23$ coat (bis)
19:28 are ... saith
19:31 should not remain
19: 42 There then, etc.
20: 14 beholdeth
$20: 18$ I have seen the Lord; and how that
$20: 20$ The disciples therefore were glad
$20: 21$ Jesus therefore said
$20: 30$ Many other signs therefore
$21: 5$ Jesus therefore saith
21:12 break your fast
$21: 15$ broken their fast
sUgGestions.
pretorium (So vs. 33 and 19:9.) ${ }^{1}$ I am. (marg. Gr. Thou sayest that I am a king.)
it was written (or the writing was =A.v.)
tunic
were . . . said
might not remain
There laid they, etc. = A.v.
beheld (or saw = A.v.) ${ }^{2}$
that she had seen the Lord, and that $=$ A.v.
Then were the disciples glad $=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{v}$.
Then said $\begin{gathered}\text { sesus }=\text { a.v. } \\ \text {. }\end{gathered}$
Many other miracles also
Then said Jesus
dine $=$ A.v. ${ }^{3}$
dined $=$ a.v. ${ }^{3}$
${ }^{1}$ It is no doubt undesirable to introduce foreign words ; but this is justifiable when our own term fails to give the exact meaning of the original.
${ }^{2}$ In vs. 13 I would not object to retaining the historical Present, they say, she saith, although I should prefer they said, she said; but here to write in English she turned ... and beholdeth . . . and knew seems to me to introduce needless confusion. To be consistent the revisers should have written, "and knew not that it is Jesus."
${ }^{3}$ In Luke $11: 37,38$ and $14 ; 1$ the revisers have retained dine and dinner. We might render there and here breakfast

REVISED VERSION.
21:20 which also leaned back who also leaned
$21: 25$ the which
$21: 25$ should be written.
which
would be written.

## ACTS.

$1: 3$ by the space of
$1: 15$ these days
$1: 15$ and there was
1:19 Akeldama
1:26 gave lots
2:46 at home
$2: 47$ to them
2:47 were being saved
3:1 going up
during
those days = A.v.
there was (or there being)
Aceldama $=$ A.v. ${ }^{1}$
cast lots
from house to house $=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{v}$. (or at their houses) ${ }^{2}$
to the church = a.v.
were saved ${ }^{3}$
going up together ${ }^{4}$
and brealfasted; but this would involve a change in nearly all, if not all, the cases where ${ }^{\alpha} \rho \iota \sigma t o v$ and $\delta \epsilon i \pi v o v ~ o c c u r . ~$
${ }^{1}$ I would retain Aceldama as the established spelling, just as I would Cyrene, Phenice, or Macedunia.
${ }^{2} \mathrm{~K} a \tau^{\prime}$ oîkov here must signify, not at home as contrasted with abroad, but in the houses of the Christians as contrasted with the temple, the place of public prayer still open to them, but in which they of course could not celebrate the Lord's supper.
${ }^{3}$ I take the force of the Present tense to be not (as Alford) that the persons referred to were in process of being saved, but that they were such as from time to time believed and were saved.
${ }^{4}$ The unsuitableness of joining $\dot{\epsilon} \pi i ̀ ̀ ~$ à av̉ró with $2: 47$ and the testimony of the Syriac version satisfy me that the reading of the Textus Receptus is the true one.

REVISED VERSION.
3:6 walk

4:12 wherein
$4: 25$ by the Holy Ghost, by the mouth of our father David thy servant,
4:36 by race
$5: 6$ wrapped him round
$5: 6$ they carried
$5: 42$ at home

6:1 Now in these days
$7: 35$ hath God sent
$7: 35$ with the hand
$7: 53$ ordained
sugakstions.
(Put rise up and walk in margin)
wherely $=$ a.v.
[by the Holy Spirit] by the mouth of thy servant David ${ }^{1}$
by birth (or =A.v. $)^{2}$
wrapped him up
carried (So vs. 10.)
in houses (or from house to house, or in every house)
And in those days = a.v. (or In those days)
did God send = a.v.
by the hand=a.v. ${ }^{3}$
announced ${ }^{4}$
${ }^{1}$ The words " by the Holy Spirit" are found in the Syriac, but not the words "our father." The latter might be noticed in the margin. No evidence short of St. Luke's autograph would satisfy me that he ever wrote such a medles as $\delta$ rov̂
 $\tau 0 \hat{v} \pi a \tau \rho o ̀ s ~ \dot{\eta} \mu \omega \hat{\nu}$ may have been a gloss intended to precede $\Delta a \beta i \delta$, but attached by some copyist to the line above.
${ }^{2}$ By race he was an Israelite or a Hebrew, by the accident of birth a Cypriot. See note on 18:24.
${ }^{3}$ Either phrase, $\sigma \grave{v} v \chi \epsilon \rho i$ or ${ }^{\boldsymbol{\epsilon} v} \nu \chi \epsilon \rho \rho^{\prime}$ represents the hand of, or by.
${ }^{4}$ I object to ordained because it implies original authority. $\Delta{ }^{\prime} a t a \gamma \eta$ i is command, but it may be a command emanating from superior authority, and thus merely an announcement.

REVISED VERSION.
9: 19 he took food and was strengthened
9:20 proclaimed Jesus
$9: 28$ going in and going out

10: 25 when it came to pass that Peter entered
$10: 28$ how that it is
$10: 30$ until this hour, I was keeping the ninth hour of prayer
$11: 14$ thou shalt be saved, thou and all thy house.
12:5 of the church
12:13 to answer
13: 18 suffered he theirmanners
13:31 of them
13: 33 how that God
13:35 give thy Holy One
14:2 Jews that were disobedient

SUGGESTIONS.
when he had taken food he was strengthened preached Jesus(Comp. 10:42.)
going in and out (or coming in and going out = A.v.)
as Peter entered
that it is
I was fasting until this hour, and at the ninth hour was praying
thou and all thy house shall be saved. $=$ A.v. ${ }^{1}$
by the church
to hearken = A.v.
he bare them as a nurse
by them
that God
suffer thy Holy One = a.v.
unbelieving Jews =A.v. (or Jews who believed not) ${ }^{2}$
14:2 the souls of theGentiles
the minds of the Gentiles ${ }^{3}$
${ }^{1}$ Here, as in Luke 8:45 (T. R), we have exemplified the principle of Gr. Syntax that a verb having subjects of different numbers may take the number of the one nearest to it.
${ }^{2}$ In reference to a command $\dot{\alpha} \pi \epsilon \bullet \epsilon \epsilon$ would signify to be disobedient; but in reference to preaching we should rather take it in its etymological sense, not to be persuaded, hence to be unbelieving.
${ }^{3}$ Stirring up minds seems certainly more idiomatic than

REVISED VERSION.
14:23 appointed
$15: 7$ questioning
$15: 23$ elder brethren
$15: 29$ it shall be well with you
$15: 39$ sailed away
16:1 And he came also
16:4 for to keep
$16: 10$ for to preach
16:13 we supposed there was a place of prayer
bugglstions.
ordained $=$ A.v. ${ }^{1}$
discussion
elders and brethren $=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{v} \cdot{ }^{2}$
ye shall do well = a.v.
sailed $=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{v}$.
And he came
to keep
to preach
prayer was wont to be made $=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{v}$.
stirring up souls. Besides $\psi v \chi^{a ́ s}$ is governed by the second verb also.
${ }^{1}$ The rendering appointed seems like a compromise between the classical and the ecclesiastical use of the verb $\chi є \iota \rho о т о \nu \epsilon \epsilon \omega$. The meaning according to the former would be elected, according to the latte: ordxined. Probably the churches chose their elders, and the aposcles set them apart by laying on of hands. Compare 6:3-6. Xєчротоши́баขтєs doubtless designates the part taken in the matter by the apostles. To say that the apostles appointed elders for the churches seems to take the whole business of selecting elders out of the hands of the people and put it into those of the apostles.
${ }^{2} \Pi \rho \in \sigma \beta v i \tau \epsilon \rho \circ \iota \dot{a} \delta \in \lambda \phi$ oí occurs nowhere else in the New Testament ; and in this passage it appears in no one of the ancient versions except the Vulgate (the Syriac, Ethiopic, Armenian, Arabic, and Slavic, all agreeing with the A.v.). If it be the genuine reading, it must signify either your elder brethren, or the older brethren among us, and in neither sense does it seem to me to harmonize with the style of the apostolic writings. The revised version does not even note the other reading in the margin.

REVISED VERSION.
16:29 trembling for fear
$17: 13$ of Paul
17:16 provoked
17:18 other some
17:19 took hold of him
17: 19 what this new teaching is which is spoken by thee?
17:21 to tell or to hear
17:22 somewhat superstitious.
17:23 What therefore ye worship in ignorance,this set I forth unto you.
$17: 26$ of one
17:33 Thus Paul went out
18:2 a man of Pontus by race
18:5 constrained by the word $18: 6$ shook out

SUGGESTIONS.
trembling $=$ A.v. (or all trembling)
by Paul
stirred $=$ a.v.
others
took him =A.v.
what this new doctrine whereof thou speakest is? = A.v. ${ }^{1}$
telling or hearing
very religious

What therefore not knowing ye worship, that declare I unto you. ${ }^{2}$
of one [blood] ${ }^{3}$
So Paul departed = a.v. born in Pontus $=$ A.v. ${ }^{4}$
earnest in preaching the word shook $=$ a.v. ${ }^{5}$
${ }^{1}$ Can we say that a teaching is spoken?
${ }^{2}$ The reading "Whom ... him ..." deserves a place in the margin. Instead of declare, I should prefer announce, except that it would seem less in accord with the general usage of the translations.
${ }^{3}$ A word having as much critical authority as blood has here, it seems to me, should appear in the text with brackets. The Revised Version has not noticed it even in the margin.
${ }^{4}$ See notes on $4: 36$ and $18: 24$.
${ }^{5}$ Shook out is literal, and would be unobjectionable if we were making a new and independent version; but shook gives

REVISED VERSION.
18:7 Titus Justus
18:7 joined hard
18: 14 villany
18: 15 am not minded to be

18:23 stablishing

18:24 an Alexandrian by born at Alexandria = A.v. ${ }^{2}$ race
18:25 carefully

18: 26 more carefully

19: 5 into the name
19:9 disobedient
19: 12 carried away
19:32 the more part

SUGGESTIONS.
Justus = A.v. (Titus in marg.). was close
plotting
have no mind to be (or will not
be, or = A.v.)
confirming (or strengthening $=$

$$
\text { A. v. })^{1}
$$

accurately (as in Luke 1:3, or
correctly)
more accurately (or more correctly)
in the name =A.v. ${ }^{3}$
believed not $=$ A.v.
carried
the greater part
the sense, as in Neh. 5:13, and I should not favor a change in such circumstances.
${ }^{1}$ It does not seem so important always to retain the same English word in rendering a particular Greek word as to justify the use of an obsolete form like stablish; neither does the use of stablish for $\sigma \tau \eta \rho i \zeta \omega$ and confirm for $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \sigma \tau \eta \rho i \zeta \omega$ convey to the English reader an idea of the delicate difference between the Greek terms.
${ }^{2}$ Even if it were his father or grandfather who was born in Alexandria, and not himself (in which case he would hardly have been called 'A $\left.\lambda \epsilon \xi \alpha v \delta \rho \epsilon v^{\prime}\right)$, still I should not think it correct to call him an Alexandrian by race. To express that idea we might perhaps say by extraction.
${ }^{3}$ See note on Matt. $28: 19$.

## REVISED VERSION.

$19: 38$ accuse
19:40 in danger to be accused coucerning this day's riot
20:1 for to go
20:7 discoursed with them
20:7 intending
20:9 by his sleep
20:10 Make ye no ado
20: 13 by land
$20: 31$ by the space of
$21: 1$ it came to pass that
21:4 set foot in
21:6 but
21:9 which did prophesy
21: 10 many days
21:22 they will certainly hear
22:25 And when they had tied
22:28 am a Roman born
23: 15 or ever
23: 18 saith

RUGGESTIONS.
prosecute
liable to be prosecuted for riot, on account of what has taken place to-day
to go
preached (or discoursed) to them being about with sleep $=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{v}$.
Be not disturbed
on foot (marg. or by land)
for
(omit ; so vs. 5.)
go to (marg. or go up to)
and $=$ A.v. ${ }^{1}$
who prophesied some (or several) days
a multitude will certainly come together, for they will hear

## And as they tied

(perhaps) have it by birth. ${ }^{2}$
before
said $^{3}$
${ }^{1}$ There is no such contrast between the one party's embarking and the other's returning home as to require the disjunctive but. To avoid too many repetitions of the word and, I should be inclined to follow the A.v.
${ }^{2}$ With a marginal note, $G r$. was born.
${ }^{3}$ This case I note because it seems to me one in which a strict adherence to the tenses of the original is specially infelicitous, because of the Past tenses took and brought immediately preceding.

REVISED VERSION.
$23: 25$ after this form
23:30 to speak against him before thee.

24:14 a sect
24:17 many years
$24: 25$ call thee unto me
24: 27 when two years were

SUGGESTIONS.
as follows ${ }^{1}$
to say before thee what they had against him. = A.v. (or what pertains to him.)
heresy $=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{v} .{ }^{2}$
(perhaps) several years ${ }^{3}$
call for thee $=\mathbf{A} . \mathrm{v}$.
after two years $=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{v}^{4}{ }^{4}$ fulfilled
24:27 desiring to gain favor Felix desiring to favor the Jews with the Jews, Felix left Paul in bonds (or to shew favor to the Jews) left Paul bound ${ }^{4}$
${ }^{1}$ I suppose the substitution of form for manner here was intended to convey to the reader the impression that what follows is a copy of the letter, and not merely its general substance; but I doubt wheiher after this form distinctly conveys this impression. A marginal note might be added, Gr. having (or comprising) this form.
${ }^{2}$ Aip $\rho \sigma \iota \iota$ here must be understood to signify, not the body of errorists, but the system of (reputed) error. It seems to me that good usage will not authorize the employment of the word sect to express that idea. I should be in favor of retaining heresy, taking the word in its widest sense. Sectarism might perhaps answer, as meaning the way of sectaries. Our modern word sectarianism would not, since it signifies excessive zeal for a sect, and not simply the system of a sect.
${ }^{3}$ If we must choose between some and many I should in this place prefer many; but if several is admissible, I should think it best expresses the force of $\pi \lambda \epsilon \iota o ́ v \omega \nu$. Tı $\iota \omega \nu$ would be $=$ some (as in Acts $9: 19$ ) and $\pi o \lambda \lambda \hat{\omega} \nu=$ many (as $24: 10$ ).
${ }^{4}$ I would like to vary as little as possible from the A.V. where the sense is the same. "After two years" expresses

REVISED VERSION.
$25: 8$ sinned
25: 20 perplexed
25: 22 could wish
26:6 stand here to be judged
$26: 8$ if God doth raise
$26: 23$ how that (bis)
$26: 23$ he first by the resurrection of the dead should

26:26 none
26:28 wouldest fain make
27: 9 gone by
27 : 12 north-east and southeast
$27: 13$ Crete, close in shore
$27: 14$ after no long time
$27: 14$ beat down from it

SUGGESTIONS.
offended $=$ a.v.
in doubt
would like
stand, and am judged = A. v .
that God raiseth ${ }^{1}$
that $=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{v}$.
he should be the first that should rise from the dead, and should $=$ a.v.
not one
wilt make
past $=$ A.v.
toward the south-west and north-west $=$ A.v. ${ }^{2}$
close by Crete =A.v. not long after =A.v.
arose (marg. or beat) against
it = A.v.
the same thought as "when two years were fulfilled, and "bound " the same as "in bonds." Both these last expressions may have a more or a less strict signification. KaraÓ́ $\sigma \theta a \iota$ $\chi$ र́pıv (or $\chi$ ápıra, or $\chi$ ápıras) though it may comprise the idea of gaining favor, I understand primarily to signify doing a favor or favors.
${ }^{1}$ This force of $\epsilon i$ is well established. Comp. vs. 23.
${ }^{2}$ The reasoning by which this change is justified seems to me fanciful. Katá I take to mean in the direction of, just as in $8: 26$. "In the direction of a wind" is in the direction from which that wind comes, as winds are universally named from that direction and never from the direction toward which they blow. To make кaтá mean down the wind seems to me entirely arbitrary.

REVISED VERSION.
$27: 28$ after a little space

27:33 wait and continue
$27: 39$ and they took counsel whether they could drive the ship upon it

27:41 began to break up
28:11 The Twin Brothers
28:12 touching
$28: 20$ intreat you to see and to speak with me

SUGGESTIONS.
when they had gone a little further = A.v.
have waited and continued ${ }^{1}$
into which they were minded, if it were possible, to thrust in the ship =a.v. (or on which they consulted, if possible, to drive the ship) ${ }^{2}$
was broken = A.v. ${ }^{3}$
Castor and Pollux $=$ A.v. ${ }^{4}$
landing $=$ A.v. ${ }^{5}$
request to see and to speak with you ${ }^{6}$
${ }^{1}$ In constructions of this kind the Greek uses the Present exactly as we do the Perfect.
${ }^{2}$ I think Dean Alford points the text correctly, ${ }^{\epsilon} \beta$ ßovicúovto,
 and not with $\delta$ v́vauvto.
${ }^{3}{ }^{3}$ Eли́єто, not merely began, but began and continued to be broken up.
${ }^{4}$ The one expression is no more a literal rendering of $\Delta$ iórкovpo than the other. If the aim of the revisers was to avoid the use of these mythological names (which indeed are not literally found in the text), I see no gain in this; for the mythology is there; if it was to present a phrase more intelligible to English readers than Castor and Pollux, it is an objection to this that in order to do so they remove the mythological allusion which exists in the text.
${ }^{5}$ Touching would be the term if the object were to make a new translation; but landing may fairly retain its place in a revision.
${ }^{6}$ The connection justifies us in understanding $\pi \rho \sigma \sigma \lambda \alpha \lambda \hat{\eta} \sigma \alpha \iota$

REVISED VERSION.
28:23 they came to him into his lodging in great number
28:24 disbelieved
28:26 in no wise
28:27 turn again
28:29 (verse in marg.)
28:31 boldness, none

SEGGESTIONE.
there came many to him into his lodging $=$ A.v. ${ }^{1}$
believed not=A.v.
not $=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{v}$. turn
(Insert in the text in brackets.) confidence, no man $=\mathbf{A} . \mathrm{v}^{2}{ }^{2}$

## ROMANS.

1:5 of faith
$1: 6$ to be Jesus Christ's
$1: 13$ in you ... in the rest

1:14 foolish
2:7 incorruption
$3: 4,6$, etc. God forbid
to faith
of Jesus Christ = A.v.
among you ... among the rest

$$
=\mathrm{A} \cdot \mathrm{v}
$$

unwise =A.v.
immortality =A.v.
By no means ${ }^{3}$
of Paul's addressing the Jews, rather than of the Jews' addressing Paul.
${ }^{1}$ The object of this change doubtless was to make it apparent that those who came were the same, or some of the same, who made the appointment; but it seems to me that this is implied in the narrative, so that the old version might stand.
${ }^{2}$ Boldness is a good rendering of $\pi \alpha \rho \rho \rho \emptyset \eta \sigma i \alpha$, but so also is confidence, and I perceive no sufficient reason for the change, in view of the rules adopted for the revision.
${ }^{\mathbf{3}} \mathrm{I}$ do not overlook the fact that $\gamma^{\prime}$ voıтo is Optative. Still that seems to me very far from justifying the introduction of the name of God into the translation. Our familiar phrase by no means seems to me to give the full force of $\mu \grave{\eta} \gamma^{\text {ćvocto }}$ wherever it occurs.

REVISED VERSION.
3:9 worse
$3: 30$ if so be
4: 19 without being weakened
$5: 1$ let us have peace
$5: 2$ let us rejoice
$5: 3$ let us also rejoice in our tribulations
5: 4 probation
$5: 7$ the good man
$5: 18$ one trespass . . . one act of righteousness
sugastions.
better
seeing $=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{v} .{ }^{1}$
being not weak $=$ A.v. ${ }^{2}$
we have peace $=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{v}$.
rejoice $=$ A.v.
we glory in tribulations also

$$
=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{v} .{ }^{3}
$$

experience $=A$. v. $^{4}$
a good man $=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{v} .{ }^{5}$
the trespass of one . . . the righteousness of one ${ }^{6}$
${ }^{1}$ I would unhesitatingly retain this rendering, whether we read $\epsilon \not ้ \pi \epsilon \rho$ or $\grave{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon i ́ \pi \epsilon \rho$.
${ }^{2}$ The original participle is not Passive, but Neuter, and is well rendered by being weak.
${ }^{3}$ Rendering каvұ $\hat{\omega} \mu \alpha \iota$ as in 2 Cor. $12: 9$. I would give it the same rendering in verse 2 if it were not followed by $\delta o ́ \xi \eta$ §.
${ }^{4} \Delta o \kappa \iota \mu \dot{\eta}$ is proof, both the process and the result. The result seems here intended. Probation is the process, and in modern usage generally refers to a season of trial. If the result were spoken of with reference to the judgment of others, it would signify approral, the being סóксцоs. But if, like the patience and hope with which it is here associated, бокц $\mu \eta$ also is subjective, it will be best rendered by experience, meaning that self-knowledge which is gained through the endurance of tribulation.
${ }^{5}$ Notwithstanding the article. This is one of those cases where the Greek uses the definite article, but we do not. I would also decidedly omit the marginal note.
${ }^{6}$ It seems to me that the rendering of the A.V. "the offence (or trespass or transgression) of one" and "the righteousness

REVIRED VERSION.
$6: 17$ whereunto ye were de- which was delivered you $=\mathbf{A} . \nabla$. livered
$6: 20$ in regard to righteous- from righteousness $=$ A.v. ness
7:1 Or, etc. ${ }^{2}$
7 : 4 were made dead
$7: 6$ so that we serve
$7: 8,9$ apart from
8:4 ordinance
9: 9 a word of promise
have become dead that we should serve $=$ A.v. ${ }^{8}$ without $=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{V}^{4}{ }^{4}$
righteousness $=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{v} \cdot{ }^{5}$
the word of promise $=$ A.v.
of one," although the more difficult one, is yet justified by the course of the apostle's reasoning, and at least deserves a place in the margin.
${ }^{1}$ חapaסíow $\mu \iota$ is repeatedly used for communicating evangelical instruction, as well as for handing down traditions. I would retain the old rendering here, understanding it as $=$ "in which ye were instructed."
${ }^{2}$ I would regard the $\eta^{\prime}$ as interrogative and retain the whole verse as in the A.V., except that I would prefer to omit how.
${ }^{3}$ Alford justifies the rendering, "so that we serve" on the ground of the verb ( $\delta o v \lambda \epsilon \epsilon^{\prime} \epsilon \iota \nu$ ) being in the Present tense. But this (in the Infinitive) only gives it the sense of continued action, and does not necessarily modify the force of $\ddot{\omega} \sigma \tau \epsilon$. I should prefer to leave the old rendering undisturbed.
${ }^{4}$ I see no gain in rendering $\chi \omega \rho i s$, either here or elsewhere, apart from, rather than without, as Matt. 13:34; Luke $6: 49$, etc.
${ }^{5}$ Taking $\delta \iota \kappa \alpha i \omega \mu \alpha$ as collective, meaning the whole course of righteous feelings and actions required by the law. So in Rev. 19:8 I would keep the rendering righteousness, because the white robes represent righteous character as a whole rather than individual acts.

REVISED VKRSION.
9:9 According to
10:17 belief
11: 1 Did God
11:2 God did not
11: 29 without repentance

12:1 reasonable
12:3 the grace that was given me
12:16 things that are lowly
13:3 to the good work
13:3 to the evil
13:3 And wouldest thou have no fear
13:6 ministers of God's service
14: 4 lord
$15: 13$ in the power
15 : 24 Spain
15 : 25 - but now, I say,

SUGGESTIONS.
At $=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{v}$.
faith =A.v.
Hath God= A.v. (comp. vs. 4.)
God hath not $=$ A.v.
irrevocable (or not to be re pented of)
spiritual (marg. Gr. rational) ${ }^{1}$
the grace given unto me=A.v
the lowly
to good works = A.v.
to evil
Desirest thou then not to be afraid
God's ministers $=$ A.v. ${ }^{2}$
master $=$ A. $\mathbf{V}$.
by the power
Spain [I will come to you] ${ }^{3}$
But now $=$ A.v.
${ }^{1}$ I apprehend that ordinary readers interpret reasonable service to mean a service reasonably required, whereas, I take
 powers, in distinction from one of the hands or lips; and since rational would also be ambiguous, I see no way but to use spiritual in the text.
${ }^{2}$ The revisers have doubtless aimed to bring out the difference between $\lambda_{\epsilon \iota \tau о v \rho \gamma o i ́ ~ a n d ~ \delta ı a ́ к о v o \iota, ~ b u t ~ I ~ d o u b t ~ w h e t h e r ~}^{\text {a }}$ the expression they have chosen conveys to an English reader any other idea than that conveyed by the old rendering.
${ }^{3}$ Putting a period at the end of the verse.

REVISED VERSION.
15:26 been the good plea- pleased them = A.v. sure

15:27 been their good plea- pleased them = A.v. sure
15:31 are disobedient do not believe = A.v.
15:32 find rest be refreshed = A.v.
16:17 them which are caus- those that cause divisions ing the divisions
16:17 learned
16:17 turn away from
16:25 times eternal
16:27 to whom
have learned = A.v. avoid $=\mathrm{a} . \mathrm{v}$.
ages
(omit) ${ }^{1}$

## 1 CORINTHIANS.

1:4 which was given
1:8 that ye be
$1: 13,15$ into
1:18 are perishing ... being saved
1:27 chose (bis)
1:28 did God choose
2:4 of wisdom
2:8 knoweth
2:9 saw not ... heard not ... entered not
given
that ye may be = A.v. in = A.v.
perish ... saved $=$ A.v. ${ }^{2}$
hath chosen $=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{v}$.
hath God chosen = A.v.
of [man's] wisdom
knew (or hath known)
hath not seen... hath not heard
... have not entered
${ }^{1}$ Whether $\hat{\mathscr{\psi}}$ be read or not.
${ }^{2} \Sigma \omega \zeta$ ou'́vots, saved from time to time. We have in English no form of verbs or participles to express just this shade of meaning. I see no reason to understand (with Alford) those who are in the way of salvation. Compare Acts $2: 47$.

REVISED VERSION.
2: 10 revealed
2:10 through the Spirit
2:12 received
3:4 are ye not men?
3:8 but each
3: 17 destroyeth
3: 19 He that taketh
5 : 2 did not rather mourn
$6: 4$ do ye set them to judge who are of no account in the church?
$6: 7 \mathrm{Nay}$, already, etc.

6:9 Or know ye not

SUGGESTIONS.
hath revealed = a.v. by his Spirit =a.v.
have received $=$ a.v. are ye not walking as men ? ${ }^{1}$ and each
defileth (or polluteth) ${ }^{2}$
Who taketh
have not rather mourned =A.v. ${ }^{3}$
set them to judge who are least
esteemed in the church $=$ A.v.

Now therefore, etc. (the whole verse = A.v.)
Know ye not =A.v. ${ }^{4}$
${ }^{1}$ I would insert these Italics because we are obliged in English to use men to represent the idea of ${ }_{\alpha} \nu \delta \rho \epsilon \varsigma$, $v i r i$, as well as of $\stackrel{\ddot{\alpha}}{ } \boldsymbol{\nu} \theta \rho \omega \pi o \iota$, homines. "Walking as men," draws attention at once to the language of vs. 3 , and the thought in both passages is the same.
${ }^{2}$ Because corrupteth, which would be the literal rendering of $\phi \theta \epsilon i \rho \epsilon \iota$, is unsuited to the idea of a temple. Neither should we attempt to render alike in the two clauses, since the meaning is not the same in both. The ancient versions do, bec:luse they have single terms which, like $\phi \theta \epsilon i \rho \omega$, unite the two meanings. Compare 2 Pet. 2 : 12.
${ }^{3}$ The apostle is describing their present condition, $\pi \epsilon \phi v \sigma \iota \omega-$ $\mu \in ́ v o \iota ~ \epsilon ̇ \sigma \tau \epsilon ́$, and therefore we should understand the force of $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \nu \theta \dot{\eta} \sigma \alpha \pi \epsilon$ as extending to the time present when he was writing.
${ }^{4}$ I would give the same rendering in vs. 16 and 19 . There is a certain additional force given to the question by prefixing

REVISED VERSION.
7:2 because of fornications
7:5 may be together
7:28 But and if
$7: 28$ Yet, etc. (to the end of the verse)
$7: 37,38$ his own
8:13 forever more

8: 13 that I make not
$9: 12$ did not use
9:15 I write not
$9: 18$ use to the full
$10: 13$ such as man can bear
$10: 22$ Or do we

SUGGESTIONS.
to avoid formication $=A \cdot \nabla_{0}^{1}$
come together $=$ A.v. ${ }^{2}$
Yet if
Nevertheless, etc. = A.v.
his
while the world standeth $=$

$$
\text { A.v. }{ }^{3}
$$

that I may not cause
have not used =a.v.
I have not written
abuse $=$ A.v. ${ }^{4}$
such as is common to man $=$

$$
\text { A.v. }{ }^{5}
$$

Dowe = A.v.
$\eta ้$, like that given to a Latin interrogation by prefixing num, but or does not express it, and whether in that sense is obsolete.
${ }^{1}$ Marg. Gr. because of fornications.
${ }^{2}$ The A.V., gives the sense, even if $\hat{\eta} \tau \epsilon$ be the true reading, while the new rendering, it seems to me, does not.
${ }^{3}$ We have no word exactly corresponding to aióv. We are obliged to translate it age, world, eternity, etc. It is here limited from the nature of the case to the writer's lifetime; and yet as long as I live would be an inadequate rendering, for it would not give the full force of cis ròv ai $\omega \hat{\omega} \alpha$; but the old rendering while the world standeth, seems to me to do so quite as well as forever more.
${ }^{4}$ Kataхрáoнаь generally signifies wrong or excessive use. To the full comes short of expressing excess, both here and in the margin of $7: 31$.
${ }^{5}$ Inserting in the margin, $G r$. human or pertaining to man.

REVISED VERSION.
11:2 1 praise you
11:2 traditions
11: 19 heresies
11:20 it is not possible
11:24 This is my body which is for you
11:29 For he that eateth and drinketh, eateth and drinketh judgment unto himself, if he discern not the body
12:7 to profit withal
12:9 in the same Spirit
12:9 in the one Spirit
13:11 I felt as a child, I thought as a child
14:1 jet
14:1 but rather
14:3 edification, and comfort,
14:6 But
14:18 you all
14:29 discern
$14: 30$ But if, etc. (the If, etc. = A.v. whole verse)
instructions
factions
it is not [Lord's] body
for profit as a child
and $=$ A.v.
more especially = A.v.
And
ye all =A.v.
judge $=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{v}$.

SUGGESTIONS.
I praise you, [brethren, ]
[Take, eat;] this is my body, which is [broken] for you.
For he that eateth and drinketh [unworthily] eateth and drinketh judgment to himself, not discerning the
by the same Spirit =A.V.
by the same Spirit $=$ A.v. ${ }^{1}$
I thought as a child, I reasoned
to edification and exhortation

REVISED VERSION.
15: 2 saved; 1 make known, I say, in what words I preached it unto you, if ye hold it fast,
15:4 hath been raised
15:20 are asleep
15:28 be subjected
15:33 Evil company doth corrupt good manners.

15:47 of heaven
$15: 55 \mathrm{O}$ death, where is thy victory? O death, where is thy sting?
$16: 2$ as he may prosper

SUGGESTIONS.
saved, if ye hold fast what I preached unto you, ${ }^{1}$
was raised ${ }^{2}$
have slept
be subject $=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{v}^{3}{ }^{3}$
Evil company corrupteth (or Evil companionships corrupt) good morals. [the Lord] from heaven
O death, where is thy sting? O Hades, where is thy victory? ${ }^{4}$
as he may be prospered
${ }^{1}$ Adding on the word what a marginal note, $G r$. with what word. I am unable to see in the R.V., any fair connection for the conditional phrase, "if ye hold it fast."
${ }^{2}$ The Greek verb is in the Perfect tense, and in vs. 12,13 , 14, etc., I would translate by an English Perfect. But it seems to me contrary to our idiom to use that tense with a specification of a distant past time.
${ }^{3}$ I object to the passive form here because it seems to imply that the Son is made subject by some other power ; whereas, I understand the meaning to be that he shall voluntarily become subject. A Middle sense not unfrequently inheres in the Passive forms of Greek verbs.
${ }^{4}$ The rendering of the Peshito Syriac confirms here the reading of the textus receptus. So does the Armenian substantially.

## 2 CORINTHIANS.

REVISED VERSION.
1:1 the whole of Achaia
$1: 5$ abound unto us
1:6 worketh
1:8 weighed down exceedingly, beyond our power
1:9 answer of death
1:10 will deliver : on whom we have set our hope that he will also still deliver us;

## 1:12 holiness

1:12 sincerity of God

SUGGESTIONS.
all Achaia = A.v. ${ }^{1}$
abound in us $=$ A.v. ${ }^{2}$
is effectual = A.v.
pressed out of measure, above strength $=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{v}$. sentence of death $=$ a.v. doth deliver : in whom we trust that he will yet deliver us; (or will still deliver us ) ${ }^{3}$
simplicity=A.v.(So the Syriac) Godly sincerity $=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{v}^{4}{ }^{4}$
${ }^{1}$ This change was doubtless made for the sake of preserving a distinction between ödos and $\pi \hat{a} s$, which, though in certain connections they give different shades of meaning, in this case I take to be absolutely synonymous, as I do also the two expressions the whole of Achaia and all Achaia in English. In such a case I feel that the old version may fairly claim to be left undisturbed.
${ }^{2}$ Here, again, I find a distinction without a difference. Both phrases mean that sufferings with and for Christ abound in our case or experience, and I fail to see that the new version conveys the meaning any better than the old.

3 "On whom we have set our hope" may be a trifle closer to the shape of the Greek, but "in whom we trust " expresses the same thought more neatly and with equal force.
${ }^{4}$ Does the new phrase convey to the reader any idea different from that conveyed by the old? If it does, I fear it will not be the right idea. If not, why change?

REVISED VERSION.
2: 14 leadeth us in triumph
$2: 15$ are being saved
2:15 are perishing
2:16 from death
2:16 from life
3:3 tables that are hearts of flesh.

3:18 reflecting as a mirror
4:3 But and if
4:3 are perishing
4: 6 Seeing, etc. (the whole verse)
5: 11 hope
7:2 Open your hearts to us, etc. (the whole verse)

SUGGESTIONS.
(Add in margin, Or causeth us to triumph.) ${ }^{1}$
are saved $=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{v}^{2}{ }^{2}$
perish $=$ A.v. ${ }^{2}$
of death = A.v. (So the Syriac.)
of life = A.v. (So the Syriac.)
fleshly tables of the heart $=$

$$
\text { A.v. }{ }^{3}
$$

beholding as in a mirror
But if indeed
perish
For God, etc. (the whole verse)

$$
=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{v}
$$

trust $=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{v} .{ }^{4}$
Receive us, etc. (the whole verse $=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{v} .{ }^{5}$
${ }^{1}$ I take it that the rendering "leadeth us in triumph" was not chosen as presenting the same ambiguity which some commentators say exists in the Greek, for any such mode of rendering is distinctly repudiated in the Preface to the Revised Version. If so, I think the reading causeth us to triumph should appear in the margin.
${ }^{2}$ See note on Acts 2: 47.
${ }^{3}$ The reading карঠías is confirmed by the Vulgate, and by the Syriac, Ethiopic, and Armenian versions.
${ }^{4}$ The use of hope in reference to something at present existing may doubtless be justified by authorities. Still it is contrary to our best usage.

5 "Open your hearts to us" is ambiguous, and might mean, "express your feelings to us with all freedom." "Open your hearts to receive us" would answer, but is too long. The

REVISED VERSION.
7 : 12 your earnest care for us
$8: 4$ in regard of this grace and the fellowship
$8: 12$ if the readiness is there,

8:19 grace
8:19 ministered
$9: 12$ filleth up the measure of the wants
$9: 13$ the obedience of your your professed subjection = confession
10:1 am of good courage
sUGGESTIONS.
our earnest care for you
to receive this gift and to accept the fellowship ${ }^{1}$
if there be first a willing mind,
= a.v.
gift
administered =a.v.
supplieth the wants A.v. ${ }^{2}$
am ${ }^{\circ}$ bold = A.v. (or am confident) ${ }^{3}$

Perfect tenses also seem to me appropriate here, since the apostle is reviewing his whole course of life, and the Greek Aorist bears that rendering perfectly well.
${ }^{1}$ If $\delta \epsilon \in \dot{\xi} \alpha \sigma \theta \alpha \iota \dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\alpha} s$ is not a genuine reading, it would seem to be a correct gloss, being implied in the fellowship which the contributors sought from the Apostle.
${ }^{2}$ I do not feel entirely satisfied with either of these renderings. Subjection is a closer rendering of $\mathfrak{v \pi} \pi \boldsymbol{\tau} \alpha \gamma \eta$ than obedience, and confession perhaps a little preferable to profession for ómodoरía, although I know of no other word in Greek but ó $\mu$ odoyia to signify a religious profession. It is a slight objection to the rendering of the A.V. that a professed subjection might be insincere, whereas the implication here is that the profession of the Corinthians was a thoroughly honest profession. On the other hand the combination confession unto, in this connection, seems to me faulty.
${ }^{3}$ Of course the object of this change was to avoid rendering the two verbs in vs. 2 alike. It strikes me that this advantage is more than balanced by the weakening of the sense in

REVISED VERSION.
$10: 13$ of the province which God apportioned to us as a measure, to reach
$10: 15$ magnified in you according to our province unto further abundance,
11:7 Or did I commit a sin
12:7 And by reason of the exceeding greatness of the revelations - wherefore, that I should not be exalted overmuch,
12: 9 hath said
12:9 strength of Christ
12:19 Ye think all this time 13: 5 Or

SUGGESTIONS.
of the rule which God assigned to us, a measure reaching
enlarged among you according to our rule abundantly,

Did I commit a fault
And lest I should be exalted above measure, through the abundance of the revelations, $=$ A.v. ${ }^{1}$
said
power of Christ = A.v. ${ }^{2}$
Again think ye $\ldots$ ? $=$ A.v. ${ }^{8}$ (omit)

## GALATIANS.

2:16 save
$3: 22$ all things
but only (or, nor otherwise save)
all $=$ A.v. ${ }^{4}$
vs. 1. "Am of good courage" most naturally means, "am cheerful and hopeful," which in many cases would express the meaning of $\theta \alpha \rho \mathcal{\rho} \rho \hat{\omega}$, but is far from the Apostle's meaning here.
${ }^{1}$ So all the versions in Walton's Polyglot; also the Armenian.
${ }^{2}$ Is there any good reason for giving two renderings to ס́voaucs in this verse?
${ }^{3}$ The Syriac translators must have had before them the reading $\Pi \alpha{ }^{\lambda} \iota \iota$, for they render precisely as the A.V.
${ }^{4} A d$ sensum. If it be thought necessary to imitate the neuter form, we might render $\tau \grave{\alpha} \pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \tau \boldsymbol{a}$ the whole world.

REVISED VERSION.
$3: 24$ hath been
$3: 28$ can be (ter)
3:28 one man
4:7 an heir through God
4:13 ye did me no wrong
4:17 zealously seek you
4:17 seek them
4:18 to be zealously sought
$4: 23$ is born
$4: 23$ is born through promise
5:1 with freedom did Christ set us free: stand fast therefore,
$6: 5$ his own burden

SUGGESTIONS.
became
is = $\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{v}$.
one $=$ a.v.
an heir[of God through Christ] ${ }^{1}$
ye have not injured me at all $=$ a.v.
are zealous for you
be zealous for them
to be zealous
was born $=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{v}$.
by promise = A.v.
stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free $=$ A.v. ${ }^{2}$
his own load ${ }^{3}$

## EPHESIANS.

$1: 10$ unto a dispensation of in the dispensation of the ful-
the fulness of the times, to sum up ness of times to gather together in one ${ }^{4}$
${ }^{1}$ These words " of God through Christ" are in the Peshito Syriac version.
${ }^{2}$ Here also the Peshito agrees with the A.V.
${ }^{3}$ This change I would make for the sake of marking the difference between the $\beta \alpha \rho_{\eta} \eta$ of vs. 2 and $\phi o \rho \tau i o v$ here, the former signifying the burdens of life, which Christian sympathy can share, and the latter that individual responsibility, which cannot be shared, but which each one must bear for himself.
${ }^{4}$ And the rest of the verse, as in the A.V. The transfer of

## REVISED VERSION.

1:12 hoped in Christ
1:13 ye also,
$1: 14$ unto
$1: 15$ and which
1:18 having the eyes of your heart enlightened
2:1 through your trespasses and sins

2:2 sons of disobedience
2:3 as the rest

SUGGEETIONS
trusted in Christ $=\mathbf{A} . \mathbf{v}$.
ye also trusted $=\mathbf{A} . \mathbf{v}$.
until $=$ A.v.
and [the love] which ${ }^{1}$
the eyes of your understanding being enlightened $=$ A.v. ${ }^{2}$
in trespasses and sins $=$ A.v. ${ }^{3}$
children of disobedience $=$ A.v. ${ }^{4}$ as others $=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{v}$.
the definite article from times to dispensation I would justify by Hebrew analogy, and the rendering of cis by in on the ground of its being viewed from the stand-point of the preexisting purpose.
${ }^{1}$ Here again the Syriac agrees with the A.V.
${ }^{2}$ Admitting карঠías as the true reading I would regard סıavoías as a correct gloss, and abide by the old version, just as in Prov. 6:32 and 7:11, I would render derstanding, and not wanting heart. I appreciate the desire of the revisers to preserve uniformity in the rendering of карঠía, but I would here be content with noting the literal rendering in the margin. "The eyes of the heart" is a perfectly legitimate combination; but I apprehend that most readers would interpret heart (in that phrase) as the seat of the affections, and not of intelligence.
${ }^{3}$ If the death here spoken of were that of the body, viewed as a consequence of sin, the new rendering would be correct; but if it be the state of $\sin$, the destitution of spiritual life the old familiar rendering seems to me better. The Greek article does not demand the insertion of your in the translation, since it is often prefixed to nouns when used generically.
${ }^{4}$ See note on Luke $20: 34$.

REVISED VERSION.
2:5 through our trespasses
2:5 have ye been saved
2:8 have ye been saved
2:14 made ... brake

3:21 Unto him be the glory
4:19 gave themselves
4:20 did not so learn
4:21 heard... were taught

4:32 forgave you
5:6 sons
$6: 4$ nurture them in the chastening
6:9 both their Master and yours
sUgGESTIONS.
in trespasses
ye are saved =A.v.
are ye saved = A.v.
hath made... hath broken $=$

$$
\text { A.v. }{ }^{1}
$$

Unto him be glory = A.v. ${ }^{2}$
have given themselves $=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{v} .{ }^{3}$
have not so learned $=\mathbf{A} . \mathbf{\nabla}$.
have heard . . . have been taught

$$
=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{v}
$$

hath forgiven you = A.v.
children $=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{v}$.
bring them up in the nurture $=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{v} .{ }^{4}$
He who is both their Master and yours
${ }^{1}$ Perfect tense appropriate, because the conditions remain. Jewish and Gentile Christians are still one; the wall remains broken down.
${ }^{2}$ The glory here, I take it, is not the glory of any particular divine work, but all glory ; and if so, it is just as well expressed in English without the article as with it.
${ }^{3}$ The Apostle is describing their present state. See vs. 17.
${ }^{4}$ The Revision has here approximated to giving the same rendering of $\epsilon \kappa \tau \rho \epsilon \in \phi \omega$ as in $5: 29$ and yet not attained to an identical rendering. Bring up is a good translation of this verb (as also of $\tau \rho \in ́ \phi \omega$ in Luke 4:16), and although chastening is comprised in $\pi \alpha \iota \delta \epsilon i \alpha$, it is not the whole it. Training would be a little more exact than either nurture or chastening, but is perhaps less in accord with the style of the translation.

REVISED VERSION.
$6: 18$ in all perseverance
6 : 24 uncorruptness

SUGGESTIONS.
with all perseverance $=\mathbf{A} . \mathbf{v}$. sincerity $=$ A.v. ${ }^{1}$

## PHILIPPIANS.

1:23 very far better
1:25 abide with you all
2:6 a prize
far better $=A . v .{ }^{2}$
continue with you all $=$ A.v. ${ }^{3}$ robbery $=$ A..${ }^{4}$
${ }^{1}$ Putting incorruption or uncorruptness in the margin as the literal rendering.
${ }^{2}$ The insertion of very in this passage seems to me objectionable on two grounds. (1) It is doubtless designed to represent the word $\pi \circ \lambda \lambda \hat{\omega}$. But $\mu \hat{a} \lambda \lambda \frac{}{}$ крєîtтov would not signify far better, but the rather better or better in comparison, and so the whole phrase signifies much better in comparison. (2) The prefixing of very does not seem to me to strengthen the phrase far better, but rather to dilute and weaken it. Would the sentence "The heaven of the holy lies far beyond these visible heavens" be at all strengthened by reading very far instead of far?
${ }^{3}$ The insertion of $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha$ in the compound verb justifies the use of a different term for it from that employed in rendering the simple verb.
${ }^{4}$ I.e. an unwarranted assumption. Even when on earth our Lord distinctly claimed equality with the Father, and did not consider it $\dot{\alpha} \rho \pi \alpha \gamma^{\prime}$ ós to advance such a claim. A fortiori, he did not so consider it before his incarnation; and yet he humbled himself, etc. But how can we conceive of his thinking of seizing that dignity, before his coming into the world? I would however place the rendering of the R.V. in the margin, as a possible one.

REVISED VERSION.
$2: 22$ as a child serveth a as a son with a father ${ }^{1}$ father
3:8 dung

3:9 of God
3:12 apprehend
3:12 apprehended
3:13 apprehended
3:19 the belly
4:10 rejoice
4: 19 fulfil
refuse
from God
lay hold of ${ }^{2}$
laid hold of
laid hold of $i t$
their belly =A.v.
rejoiced $=$ a. . $^{3}{ }^{3}$
supply = A.v.
${ }^{1}$ Since the reference here is not to service rendered by a child to a parent, but to coöperation in a filial spirit by an adult standing in the relation of a child to a parent, it would seem to be best expressed by the use of the term son. A similar remark would apply to $1 \mathrm{Tim} .1: 2 ; 2: 1$; Tit. $1: 4$. In Luke 2:48 the R.V. has (properly as I think) retained son as a rendering of $\tau \epsilon \in \kappa v o \nu . ~ C o m p a r e ~ n o t e ~ o n ~ v i o i ́, ~ L u k e ~$ 20:34.
${ }^{2}$ In its primary meaning apprehend is precisely the proper term here; but since usage has restricted its meaning, the change here proposed by the American company of revisers has the merit of making the passage plainer than it was in the A.V.
${ }^{3}$ The reference seems to be to his feelings on the arrival of the supplies. Had it been to his feelings at the time of writing, there seems to be no reason why he should not have employed the Present tense of the verb.

## COLOSSIANS.

REVISED VERSION.
$1: 7$ on our behalf
1:11 the might of his glory
2:7 builded up
$2: 13$ through your trespasses
2:13 did he quicken
$2: 15$ having put off from himself
$2: 18$ dwelling in the things which he hath seen
$2: 20$ If ye died
3:1 If ye then were raised

SUGGESTIONS.
on your behalf ${ }^{1}$
his glorious might ${ }^{2}$
built up
in your trespasses
hath he quickened = A.v.
having spoiled $=$ A.v. (or having despoiled)
intruding into those things which he hath not seen $=$ A.v. ${ }^{3}$

If ye have died
If ye then are risen with Christ, together with Christ,
${ }^{1}$ I regard the testimony of the Syriac version as outweighing the preponderance of Greek manuscript testimony, especially in a case where the question is between $\eta$ and $v$, two letters pronounced absolutely alike from the days of our earliest mss. This verse I should have preferred to leave untouched, except by the substitution of beloved for dear.
${ }^{2}$ I suppose that the revisers did not intend to give a different interpretation of this phrase from that of the A.V., but simply a more literal translation, and for this they seem to me to have sacrificed something of clearness.
${ }^{8}$ I do not know of any authority for rendering $\epsilon^{\epsilon} \mu \beta a \tau \epsilon \dot{v} \omega \nu$ dwelling; and in reference to the question of reading or not reading $\mu \boldsymbol{\eta}$, it strikes me that its insertion by a copyist is far less likely than its omission. Here, again, the authority of the Peshito Syriac seems to me very weighty. Its rendering is precisely like that of the A.V.

REVIRED VERSION.
3:3 ye died
3:11 there cannot be
$3: 15$ to the which
4:6 each one
4:13 labour

SUGGESTIONS.
ye lave died
there is no more
to which
every one
concern ${ }^{1}$

## 1 THESSALONImNS.

$2: 1$ hath not been found vain was not in vain $=A . \nabla_{.}{ }^{2}$
4:12 honestly
$4: 13$ the rest
$5: 5$ sons (bis)
$5: 18$ to you-ward
$5: 27$ all the brethren
becomingly (or with propriety) others = A.v. (So 5:6.)
children $=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{v}^{3}{ }^{3}$
concerning you =A.v. (or with regard to you)
all the [holy] brethren ${ }^{4}$

## 2 THESSALONIANS.

1:3 each one of you all every one of you all toward toward one another each other = A.v.
$1: 6$ if so be that

2:2 is now present
seeing = A.v. (Comp. Rom. 3:30.)
is just at hand
${ }^{1}$ The Syriac reads zeal ; but if the true reading be $\pi \boldsymbol{o}^{2} \boldsymbol{v} \boldsymbol{v}$, the labor (or pain) intended must be mental, and so may well be rendered concern, or anxiety.
${ }^{2}$ I appreciate the effort to express the force of $\gamma \in \mathcal{\epsilon} \gamma \boldsymbol{\tau} \in \nu$, but it does not seem to me successful.
${ }^{3}$ See note on Luke 20:34.
${ }^{4}$ The Syriac has "all the holy brethren."

REVISED VERSION.
2:11 sendeth
2:11 a working of error
2:12 might be judged
2:13 in sanctification
2:15 traditions which were taught
2:16 which loved us and gave us
2:16 eternal comfort
3:6 tradition
3:14 note that man, that ye have no company

EUGGESTIONS.
will send ${ }^{1}$
strong delusion $=$ A.v. ${ }^{2}$
may be condemned ${ }^{3}$
by sanctification
ye instructions which ye received
who hath loved us and given us everlasting consolation $=\mathrm{A}$ v. ${ }^{4}$ instruction
note that man, to have (or and have = A.v.) no company

## 1 TIMOTHY.

1:2 my true child 1:4 a dispensation of God
my own son = A.v. ${ }^{5}$
godly edifying $=A . v .{ }^{6}$
${ }^{1}$ The Syr. has the Future tense.
${ }^{2}$ Putting in the margin, $G r$. an inworking or energy of delusion or error.
${ }^{3}$ The R.V. retains condemn as a rendering of $\kappa \rho i v \omega$, in Acts $13: 27$, and might rightly have done so in John $3: 17,18$.
${ }^{4}$ I presume it will not be denied that the signification of aíwvos is just as well given by everlasting as by eternal, and that of $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha ́ к \lambda \eta \sigma \iota s ~ j u s t ~ a s ~ w e l l ~ b y ~ c o n s o l a t i o n ~ a s ~ b y ~ c o m f o r t . ~ I ~$ suggest here a return to the rendering of the A.V. because I would not for the sake of maintaining uniformity of rendering (in the case of terms not specific or technical) desert the old version and a familiar and acceptable phrase.
${ }^{5}$ See note on Phil. 2: 22.
${ }^{6}$ The idea of dispensation, or even of stewardship, in this

REVISED VERSION.
1:11 gospel of the glory 2:2 in high place
2:4 willeth that all men should be saved
$2: 9$ in modest apparel with shamefastness
2: 14 hath fallen
3:3 no brawler
$3: 3$ no lover of money
$3: 15$ how men ought to behave themselves

4:2 branded

SUGGESTIONS.
glorious gospel $=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{v}$. in authority $=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{v}$.
would have all men to be saved (or desireth that all men should be saved)
in becoming apparel with modesty ${ }^{1}$ fell
Not given to wine $=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{v} .{ }^{2}$ not covetous $=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{v} .{ }^{3}$
how thou oughtest to conduct thyself (or how one ought to conduct himself) seared $=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{v}$.
connection seems extremely harsh. The Syriac translates edification. Is it not altogether likely that the Apostle wrote instead of oiкобон $\eta$ v the less usual word оiкобоцiav, which, appearing to some copyist an error, gave place to oiкоvоцíay?
${ }^{1}$ If we have in our language a word exactly answering to a term in Greek, it is modesty for aidós as applied to the deportment of women. The retention of this obsolete substitute for it seems quite unnecessary.
${ }^{2}$ As applied to conduct $\pi \alpha$ óporvos would signify " over winecups," or "such as results from wine-drinking ;" but as applied to persons our best lexicons authorize the rendering "given to wine" or even "drunkard."
${ }^{3}$ If it be deemed essential to use uniformly different Eng-
 avaricious for the latter. But there seems to me to be more lost by substituting three words for one than is gained by securing different expressions for the two Greek words.

REVISED VERSION.
4:10 strive
4: 10 have our hope set on
$5: 5$ hath her hope set on
$5: 16$ any woman
$5: 16$ her
6:7 for neither can we carry any thing out
$6: 16$ eternal

SUGGESTIONG.
suffer reproach $=$ A.v. ${ }^{1}$
trust in $=$ A.v. ${ }^{2}$
trusteth in =A.v.
any man or woman $=$ A.v. ${ }^{8}$
them $=A . v{ }^{4}$
and it is certain we can carry nothing out $=$ A.v. ${ }^{5}$
everlasting $=$ A.v. ${ }^{6}$

## 2 TIMOTHY.

1:2 child
1:3 how unceasing is myremembrance of thee

1:7 gave us not
son (so in $2: 1$.)
that without ceasing $I$ have remembrance of thee $=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{v}$. (or that without ceasing I remember thee)
hath not given us $=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{v}$.
${ }^{1}$ The reading ${ }^{0} v \epsilon \iota \delta_{\iota} \zeta o ́ \mu \epsilon \theta a$ is confirmed by the Syriac.
${ }^{2}$ See note on 2 Cor. 1:10.
${ }^{3}$ Syriac, man or woman.
${ }^{4}$ Plural, for lack of a singular of common gender.
${ }^{5}$ The Syr. confirms the reading $\delta \hat{\eta} \lambda o v$. I would retain here the rendering of the A.V. only printing the words and it is in Roman letters, the and representing the $\delta \boldsymbol{\epsilon}$ of ov $\delta \dot{\epsilon}$. If persuaded that $\delta \hat{\eta} \lambda o v$ was not genuine, I would neglect the ${ }_{\circ}^{\circ} \tau \iota$, as not required by the idiom of our language, and render, neither can we, etc.
${ }^{6}$ Regarding these two terms as synonymous, I object to the change as being without necessity.

REVISED VERSION.
1:10 incorruption
$2: 26$ by the Lord's servant unto the will of God.
$3: 10$ didst follow
$3: 13$ shall wax worse
$4: 1$ the quick

SUGGESTIONS. immortality $=$ A.v. ${ }^{1}$
by him unto his will. ${ }^{2}$
hast fully known =A.v. (or hast followed up) ${ }^{3}$ will wax worse
the living
${ }^{1}$ Our best lexicons set down immortality as one of the definitions of áфӨapoia. So do the native Greek lexicons. Robinson calls $\zeta \omega \grave{\nu \nu}$ кai ả $\phi \theta a \rho \sigma i a \nu$ in this passage a hendiadys for immortal life. $\phi \theta \in i \rho \omega$ is not only to corrupt, but also to destroy, 1 Cor. $3: 17$, and $\phi$ opá, destruction 2 Pet. $2: 12$. So ఢぃ̀̀ ä $\phi \theta$ aptos is not incorruptible life, but indestructible life, i.e. immortal life. If one were newly translating the Scriptures into English, perishable and imperishable, as referring to a crown in 1 Cor. 9:25, would be better than corruptible and incorruptible.
${ }^{2}$ Peculiar as is this case, I still think it does not justify the introduction of so much of commentary into a translation as the R.V. has here admitted. There are strong arguments in favor of the interpretation which it presents. Yet it is by no means impossible to regard the demonstrative éкcivov as merely emphatic, and thus to understand, "taken captive by him (the devil) unto the will of that (terrible enemy)." The Syriac translators seem to have so understood the text, for they translate, "in which they were taken captive to his will." The marginal note might read, That is, either by the devil unto his will, or by the Lord's servant unto God's will.
${ }^{3}$ Whether the true reading of the Greek be a Perfect or an Aorist. Follow is objectionable because liable to be understood as meaning imitate, which meaning is here excluded by the context.

REVISED VERSION.
$4: 5$ be thou soler

4:9 Do thy diligence
4:10 forsook me
4:10 and went
4:10 Crescens
4:21 Do thy diligence

SUGGESTIONS.
watch thou = A.v. (or be thou watchful) ${ }^{1}$
Endeavor ${ }^{2}$
hath forsaken me $=$ a.v.
and is gone
Crescens is gone
Endeavor

## TITUS.

1:5 appoint
1:7 the bishop
1:7 no brawler
1:9 according to the teach-
constitute (or ordain $=$ A.v.) $)^{3}$
a bishop = A.v.
not given to wine $=$ A.v. ${ }^{4}$
as he hath been taught $=$ A.v. ${ }^{5}$ ing
${ }^{1}$ Sobriety does not pertain to all things, but watchfulness does. Our best authorities in Greek lexicography give two meanings to $\nu \eta \dot{\eta} \phi \omega$; (1) to be sober; (2) to be vigilant. In this passage the Syriac version renders it, be vigilant, I have no doubt rightly.
${ }^{2}$ Or, Give diligence, or, Diligently endeavor. In modern phrase we should say, Do your best. These remarks of course apply equally to vs. 21 and Titus $3: 12$.
${ }^{3}$ Appoint seems to shut out the idea of the elders being chosen by the churches. This objection does not hold against the same word in Acts $6: 3$, because there the election is distinctly invited.
${ }^{4}$ See note on 1 Tim. 3:3.
${ }^{5}$ If " the teaching" were an established designation of Christian teaching, I would not object to the literal rendering. Not being so, it seems naked here; and since the meaning of the

REVISED VERSION.
1:9 in the sound doctrine
2:1 the sound doctrine
2:3 reverent in demeanor
2:7 an eusample
2:7 in thy doctrine
$2: 13$ our great God and Saviour Jesus Christ 3:3 aforetime
3:10 heretical
$3: 12$ give diligence

## SUGGESTIONS.

with sound doctrine
sound doctrine $=$ a.v.
in behavior as becometh holiness $=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{v}$.
a pattern = A.v.
in teaching
the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ $=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{v} .{ }^{1}$
once
factious (or a promoter of faction)
endeavor

## PHILEMON.

1 our beloved and fellow our beloved brother and fellow
worker
2 our sister
5 of thy love, and of the faith
6 unto Christ
12 my very heart
worker
our beloved sister ${ }^{2}$
of thy love and faith, $=$ A.v. ${ }^{8}$
in Christ [Jesus]
my own bowels ${ }^{4}$
apostle is plainly, "according to the teaching which he has received," it seems to me better to retain the rendering of the A.V. and sufficient to give the literal rendering in the margin.
${ }^{1}$ The Syriac here agrees with the A.V. Compare R.V., 2 Thess. 1:12.
${ }^{2}$ Syriac, our beloved (fem. gen.)
${ }^{3}$ Syriac, of thy faith and the love.
${ }^{4}$ Alluding to his calling Onesimus his son, whom he had begotten. Comp. Gen. 15: 4.

REVISED VERSION.
19 write it
21 write

## SUGGEESTIONS.

have written $i t=\mathbf{A} . \mathrm{v}$.
have written

## HEBREWS.

$1: 1$ in the prophets
1:1 by divers portions
$1: 2$ at the end of these days
1:2 appointed
1:3 when he had made purification of sins,
by the prophets $=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{v} .{ }^{1}$
in divers (or many) portions
in these last days $=$ A.v. ${ }^{2}$
hath appointed $=$ A.v.
when he had [by himself] made expiation for sins, ${ }^{3}$
${ }^{1}$ Just as when our Saviour claims to cast out demons $\hat{\epsilon}^{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}} \nu$ $\delta a \kappa \tau v i \lambda \omega \theta \epsilon \iota \hat{v}$, we render, not $i n$, but by the finger of God, so here I understand the text to state, not that God spake in the prophets (which might be said), but that he spoke by them as his messengers, and this view seems to me confirmed by the adverb $\pi о \lambda ข \tau \rho o ́ \pi \omega \mathrm{~s}$, alluding to the various methods employed for communicating to them God's messages. Examples need not be cited to prove the frequent use of ${ }^{\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \nu} \boldsymbol{\nu}$ as instrumental. In such cases by is the strictly literal rendering of $\dot{\epsilon} \nu$, and it would be not only superfluous but inaccurate to tell the reader in the margin that the Greek is $i n$.
${ }^{2}$ The literal rendering of the R.V. here reminds me of the commercial adage, " Obey orders, if you break owners." Does any one doubt that the writer's meaning was "at the end of days, viz. in these our days"? I regard the rendering of the A.V. as conveying the exact meaning of the text, although it would here be correct to say in the margin that the Greek is literally "at the end of these days."
${ }^{3}$ On the word expiation I would put a marginal note, Greek purification. To speak of making expiation (or atone-

REVISED VERSION.
1:6 when he again bringeth
1:12 as a garment
2:1 the things that were heard
2:1 lest haply we drift away from them
2:4 powers
$2: 17$ that he might be
3:6 a son, over his house
$3: 7$ if ye shall hear his voice
$3: 10$ but they did not know my ways
$3: 12$ lest haply there shall be
3:16 For who, etc. ${ }^{6}$
$3: 19$ were not able to enter could not enter $=$ A.v. ${ }^{7}$
ment) for $\sin s$, accords with the usage of our language, but to speak of making purification of sins, I should say does not. The words by himself, are supported by high authority, and are found in the Syriac version.
${ }^{1}$ The $\pi \alpha{ }^{\alpha} \lambda \iota v$ is parenthetical, as frequently. The Syriac is like the A.V. "And again, when he bringeth," etc.
${ }^{2}$ These words are not in the Syriac version.
${ }^{3}$ The Armenian and Slavic versions have his own.
${ }^{4}$ I take hear in the sense of listen to, hearken to, and this is confirmed by the prefixed to ${ }^{2}$ in Ps. $95: 7$.
${ }^{5}$ If it be thought necessary to represent the enclitic $\pi ⿰ \tau \epsilon \in$ in a translation, I would render lest there be ever, or lest there be at all.
${ }^{6}$ Although the probability seems strongly in favor of this reading and rendering, yet it seems to me that the rendering of the A.V. is deserving of notice in the margin.
${ }^{7}$ It was not a question of ability, but of privilege. That privilege they could not enjoy because of their unbelief.

REVISED VERSION.
4:2 because they were not united by faith with them that heard
5:11 hard of interpretation hard to explain ${ }^{2}$
5:12 rudiments of the first first rudiments principles
6:1 let us cease to speak of leaving the first principles of the first principles of Christ, and press
7:1 God most High
7:6 hath taken tithes of Abraham, and hath blessed him that hath the promises
7:7 of the better
7:26 guileless
7:28 a Son
8:1 in the things which we are saying the chief point is this
8:1 sat down
the doctrine of Christ, let us press ${ }^{3}$
the most High God = A.v.
received tithes from Abraham, and blessed him that had the promises
by the greater
harmless $=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{v}$.
the Son $=$ A. $\mathrm{V}^{4}{ }^{4}$
of the things which we are saying this is the sum
${ }^{1}$ The reading of the Textus Receptus is here confirmed by the Syriac.
${ }^{2}$ That is, for the writer, considering the dullness of his readers. So the Syriac.
$3^{\text {e }} \mathrm{O} \tau \hat{\eta} \mathrm{\alpha} \dot{\alpha} \rho \chi \hat{\eta} \mathrm{~s}$ dóyos is the elementary doctrine, and the Genitive $\tau o \hat{v} \mathrm{X} \rho \iota \sigma \tau o \hat{v} \mathrm{I}$ take to be governed not by $\dot{\alpha} \rho \chi \hat{\eta} s$ alone, but by the combined phrase ròv $\tau \hat{\eta} s \dot{\alpha} \rho \chi \hat{\eta} s$ 入ó $\alpha o v$.
${ }^{4}$ In contrast with $\dot{\alpha} \nu \theta \rho \omega \dot{\sigma} \pi o v s$, vióv must here designate the Son of God, being perhaps left without the article as being a
 äycov. The Syriac has the definite form.

REVISED VERSION.
$8: 5$ is warned of God when he is about
9:5 severally
9:6 go
$9: 7$ offereth
$9: 8$ hath not
$9: 8$ is yet standing
$9: 9$ is a parable for the time now present... are ofered ... canuot

SUGGESTIONS.
was admouished by God when he was about particularly $=$ a.v.
went $=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{v}$.
offered $=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{v}$.
had not
was yet standing = A.v.
was a figure for the time then present... were offered... could not $=$ A.v. ${ }^{1}$

Several commentators have confidently charged the A.V. with mistranslation in this passage ; but I feel equal confidence in maintaining its correctness. The Syriac, fifteen centuries before, treated the whole passage in precisely the same way. The writer says in vs. 1 that the first covenant had, not has, ordinances; in vs. 2 that a tabernacle was constructed; in vs. 6 that, these things (the tabernacle and its contents) having been so constructed, the priests enter, etc., i.e. when the construction of the tabernacle and its furniture was completed, ther began (and still continue) to go in and perform the appointed services, as a figure (not a parable) of the good things which the new covenant was to bring; and in vs. 11 he goes on to say, But when Christ came (showing that what he had said about the ordinances of the first covenant related to the time before the coming of Christ) ... he entered once for all, etc. The gist of the passage is that Christ's perfect work has taken the place of the typical services of the old tabernacle. In this view, and considering that our language admits the use of the historical Present with much less facility than the Greek, it seems to me that an English translator is fully justified in rendering the passage as the A.V. does.

REVISED VERSION.
9:17 for doth it ever avail while he that made it liveth?
9:20 the covenant which God commanded to youward
9:22 apart from shedding
$9: 28$ apart from sin
10:8 the which
$10: 9$ then hath he said

## BUGGESTIONS

since it is never in force while the testator is living. ${ }^{1}$
the covenant which God hath enjoined upon you ${ }^{2}$
without shedding = A.v.
without $\sin =A . \nabla$.
which = A.v.
then he said
${ }^{1}$ There is classical authority for the occasional use of $\mu \eta^{\prime} \pi о \tau \epsilon$ instead of ov̇ס́є́тотє. Compare $\mu \eta \delta \epsilon i s$ for ov̉סєis. The rendering of the Syriac here agrees with that of the A.V.
${ }_{2}$ The R.V. seems to me to have done right in rendering $\delta \iota a \theta \dot{\eta} \kappa \eta$ testament in vs. 16 and 17 , and covenant elsewhere. I would not, however, in the marginal note speak of these as two separate significations of $\delta \iota \theta$ Ө́ $\kappa \eta$, but rather as different shades of one general signification. $\Delta \iota a \tau i \theta \eta \mu \iota$ is to dispose, to arrange. Hence, $\delta \iota a \not \eta^{\prime} \kappa \eta$ signifies that arrangement or ordering of the relations between God and his covenant people. The people were indeed graciously admitted to it as a party, and so we rightly call it a covenant; still it was God's sovereign disposal or arrangement, and hence he is said to have enjoined it upon the people. When used for that disposal which a man makes of his property in a will, $\delta \iota \alpha \theta \dot{\eta} \kappa \eta$ is rightly rendered testament. The Apostle glides in this chapter from the one shade of meaning to the other, and that not carelessly and inaccurately, but in view of the great fact that the blessings of the new covenant can be conferred only through the death of Christ, and thus may well be viewed as a legacy, which comes into the possession of the heir only through the death of the testator.

REVISED VERSION.
10:15 after he hath said
10:16 then saith he
10:34 that
10:38 my righteous one
11:1 proving
11:5 hath had
11: 17 had gladly received
11: 19 parable
11:21 a dying
11:40 apart from us
12:7 It is for chastening that ye endure ;
12: 15 the many
12:17 rejected (for he found no place for repentance), though he sought it diligently

## SUGGESTIONS.

after having said
he saith
(omit marg.) ${ }^{1}$
the righteous ${ }^{2}$
demonstration
had
had received $=\mathbf{A} . \nabla$.
figure $=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{v}$.
dying
without us = A.v.
If ye endure chastening, $=$ A.v. ${ }^{3}$
many $=\mathbf{A} . \mathrm{v}$.
rejected ; for he found no room for a change of mind in his father, though he sought it earnestly

13:2 to shew love unto to shew hospitality (or, to exerstrangers
cise hospitality) ${ }^{4}$
${ }^{1}$ If éavtov́s is the genuine reading, regard it as the subject of ${ }^{\prime \prime} \chi \in \iota \nu$. To account it as the object, and in apposition with $\dot{v} \pi \alpha \rho \xi \iota v$, seems very unnatural. The Syriac here confirms the rendering of the R.V.
${ }^{2}$ Putting the rendering of the text into the margin. The Syriac has "the upright shall live by faith in me."
${ }^{3}$ Put in the margin, Or, In chastening (i.e. when chastened), endure. The reading $\epsilon \boldsymbol{\epsilon}$ is strongly confirmed by the $\epsilon \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \delta^{\prime} \in$ of vs. 8.
${ }^{4}$ So фıлoگ̇єvía is translated Rom. $12: 13$, R.V.

REVISED VERSION.
13: 4 Let marriage be had in honour among all, and let the bed be undefiled: for
13:5 Be ye free from the Let your conduct be free from love of money ; centent 13: 6 with good courage we say
13:8 yea and forever
13: 9 stablished

SUGGESTIONS.
Marriage is honorable in all and the bed undefiled; but $=\mathrm{A} \cdot \mathrm{v}$. ${ }^{1}$ covetousness, and be content with confidence we may say (or, we may confidingly say) and forever = A.v. established

## JAMES.

1:1 of the Dispersion

1:2 temptations
1:3 proof
$1: 15$ the lust ... the sin
1: 17 boon
scattered abroad $=$ A.v. (or in dispersion) ${ }^{2}$
trials
testing (or trying)
lust $. . . \sin =$ A.v.
gift
${ }^{1}$ The Syriac agrees with the A.V. If the Imperative form be preferred out of regard to the context, the meaning is not changed. In that case in order to bring out the true sense of the second clause, I think it should be rendered, Let marriage be esteemed honorable in all, and the bed undefiled.
${ }^{2}$ "Of the Dispersion" seems to suggest the idea that "the tribes which are of the Dispersion" are something different from the old twelve tribes. Of course, the meaning is, the twelve tribes of Israel now in their well-known state of dispersion. This is doubtless the force of the Article $\tau \hat{\eta}$, and in English this idea is well expressed by in dispersion, or by scattered abroad.

REVISED VERSION.
1:19 Ye know this, my beloved brethren. But let
1:27 himself
2:2 synagogue
2:4 are ye not divided in your own mind
2:10 stumble
$2: 18$ shew me thy faith apart from thy works, and I by my works will shew thee $m y$ faith
2:20 barren
$2: 20,26$ apart from
3:1 heavier
$3: 2$ stumble ... stumbleth

SUGGESTIONS.
Wherefore, my heloved brethren, let $=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{v} \cdot{ }^{1}$
one's self
assembly $=$ A.v. ${ }^{2}$
do ye not make distinctions among yourselves offend = A.v. (or transgress) ${ }^{3}$ shew me thy faith without works, and I by my works will shew thee [my] faith ${ }^{4}$ dead $=$ A.v. ${ }^{5}$
without $=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{v}$.
severer
offend . . . offendeth
${ }^{1}$ So the Syriac, Ethiopic, Armenian, Arabic, and Slavic. Only the Vulgate confirms the reading ${ }^{\prime} \sigma \tau \epsilon$.
${ }^{2}$ Although the epistle is addressed to the twelve tribes, yet it is clear we are to understand, those from among them who had embraced the Christian religion. See vs. 1. The assemblies of such might well be called in Greek ovvararai, gatherings, but surely in English we cannot call them synagogues.
${ }^{3}$ No English word could more exactly represent $\pi \tau a i$, than offend (in the usage of the present day). The word stumble, one would think, must have been inserted here from the habit of substituting it for offend ; but the A.V. evidently uses offend in two senses, as it does also let and tell.
${ }^{4}$ On without put a marginal note, or by.
${ }^{5}$ Margin, Or barren. The reading dead is confirmed by the Syriac.

REVISED VERBION.
3:3 Now if we put the horses' bridles into their mouths, that they may obey us, we turn about their whole body also
$3: 5$ is kindled by how small a fire
$3: 14,16$ faction
3: 17 variance
4:1 pleasures
4: 4 adulteresses
$5: 7$ until it receive

SUGGESTIONS.
Behold, we put bits in the horses' mouths, that they may obey us; and we turn about their whole body $=$ A.v. ${ }^{1}$
a little fire kindleth $=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{v}^{2}{ }^{2}$
strife $=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{v} .^{3}$
partiality = A.v.
lusts $=A$. v. $^{4}$
[adulterers and] adulteresses ${ }^{5}$ until he receive $=$ A.v. ${ }^{6}$
${ }^{1}$ The reading Behold is confirmed by the Syriac. Even if satisfied that the Apostle wrote EIDE, I should regard it as only another spelling of iठє́. Behold also, vs. 4, confirms this.
${ }^{2}$ Confirmed by the Syriac.
${ }^{3}$ This also accords with the Syriac. The rendering strife is not altogether satisfactory, but faction seems to me less so. 'Epi $\theta \epsilon \iota \alpha$ is the spirit of faction, party spirit. Perhaps rivalry would answer.
${ }^{4}$ So also the Syriac. ${ }^{\text {e}} \mathrm{H} \delta o \nu \eta$ ' is primarily pleasure, then specially sensual pleasure. The Apostle seems to use it here for the desire of such pleasure. To say that pleasures war, seems incongruous; so that even though the margin should state that the literal meaning of the Greek is pleasures, I would retain lusts or desircs in the text, as do the Syriac, Armenian, etc. Such a marginal note would prepare the way for the rendering pleasures in vs. 3. Or, the rendering lusts might be given there also.
${ }^{5}$ The Syriac has but one word, but that is masculine.
${ }^{6}$ So the Syriac.
revibed verbion.
$5: 11$ which endured
$5: 15$ it shall be forgiven him
$5: 16$ your sins
$5: 16$ The supplication of a righteous man availeth much in its working.
$5: 17$ fervently

SUGGESTIONS.
who endure ${ }^{1}$
they shall be forgiven him $=$
A.v. ${ }^{2}$
your faults $=\mathrm{A} \cdot \mathrm{v} .^{3}$
The earnest supplication of a righteous man availeth much.
earnestly $=$ a.v.

## 1 PETER.

1:6 temptations
1:7 proof
1:7 proved
$1: 12$ but unto you
1:12 by the Holy Ghost sent forth from heaven
2:1 wickedness
2:2 long for the spiritual milk which is without guile,
trials
testing (or trying)
tried $=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{v}$.
but unto us = A.v. (and Syr.)
with the Holy Spirit sent from
heaven
malice $=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{v}^{4}{ }^{4}$
earnestly desire the pure milk of the word, ${ }^{5}$
${ }^{1}$ Or, if the Aor. reading be adopted, who have endured.
${ }^{2}$ Ad sensum.
${ }^{3}$ So the Syriac.
${ }^{4}$ That какia has both the general and the special meaning is unquestioned. That the same writer should use it in both ways, here in the special sense, where other things are specified (all of which would come under the general sense of wickerness), and in the general sense in vs. 16 , where no such specifications occur, is not unreasonable.
${ }^{5}$ That $\lambda$ oyıкòv $\gamma$ áda is rightly rendered, milk of the word, i.e.

REVISED VERSION.
2:16 bondservants
$3: 12$ upon them that do evil

3: 14 But and if
$3: 17$ if the will of God should so will,
3:20 a preparing

3:21 not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the interrogation of a good conscience toward God,

SUGGESTIONS.
servants = A.v.
against them that do evil $=$ A.v. ${ }^{1}$

But even if
if the will of God be so, = A.V.
in preparation (or being constructed)
(not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the confession to God of a pure conscience) ${ }^{2}$
the word of God (comp. vs. 8), I am satisfied from the testimony of the Syriac version, which renders, "desire the word, as pure and spiritual milk."
${ }^{1}$ The rendering of $\dot{\epsilon} \pi i^{\prime}$ against (as in Matt. 10:21). notwithstanding its use just before in a different sense, is justified by a comparison of the Hebrew construction in Ps. 34: 16.
${ }_{2}^{2}$ The whole in parenthesis. 'E $\pi \epsilon \rho \omega$ íт $\eta \mu$, primarily interrogation, must here be understood of the profession of devotion to God, made by the candidate for baptism. So the Syriac, " not when ye put away the filth of the flesh, but when ye confess to God with a pure conscience." It is scarcely possible that the Syriac translators could have misunderstood the passage. The rendering of the R.V. probably looks in the same direction ; but if so, it is obscure, especially as the words towards God will naturally be joined by the reader with the words a good conscience, whereas their real connection is with є่ $\pi \epsilon \rho \dot{\tau} \tau \eta \mu$, whatever that may be.

REVISED VERSION.
4:6 even
$4: 7$ be ye therefore of be ye therefore sober-minded, sound mind, and be sober unto prayer
$5: 2$ according unto God [according to the will of God]
${ }^{2}$ The dead, doubtless, refers to the division of all men into living and dead (vs. 5 ), viz. at the time of the judgment. I understand the Apostle to say that there will be no difference in the judgment of the two classes. Thus there is no implication here that the preaching was to men already dead. My objection to even is that it seems to convey such an implication. I regard the gloss of the A.V. "them that are dead" as correct. Still, it is a gloss, and perhaps should not appear in a translation.
${ }^{1}$ Rendering $\sigma \omega \phi \rho \omega \nu \epsilon \epsilon$ as in Tit. 2:6. To be of sound mind is God's gift. To be sober-minded depends largely upon our efforts. In respect to $\nu \dot{\eta} \phi \omega$, see note on 2 Tim. 4: 5 . The Syriac here also agrees with the A.V. using for $\nu \dot{\eta} \psi a \tau \epsilon$ the same word which in Matt. 26:41 and elsewhere it employs to render $\gamma \rho \eta \gamma о \rho є i \tau \epsilon$. I cannot doubt that the Apostle had that injunction of our Saviour in mind. Sobriety has not, any more than many others virtues, that special relation to prayer that watchfulness has. The testimony of the Syriac version, coming to us from the age immediately succeeding that of the apostles, seems to me of special importance in cases where the Greek admits of two renderings. Compare note on John 5 : 39 .

## 2 PETER.

REVISED VERSION.
1:5 adding on your part
1:5 in your faith supply virtue, and in your virtue knowledge
1:6 in your (ter.)
1:7 and in your godliness love of the brethren, and in your love of the brethren love

1:8 unto the knowledge
1:10 stumble
1:21 men spake from God, being moved
suggestions.
giving $=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{v} .{ }^{1}$
add to your faith virtue, and to virtue knowledge $=$ A.v. ${ }^{2}$

$$
\text { to }=\mathbf{A} . \mathrm{v}
$$

and to godliness brotherly affection, and to brotherly affection love (or and to godliness love of the brethren, and to love of the brethren love to all.)
in the knowledge $=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{v}^{3}{ }^{3}$
fall = A.v.
[holy] men of God spake as they were moved ${ }^{4}$
${ }^{1}$ Neither is an exact rendering of $\pi \alpha \rho \epsilon \iota \sigma \epsilon \nu \epsilon \dot{\gamma} \kappa \alpha \nu \tau \epsilon \varsigma$. "Bringing in by the way" would be closer. Some such attempt at a literal rendering might have a place in the margin.
${ }^{2}$ Combining the force of the preposition $\dot{\epsilon} v$ (indicating the attainment already made) with that of $\epsilon \pi i$ in the composition of $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \pi \iota \chi \circ \rho \eta \gamma \eta \eta^{\prime} \sigma \alpha \tau \in$ (indicating addition to that attainment), the rendering of the A.V. is justified, and need not be disturbed. It is sustained by the general consensus of the versions and of commentators. Calvin says, Subministrare in fide, est fidei adjungere.
${ }^{3}$ So Calvin, in cognitione, recognizing the later use of cis as equivalent to $\epsilon_{\epsilon} \nu$.
${ }^{4}$ So the old versions generally. It seems incredible that ${ }_{\alpha} \nu \theta \rho \omega \pi \sigma \iota$, without article or adjective or any defining term, should be the subject of $\epsilon \lambda \lambda a ́ \lambda \eta \sigma \alpha \nu$.

REVISED VERSION.
2:3 sentence
$2: 12$ shall in their destroying surely be destroyed
$2: 14$ unstedfast
2:15 hire of wrong-doing
2:17 storm
2:17 reserved
3:16 unstedfast

## SUGGESTIONS.

condemnation
shall surely perish (or be destroyed) in their corruption ${ }^{1}$ unstable $=$ A.v. ${ }^{2}$ wages of unrighteousness=A.v. tempest $=\mathrm{A} \cdot \mathrm{v}$. reserved [for ever] unstable $=$ a.v.

## 1 JOHN.

$1: 2$ the life, the eternal life that eternal life $=\mathbf{A} . \mathrm{v}^{\mathbf{8}}{ }^{\mathbf{8}}$
$2: 29$ begotten of him boru of him = A.v. ${ }^{4}$
${ }^{1}$ Rendering $\phi \theta_{o p a ̂}^{c}$ as in $1: 4$ and $2: 19$. See note on 1 Cor. $3: 17$. To give $\phi \theta_{o \rho a ̆}^{c}$ an active sense is hard.
${ }^{2}$ If the object of this change was to avoid rendering $\dot{\alpha} \sigma \tau \eta \eta^{-}$ pıктоs and ăката́бтатоs by the same word, would it not be better to render the latter unsteady, leaving the former unchanged ?
${ }^{3}$ There is no more occasion to repeat the word life here than there would be to repeat bread in translating tòv äprov
 the repetition of the article when the adjective follows the noun, and the slight emphasis which that repetition gives is very fairly represented by the demonstrative that in the A.V.
${ }^{4}$ Begotten and born are equally legitimate renderings of the verb here used. That the phrase, born of God, is well established in our religious language, need not be argued. That it is to be preferred in this passage, most Christians, I am confident, will feel. The revisers have recognized the propriety of using it in translating the N.T., as appears from their ren-

REVISED VERSION.
3:3 him ... he
3: 4 doeth $\sin$

3: 4 doeth also lawlessness: and $\sin$ is lawlessness
3:9 begotten (twice)
3:9 doeth no sin
3:19 before him,
3:20 wherënsoever our heart condemn us; be-

EUGGESTIONS.
Him . . . He
committeth $\sin =\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{v}$. (So in vs. 8.)
committeth also iniquity ; and $\sin$ is iniquity ${ }^{1}$
born $=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{v}$. (See n. on $2: 29$.)
doth not commit $\sin =$ A.v. ${ }^{2}$
before him. = A.v.
For if our heart condemn us, God is greater =A.v. ${ }^{3}$ cause God is greater
dering of John 1:13. I admit that a slight infelicity appears in the necessity of rendering $\gamma \epsilon \gamma \epsilon \nu \nu \eta \mu \epsilon$ 'vov, begotten, in 1 John $5: 1$, where it immediately follows the active verb (which must be rendered begat); but notwithstanding this, it seems to me far better, in all the other places in which the phrase occurs in this epistle, to use the well established, tender, and justly dear expression, born of God.
${ }^{1}$ To commit $\sin$ is the normal, idiomatic expression, rather than to do sin ; and lawlessness designates rather character in general than particular acts. We might even retain here the rendering of the A.V. "transgresseth also the law," and put the literal rendering in the margin.
${ }^{2}$ The rendering of the A.V. is both more idiomatic and truer to the Apostle's meaning; for the words, he cannot sin in the last clause of the verse are shown by the use of the Present Infinitive, and not the Aorist, to mean that he cannot sin habitually, not that he cannot commit any sin.
${ }^{3}$ The difficulty here arises from St. John's use of ö $\tau \iota$ before the phrase " God is greater." The R.V. endeavors to solve it by reading in the beginning of vs. $200^{\circ} \tau \iota$, and by taking $\epsilon^{\prime} \alpha{ }^{\nu}$ as $=\stackrel{a}{\alpha} v$. But it seems to me that this fails to give any good

REVISED VERSION.
4:7 begotten of God
4:9 in us
4:9 hath sent
4:12 beheld
4:16 the love which God hath in us
4:18 punishment
4:19 We love,
4:20 cannot
$5: 1,4$ begotten of God
$5: 9$ the witness of God is this, that he hath borne witness of his Son
$5: 10$ in him
5: 11 gave
$5: 18$ is begotten of God
$5: 18$ was begotten of God
$5: 18$ keepeth him

SUGGESTIONS.
born of God $=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{v}$.
toward us = A.v. (and Sjr.)
sent $=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{v} .{ }^{1}$
seen $=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{v}$.
the love that God hath to us $=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{v}$.
torment $=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{v}$.
We love [Him],
how can he ...? $=$ A.v. (So the Syr.)
born of God=A.v.
this is the witness of God, which he hath borne concerning his Son
in himself =A.v. (and Syr.)
hath given =a.v.
is born of God=A.v.
hath been born of God
keepeth himself $=$ A.v. ${ }^{2}$
sense to the second ӧть. The Syriac, like the A.V. takes є́áv as meaning if, and joins "if our heart condemn us" with what follows; and this seems to me to be confirmed by the $\epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \nu$, $i f$, of vs. 21. Robinson explains the secoud ör by supposing an ellipsis [then will God also condemn us], and this agrees well with what follows. The Syriac treats ö ö as an adverb, rendering öT८ $\mu \epsilon^{\prime} \zeta \omega \nu$, how much greater !
${ }^{1} \mathrm{Or}$, "in this is the love of God toward us made manifest, that God hath sent." Either may be justified by the later usage of both the Aorist and Perfect.
${ }^{2}$ The Syriac rersion, to which lies our most natural appeal in cases of ambiguity in the Greek text, has, " keepeth his own

## 2 JOHN .

REVISED VERSION.
8 we have wrought

SUGGESTIONS.
ye have wrought ${ }^{1}$

## 3 JOHN .

4 Greater joy have I none
7 for the sake of the Name
8 to welcome
8 with the truth

I have no greater joy = A.v. for His name's sake
to receive $=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{v}$.
for the truth

## JUDE.

1 for Jesus Christ in Jesus Christ = A.v.
5 though ye know all things once for all
10 are they destroyed
though ye have once known it all
they corrupt themselves $=$ a.v. (or, they become corrupt)
11 went ... ran ... perished have gone ... have run ... have perished
spots = A.v.
12 hidden rocks
soul." The force of the Greek Perfect Participle is expressed by is born, while our Perfect, hath been born brings out just what the Aorist Participle is here designed to express, viz. that there was a time when the Christian had not been born of God, but that after experiencing that heavenly birth he guards himself.
${ }^{1}$ So the Syriac, having the three verbs in the second person. The reading of the A.V. with all three in the first person, should appear in the margin.

REVISED VERSION.
15 ungodly wrought
17 But je, beloved, remem- But beloved, remember ye $=$ ber ye
22, 23 mercy
24 stumbling

SUGGESTIONS.
wrought A.v.
compassion
falling = A.v.

## REVELATION.

$1: 7$ shall mourn over him shall wail because of him $=$

$$
\text { A. } \cdot .^{1}
$$

1:10 a great voice
a loud voice ${ }^{2}$
1:11 Pergamum
1:19 sawest
2:2 didst try them which
2:2 didst find
2:3 didst bear
2:4 didst leave
2:5 I come
hast seen $=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{v} .{ }^{3}$
hast tried those who
hast found = a.v.
hast borne $=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{V}$.
hast left $=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{v}^{4}{ }^{4}$
I will come = A.v. (So in vs. 16.)
 The wailing will not be over or for him, but for themselves, because of his coming.
${ }^{2}$ So rendered by the A.V. in a large majority of the cases where it occurs, and by the R.V. except in Revelation.
${ }^{8}$ Because relating to the vision which he had just seen.
${ }^{4}$ The Lord is here describing the present state of the Ephesian church and its pastor, and the past in its relation to the present. The Aorists and Perfect which he uses relate to the same time.

## REVISED VERSION.

SUGGESTIONB.
2:7 To him that overcom- To him that overcometh, will eth, to him will I give I give $=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{v} .{ }^{1}$
2:22 I do cast
$2: 23$ each one of you
I will cast $=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{v}$.
3:2 I have found no works of thine fulfilled
3:3 hast received and didst hear
3:4 did not defile
$3: 8$ didst keep ... didst not deny
3:9 Behold, I give of the Behold I will make them who synagogue of Satan, of them which say
3:10 didst keep
have not defiled = A.v.
hast kept ... hast not denied $=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{v}$. are of the synagogue of Satan, who say ${ }^{4}$
hast kept $=$ A.v.
3:12 He that overcometh, I will make him

Him that overcometh will I make $=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{v}$.
${ }^{1}$ The repetition is a Hebraism. So in vs. 17. A similar repetition occurs in Acts 15: 17, where the R.V. rightly uses but a single pronoun.
${ }^{2}$ The meaning is the same. I object to the change as unnecessary.
${ }^{3}$ I make this suggestion with some hesitation. We speak of fulfilling duty or obligation, but can scarcely speak of fulfilling works. Neither do I quite like perfected (the suggestion of the American Committee), nor the Participle completed, which would be understood to mean simply finished, whereas the meaning seems to be that they were not performed as duty demanded.
${ }^{4}$ I regard the construction in the beginning of this verse as a Hebraism. Compare the frequent use of in the sense of causing or permitting. Compare also $\delta \epsilon \in \delta \omega \kappa \alpha$ in vs. 8.

## RETISED VERSION.

SUGGESTIONS.
3:21 He that overcometh, I To him that overcometh will
will give to him
4: 5 proceed
4:8 have no rest
4:9 shall give glory
$4: 10$ shall fall down
4: 10 shall worship
4: 10 shall cast
4:11 the glory and the honor and the power
5: 2 a strong angel
5:5 overcome
5:7 and he came, and he taketh it
5: 10 a kingdom
$5: 10$ they reign
$5: 12$ the power
5 : 13 the blessing, and the honour, and the glory, and the dominion
$6: 1,3,5,7$ Come

I grant $=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{v}$.
proceeded $=\mathbf{A . v}$.
rest not =A.v. (or, cease not)
give glory = A.v.
fall down $=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{v}$.
worship $=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{v}$.
cast $=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{v} .{ }^{1}$
glory, and honor, and power $=$

$$
\text { A.v. }{ }^{2}
$$

a mighty angel
prevailed =A.v.
and he came and took [the book]
kings = A. v .
they shall reign ${ }^{3}$
power = A.v.
blessing, and honor, and glory, and dominion ${ }^{4}$

Come [and see]
${ }^{1}$ I consider the use of these Futures as pure Hebraism, and must therefore regard it as not only unnecessary, but positively wrong to render them by Futures in English.
${ }^{2}$ That is, all glory, etc. Either rendering will answer, but I think that of the A.V. preferable.
${ }^{3}$ I should think the rendering kings admissible, even though ßaбi入єiav be accepted as the true reading. The Future verb, shall reign, is sustained by the majority of the most ancient versions.
${ }^{4}$ Compare $7: 12$, R.V.

REVISED VERSION.
6:6 a measure of wheat for a penny, and three measures of barley for a penny
6:8 he that sat upon him, his name
6:8 (Marg.) or, pestilence
6:9 underneath
$6: 10$ great voice
$6: 10$ O Master, the holy and true,
6:11 their fellow-servants ... be fulfilled
6: 13 her unripe figs when she
$6: 15$ the strong
$6: 16$ and they say
$6: 17$ their wrath
$7: 2$ the sunrising
7:2 great voice
7 : 14 I say
$7: 14$ washed
$8: 3$ add it unto

SUGGESTIONS.
A quart of wheat for a shilling, and three quarts of barley for a shilling (or for a denarius) ${ }^{1}$
the name of him that sat on him
That is pestilence.
under =A.v. (or beneath)
loud voice $=$ A.v.
O Lord, holy and true, =A.v. ${ }^{2}$
the number of their fellow-servants . . . be completed ${ }^{3}$ its unripe figs when it
the mighty men $=$ a.v. ${ }^{4}$ saying (or and said = A.v.)
(Add marg. Many ancient authorities have his wrath.)
the east $=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{v}$.
loud voice $=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{v}$.
I said = A.v.
have washed = A.v.
offer $i t$ with $=\mathbf{A} . v$.
${ }^{1}$ See note on Luke 16:6,7.
${ }^{2}$ On the rendering of $\Delta \epsilon \sigma \pi o ́ t \eta s$ and Kúpıos, see preface, p. xi.
${ }^{3}$ Put in the margin with reference to the words the number of, Or, the course of.
${ }^{4}$ As in $19: 18$, R.V.

REVISED VERSION.
8:5 taketh the censer; and he filled it
10:1 strong angel
$10: 7$ is finished
10: 11 they say
11: 6 the power ... the heaven
11:9 do men look
11:9 suffer not
11:10 rejoice
11: 17 didst reign
12:2 crieth out
12:4 draweth
13:3 smitten
13:3 death-stroke
13:6 the heaven
13:8 written in the book of life of the Lamb that hath been slain from the foundation of the world
13:13 that he should even make
13: 14 the stroke of

SUGGESTIONS.
took the censer and filled it $=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{v}$.
mighty angel $=$ A.v. shall be finished ${ }^{1}$
he said = a.v. ${ }^{1}$ power . . . heaven = a.v.
shall men look
shall not suffer $=$ A.v. ${ }^{2}$
shall rejoice $=$ A.v. ${ }^{2}$
hast reigned $=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{v}$.
cried out
drew $=$ A.v. ${ }^{3}$
wounded $=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{v}$.
deadly wound=A.v.(So vs. 12.)
heaven = A.v.
written from the foundation of the world in the book of life of the Lamb that bath been slain ${ }^{4}$
so as even to make
the wound by $=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{v}$.
${ }^{1}$ Both these renderings are sustained by the ancient versions.
${ }^{2}$ The ancient versions are unanimous in rendering these verbs by Futures.

3 "Draweth . . and did cast." The object and duty of a translator is to convey the meaning of his author. Surely he is not bound to imitate grammatical anomalies like this.
${ }^{4}$ As suggested by the American Revisers. Comp. 17:8.

REVISED VERSION.
13:16 that there be given to receive = A.v. them
$13: 18$ He that hath under- Let him that hath understandstanding, let him count ing count =A.v.
14:3 sing
14:3 purchased out of
14:4 purchased
14: 4 to be
14:6 eternal gospel
14: 6 to proclaim
14:7 and he saith
14:11 day and night, they that worship
14: 11 whoso
14: 15 great voice
14: 15 Send forth thy sickle
14: 15 the hour
14: 16 cast his sickle
14:18 Send forth
14:19 Cast his sickle into the earth
14:19 the winepress, the the great winepress =A.r. ${ }^{1}$ great winepress
15: 1 seven plagues, which the seven last plagues $=$ A.v. are the last
15: 2 come victorious from gotten the victory over... over . . . from . . . from
sung $=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{v}$.
redeemed from =A.v.
redeemed $=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{v}$.
being = A.v.
everlasting gospel $=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{v}$.
to preach $=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{v}$.
saying = A.v.
day nor night, who worship = A.v.
whosoever = A.v.
loud voice = A.v. (So vs. 18.)
Thrust in thy sickle = A.v.
the time $=$ A.v.
put in his sickle
Thrust in =A.v.
put in his sickle in the earth

REVISED VERSION.
$15: 6$ with precious stone $16: 1,2$ into the earth
$16: 9$ of the God which
16:12 sunrising
16:16 Har-Magedon
16:21 cometh down
16:21 is exceeding great
17: 8 whose name hath not been written
17:14 and they also shall overcome that are with him, called
18:3 by the wine ... all the nations are fallen

## SUGGESTIONS.

in linen $=\mathrm{A} \cdot \mathrm{v} \cdot{ }^{1}$
upon the earth $=$ A.v. ${ }^{2}$
of God, who
east $=$ A.v.
Armageddon $=$ A.v. ${ }^{8}$
came down
was exceeding great
whose names have not been written ${ }^{4}$
and they that are with him are called $=$ A.v. ${ }^{5}$
all nations have drunk of the wine...$=$ A. $\mathrm{v} .{ }^{6}$
${ }^{1}$ I do not find a trace of the reading $\lambda i \theta o v$ in any of the ancient versions.
${ }^{2}$ As in a parallel passage ( $8: 7$ ) the R.V. has it. Eis has so wide a range of meaning in rarious connections, though followed always by an Accusative, that we are obliged to render it, into, in, unto, to, for, on, upon, until, etc. A motive for rendering it into in this verse was doubtless the occurrence of $\dot{\epsilon} \pi i$ in vs. $8,10,12$. Still, considering the variety of senses in which cis is used, I think we should prefer the rendering best suited to the counection. In vs. 3 and 4 perhaps into should be preferred.
${ }^{3}$ I see no gain in changing such a name as this, whatever be the spelling of the uss. If we wish to represent the He brew orthography, we must write neither Har nor Magedon.
${ }^{4}$ Even if oैvoua be the true reading.
${ }^{5}$ So the ancient versions unanimously.
${ }^{6}$ So the Vulgate, Armenian, Arabic, Syriac, and Slavic. Only the Ethiopic confirms the reading of the R.V.

REVISED VERSION.
18:21 a strong angel
19:3 they say
19:7 the glory
19:8 righteous acts
19:18 and small and great
$20: 15$ if any was not found
. . . he was cast
21:6 They are come to pass.
$22: 14$ wash their robes

SUGGESTIONS.
a mighty angel $=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{v}$.
they said
glory
righteousness $=$ A.v. ${ }^{1}$
both small and great $=$ A.v. ${ }^{2}$ whosoever was not found...

$$
\text { was cast }=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{v} .
$$

It is done $=\mathrm{A} . \mathrm{v} .^{3}$
do his commaudments $=$ A.v. ${ }^{4}$
${ }^{1}$ See note on Rom. 8:4.
${ }^{2}$ I note this passage for the sake of remarking that kui $\mu \kappa \rho \hat{\omega} \nu \kappa \alpha \grave{~} \mu \epsilon \gamma \alpha ́ \lambda \omega \nu$ should be rendered, both small and great, none the less because of the synonymous construction with $\tau \boldsymbol{\tau}$ which immediately precedes.
${ }^{3}$ All of the ancient versions which have this passage, translate, It is done, reading of course $\Gamma$ '́ $\gamma о \nu \epsilon$. The Ethiopic and Syriac omit it.
${ }^{4}$ Placing of course the other reading in the margin. The majority of the most ancient versions confirm the reading followed by the A.V.
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