**BS** 2088 .R5

# SUGGESTED MODIFICATIONS OF THE

# REVISED NEW TESTAMENT.

## RIGGS.



.

## SUGGESTED MODIFICATIONS

OF THE

# REVISED VERSION

OF THE

# NEW TESTAMENT.

BY ELIAS RIGGS, D.D., LL.D., MISSIONARY OF THE A.B. C. F. M. AT CONSTANTINOPLE.







### Andaugr: WARREN F. DRAPER. 1883.



Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1883, by WARREN F. DRAPER, in the Office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington.

13/1325

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,<sup>1</sup> 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

<sup>1</sup> 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 inconsistency is simply to say that their work is the work of fallible men. But though all are fallible, yet "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 Scriptures, is the rendering of words which have no single and uniform representation in our language. For example,  $\psi v \chi \dot{\eta}$  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  $\tau o\hat{v} \, d\gamma a \theta o\hat{v}$ , viz. that  $\delta \kappa a \delta v$  just before is without it; and yet in my judgment it mars the sense; for  $\delta \, d\gamma a \theta \delta \hat{s}$  is not here *the good man* generically, but

۷

a single good man. The force of the article I take to be such a man as is  $d\gamma a\theta \delta s$ , 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  $\epsilon i_s$  and  $\epsilon \nu$ , see note on Matt. 28:19. Our 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.  $E\pi d\lambda \eta \theta \epsilon d\alpha s$  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 (1 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 $\hat{\nu}\nu$   $\hat{\delta}\delta\delta\hat{a}\sigma\theta\eta$ , 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  $\epsilon \ell \rho \eta \kappa a$  preceded by  $\dot{a} \pi \epsilon \kappa \rho \ell \theta \eta$  and followed by  $\epsilon \tilde{l} \pi \epsilon$ , and all relating to the same conversation; so that the revisers seem to me to have quite needlessly gone out of their way to 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

viii

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,<sup>1</sup> weights and measures,

<sup>1</sup> In respect to the names of Roman coins, seeing we have *mite* for  $\lambda\epsilon\pi\tau\delta\nu$  and *farthing* for  $\kappa\circ\delta\rhod\nu\tau\eta s$  (both of them names of similar import with the Greek terms), I should be inclined to use *penny* for  $\lambda\sigma\sigmad\rho_{10}\nu$  (equal to four  $\kappa\circ\delta\rhod\nu\tau\alpha t$ ), and perhaps *shilling* for  $\delta\eta\nu d\rho_{10}\nu$ . 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  $\lambda\sigma\sigmad\rho_{10}\nu$  and  $\kappa\circ\delta\rho d\nu\tau\eta s$ ; neither should I like to use both *denarius* and *shilling* for  $\delta\eta\nu d\rho_{10}\nu$ , 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, know 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 σκανδαλίζω 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 σκανδαλίζω. Το 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 δούλos 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 κύριος 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. 1:1 διà  $\theta \epsilon \lambda \eta \mu a \tau os$   $\theta \epsilon o \hat{v}$  is rendered by the will of God, and in 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 διά with a Genitive, still both are legitimate renderings. Witness the phrases, "he spake by parables," and "we walk by faith." In Luke  $2:29 \Delta \epsilon \sigma \pi \sigma \tau a$ 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 rendering is Master. Both  $\Delta\epsilon\sigma\pi\delta\tau\eta_5$  and  $K\ell\rho\iota\sigma_5$  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.	SUGGESTIONS.
2:1 wise men came	there came wise men $= A.v.^1$
2:7 learned of them carefully	inquired of them particularly <sup>2</sup>
2:8 search out	examine
2:13, 19, etc. appeareth	appeared <sup>3</sup>
2:16 was mocked of	had been mocked by
2:16 carefully learned	particularly inquired
3:3 Make ye ready	Prepare ye = A.v.
3:9 to our father	as our father
3:10 is the axe laid unto	the axe lieth at
3:15 suffereth	suffered
4:5 taketh and he set	took and set
4:8 taketh sheweth	took shewed
4:9 and he said	and said
4:24 devils	demons <sup>4</sup>
5:22 in danger of (ter.)	(marg. Gr. amenable or liable to)
5:25 whiles	while

<sup>1</sup> I should attach no importance to connecting  $d\pi \partial d\nu a\tau \sigma \lambda \hat{\omega} \nu$ with  $\mu \dot{\alpha} \gamma \sigma \iota$  rather than with  $\pi \alpha \rho \epsilon \gamma \dot{\epsilon} \nu \sigma \nu \tau \sigma$ . The ambiguity of the A. V. is essentially identical with that of the Greek.

 $^{2}$  The root of the verb here used signifies rather *accuracy* than *care*.

<sup>8</sup> It seems to me to accord better with the idiom of our present language not to imitate the historic Present.

<sup>4</sup> And so wherever δαίμων or δαιμόνιον occurs.

2

(13)

REVISED VERSION.	SUGGESTIONS
5:41 compel	impress <sup>1</sup>
5:48 Ye therefore shall be	Be ye therefore $= A \cdot V^{-2}$
6:1 righteousness	good deeds <sup>8</sup>
6:1 of them	by them
6:6 thine inner chamber	thy closet $=$ A.V.
6:19 doth consume	consume
6:25 the food the raiment	food raiment
6:31 wherewithal	wherewith
7:9 a loaf	bread
8:12 sons	children = A.v.
8:12 the weeping	weeping <sup>4</sup>
8:20 heaven	air
9:5 whether	which
10:4 Cananaean	Canaite
10:24,25 master	teacher <sup>5</sup>
10:24 lord	master
11:2 the Christ	$Christ = A.v.^{6}$

<sup>1</sup> To hint that it is done by authority.

<sup>2</sup> A Future with an Imperative meaning. Our language bears the same construction, but not so freely as Hebraistic Greek.

<sup>8</sup> 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*.

<sup>4</sup> The use of the article in Greek by no means necessitates its use in English. See Preface.

<sup>5</sup> So everywhere for διδάσκαλος.

<sup>6</sup> 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).

14

REVISED VERSION.	SUGGESTIONS.
11:4 Go your way	Go = A.v.
11:7 to behold	to see = A.V.
11:14 which is to come	who was to come
12:1, 3 an hungred	hungry <sup>1</sup>
12:50 he	the same $=$ A.V. <sup>2</sup>
13:14 unto them	in them $=$ A.v.
13:52 made a disciple to	instructed in regard to
14:8 put forward	set on
14:8 etc. charger	platter
14:13 from thence	thence
14:16 have no need to	need not $=$ A.v.
14:20 baskets	panniers <sup>8</sup>
15:9 as their doctrines	as doctrines (or for doctrines
	= A.V.)
16:2, 3 heaven	sky
16:3 but ye cannot	and can ye not?

<sup>1</sup> And so wherever the expression occurs.

<sup>2</sup> 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 *is*.

<sup>8</sup> 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.	SUGGESTIONS.
16:26 forfeit his life	lose his soul
16:26 for his life	for his soul $=$ A.V. <sup>1</sup>
17:6 face	faces
17:22 abode	were going about
17:25 spake first to him	met him <sup>2</sup>
17:25 the kings of the earth,	from whom do the kings of the
from whom do they	earth
17:27 cause them to stumble	should scandalize them (or
	cause them to find fault) <sup>3</sup>
18:28 pence	denarii (or shillings) <sup>4</sup>
19:5,6 twain	two
19:22 he was one that had	he had $=$ A.V.

<sup>1</sup> I justify the A. V. in rendering  $\psi v \chi \dot{\eta}$  life, in v. 25, and soul in v. 26. Greek idiom employs  $\psi v \chi \dot{\eta}$  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  $\psi v \chi \dot{\eta}$  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  $\zeta \eta \mu la$  in the sense of loss is the correlative of  $\kappa \epsilon \rho \delta os$ , gain, in the usual language of commerce.

<sup>2</sup> Neither of these renderings conveys fully the force of the original. "Confronted him," would come nearer to it, but would perhaps be too modern.

<sup>3</sup> 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.

<sup>4</sup> In reference to the mode of rendering the Greek names of coins, see Preface.

REVISED VERSION.	SUGGESTIONS.
19:30 many shall be last	many that are first shall be
that are first; and first	iast, and the last first. =
that are last.	A.V. in Mark. <sup>1</sup>
20:14 Take up	Take
20:14 it is my will	I wish
21:4 is come to pass	came to pass
21:29 I will not	I do not wish to go <sup>2</sup>
21:29 repented himself	repented $= A.v.$
21:31 whether of the twain	which of the two
21:32 repent yourselves	repent
23:23 anise	dill
23:23 but these	these $=$ A.v.
23:37 killeth stoneth	killest stonest <sup>8</sup>
23:37 unto her	unto thee <sup>3</sup>
24:8 travail	sorrows == A.V. (or pangs)
24:23 or, Here	or there $=$ A.V.
24:36 neither the Son	(Put in margin.)
25:6 there is a cry	there was a cry
26:15 weighed unto him	covenanted with him for $=$ A.v.
	(or agreed with him for)
26:18 I keep	I will keep $= A.v.^4$

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> "I will not" is stronger than  $O_{\vartheta}^{\vartheta} \theta_{\epsilon} \lambda \omega$ .

<sup>8</sup> 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.

<sup>4</sup> A perfectly legitimate use of the Greek Present for a Future, which we sometimes imitate, but which here seems forced.

2\*

REVI	SED VERSION.	SUGGESTIONS.
26:25 Th	ou hast said.	It is. (marg. Gr. Thou hast said.) <sup>1</sup>
26:28 unt	o remission	for the remission $= A.V.^2$
26:32 am	raised up	am risen == A.V. <sup>8</sup>
26:64 Th	ou hast said:	I am: (marg. Gr. Thou hast said.) <sup>1</sup>
26:73 bev	vrayeth thee	betrayeth thee (or maketh thee manifest)
27:5 into	the sanctuary	in the temple == A.V.
27:21 WI	nether of the twain	Which of the two
27:38 Th	en are	Then were = A.V. <sup>4</sup>
27:43 tru	steth	hath put his trust
27:63 I r	ise	I shall rise
27:66 the them	guard being with	and setting the guard <sup>5</sup>

28:1 late on the sabbath at the end of the sabbath

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> 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.

<sup>8</sup> As retained in the Revision, chap. 28:7. Comp. Matt. 17:7; John 13:4, etc., where a strictly Passive sense is inadmissible.

<sup>4</sup> 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.

<sup>5</sup> I understand  $\mu\epsilon\tau\dot{\alpha} \tau\eta\hat{s} \kappa ov\sigma\tau\omega\delta \delta s$  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.

18

### MARK.

REVISED VERSION.	SUGGESTIONS.
28:4 the watchers did quake	the guards trembled
28:5 which hath been cru-	who was crucified
cified	
28:14 rid you of care	secure you = A.V.
28:19 into the name	in the name $= A.V.^1$
28:20 commanded	have commanded $= A.V$

### MARK,

1	:	8	baptized

1:9 of John

have baptized  $= A.v.^2$  by John

<sup>1</sup> 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  $\epsilon$ is, which in later times utterly supplanted *èv*, had evidently begun to do this in the age of the New Testament. Witness είς οἶκόν ἐστι, Mark 2:1; είς την κοίτην εἰσίν, Luke 11:7; εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρὸς, John i. 18, and numerous other passages. John baptized έν τώ Ιορδάνη, Matt. 3:6, and eis tor 'lopdárny, Mark 1:9. So in the phrase, Go in peace, the Greek is sometimes  $\epsilon i_{S} \epsilon i_{\rho} \eta \nu \eta \nu$  and sometimes έν εἰρήνη. So also baptism is said, as here and elsewhere, to be είς τὸ ὄνομα, but in Acts 10:48 ἐν τῷ ὄνόματι, and in Acts 2:38 έπι τώ ονόματι, all, as Robinson (Lex. under  $Ba \pi \tau i \zeta \omega$ ) remarks, in the same sense. That sense, I am persuaded, is well expressed by our old established phrase in the name.

<sup>2</sup> 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,  $\epsilon \mu \eta \rho \nu \sigma \sigma \epsilon$  $\lambda \epsilon \gamma \omega \nu$ ), 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

together

5:30 that the power proceeding from him had gone forth

 $6:20^{2}$ 

6:43 basketfuls	panniers full
6:45 he himself sendeth	he should send (or he sent ==
	A.V.)
7:1 And there are gathered	Then came together $=$ A.v.

<sup>1</sup> Whether the  $\tau \dot{a}$  be read or not.

<sup>2</sup> 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  $\sigma v retripet$  is open to some doubt.

SUGGESTIONS.

```
(omit)
```

convulsing

sent him away = A.V.

- in the days of Abiather the high priest = A.v.
- was gathered = A.v.
- some thirty, and some sixty, and some a hundred. = A.v. turn and be forgiven

And they that were sown upon the good ground are such as hear (or are those that hear) some thirty, some sixty, and some a hundred fold strangled (or drowned)

(omit)<sup>1</sup>

that power had gone forth from him (*marg. lit.* the power which had gone forth from him) MARK.

REVISED VERSION.	SUGGESTIONS.
7:7 as their doctrines	as doctrines (or for doctrines $= A.v.$ )
7:19 This he said making all	
meats clean <sup>1</sup>	
7:26 by race	by birth (see notes on Acts 4:36 and 18:24.)
7:31 through Sidon	by way of Sidon
8:19 baskets	panniers <sup>2</sup>
8:36 forfeit his life	lose his soul <sup>8</sup>
8:37 life	soul <sup>8</sup>
9:3 glistering	glittering
9:11 The scribes say	How say the scribes?
9:17 brought	have brought = A.V.
9:20 tare	convulsed
9:26 torn	convulsed
9:28 We could not	Why could not we $= A.v.$
9:35 minister	servant == A.V.
9:49 (end)	(add) [and every sacrifice shall be salted with salt] <sup>4</sup>
10:39 withal	with (as in v. 38)

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> See note on Matt. 14:20.

<sup>3</sup> See note on Matt. 16:26.

<sup>4</sup> 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 == A.V. it ought not  $= A.v.^2$ it is nigh of unleavened bread 8 who was one stumbled [because of me this night]:4 (omit) = A.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	believed
1:7 well stricken	advanced (so v. 18)
1:19 was sent	am sent == A.V.

<sup>1</sup> Perhaps putting "back" or "again" in the margin.

<sup>2</sup> The MSS. are divided. It seems to me easier to consider  $\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\eta\kappa\dot{\sigma}\tau a$  the error of a copyist than  $\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\dot{\omega}s$  a correction.

<sup>8</sup> Usage requires the before Passover, but not before unleavened bread. For was in the beginning of this verse, I should prefer was to be.

<sup>4</sup> In respect to σκανδαλίζω, see Preface and Matt. 17:27 note.

22

REVISED VERSION.

- 1:24 these days
- 1:28 And he came in, etc.

1:35 that which is to be born shall be called holy,

1:37 For no word from God

1:42 lifted up her voice with

2:2 This was the first en-

rolment made

2:5 to enrol himself

shall be void of power.

the Son of God.

SUGGESTIONS.

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.")

the holy *child* which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God. (nearly = A.v.)

For with God nothing is impossible.<sup>1</sup>

those days = A.v.

spake out with a loud voice, = A.V.

prepare = A.V.

hath visited = A.V.

This first enrolment was made<sup>2</sup>

to be enrolled (or to have himself enrolled)

2:17 concerning

1:39 these days

a loud cry,

1:76 make ready

1:78 shall visit

(omit)

<sup>1</sup> Or, can be impossible. The whole construction of the verse is Hebraistic; the use of the Future, of  $\pi \hat{a}\nu$  with a negative, and of  $\hat{\rho}\hat{\eta}\mu a$ . For the last compare Luke 2:15; Acts 5:32, etc.

<sup>2</sup> 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).

24

REVISED VERSION.	SUGGESTIONS.
2:32 for revelation to the	to enlighten the Gentiles
Gentiles	(marg. Gr. for a revelation
	of the Gentiles)
2:33 were marvelling	marvelled == A.V.
3:4 Make ye ready	Prepare ye = A.v.
3:7 of him	by him
3:13 extort	exact = A.V.
3:14 exact anything wrong-	accuse any one falsely
fully	
3:15 haply he were the	he were the Christ or not
Christ	= A.V.
3:18 therefore preached he	also preached he unto the
good tidings unto the	people
people	
4:4 answered unto him	answered him, saying 1
4:38 holden	$taken = A.v.^2$
4:44 was preaching	preached == A.V. <sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> At the close of the verse add a marginal note, *Some ancient* copies add, but by every word of God.

<sup>2</sup> 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.

<sup>8</sup> 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.	SUGGESTIONS.
5:6 had this done	had done this
7:10 whole	well (or in health)
7:19 the Lord	Jesus (at least in the margin)
7:24 to behold	to see = A.v. <sup>1</sup>
7:28 but little	least $=$ A.v. (comp. 9 : 48.)
7:29,30	(Put in parenthesis.)
8:14 they are choked	are choked
8:33 choked	strangled (or drowned)
8:42 a dying	dying
8:45 Peter said, and they	Peter and they that were with
that were with him,	him said, $=$ A.V.
9:11 welcomed	received = A.v.
9:25 lose or forfeit his own	destroy or lose himself <sup>2</sup>
self	
9:39 teareth	convulseth
9:42 tare him grievously	convulsed him violently <sup>8</sup>
9:54 (end)	(add) [even as Elijah did.]
9:55 (end)	(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.]

9:58 birds of the heaven

<sup>1</sup> To behold can hardly be considered  $= \theta \epsilon \acute{a} \sigma a \sigma \theta a \iota$ . Colloquially we should say to look at; but this would hardly be accepted as fitting the style of a scripture translation.

birds of the air  $= A.V.^4$ 

<sup>2</sup> See note on Matt. 16:26.

<sup>8</sup> The word him need not be printed in italics, since Greek idiom does not require the repetition of the pronoun.

<sup>4</sup> So 13:19, and wherever the phrase occurs.

REVISED VERSION.	SUGGESTIONS.
10:19 authority	power == A.V. <sup>1</sup>
10:40 came up to him	came to $him = A.v.$
10:40 did leave	hath left $=$ A.v.
11:52 took	have taken $=$ A.V. <sup>2</sup>
12:18 corn	fruits (or produce) <sup>8</sup>
12:23 the food	food
12:23 the raiment	raiment = A.V.
12:33 draweth near	approacheth == A.V.
12:58 hale	drag
13:14,16 day of the sabbath	sabbath day $= A.v.$
14:10 glory	honor
15:1 for to hear	to hear
16:6 measures	baths <sup>4</sup> (with marg. explana-
	tions.)
16:7 measures	cors <sup>4</sup> (with marg. explanations.)

<sup>1</sup> 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  $\delta \xi ov \sigma (av and \delta \delta v a \mu w)$  by the same term, the latter might be rendered *might*.

<sup>2</sup> Jesus is describing their present state and character.

<sup>3</sup> The term is not limited to grains, but comprises all the fruits of the earth.

<sup>4</sup> 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.

26

REVISED VERSION.	SUGGESTIONS.
16:8 sons (bis)	children $=$ A.V. <sup>1</sup>
16:8 of the light	of light = A.V.
16:14 lovers of money	covetous = A.v.
16:16 entereth violently	presseth = A.v.
16:31 if one rise	though one should rise
17:6 have faith	had faith = A.v.
17:6 would say	might say $=$ A.V.
17:6 would have obeyed	would obey <sup>2</sup>
18:15 their babes	babes
18:28 our own	what we had (or our homes)
19:1 called by name Zac-	named Zacchaeus = A.v.
chaeus	
19:14 ambassage	embassy
19:14 will not that this man	do not wish to have this man
reign	reign (or do not wish that
	this man should reign)
19:26 shall be taken away	shall be taken away
from him	
19:30 in the which	in which
19:44 dash thee to the	lay thee even with the ground
ground	= A.V.
20:20 rule	power = A.V. <sup>8</sup>
20:21 of a truth	truly

<sup>1</sup> As in Acts 13 : 26, R.V.

<sup>2</sup> 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.

<sup>8</sup> The closest rendering of  $d\rho_X \dot{\eta}$  here would be *authority*; but as  $\dot{\epsilon}\xi ov\sigma i a$  follows, we must seek the nearest synonyme, and as such *power* seems better than *rule*. JOHN.

REVISED VERSION.	SUGGESTIONS.
20:34 sons	children <sup>1</sup>
20:36 sons (bis)	children
22:5 covenanted	(perhaps) agreed
22:27 whether	which
22:36 he that hath none, let	let him that hath no sword
him sell his cloke, and	sell his garment, and buy
buy a sword.	one.
22:37 hath fulfilment	is about to be accomplished
	(marg. Gr. hath an end)
22:70 Ye say that I am.	I am. (marg. Gr. Ye say that
	I am.)
23:3 Thou sayest.	I am. (marg. Gr. Thou sayest.)
23:7 in these days	in those days
24:11 disbelieved them	believed them not $=$ A.V.

### JOHN.

1:9 There was the true light	That was the true light = A.v. <sup>2</sup>
1:12 the right	power == A.V.
1:15 beareth crieth	bare $\ldots$ cried $=$ A.V.
1:49 King	the King $=$ A. v. (so the
	Syriac.)

<sup>1</sup> γαμίσκονται 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 ἄρρενα, Rev. 12:5; also from the use of vioi to designate a people, as vioi ໄσραήλ; also figuratively vioi  $^{A}\beta\rho\alpha\alpha'\mu$ , Gal. 3:7.

<sup>2</sup> Tò  $\phi \hat{\omega}$ s may well be regarded as the subject of  $\hat{\eta}\nu$ . "The light (of which I speak) was the true *light*," etc.

REVISED VERSION.	SUGGESTIONS.
1:50 underneath	under == A.V. <sup>1</sup>
1:51 the heaven	heaven = A.V. <sup>1</sup>
3:8 voice	sound == A.V.
4:6 Jacob's well was there.	there was there a well of
	Jacob.
4:10 knewest	hadst known
4:12 sons	children == A.V.
4:54 sign	miracle $=$ A.V. <sup>2</sup>
5:13 wist	knew
5:26 gave he	hath he given $= A.v.$
5:27 he gave	hath given $=$ A.V.
5:29 ill	evil = A.v.
5:39 Ye search	$Search = A.V.^3$
7:6 alway	always=A.v.
8:52 is dead	died
8:53 which is dead	who died
8:53 are dead	died

<sup>1</sup> "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.

<sup>2</sup> It seems to me unsuitable to use the word *sign* except where something is expressed or implied of which it is a sign; whereas  $\sigma\eta\mu\hat{\omega}\nu$  has the more general sense of miracle. Even in 10:41 and 11:47 I should prefer miracle and miracles.

<sup>8</sup> 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.

2\*

REVISED VERSION. SUGGESTIONS. 9:4 We must work I must work = A.v. (marg. Many ancient authorities have We must work) 9:9 Others Some = A.V.10:16 they shall become there shall be (or there shall come to be) 12:1 Jesus therefore Then Jesus = A.v.12:3 Mary therefore Then Mary 12:9 The common people A great multitude<sup>1</sup> 12:13 the branches of the branches of palm  $= A. \mathbf{v}$ . palm 12:18 sign miracle = A.V. 12:22 Andrew cometh, and Andrew and Philip came and told Jesus<sup>2</sup> Philip, and they tell Jesus 12:36 sons children = A.V.12:36 he departed departed = A.V. hardened = A.V.<sup>8</sup> 12:40 he hardened 12:43 glory (bis) praise == A.V. (or glory which is) 12:48,49 spake have spoken <sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> δ ὄχλος πολύς is an inadmissable form, and must be regarded as the mistake of a copyist. We must read either ὄχλος πολύς, or δ ὄχλος δ πολύς, but for the latter there is no authority.

<sup>2</sup> We surely are not bound to make our English grotesque for the sake of imitating the construction of the Greek.

<sup>8</sup> 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.

<sup>4</sup> 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	going
13:18 my bread	bread with me A.v.
13:26 for whom I shall dip	to whom I shall give the sop
the sop, and give it him	(or morsel) when I have
	dipped it $=$ A.V. <sup>1</sup>
13:27 That thou doest	What thou doest
14:1 ye believe in God	believe in God <sup>2</sup>
14:14 ask me	ask = A.v. (Putting <i>ask me</i> in
	marg.)
14:28 have rejoiced	rejoice == A.V. <sup>3</sup>
14:30 I will no more speak	Hereafter I will not talk much
much with you	with you == A.V.
15:2 cleanseth	(Add in marg. i.e. pruneth)
15:11 be fulfilled	be full $=$ A.v. (or become
	full) (So 16 : 24)
15:19 chose	have chosen == A.v. <sup>4</sup>
16:4 their hour	the time $=$ A.V.

<sup>1</sup> If morsel be preferred to sop in this verse it would be also in verses 27 and 30.

<sup>2</sup> See note on 5:39.

<sup>8</sup> 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.

<sup>4</sup> 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 received ... 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
- 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  $him = A.V.^2$
- have glorified = A.v.
- have received ... have known
  - ... have believed  $= A.V.^3$
- through the truth <sup>4</sup>

through truth

- made perfect in one  $= A.v.^5$
- I will that they also whom thou hast given me be with me where I am,  $= A.v.^6$

 $(omit) = A.V.^7$ 

18:21 these know the things they know what I said. = A.V.

<sup>1</sup> Ad sensum.

<sup>2</sup> See note on Matt. 23 : 37.

<sup>3</sup> Because they still retain what they received, know what they knew, and believe what they believed.

<sup>4</sup> 'E<sub>ν</sub> instrumental  $\Longrightarrow$  in Hebrew.

<sup>5</sup> The old rendering gives the idea of advancing to the condition of oneness, and this is all that the new one aims to give.

<sup>6</sup> Compare 17 : 2.

<sup>7</sup> Why add an expletive?

REVISED VERSION.	SUGGESTIONS.
18:28 palace (bis)	pretorium (Sovs. 33 and 19:9.) <sup>1</sup>
18:37 Thou sayest that I	I am. (marg. Gr. Thou sayest
am a king.	that I am a king.)
19:19 there was written	it was written (or the writing
	was == A.V.)
19:23 coat (bis)	tunic
19:28 are saith	were said
19:31 should not remain	might not remain
19:42 There then, etc.	There laid they, etc. $= A.v.$
20:14 beholdeth	beheld $(or \text{ saw} = A.v.)^2$
20:18 I have seen the Lord;	that she had seen the Lord,
and how that	and $that = A.v.$
20:20 The disciples there-	Then were the disciples glad
fore were glad	
20:21 Jesus therefore said	Then said Jesus = A.V.
20:30 Many other signs	Many other miracles also
therefore	
21:5 Jesus therefore saith	Then said Jesus
21:12 break your fast	dine $=$ A.V. <sup>8</sup>
21:15 broken their fast	dined == A.V. <sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> 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."

<sup>3</sup> In Luke 11: 37, 38 and 14; 1 the revisers have retained *dine* and *dinner*. We might render there and here *breakfast* 

ACTS.

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

SUGGESTIONS. which would be written.

#### ACTS. 1:3 by the space of during 1:15 these days those days = A.v. 1:15 and there was there was (or there being) 1:19 Akeldama $A celdama = A.V.^1$ 1:26 gave lots cast lots 2:46 at home from house to house = A.V. (or at their houses)<sup>2</sup> to the church = A.V.2:47 to them 2:47 were being saved were saved <sup>8</sup> 3:1 going up going up together 4

and breakfasted; but this would involve a change in nearly all, if not all, the cases where  $\delta \rho_{i\sigma\tau\sigma\nu}$  and  $\delta \epsilon \hat{i} \pi \nu \sigma \nu$  occur.

<sup>1</sup> I would retain Aceldama as the established spelling, just as I would Cyrene, Phenice, or Macedonia.

<sup>2</sup> Kar' olkov 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.

<sup>8</sup> 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.

<sup>4</sup> The unsuitableness of joining  $\epsilon \pi i$   $\tau i$  airo with 2:47 and the testimony of the Syriac version satisfy me that the reading of the Textus Receptus is the true one.

34

REVISED VERSION.	SUGGESTIONS.
3:6 walk	(Put rise up and walk in margin)
4:12 wherein	whereby $=$ A.v.
4:25 by the Holy Ghost, by	[by the Holy Spirit] by the
the mouth of our father	mouth of thy servant David <sup>1</sup>
David thy servant,	
4:36 by race	by birth $(or = A.v.)^2$
5:6 wrapped him round	wrapped him up
5:6 they carried	carried (So vs. 10.)
5:42 at home	in houses (or from house to
	house, or in every house)
6:1 Now in these days	And in those days $=$ A.v. (or
	In those days)
7:35 hath God sent	did God send $=$ A.V.
7:35 with the hand	by the hand == A.v. <sup>3</sup>
7:53 ordained	announced <sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> 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 medley as  $\delta \tau o \hat{\upsilon}$  $\pi a \tau \rho \delta \hat{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu \delta u \hat{\Pi} \nu \epsilon \hat{\upsilon} \mu a \tau o \hat{\upsilon} \delta \gamma ( \delta \upsilon \sigma \tau \delta \mu a \tau o \hat{\delta} \delta \hat{\eta} )$ . The words  $\tau o \hat{\upsilon} \pi a \tau \rho \delta \hat{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$  may have been a gloss intended to precede  $\Delta a \beta \delta \delta$ , but attached by some copyist to the line above.

<sup>2</sup> By *race* he was an Israelite or a Hebrew, by the accident of *birth* a Cypriot. See note on 18:24.

<sup>8</sup> Either phrase, συν χειρί or ἐν χειρί represents בְּרַד, i.e. by the hand of, or by.

<sup>4</sup> I object to *ordained* because it implies original authority.  $\Delta \iota a \tau a \gamma \dot{\eta}$  is command, but it may be a command emanating from superior authority, and thus merely an announcement.

- 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 their manners
- 13:31 of them
- 13:33 how that God
- 13:35 give thy Holy One
- 14:2 Jews that were disobedient

when he had taken food he was strengthened preached Jesus(Comp. 10:42.)

SUGGESTIONS.

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)<sup>2</sup> the minds of the Gentiles<sup>3</sup>

14:2 the souls of the Gentiles t

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> In reference to a command  $i\pi\epsilon\iota\theta\epsilon\omega$  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.

<sup>3</sup> Stirring up *minds* seems certainly more idiomatic than

ACTS.

REVISED VERSION. 14:23 appointed 15:7 questioning 15:23 elder brethren	suggestions. ordained $\Longrightarrow A.V.^1$ discussion elders and brethren $\Longrightarrow A.V.^2$
15:29 it shall be well with	ye shall do well == A.V.
you	
15:39 sailed away	sailed $=$ A.V.
16:1 And he came also	And he came
16:4 for to keep	to keep
16:10 for to preach	to preach
16:13 we supposed there was a place of prayer	prayer was wont to be made $=$ A.V.

stirring up souls. Besides  $\psi v \chi \dot{\alpha} s$  is governed by the second verb also.

<sup>1</sup> The rendering appointed seems like a compromise between the classical and the ecclesiastical use of the verb  $\chi\epsilon\mu\rho\sigma\sigma\nu\epsilon\omega$ . The meaning according to the former would be *elected*, according to the latter *ordained*. Probably the churches chose their elders, and the apostles set them apart by laying on of hands. Compare 6: 3-6.  $X\epsilon\mu\rho\sigma\sigma\nu\gamma\sigma\sigma\mu\sigma\sigma\tau\epsilon$ s 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.

<sup>2</sup>  $\Pi \rho \epsilon \sigma \beta \dot{\upsilon} \tau \epsilon \rho \upsilon \dot{d} \delta \epsilon \lambda \phi o \dot{d}$  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.

ACTS.

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

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.<sup>1</sup>

SUGGESTIONS.

telling or hearing very religious

- What therefore not knowing ye worship, that declare I unto you.<sup>2</sup> of one [blood]<sup>8</sup> So Paul departed = A.V. born in Pontus = A.V.<sup>4</sup>
- earnest in *preaching* the word shook  $= A.y.^5$

<sup>1</sup> Can we say that a teaching is spoken?

<sup>2</sup> 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.

<sup>8</sup> 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.

<sup>4</sup> See notes on 4:36 and 18:24.

<sup>5</sup> Shook out is literal, and would be unobjectionable if we were making a new and independent version; but shook gives

REVISED VERSION.	SUGGESTIONS.
18:7 Titus Justus	Justus == A.v. (Titus in marg.).
18:7 joined hard	was close
18:14 villany	plotting
18:15 am not minded to be	have no mind to be (or will not be, $or = A.V.$ )
18:23 stablishing	confirming (or strengthening $=$ A. v.) <sup>1</sup>
18:24 an Alexandrian by race	born at Alexandria $=$ $\Lambda$ .v. <sup>2</sup>
18:25 carefully	accurately (as in Luke 1:3, or correctly)
18:26 more carefully	more accurately (or more correctly)
19:5 into the name	in the name $=$ A.V. <sup>3</sup>
19:9 disobedient	believed not $=$ A.v.
19:12 carried away	carried
19:32 the more part	the greater part

the sense, as in Neh. 5:13, and I should not favor a change in such circumstances.

<sup>1</sup> 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  $\epsilon \pi \iota \sigma \tau \eta \rho i \zeta \omega$  convey to the English reader an idea of the delicate difference between the Greek terms.

<sup>2</sup> 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 ' $A\lambda\epsilon\xiav\delta\rho\epsilon vs$ ), still I should not think it correct to call him an Alexandrian by race. To express that idea we might perhaps say by extraction.

<sup>8</sup> See note on Matt. 28:19.

10	•	00	au	Juse			
19	:	40	in	danger	to	be	ac-
		cus	ed	concer	nin	g	this
		day	y's :	riot			

20:1 for to go

10.99 .....

- 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

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 = A.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

SUGGESTIONS.

(perhaps) have it by birth.<sup>2</sup> before said <sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> With a marginal note, Gr. was born.

<sup>3</sup> 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.

- 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 fulfilled
- 24:27 desiring to gain favor with the Jews, Felix left Paul in bonds

SUGGESTIONS.

```
as follows<sup>1</sup>
```

to say before thee what they had against him. = A.V. (or what pertains to him.) heresy = A.V.<sup>2</sup> (perhaps) several years <sup>8</sup>

call for thee = A.V.

after two years  $= A.V.^4$ 

Felix desiring to favor the Jews (or to shew favor to the Jews) left Paul bound <sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> 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 whether *after this form* distinctly conveys this impression. A marginal note might be added, *Gr.* having (or comprising) this form.

<sup>2</sup> A  $i\rho\epsilon\sigma\iota$ s 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.

<sup>8</sup> 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  $\pi\lambda\epsilon\iota\delta\nu\omega\nu$ . Two would be some (as in Acts 9:19) and  $\pi\circ\lambda\lambda\omega\nu$  many (as 24:10).

<sup>4</sup> I would like to vary as little as possible from the A.V. where the sense is the same. "After two years" expresses ACTS.

REVISED VERSION.	SUGGESTIONS.
25:8 sinned	offended $=$ A.v.
25:20 perplexed	in doubt
25:22 could wish	would like
26 : 6 stand here to be judged	stand, and am judged $=$ A.V.
26:8 if God doth raise	that God raiseth <sup>1</sup>
26:23 how that (bis)	that = A.v.
26:23 he first by the resur-	he should be the first that
rection of the dead should	should rise from the dead,
	and should $=$ A.V.
26:26 none	not one
26:28 wouldest fain make	wilt make
27:9 gone by	past == A.V.
27:12 north-east and south-	toward the south-west and
east	$north-west = A.v.^2$
27:13 Crete, close in shore	close by $Crete = A.v.$
27:14 after no long time	not long after $=$ A.V.
27:14 beat down from it	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.  $Ka\tau a\theta \epsilon \sigma \theta a t$  $\chi \alpha \rho \iota \tau \alpha$  (or  $\chi \alpha \rho \iota \tau \alpha$ , or  $\chi \alpha \rho \iota \tau \alpha s$ ) though it may comprise the idea of gaining favor, I understand primarily to signify doing a favor or favors.

<sup>1</sup> This force of  $\epsilon i$  is well established. Comp. vs. 23.

<sup>2</sup> The reasoning by which this change is justified seems to me fanciful. Ka $\tau \dot{a}$  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  $\kappa a \tau \dot{a}$  mean down the wind seems to me entirely arbitrary.

REVISED VERSION.	SUGGESTIONS.
27:28 after a little space	when they had gone a little
	further = A.V.
27:33 wait and continue	have waited and continued <sup>1</sup>
27:39 and they took counsel	into which they were minded,
whether they could drive	if it were possible, to thrust
the ship upon it	in the ship $=$ A.V. (or on
	which they consulted, if pos-
	sible, to drive the ship) $^2$
27:41 began to break up	was broken == A.V. <sup>3</sup>
28:11 The Twin Brothers	Castor and Pollux $= A.v.^4$
28:12 touching	landing = A.V. <sup>5</sup>
28:20 intreat you to see and	request to see and to speak
to speak with me	with you <sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> In constructions of this kind the Greek uses the Present exactly as we do the Perfect.

<sup>2</sup> I think Dean Alford points the text correctly,  $\epsilon \beta o \upsilon \lambda \epsilon \upsilon o \upsilon \tau \sigma$ ,  $\epsilon \delta \upsilon \tau a \upsilon \tau \sigma$ ,  $\epsilon \xi \omega \sigma a \iota$ , thus connecting  $\epsilon \xi \omega \sigma a \iota$  with  $\epsilon \beta o \upsilon \lambda \epsilon \upsilon o \upsilon \tau \sigma$ and not with  $\delta \upsilon \tau a \upsilon \tau \sigma$ .

<sup>8</sup> Ἐλύετο, not merely began, but began and continued to be broken up.

<sup>4</sup> The one expression is no more a literal rendering of  $\Delta \iota \dot{o} \sigma \kappa o \nu \rho o \iota$  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.

<sup>5</sup> *Touching* would be the term if the object were to make a new translation; but *landing* may fairly retain its place in a revision.

<sup>6</sup> The connection justifies us in understanding  $\pi\rho\sigma\lambda\lambda\eta\sigma\alpha$ 

ROMANS.

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

SUGGESTIONS.

there came many to him into his lodging  $= A.V.^1$ 

believed not = A.v. not = A.v. turn (Insert in the text in brackets.) confidence, no man = A.v.<sup>2</sup>

# ROMANS.

1:5 of faith	to faith
1:6 to be Jesus Christ's	of Jesus Christ = A.v.
1:13 in you in the rest	among you among the rest
	== A.V.
1:14 foolish	unwise == A.V.
2:7 incorruption	immortality == A.v.
3:4, 6, etc. God forbid	By no means <sup>8</sup>

of Paul's addressing the Jews, rather than of the Jews' addressing Paul.

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> Boldness is a good rendering of  $\pi a \dot{\rho} \dot{\rho} \eta \sigma t a$ , but so also is confidence, and I perceive no sufficient reason for the change, in view of the rules adopted for the revision.

<sup>8</sup> I do not overlook the fact that  $\gamma \epsilon \nu \sigma \tau \sigma$  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  $\mu \eta \gamma \epsilon \nu \sigma \tau \sigma$ wherever it occurs.

better

seeing  $= A.V.^1$ 

rejoice = A.V.

 $= A.V.^{3}$ experience =  $A.V.^{4}$ 

being not weak = A.V.<sup>2</sup>

we have peace = A.V.

a good man = A.V.<sup>5</sup>

	3	:	9	wo	rse
--	---	---	---	----	-----

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 the trespass of one ... the act of righteousness righteousness of one <sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> I would unhesitatingly retain this rendering, whether we read  $\epsilon i \pi \epsilon \rho$  or  $\epsilon \pi \epsilon i \pi \epsilon \rho$ .

<sup>2</sup> The original participle is not Passive, but Neuter, and is well rendered by *being weak*.

<sup>8</sup> Rendering καυχώμαι as in 2 Cor. 12:9. I would give it the same rendering in verse 2 if it were not followed by δόξης.

<sup>4</sup>  $\Delta \alpha \kappa \mu \eta'$  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 *approval*, the being  $\delta \delta \kappa \mu \sigma s$ . But if, like the *patience* and *hope* with which it is here associated,  $\delta \sigma \kappa \mu \eta'$  also is subjective, it will be best rendered by *experience*, meaning that self-knowledge which is gained through the endurance of tribulation.

<sup>5</sup> 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.

<sup>6</sup> It seems to me that the rendering of the A.V. "the offence (or trespass or transgression) of one" and "the righteousness

SUGGESTIONS.

we glory in tribulations also

ROMANS.

REVISED VERSION. 6:17 whereunto ye were de- livered 6:20 in regard to righteous-	SUGGESTIONS. which was delivered you $\implies$ A.V. (or unto you) <sup>1</sup> from righteousness $\implies$ A.V.
ness	
7:1 Or, etc. <sup>2</sup>	
7:4 were made dead	have become dead
7:6 so that we serve	that we should serve $=$ A.V. <sup>3</sup>
7:8,9 apart from	without = A.V. <sup>4</sup>
8:4 ordinance	$righteousness = A.V.^5$
9:9 a word of promise	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.

<sup>1</sup> Παραδίδω $\mu\iota$  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."

<sup>2</sup> I would regard the  $\eta$  as interrogative and retain the whole verse as in the A.V., except that I would prefer to omit *how*.

<sup>8</sup> Alford justifies the rendering, "so that we serve" on the ground of the verb  $(\delta ou\lambda\epsilon \acute{\upsilon} \epsilon \nu)$  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  $\breve{\omega}\sigma\tau\epsilon$ . I should prefer to leave the old rendering undisturbed.

<sup>4</sup> 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.

<sup>5</sup> Taking  $\delta\iota\kappa a\iota\omega\mu a$  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.

### ROMANS.

REVISED VERSION.	SUGGESTIONS.
9:9 According to	At = A.v.
10:17 belief	faith = A.v.
11:1 Did God	Hath $God = A.v.$ (comp. vs. 4.)
11:2 God did not	God hath not $=$ A.v.
11:29 without repentance	irrevocable (or not to be re pented of)
12:1 reasonable	spiritual $(marg. Gr. rational)^1$
12:3 the grace that was	the grace given unto $me = A.v$
given me	
12:16 things that are lowly	the lowly
13:3 to the good work	to good works = A.V.
13:3 to the evil	to evil
13:3 And wouldest thou have no fear	Desirest thou then not to be afraid
13:6 ministers of God's service	God's ministers = A.V. <sup>2</sup>
14:4 lord	master — A.V.
15:13 in the power	by the power
15:24 Spain	Spain [I will come to you] <sup>8</sup>
15:25 — but now, Isay,	But now $=$ A.V.

<sup>1</sup> I apprehend that ordinary readers interpret reasonable service to mean a service reasonably required, whereas, I take  $\lambda \circ \gamma \iota \kappa \dot{\eta} \quad \lambda \alpha \tau \rho \epsilon i \alpha$  to mean a service rendered by the rational 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.

<sup>2</sup> The revisers have doubtless aimed to bring out the difference between  $\lambda \epsilon_{i\tau ov \rho\gamma o'}$  and  $\delta_{i \acute{\alpha} \kappa ov oi}$ , but I doubt whether the expression they have chosen conveys to an English reader any other idea than that conveyed by the old rendering.

<sup>8</sup> Putting a period at the end of the verse.

REVISED VERSION.

- 15:26 been the good plea- pleased them = A.V. sure
- SUGGESTIONS.
- 15:27 been their good plea- pleased them = A.v. sure
- 15:31 are disobedient
- 15:32 find rest
- 16:17 them which are causing the divisions
- 16:17 learned

16:17 turn away from

16:25 times eternal

16:27 to whom

do not believe  $= \mathbf{A} \cdot \mathbf{v}$ . be refreshed = A.v.those that cause divisions

have learned = A.V. avoid = A.v.ages (omit)<sup>1</sup>

# **1 CORINTHIANS.**

1:4 which was given	given
1:8 that ye be	that ye may be $=$ A.V.
1:13,15 into	in = A.v.
1:18 are perishing being	perish $\dots$ saved $=$ A.v. <sup>2</sup>
saved	
1:27 chose (bis)	hath chosen $=$ A.v.
1:28 did God choose	hath God chosen $=$ A.v.
2:4 of wisdom	of [man's] wisdom
2:8 knoweth	knew (or hath known)
2:9 saw not heard not	hath not seen hath not heard
entered not	have not entered

<sup>1</sup> Whether  $\hat{\psi}$  be read or not.

<sup>2</sup>  $\sum \omega \zeta_{0} \omega \zeta_{0}$ , 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.	SUGGESTIONS.
2:10 revealed	hath revealed $=$ A.v.
2:10 through the Spirit	by his Spirit = A.v.
2:12 received	have received $=$ A.v.
3:4 are ye not men?	are ye not walking as men? <sup>1</sup>
3:8 but each	and each
3:17 destroyeth	defileth (or polluteth) <sup>2</sup>
3:19 He that taketh	Who taketh
5:2 did not rather mourn	have not rather mourned $=$ A.v. <sup>3</sup>
6:4 do ye set them to judge	set them to judge who are least
who are of no account in	esteemed in the church ==
the church?	A.V.
6:7 Nay, already, etc.	Now therefore, etc. (the whole
	verse = A.V.)
6:9 Or know ye not	Know ye not = A.v. <sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> I would insert these Italics because we are obliged in English to use *men* to represent the idea of  $a\nu\delta\rho\epsilon\varsigma$ , *viri*, as well as of  $a\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\sigma\sigma$ , *homines.* "*Walking as* men," draws attention at once to the language of vs. 3, and the thought in both passages is the same.

<sup>2</sup> 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, because they have single terms which, like  $\phi \theta \epsilon i \rho \omega$ , unite the two meanings. Compare 2 Pet. 2 : 12.

<sup>8</sup> The apostle is describing their present condition,  $\pi\epsilon\phi\nu\sigma\iota\omega-\mu\epsilon\nu\sigma\iota$  ior i, and therefore we should understand the force of  $\epsilon\pi\epsilon\nu\theta\eta\sigma\alpha\tau\epsilon$  as extending to the time present when he was writing.

<sup>4</sup> 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.	SUGGESTIONS.
7:2 because of fornications	to avoid fornication $=$ A.v. <sup>1</sup>
7:5 may be together	come together $=$ A.V. <sup>2</sup>
7:28 But and if	Yet if
7:28 Yet, etc. (to the end of	Nevertheless, etc. $=$ A.V.
the verse)	
7:37,38 his own	his
8:13 forever more	while the world standeth =
	A.V. <sup>3</sup>
8:13 that I make not	that I may not cause
9:12 did not use	have not used == A.V.
9:15 I write not	I have not written
9:18 use to the full	abuse = A.V. <sup>4</sup>
10:13 such as man can bear	such as is common to man ==
	A.V. <sup>5</sup>
10:22 Or do we	Do we $=$ A.V.

 $\ddot{\eta}$ , like that given to a Latin interrogation by prefixing *num*, but or does not express it, and *whether* in that sense is obsolete.

<sup>1</sup> Marg. Gr. because of fornications.

<sup>2</sup> The A.V., gives the sense, even if  $\tilde{\eta}\tau\epsilon$  be the true reading, while the new rendering, it seems to me, does not.

<sup>8</sup> We have no word exactly corresponding to  $a\dot{i}\omega v$ . 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  $\epsilon i_5 \tau \delta v \ a i \omega v a$ ; but the old rendering *while the world standeth*, seems to me to do so quite as well as *forever more*.

<sup>4</sup> Kata $\chi\rho$ áoµaı generally signifies wrong or excessive use. To the full comes short of expressing excess, both here and in the margin of 7:31.

<sup>5</sup> Inserting in the margin, Gr. human or pertaining to man.

		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 yet

- 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 whole verse)

I praise you, [brethren,] instructions factions it is not [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 [Lord's] body for profit by the same Spirit = A.V. by the same Spirit = A.V.

SUGGESTIONS.

- I thought as a child, I reasoned as a child
- and = A.V.
- more especially
- to edification and exhortation = A.v.
- And

ye all = A.V.

judge = A.V.

### = If, etc. = A.v.

<sup>1</sup> The majority of uncial manuscripts have same. It seems to me that much stress should not be laid on the greater probability of a change of one to same than of same to one having been made by copyists, because the two expressions are so nearly synonymous.

15:2 saved; I make known, I say, in what words I preached unto you,1 preached it unto you, if ye hold it fast, 15:4 hath been raised was raised <sup>2</sup> 15:20 are asleep have slept 15:28 be subjected be subject = A.V.<sup>3</sup> Evil company corrupteth (or 15:33 Evil company doth corrupt good manners. Evil companionships corrupt) good morals. 15:47 of heaven [the Lord] from heaven 15:55 O death, where is thy O death, where is thy sting? O Hades, where is thy vicvictory? O death, where is thy sting? tory?<sup>4</sup> 16:2 as he may prosper as he may be prospered

<sup>1</sup> Adding on the word what a marginal note, Gr. with what word. I am unable to see in the R.V., any fair connection for the conditional phrase, "if ye hold it fast."

<sup>2</sup> 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.

<sup>8</sup> 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.

<sup>4</sup> The rendering of the Peshito Syriac confirms here the reading of the textus receptus. So does the Armenian substantially.

REVISED VERSION.

saved, if ye hold fast what I

SUGGESTIONS.

REVISED VERSION.	SUGGESTIONS.
1:1 the whole of Achaia	all Achaia = A.V. <sup>1</sup>
1:5 abound unto us	abound in $us = A.v.^2$
1:6 worketh	is effectual $=$ A.v.
1:8 weighed down exceed-	pressed out of measure, above
ingly, beyond our power	strength $=$ A.V.
1:9 answer of death	sentence of death $=$ A.v.
1:10 will deliver : on whom	doth deliver: in whom we trust
we have set our hope	that he will yet deliver us;
that he will also still	(or will still deliver us) <sup>8</sup>
deliver us;	
1:12 holiness	simplicity=A.v.(So the Syriac)
1:12 sincerity of God	Godly sincerity $=$ A.V. <sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> This change was doubtless made for the sake of preserving a distinction between  $\delta\lambda$ os 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.

<sup>2</sup> 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.

<sup>8</sup> "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.

<sup>4</sup> 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?

5\*

REVISED VERSION.	SUGGESTIONS.
2:14 leadeth us in triumph	(Add in margin, Or causeth us
	to triumph.) <sup>1</sup>
2:15 are being saved	are saved $=$ A. v. <sup>2</sup>
2:15 are perishing	$perish = A.V.^2$
2:16 from death	of death $=$ A.v. (So the Syriac.)
2:16 from life	of life $=$ A.V. (So the Syriac.)
3:3 tables that are hearts	fleshly tables of the heart ==
of flesh.	A.V. <sup>8</sup>
3:18 reflecting as a mirror	beholding as in a mirror
4:3 But and if	But if indeed
4:3 are perishing	perish
4:6 Seeing, etc. (the whole	For God, etc. (the whole verse)
verse)	=A.V.
5:11 hope	trust == A.V. <sup>4</sup>
7:2 Open your hearts to us,	Receive us, etc. (the whole
etc. (the whole verse)	$verse = A.V.^5$

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> See note on Acts 2:47.

<sup>3</sup> The reading  $\kappa \alpha \rho \delta i \alpha s$  is confirmed by the Vulgate, and by the Syriac, Ethiopic, and Armenian versions.

<sup>4</sup> 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.

<sup>5</sup> "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

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
your professed subjection =
A.V. <sup>2</sup>
am bold = A.V. (or am con-
fident) <sup>3</sup>

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.

<sup>1</sup> If  $\delta \dot{\epsilon} \xi a \sigma \theta a \dot{\eta} \mu \hat{a} s$  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.

<sup>2</sup> I do not feel entirely satisfied with either of these renderings. Subjection is a closer rendering of  $\delta\pi\sigma\tau\alpha\gamma\dot{\eta}$  than obedience, and confession perhaps a little preferable to profession for  $\delta\mu\alpha\lambda\alpha\gamma\dot{\alpha}$ , although I know of no other word in Greek but  $\delta\mu\alpha\lambda\alpha\gamma\dot{\alpha}$  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.

<sup>8</sup> 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

- 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 ...?  $= A.V.^3$ (omit)

## GALATIANS,

2:16 savebut only (or, nor otherwise save)3:22 all thingsall =  $A.V.^4$ 

vs. 1. "Am of good courage" most naturally means, "am cheerful and hopeful," which in many cases would express the meaning of  $\theta a \dot{\rho} \dot{\omega}$ , but is far from the Apostle's meaning here.

<sup>1</sup> So all the versions in Walton's Polyglot; also the Armenian.

<sup>2</sup> Is there any good reason for giving two renderings to  $\delta \delta i \nu a \mu \iota s$  in this verse?

<sup>8</sup> The Syriac translators must have had before them the reading  $\Pi \dot{\alpha} \lambda w$ , for they render precisely as the A.V.

<sup>4</sup> Ad sensum. If it be thought necessary to imitate the neuter form, we might render  $\tau \dot{a} \pi \dot{a} \nu \tau a$  the whole world.

#### EPHESIANS.

REVISED VERSION. SUGGESTIONS. 3:24 hath been became 3:28 can be (ter) is = A.V.3:28 one man one = A.V. 4:7 an heir through God an heir of God through Christ ]1 4:13 ye did me no wrong ye have not injured me at all = A.V. 4:17 zealously seek you are zealous for you be zealous for them 4:17 seek them 4:18 to be zealously sought to be zealous 4:23 is born was born = A.v. 4:23 is born through promise by promise = A.V. 5:1 with freedom did Christ stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ hath set us free: stand fast made us free  $= A_{2}V_{2}^{2}$ therefore. 6:5 his own burden his own load 8

## EPHESIANS.

1:10 unto a dispensation of	in the dispensation of the ful-
the fulness of the times,	ness of times to gather to-
to sum up	gether in one <sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> These words "of God through Christ" are in the Peshito Syriac version.

<sup>2</sup> Here also the Peshito agrees with the A.V.

<sup>3</sup> This change I would make for the sake of marking the difference between the  $\beta \acute{a}\rho \eta$  of vs. 2 and  $\phi o\rho \tau \acute{o}\nu$  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.

<sup>4</sup> And the rest of the verse, as in the A.V. The transfer of

#### EPHESIANS.

REVISED VERSION.	SUGGESTIONS.
1:12 hoped in Christ	trusted in Christ $= A.v.$
1:13 ye also,	ye also $trusted = A.v.$
1:14 unto	until = A.V.
1:15 and which	and [the love] which <sup>1</sup>
1:18 having the eyes of your	the eyes of your understanding
heart enlightened	being enlightened $=$ A.v. <sup>2</sup>
2:1 through your trespasses	in trespasses and sins $= A.v.^3$
and sins	
2:2 sons of disobedience	children of disobedience $=$ A.v. <sup>4</sup>
2:3 as the rest	as others $=$ A.V.

the definite article from times to dispensation I would justify by Hebrew analogy, and the rendering of  $\epsilon i_s$  by in on the ground of its being viewed from the stand-point of the preexisting purpose.

<sup>1</sup> Here again the Syriac agrees with the A.V.

<sup>2</sup> Admitting  $\kappa a \rho \delta i a s$  as the true reading I would regard  $\delta i a \nu o i a s$  a correct gloss, and abide by the old version, just as in Prov. 6:32 and 7:11, I would render  $\neg \neg \neg \neg wanting$  understanding, and not wanting heart. I appreciate the desire of the revisers to preserve uniformity in the rendering of  $\kappa a \rho \delta i a$ , 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.

<sup>8</sup> 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.

<sup>4</sup> See note on Luke 20:34.

#### EPHESIANS.

REVISED VERSION.	SUGGESTIONS.
2:5 through our trespasses	in trespasses
2:5 have ye been saved	ye are saved $=$ A.V.
2:8 have ye been saved	are ye saved $=$ A.v.
2:14 made brake	hath made hath broken ==
	A.V. <sup>1</sup>
3:21 Unto him be the glory	Unto him be glory $=$ A.V. <sup>2</sup>
4:19 gave themselves	have given themselves $= A.V.^3$
4:20 did not so learn	have not so learned $= A.v.$
4:21 heard were taught	have heard have been taught
	== A.V.
4:32 forgave you	hath forgiven you $=$ A.v.
5:6 sons	children = A.v.
6:4 nurture them in the	bring them up in the nurture
chastening	= A.V. <sup>4</sup>
6:9 both their Master and	He who is both their Master
yours	and yours

<sup>1</sup> Perfect tense appropriate, because the conditions remain. Jewish and Gentile Christians are still one; the wall remains broken down.

<sup>2</sup> 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.

<sup>8</sup> The Apostle is describing their present state. See vs. 17.

<sup>4</sup> The Revision has here approximated to giving the same rendering of  $\epsilon \kappa \tau \rho \epsilon \phi \omega$  as in 5:29 and yet not attained to an identical rendering. Bring up is a good translation of this verb (as also of  $\tau \rho \epsilon \phi \omega$  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.

6:18 in all perseverance

SUGGESTIONS. with all perseverance = A.V. sincerity = A.V.<sup>1</sup>

6:24 uncorruptness

## PHILIPPIANS.

1:23 very far better1:25 abide with you all2:6 a prize

far better  $= A.V.^2$ continue with you all  $= A.V.^3$ robbery  $= A.V.^4$ 

<sup>1</sup> Putting *incorruption* or *uncorruptness* in the margin as the literal rendering.

<sup>2</sup> The insertion of very in this passage seems to me objectionable on two grounds. (1) It is doubtless designed to represent the word  $\pi o\lambda\lambda \hat{\varphi}$ . But  $\mu \hat{a}\lambda\lambda ov \kappa\rho \hat{\epsilon} \hat{\tau} \tau \sigma v$  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?

<sup>8</sup> The insertion of  $\pi \alpha \rho \dot{\alpha}$  in the compound verb justifies the use of a different term for it from that employed in rendering the simple verb.

<sup>4</sup> I.e. an unwarranted assumption. Even when on earth our Lord distinctly claimed equality with the Father, and did not consider it  $\delta\rho\pi\alpha\gamma\mu\delta$ s 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. PHILIPPIANS.

REVISED VERSION.	SUGGESTIONS.
2:22 as a child serveth a	as a son with a father <sup>1</sup>
father	
3:8 dung	refuse
3:9 of God	from God
3:12 apprehend	lay hold of <sup>2</sup>
3:12 apprehended	laid hold of
3:13 apprehended	laid hold of <i>it</i>
3:19 the belly	their belly $=$ A.V.
4:10 rejoice	$rejoiced = A.v.^{3}$
4:19 fulfil	supply = A.v.

<sup>1</sup> 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 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  $\tau \epsilon \kappa \nu \sigma \nu$ . Compare note on  $\nu i \sigma i$ , Luke 20:34.

<sup>2</sup> 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.

<sup>8</sup> 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.

# COLOSSIANS.

REVISED VERSION.	SUGGESTIONS.
1:7 on our behalf	on your behalf <sup>1</sup>
1:11 the might of his glory	his glorious might <sup>2</sup>
2:7 builded up	built up
2:13 through your trespasses	in your trespasses
2:13 did he quicken	hath he quickened $=$ A.V.
2:15 having put off from	having spoiled $=$ A.V. (or hav-
himself	ing despoiled)
2:18 dwelling in the things	intruding into those things
which he hath seen	which he hath not seen == A.v. <sup>3</sup>
2:20 If ye died	If ye have died
3:1 If ye then were raised together with Christ,	If ye then are risen with Christ,

<sup>1</sup> 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*.

<sup>2</sup> 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.

<sup>8</sup> I do not know of any authority for rendering  $i\mu\beta a\tau\epsilon i\omega\nu$ dwelling; and in reference to the question of reading or not reading  $\mu\eta$ , 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.

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

ye have died there is no *more* to which every one concern <sup>1</sup>

# 1 THESSALONIANS.

2	: 1 hath not been found vain
4	:12 honestly
4	:13 the rest
5	: 5 sons (bis)
<b>5</b>	:18 to you-ward

5:27 all the brethren

was not in vain = A.V.<sup>2</sup> becomingly (or with propriety) others = A.V. (So 5:6.) children = A.V.<sup>3</sup> concerning you = A.V. (or with regard to you) all the [holy] brethren <sup>4</sup>

# 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	seeing $=$ A.v. (Comp. Rom.
	3:30.)
2:2 is now present	is just at hand

<sup>1</sup> The Syriac reads zeal; but if the true reading be  $\pi \acute{o}vov$ , the *labor* (or *pain*) intended must be mental, and so may well be rendered *concern*, or *anxiety*.

<sup>2</sup> I appreciate the effort to express the force of  $\gamma \epsilon \gamma o \nu \epsilon \nu$ , but it does not seem to me successful.

<sup>8</sup> See note on Luke 20:34.

<sup>4</sup> The Syriac has "all the holy brethren."

#### 1 TIMOTHY.

REVISED VERSION. 2:11 sendeth 2:11 a working of error 2:12 might be judged	SUGGESTIONS. will send <sup>1</sup> strong delusion $= A.v.^2$ may be condemned <sup>8</sup>
2:12 in sanctification	by sanctification
2:15 traditions which ye were taught	instructions which ye received
2:16 which loved us and gave us	who hath loved us and given us
2:16 eternal comfort	everlasting consolation $=$ A V. <sup>4</sup>
3:6 tradition	instruction
3:14 note that man, that ye have no company	note that man, to have (or and have = A.v.) no company

## 1 TIMOTHY.

1:2 my true child	my own son $=$ A.V. <sup>5</sup>
1:4 a dispensation of God	godly edifying $=$ A.V. <sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The Syr. has the Future tense.

<sup>2</sup> Putting in the margin, Gr. an inworking or energy of delusion or error.

<sup>8</sup> The R.V. retains *condemn* as a rendering of  $\kappa \rho i \nu \omega$ , in Acts 13:27, and might rightly have done so in John 3:17, 18.

<sup>4</sup> I presume it will not be denied that the signification of alónos is just as well given by everlasting as by eternal, and that of  $\pi a \rho \dot{\alpha} \kappa \lambda \eta \sigma \iota s$  just as well by consolation as by comfort. 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.

<sup>5</sup> See note on Phil. 2:22.

<sup>6</sup> The idea of dispensation, or even of stewardship, in this

REVISED VERSION.	SUGGESTIONS.
1:11 gospel of the glory	glorious gospel $=$ A.V.
2:2 in high place	in authority $=$ A.v.
2:4 willeth that all men	would have all men to be saved
should be saved	(or desireth that all men
	should be saved)
2:9 in modest apparel with	in becoming apparel with mod-
shamefastness	esty <sup>1</sup>
2:14 hath fallen	fell
3:3 no brawler	Not given to wine $=$ A.V. <sup>2</sup>
3:3 no lover of money	not covetous $= A.V.^3$
3:15 how men ought to be-	how thou oughtest to conduct
have themselves	thyself (or how one ought to
	conduct himself)
4:2 branded	seared = A.v.

connection seems extremely harsh. The Syriac translates *edification*. Is it not altogether likely that the Apostle wrote instead of  $oi\kappa o\delta o\mu \eta' v$  the less usual word  $oi\kappa o\delta o\mu \mu' v$ , which, appearing to some copyist an error, gave place to  $oi\kappa ovo\mu \mu' v$ ?

<sup>1</sup> If we have in our language a word exactly answering to a term in Greek, it is *modesty* for allows as applied to the deportment of women. The retention of this obsolete substitute for it seems quite unnecessary.

<sup>2</sup> As applied to *conduct*  $\pi \acute{a}\rho \imath \imath v \sigma s$  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."

<sup>8</sup> If it be deemed essential to use uniformly different English words for  $\pi\lambda\epsilon_{0}\nu\epsilon_{\kappa\tau\eta}$ s and  $\phi\iota\lambda\dot{a}\rho\gamma\nu\rho\sigma$ s, we might employ *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.

6\*

### 2 TIMOTHY.

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

1:2 child

SUGGESTIONS. suffer reproach  $\implies$  A.V.<sup>1</sup> trust in  $\implies$  A.V.<sup>2</sup> trusteth in  $\implies$  A.V. any man or woman  $\implies$  A.V.<sup>3</sup> them  $\implies$  A.V.<sup>4</sup> and it is certain we can carry nothing out  $\implies$  A.V.<sup>6</sup> everlasting  $\implies$  A.V.<sup>6</sup>

## 2 TIMOTHY.

son (so in 2:1.)

1:3 how unceasing is myremembrance of thee

that without ceasing I have remembrance of thee = A.v.(or that without ceasing I remember thee) hath not given us = A.v.

1:7 gave us not

<sup>1</sup> The reading ὀνειδιζόμεθα is confirmed by the Syriac.

- <sup>2</sup> See note on 2 Cor. 1:10.
- <sup>3</sup> Syriac, man or woman.
- <sup>4</sup> Plural, for lack of a singular of common gender.

<sup>5</sup> The Syr. confirms the reading  $\delta\hat{\eta}\lambda\rho\nu$ . I would retain here the rendering of the A.V. only printing the words and it is in Roman letters, the and representing the  $\delta\epsilon$  of  $o\delta\delta\epsilon$ . If persuaded that  $\delta\hat{\eta}\lambda\rho\nu$  was not genuine, I would neglect the  $\delta\tau\iota$ , as not required by the idiom of our language, and render, neither can we, etc.

<sup>6</sup> Regarding these two terms as synonymous, I object to the change as being without necessity.

1:10 incorruption

SUGGESTIONS. immortality = A.V.<sup>1</sup> by him unto his will.<sup>2</sup>

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 hast fully known == A. v. (or hast followed up)<sup>3</sup> will wax worse the living

<sup>1</sup> Our best lexicons set down *immortality* as one of the definitions of  $\dot{a}\phi\theta a\rho\sigma ia$ . So do the native Greek lexicons. Robinson calls  $\zeta \omega \dot{\eta} \nu \kappa a \dot{a} \dot{a}\phi\theta a\rho\sigma ia \nu$  in this passage a hendiadys for *immortal life*.  $\phi\theta\epsilon i\rho\omega$  is not only to corrupt, but also to destroy, 1 Cor. 3:17, and  $\phi\theta o\rho \dot{a}$ , destruction 2 Pet. 2:12. So  $\zeta \omega \dot{\eta} \ddot{a}\phi\theta a\rho\tau os$  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*.

<sup>2</sup> 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  $\epsilon \kappa \epsilon i row$  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.

<sup>8</sup> 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.

TITUS.

REVISED VERSION. 4:5 be thou sober

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)<sup>1</sup> Endeavor <sup>2</sup> hath forsaken me = A.V. and is gone Crescens *is gone* Endeavor

## TITUS.

1:5 appoint	constitute (or ordain $=$ A.v.) <sup>3</sup>
1:7 the bishop	a bishop $=$ A.v.
1:7 no brawler	not given to wine $=$ A.V. <sup>4</sup>
1:9 according to the teach-	as he hath been taught $=$ A.v. <sup>5</sup>
ing	

<sup>1</sup> Sobriety does not pertain to all things, but watchfulness does. Our best authorities in Greek lexicography give two meanings to  $\nu \eta \phi \omega$ ; (1) to be sober; (2) to be vigilant. In this passage the Syriac version renders it, be vigilant, I have no doubt rightly.

<sup>2</sup> 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.

<sup>3</sup> 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.

<sup>4</sup> See note on 1 Tim. 3:3.

<sup>5</sup> 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

### PHILEMON.

REVISED VERSION.	SUGGESTIONS.
1:9 in the sound doctrine	with sound doctrine
2:1 the sound doctrine	sound doctrine = A.V.
2:3 reverent in demeanor	in behavior as becometh holi-
	ness == A.V.
2:7 an ensample	a pattern == A.V.
2:7 in thy doctrine	in teaching
2:13 our great God and -	the great God and our Saviour
Saviour Jesus Christ	Jesus Christ $= A.v.^1$
3:3 aforetime	once
3:10 heretical	factious (or a promoter of fac-
	tion)
3:12 give diligence	endeavor

# PHILEMON.

1	our beloved and fellow	our beloved brother and fellow
	worker	worker
2	our sister	our beloved sister <sup>2</sup>
<b>5</b>	of thy love, and of the	of thy love and faith, = A.V. <sup>8</sup>
	faith	
6	unto Christ	in Christ [Jesus]
12	my very heart	my own bowels <sup>4</sup>

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.

<sup>1</sup> The Syriac here agrees with the A.V. Compare R.V., 2 Thess. 1:12.

<sup>2</sup> Syriac, our beloved (fem. gen.)

<sup>8</sup> Syriac, of thy faith and the love.

<sup>4</sup> Alluding to his calling Onesimus his son, whom he had begotten. Comp. Gen. 15:4.

- 19 write it
- 21 write

SUGGESTIONS. have written it = A.V.have written

# HEBREWS.

1:1 in the prophets	by the prophets $=$ A.V. <sup>1</sup>
1:1 by divers portions	in divers (or many) portions
1:2 at the end of these days	in these last days $=$ A.v. <sup>2</sup>
1:2 appointed	hath appointed $=$ A.V.
1:3 when he had made puri-	when he had [by himself] made
fication of sins,	expiation for sins, <sup>8</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Just as when our Saviour claims to cast out demons  $i\nu$  $\delta a \kappa \tau i \lambda \varphi \ \theta \epsilon \omega \hat{v}$ , we render, not *in*, 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  $\pi o \lambda \upsilon \tau p \delta \pi \omega s$ , alluding to the various methods employed for communicating to them God's messages. Examples need not be cited to prove the frequent use of  $i\nu$  as *instrumental*. In such cases by is the strictly literal rendering of  $i\nu$ , and it would be not only superfluous but inaccurate to tell the reader in the margin that the Greek is *in*.

<sup>2</sup> 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."

<sup>8</sup> On the word *expiation* I would put a marginal note, Greek purification. To speak of making expiation (or atone-

REVISED VERSION.	SUGGESTIONS.
1:6 when he again bringeth	again, when he bringeth $=$ A.v. <sup>1</sup>
1:12 as a garment	[as a garment] <sup>2</sup>
2:1 the things that were	the things heard
heard	
2:1 lest haply we drift away	lest at any time we slip away
from them	from them
2:4 powers	miracles $=$ A.V.
2:17 that he might be	that he might become
3:6 a son, over his house	a son, over his own house=A.v. <sup>3</sup>
3:7 if ye shall hear his voice	if ye hear <sup>4</sup>
3:10 but they did not know	and they have not known my
my ways	ways == A.V.
3:12 lest haply there shall be	lest there be $= A.V.^5$
3:16 For who, etc. <sup>6</sup>	
9 10	

3:19 were not able to enter could not enter = A.V.<sup>7</sup>

ment) for sins, 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.

<sup>1</sup> The  $\pi \dot{\alpha} \lambda w$  is parenthetical, as frequently. The Syriac is like the A.V. "And again, when he bringeth," etc.

<sup>2</sup> These words are not in the Syriac version.

<sup>8</sup> The Armenian and Slavic versions have his own.

\* I take hear in the sense of listen to, hearken to, and this is confirmed by the = prefixed to = prefixed to = 5:7.

<sup>5</sup> If it be thought necessary to represent the enclitic  $\pi \sigma \tau \dot{\epsilon}$  in a translation, I would render lest there be ever, or lest there be at all.

<sup>6</sup> 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.

<sup>7</sup> It was not a question of ability, but of privilege. That privilege they could not enjoy because of their unbelief.

## 4:2 because they were not not being mixed with faith in united by faith with them

the first principles of

Abraham, and hath bless-

ed him that hath the

Christ, and press 7:1 God most High

7:6 hath taken tithes of

8:1 in the things which we

are saying the chief point

that heard

principles

promises 7:7 of the better

7:26 guileless

7:28 a Son

SUGGESTIONS.

them that heard  $= A.V.^1$ 

5:11 hard of interpretation hard to explain<sup>2</sup> 5:12 rudiments of the first first rudiments

6:1 let us cease to speak of leaving the first principles of the doctrine of Christ, let us press<sup>3</sup>

the most High God = A.v.

received tithes from Abraham, and blessed him that had the promises

by the greater

harmless = A.V.

the Son  $== A.V.^4$ 

of the things which we are saying this is the sum

is this 8:1 sat down

hath sat down

<sup>1</sup> The reading of the Textus Receptus is here confirmed by the Syriac.

<sup>2</sup> That is, for the writer, considering the dullness of his readers. So the Syriac.

<sup>8</sup> Ο της ἀρχής λόγος is the elementary doctrine, and the Genitive  $\tau \circ \hat{v} X \rho \iota \sigma \tau \circ \hat{v}$  I take to be governed not by  $d \rho \chi \hat{\eta} s$  alone, but by the combined phrase  $r \partial v \tau \eta s \, d\rho \chi \eta s \, \lambda \delta \gamma o v$ .

<sup>4</sup> In contrast with  $d\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\sigma\sigma\sigma$ ,  $\nu\delta\sigma\nu$  must here designate the Son of God, being perhaps left without the article as being a kind of proper name, as are frequently  $K \dot{\nu} \rho \iota os$ ,  $\Theta \epsilon \dot{os}$ , and  $\Pi \nu \epsilon \hat{\nu} \mu a$ äylov. The Syriac has the definite form.

REVISED VERSION.

REVISED VERSION.	SUGGESTIONS.
8:5 is warned of God when	was admonished by God when
he is about	he was about
9:5 severally	particularly == A.V.
9:6 go	went $=$ A.V.
9:7 offereth	offered $=$ A.V.
9:8 hath not	had not
9:8 is yet standing	was yet standing $=$ A.V.
9:9 is a parable for the time	was a figure for the time then
now present are of-	present were offered
ered cannot	could not $=$ A.V. <sup>1</sup>

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, they 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.	SUGGESTIONS.
9:17 for doth it ever avail	since it is never in force while
while he that made it	the testator is living. <sup>1</sup>
liveth?	
9:20 the covenant which	the covenant which God hath
God commanded to you-	enjoined upon you <sup>2</sup>
ward	
9:22 apart from shedding	without shedding $=$ A.v.
9:28 apart from sin	without $\sin = A.v.$
10:8 the which	which == A.V.
10:9 then hath he said	then he said

<sup>1</sup> There is classical authority for the occasional use of  $\mu \eta \pi \sigma \tau \epsilon$ instead of  $\sigma \delta \delta \epsilon \pi \sigma \tau \epsilon$ . Compare  $\mu \eta \delta \epsilon \delta \epsilon$  for  $\sigma \delta \delta \epsilon \delta \epsilon$ . The rendering of the Syriac here agrees with that of the A.V.

<sup>2</sup> The R.V. seems to me to have done right in rendering  $\delta_{ia}\theta_{\eta\kappa\eta}$  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  $\delta \iota a \theta \eta \kappa \eta$ , but rather as different shades of one general signification.  $\Delta \iota a \tau i \theta \eta \mu \iota$  is to dispose, to arrange. Hence, Suabyry 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,  $\delta_{ia}\theta_{\eta\kappa\eta}$  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.	SUGGESTIONS.
10:15 after he hath said	after having said
10:16 then saith he	he saith
10:34 that	(omit marg.) <sup>1</sup>
10:38 my righteous one	the righteous <sup>2</sup>
11:1 proving	demonstration
11:5 hath had	had
11:17 had gladly received	had received $= A.v.$
11:19 parable	figure == A.V.
11:21 a dying	dying
11:40 apart from us	without $us = A.v.$
12:7 It is for chastening that	If ye endure chastening, =
ye endure ;	A.V. <sup>3</sup>
12:15 the many	many = A.V.
12:17 rejected (for he found	rejected; for he found no room
no place for repentance),	for a change of mind in his
though he sought it dili-	father, though he sought it
gently	earnestly
13:2 to shew love unto	to shew hospitality (or, to exer-
strängers	cise hospitality) <sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> If  $\dot{\epsilon}av\tau o \dot{v}s$  is the genuine reading, regard it as the subject of  $\ddot{\epsilon}\chi\epsilon w$ . To account it as the object, and in apposition with  $\ddot{v}\pi a\rho\xi w$ , seems very unnatural. The Syriac here confirms the rendering of the R.V.

<sup>2</sup> Putting the rendering of the text into the margin. The Syriac has "the upright shall live by faith in me."

<sup>8</sup> Put in the margin, Or, In chastening (i.e. when chastened), endure. The reading  $\epsilon i$  is strongly confirmed by the  $\epsilon i \, \delta \epsilon$  of vs. 8.

<sup>4</sup> So φιλοξενία is translated Rom. 12: 13, R.V.

13:4 Let marriage be had in honour among all, and let the bed be undefiled: for

- 13:5 Be ye free from the love of money; content
- 13:6 with good courage we say
- 13:8 yea and forever

1:1 of the Dispersion

13:9 stablished

#### SUGGESTIONS.

Marriage is honorable in all and the bed undefiled; but  $= A.v.^{1}$ 

Let your conduct be free from covetousness, and be content with confidence we may say(or, we may confidingly say) and forever = A.V. established

scattered abroad = A.V. (or in

## JAMES.

·	dispersion) <sup>2</sup>
1:2 temptations	trials
1:3 proof	testing (or trying)
1:15 the lust the sin	lust $\ldots \sin = A.v.$
1:17 boon	gift

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> "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  $\tau \hat{y}$ , and in English this idea is well expressed by *in dispersion*, or by *scattered abroad*.

SHOONS WOMEN

DEVISED TEDSIO

REVISED VERSION.	SUGGESTIONS.
1:19 Ye know this, my be-	Wherefore, my beloved breth-
loved brethren. But let	ren, let $=$ A.v. <sup>1</sup>
1:27 himself	one's self
2:2 synagogue	assembly $= A.V.^2$
2:4 are ye not divided in	do ye not make distinctions
your own mind	among yourselves
2:10 stumble	offend $\doteq$ A.v. (or transgress) <sup>3</sup>
2:18 shew me thy faith apart	shew me thy faith without
from <i>thy</i> works, and I by	works, and I by my works
my works will shew thee	will shew thee $[my]$ faith <sup>4</sup>
my faith	
2:20 barren	dead $=$ A.V. <sup>5</sup>
2:20,26 apart from	without = A.V.
3:1 heavier	severer
3:2 stumble stumbleth	offend offendeth

<sup>1</sup> So the Syriac, Ethiopic, Armenian, Arabic, and Slavic. Only the Vulgate confirms the reading  $i\sigma\tau\epsilon$ .

<sup>2</sup> 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  $\sigma v v a \gamma \omega \gamma a i$ , gatherings, but surely in English we cannot call them synagogues.

<sup>8</sup> No English word could more exactly represent  $\pi \tau a i_{D}$  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.

<sup>4</sup> On without put a marginal note, or by.

<sup>5</sup> Margin, Or barren. The reading dead is confirmed by the Syriac.

REVISED VERSION.	SUGGESTIONS.
3:3 Now if we put the horses'	Behold, we put bits in the
bridles into their mouths,	horses' mouths, that they
that they may obey us,	may obey us; and we turn
we turn about their	about their whole body ==
whole body also	A.V. <sup>1</sup>
3:5 is kindled by how small	a little fire kindleth $= A.V.^2$
a fire	
3:14,16 faction	strife == A.V. <sup>3</sup>
3:17 variance	partiality == A.V.
4:1 pleasures	$lusts = A.v.^4$
4:4 adulteresses	[adulterers and] adulteresses <sup>5</sup>
5:7 until it receive	until he receive $= A.v.^6$

<sup>1</sup> The reading *Behold* is confirmed by the Syriac. Even if satisfied that the Apostle wrote  $EI\Delta E$ , I should regard it as only another spelling of  $i\delta \epsilon$ . *Behold also*, vs. 4, confirms this.

<sup>2</sup> Confirmed by the Syriac.

<sup>8</sup> This also accords with the Syriac. The rendering strife is not altogether satisfactory, but faction seems to me less so. ' $E\rho i\theta \epsilon \mu a$  is the spirit of faction, party spirit. Perhaps rivalry would answer.

<sup>4</sup> So also the Syriac. 'H $\delta or\eta$  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 *desires* 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.

<sup>5</sup> The Syriac has but one word, but that is masculine.

<sup>6</sup> So the Syriac.

- 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<sup>1</sup>

they shall be forgiven him = A.v.<sup>2</sup>

your faults  $= A.V.^3$ 

The earnest supplication of a righteous man availeth much.

earnestly = A.v.

**1 PETER.** 

1:6 temptations	trials
1:7 proof	testing (or trying)
1:7 proved	tried = A.v.
1:12 but unto you	but unto us = A.v. (and Syr.)
1:12 by the Holy Ghost	with the Holy Spirit sent from
sent forth from heaven	heaven
2:1 wickedness	malice == A.v. <sup>4</sup>
2:2 long for the spiritual	earnestly desire the pure milk
milk which is without	of the word, <sup>5</sup>
guile,	

<sup>1</sup> Or, if the Aor. reading be adopted, who have endured.

- <sup>2</sup> Ad sensum.
- <sup>8</sup> So the Syriac.

<sup>4</sup> That  $\kappa \alpha \kappa i \alpha$  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 *wickedness*), and in the general sense in vs. 16, where no such specifications occur, is not unreasonable.

<sup>5</sup> That λογικόν γάλα is rightly rendered, milk of the word, i.e.

1 PETER.

REVISED VERSION.	SUGGESTIONS.
2:16 bondservants	servants $=$ A.v.
3:12 upon them that do evil	against them that do evil $=$
3:14 But and if	But even if
3:17 if the will of God	if the will of God be so, =
should so will,	A.V.
3:20 a preparing	in preparation (or being con- structed)
3:21 not the putting away	(not the putting away of the
of the filth of the flesh,	filth of the flesh, but the
but the interrogation of	confession to God of a pure
a good conscience toward	$conscience)^2$
God,	

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."

<sup>1</sup> The rendering of  $\epsilon \pi i$  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.

<sup>2</sup> The whole in parenthesis.  $E \pi \epsilon \rho \omega \tau \eta \mu a$ , 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  $\epsilon \pi \epsilon \rho \omega \tau \eta \mu a$ , whatever that may be.

80

4:6 even

- SUGGESTIONS.
- $also = A.V.^1$
- sound mind, and be sober unto prayer

5:2 according unto God

4:7 be ye therefore of be ye therefore sober-minded, and watch unto prayer<sup>2</sup>

[according to the will of God]

<sup>2</sup> 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. Mv 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.

<sup>1</sup> Rendering σωφρωνέω 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  $\nu \eta \phi \omega$ , see note on 2 Tim. 4:5. The Syriac here also agrees with the A.V. using for  $\nu \eta \psi a \tau \epsilon$  the same word which in Matt. 26:41 and elsewhere it employs to render γρηγορείτε. 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.)

1:10 stumble

1:7 and in your godliness love of the brethren, and in your love of the brethren love

### SUGGESTIONS.

- giving  $= A.V.^1$
- add to your faith virtue, and to virtue knowledge  $= A.V.^2$

### to $= \mathbf{A} \cdot \mathbf{V} \cdot$

- 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.)
- 1:8 unto the knowledge in the knowledge = A.V.<sup>3</sup>
  - fall = A.V.
- 1:21 men spake from God, [holy] men of God spake as being moved
  - they were moved <sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Neither is an exact rendering of  $\pi a \rho \epsilon \iota \sigma \epsilon \nu \epsilon \gamma \kappa a \nu \tau \epsilon s$ . "Bringing in by the way" would be closer. Some such attempt at a literal rendering might have a place in the margin.

<sup>2</sup> Combining the force of the preposition  $i\nu$  (indicating the attainment already made) with that of  $\epsilon \pi i$  in the composition of  $\epsilon \pi i \chi_{0} \rho \eta \gamma \eta \sigma a \tau \epsilon$  (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.

<sup>3</sup> So Calvin, in cognitione, recognizing the later use of  $\epsilon$ is as equivalent to ev.

<sup>4</sup> So the old versions generally. It seems incredible that  $a\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\sigma\sigma$ , without article or adjective or any defining term, should be the subject of ἐλάλησαν.

- 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

condemnation
shall surely perish (or be destroyed) in their corruption 1
unstable == A.v.<sup>2</sup>
wages of unrighteousness==A.v.
tempest == A.v.
reserved [for ever]
unstable == A.v.

SUGGESTIONS.

## 1 JOHN.

1:2 the life, the eternal lifethat eternal life2:29 begotten of himborn of him

<sup>1</sup> Rendering  $\phi \theta o \rho \hat{\rho}$  as in 1:4 and 2:19. See note on 1 Cor. 3:17. To give  $\phi \theta o \rho \hat{\rho}$  an active sense is hard.

<sup>2</sup> If the object of this change was to avoid rendering  $d\sigma \tau \dot{\eta}$ - $\rho \iota \kappa \tau \sigma \sigma$  and  $d\kappa a \tau \dot{a} \sigma \tau a \tau \sigma \sigma$  by the same word, would it not be better to render the latter *unsteady*, leaving the former unchanged?

<sup>8</sup> There is no more occasion to repeat the word life here than there would be to repeat bread in translating  $\tau \partial \nu \ \tilde{a} \rho \tau o \nu$  $\eta \mu \hat{\omega} \nu \tau \partial \nu \ \tilde{\epsilon} \pi i o \dot{\sigma} \sigma i o \nu$  in the Lord's prayer. Greek idiom demands 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.

<sup>4</sup> 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-

- 3:3 him ... he 3:4 doeth sin
- 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 whereinsoever our heart condemn us; because God is greater

SUGGESTIONS.

Him ... He
committeth sin = A.v. (So in vs. 8.)
committeth also iniquity ; and sin is iniquity <sup>1</sup>
born = A.v. (See n. on 2:29.)
doth not commit sin = A.v.<sup>2</sup>
before him. = A.v.
For if our heart condemn us, God is greater = A.v.<sup>8</sup>

dering of John 1:13. I admit that a slight infelicity appears in the necessity of rendering  $\gamma \epsilon \gamma \epsilon \nu \tau \eta \mu \epsilon \nu \sigma \nu$ , 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.

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> 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.

<sup>3</sup> The difficulty here arises from St. John's use of  $\delta \tau \iota$  before the phrase "God is greater." The R.V. endeavors to solve it by reading in the beginning of vs. 20  $\delta \tau \iota$ , and by taking  $\epsilon d \mu$ as  $= d \mu$ . But it seems to me that this fails to give any good

- 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 = A.V.toward us = A. v. (and Syr.) sent  $= A.V.^1$ seen = A.V. the love that God hath to us = A.V.torment = A.V.We love [Him], how can he  $\dots$ ? = 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  $\delta\tau\iota$ . The Syriac, like the A.V. takes  $\dot{\epsilon}a\nu$  as meaning *if*, and joins "if our heart condemn us" with what follows; and this seems to me to be confirmed by the  $\dot{\epsilon}a\nu$ , *if*, of vs. 21. Robinson explains the second  $\delta\tau\iota$  by supposing an ellipsis [then will God also condemn us], and this agrees well with what follows. The Syriac treats  $\delta\tau\iota$  as an adverb, rendering  $\delta\tau\iota \ \mu\epsilon\ell\zeta\omega\nu$ , how much greater !

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> The Syriac version, to which lies our most natural appeal in cases of ambiguity in the Greek text, has, "keepeth his own

### 2 JOHN.

8 we have wrought

suggestions. ye have wrought <sup>1</sup>

## 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 = A.v. for the truth

## JUDE.

1 for Jesus Christ	in Jesus Christ $=$ A.v.
5 though ye know all things	though ye have once known it
once for all	all
10 are they destroyed	they corrupt themselves $=$ A.v.
	(or, they become corrupt)
11 went ran perished	have gone have run have
	perished
12 hidden rocks	spots == A.V.

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.

<sup>1</sup> 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.

86

## REVISED VERSION.

- 15 ungodly wrought
- 17 But ye, beloved, remember ye
- 22, 23 mercy
- 24 stumbling

wrought But beloved, remember ye = A.v. compassion falling = A.v.

SUGGESTIONS.

## REVELATION.

shall wail because of him $=$
A.V. <sup>1</sup>
a loud voice <sup>2</sup>
Pergamos = A.v. (So 2:12.)
hast seen $=$ A.V. <sup>3</sup>
hast tried those who
hast found = A.v.
hast borne $=$ A.v.
hast left $=$ A.v. <sup>4</sup>
I will come $=$ A.V. (So in vs.
16.)

<sup>1</sup> Translating  $\kappa \delta \psi o \nu \tau \alpha \iota$  as in Rev. 18:9, and  $\epsilon \pi \iota$  as  $= 2 \Sigma$ . The wailing will not be over or for him, but for themselves, because of his coming.

<sup>2</sup> So rendered by the A.V. in a large majority of the cases where it occurs, and by the R.V. except in Revelation.

<sup>8</sup> Because relating to the vision which he had just seen.

<sup>4</sup> 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.	SUGGESTIONS,
2:7 To him that overcom-	To him that overcometh, will
eth, to him will I give	I give $=$ A. v. <sup>1</sup>
2:22 I do cast	I will cast $=$ A.v.
2:23 each one of you	every one of you $= A.V.^2$
3:2 I have found no works	I have not found any of thy
of thine fulfilled	works complete <sup>3</sup>
3:3 hast received and didst	hast received and heard $=$ A.v.
hear	
3:4 did not defile	have not defiled $=$ A.v.
3:8 didst keep didst not	hast kept hast not denied
deny	<u> </u>
3:9 Behold, I give of the	Behold I will make them who
synagogue of Satan, of	are of the synagogue of Satan,
them which say	who say <sup>4</sup>
3:10 didst keep	hast kept = A.V.
3:12 He that overcometh,	Him that overcometh will I
I will make him	make == A.v.
3:10 didst keep 3:12 He that overcometh,	who say <sup>4</sup> hast kept = A.v. Him that overcometh will I

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> The meaning is the same. I object to the change as unnecessary.

<sup>8</sup> 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.

<sup>4</sup> 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 δέδωκα in vs. 8.

88

REVISED VERSION. 3:21 He that overcometh, I 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

To him that overcometh will I grant = A.v. proceeded = A.v.rest not = A.V. (or, cease not) give glory = A.V. fall down = A.V. worship = A.V.  $cast = A.V.^1$ glory, and honor, and power == A.V.2 a mighty angel prevailed = A.V. and he came and took [the book] kings = A.v. they shall reign <sup>8</sup> power = A.V. blessing, and honor, and glory, and dominion 4

SUGGESTIONS.

6:1, 3, 5, 7 Come

Come [and see]

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> That is, all glory, etc. Either rendering will answer, but I think that of the A.V. preferable.

<sup>8</sup> I should think the rendering kings admissible, even though  $\beta a\sigma i\lambda \epsilon iav$  be accepted as the true reading. The Future verb, shall reign, is sustained by the majority of the most ancient versions.

<sup>4</sup> Compare 7:12, R.V.

8\*

- 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

A quart of wheat for a shilling, and three quarts of barley for a shilling (or for a denarius)<sup>1</sup> 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.<sup>2</sup>

SUGGESTIONS.

- the number of their fellow-servants ... be completed <sup>3</sup> its unripe figs when it
- the mighty men = A.V.<sup>4</sup>
  saying (or and said = A.V.)
  (Add marg. Many ancient authorities have his wrath.)
  the east = A.V.
  loud voice = A.V.
  I said = A.V.
  have washed = A.V.
  offer it with = A.V.

<sup>1</sup> See note on Luke 16:6, 7.

<sup>2</sup> On the rendering of  $\Delta \epsilon \sigma \pi \delta \tau \eta s$  and  $K \delta \rho \iota \sigma s$ , see preface, p. xi.

<sup>8</sup> Put in the margin with reference to the words the number of, Or, the course of.

<sup>4</sup> As in 19:18, R.V.

REVISED VERSION. SUGGESTIONS. 8:5 taketh the censer; and took the censer and filled it he filled it = A.V.10:1 strong angel mighty angel = A.v. shall be finished 1 10:7 is finished he said = A.V.<sup>1</sup> 10:11 they say 11:6 the power ... the power  $\dots$  heaven = A.V. heaven 11:9 do men look shall men look shall not suffer  $= A.v.^2$ 11:9 suffer not shall rejoice  $= A.V.^2$ 11:10 rejoice 11:17 didst reign hast reigned = A.v. 12:2 crieth out cried out 12:4 draweth  $drew == A.V.^{8}$ 13:3 smitten wounded = A.v. 13:3 death-stroke deadly wound=A.v.(So vs. 12.) 13:6 the heaven heaven = A.v. 13:8 written in the book of written from the foundation of life of the Lamb that bath the world in the book of life been slain from the founof the Lamb that hath been slain<sup>4</sup> dation of the world 13:13 that he should even so as even to make

make

13:14 the stroke of

the wound by = A.V.

<sup>1</sup> Both these renderings are sustained by the ancient versions.

<sup>2</sup> The ancient versions are unanimous in rendering these verbs by Futures.

<sup>8</sup> "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.

<sup>4</sup> 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 understanding, let him count  $14:3 \operatorname{sing}$ 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 = A.V.14:11 whose 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 great winepress 15:1 seven plagues, which are the last 15:2 come victorious from gotten the victory over ... over ... from ... from  $\dots$  over = A.V.

SUGGESTIONS.

Let him that hath understanding count = A.V. sung = A.V.redeemed from = A.V.redeemed = A.V. being = A.V.everlasting gospel = A.V. to preach = A.V. saying = A.V. day nor night, who worship whose ver = 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 the great winepress = A.V.<sup>1</sup> the seven last plagues = A.v.

<sup>1</sup> See note on 1 John 1:2, and compare the rendering, by the glassy sea, Rev. 15:2.

REVISED VERSION.	SUGGESTIONS.
15:6 with precious stone	in linen $= A.v.^1$
16:1,2 into the earth	upon the earth $= A.V.^2$
16:9 of the God which	of God, who
16:12 sunrising	east == A.V.
16:16 Har-Magedon	Armageddon = A.V.8
16:21 cometh down	came down
16:21 is exceeding great	was exceeding great
17:8 whose name hath not	whose names have not been
been written	written <sup>4</sup>
17:14 and they also shall	and they that are with him are
overcome that are with	called $= A.V.^5$
him, called	
18:3 by the wine all the	all nations have drunk of the
nations are fallen	wine $\ldots = A.v.^6$

<sup>1</sup> I do not find a trace of the reading  $\lambda i \theta o \nu$  in any of the ancient versions.

<sup>2</sup> As in a parallel passage (8:7) the R.V. has it. Eis has so wide a range of meaning in various 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 doubless the occurrence of  $\epsilon \pi i$ in vs. 8, 10, 12. Still, considering the variety of senses in which  $\epsilon is$  is used, I think we should prefer the rendering best suited to the connection. In vs. 3 and 4 perhaps *into* should be preferred.

<sup>8</sup> I see no gain in changing such a name as this, whatever be the spelling of the MSS. If we wish to represent the *He*brew orthography, we must write neither *Har* nor *Magedon*.

<sup>4</sup> Even if *ovoµa* be the true reading.

<sup>5</sup> So the ancient versions unanimously.

<sup>6</sup> So the Vulgate, Armenian, Arabic, Syriac, and Slavic. Only the Ethiopic confirms the reading of the R.V.

REVISED VERSION.	SUGGESTIONS.
18:21 a strong angel	a mighty angel $=$ A.v.
19:3 they say	they said
19:7 the glory	glory
19:8 righteous acts	righteousness == A.V. <sup>1</sup>
19:18 and small and great	both small and great $= A.V.^2$
20:15 if any was not found	whosoever was not found
he was cast	was cast == A.V.
21:6 They are come to pass.	It is done $= A.V.^3$
22:14 wash their robes	do his commandments $= A.v.^4$

<sup>1</sup> See note on Rom. 8:4.

<sup>2</sup> I note this passage for the sake of remarking that kai  $\mu \kappa \rho \hat{\omega} \nu$  kai  $\mu \epsilon \gamma \dot{a} \lambda \omega \nu$  should be rendered, both small and great, none the less because of the synonymous construction with  $\tau \dot{\epsilon}$  which immediately precedes.

<sup>8</sup> All of the ancient versions which have this passage, translate, *It is done*, reading of course  $\Gamma \epsilon \gamma o \nu \epsilon$ . The Ethiopic and Syriac omit it.

<sup>4</sup> Placing of course the other reading in the margin. The majority of the most ancient versions confirm the reading followed by the A.V.

94

# ANDOVER PUBLICATIONS. W. F. DRAPER, PUBLISHER,

## ANDOVER, MASS.

Among the Andover Publications will be found choice and valuable books for intelligent readers; also works for the special use of Theological Students and Clergymen. The Catalogue embraces works on the Evidences and Defences of Christianity, Devotional books, Essays in Philosophy and Theology, Church History, Discrepancies of the Bible, Hermeneutics, Commentaries on various books of the Old and New Testaments, Harmonies of the New Testament in Greek and in English, Grammars of the New Testament Greek, Hebrew Lexicon and Grammars, etc.

Descriptive Catalogues sent free on application. Any book sent by mail or express prepaid, at the prices annexed, with special discounts to clergymen and theological students.

### ADDRESS

W. F. DRAPER, Publisher, ANDOVER, MASS.

## DR. RIGGS'S WORKS.

## Suggested Emendations of the Authorized English Version of the Old Testament. By Elias Riggs, D.D., LL.D., Missionary of the A.B.C.F.M., at Constantinople. 12mo. pp. 130.

"The unlearned reader will be gratified to find texts, which have been life-long enigmas to him, cleared up by a rectification of the rendering. The student in his turn, will be interested to discover what view is taken of obscure passages by one who, to occidental learning has added the advantages of a life spent in biblical studies amid the languages and customs of the East "

As an illustration of the above remarks, the author says that the adjective quick never means speedy, but always alive, as, "And they go down quick, i.e. alive, into the pit," Num. xvi. 30. "Then had they swallowed us up quick, i.e. alive," Ps. exxiv. 3. A flood of light is let in by such "suggestions." — Prof. J. Henry Thayer, D.D.

"An interesting and suggestive little treatise." -- Zion's Herald.

### Suggested Modifications of the Revised Version of the New

Testament. By Elias Riggs, D.D., LL.D., Missionary of the A.B.F.M., at Constantinople. 12mo. pp. 94. 75 cents.

These "Suggested Modifications" from an able scholar, thoroughly conversant with the customs and scenes of the East, are designed to aid and will have great weight in securing that perfect version of the New Testament which the English-speaking world still seeks.

Dr. Riggs acknowledges his obligation to the Revisers for greatly improving the common version in many places, removing many inaccuracies, infelicities, and inconsistencies, and then specifies several classes of cases in which he would suggest further improvements, e.g. words which have no single uniform representation in our language, the use of the article, the rendering of prepositions, the use of tenses, especially the Greek Aorist, the use of certain pronouns, the principle of preserving a uniform rendering of the same Greek word, the use of brackets, all which he exemplifies in detail.

Both of the above books bound in one volume, \$1.25.

Deacidified using the Bookkeeper process. Neutralizing agent: Magnesium Oxide Treatment Date: June 2005

Preservation Technologies

111 Thomson Park Drive Cranberry Township, PA 16066

