

we to have no thought for the countless numbers of those simple trustful believers who, in the language of a modern poet, are leading "lives of melodious days," because clinging to the old faith, and accepting what Apostles and Evangelists, yea, and the dear Lord Himself, have expressly guaranteed to them? Are these babes in Christ to be forgotten? Are good and earnest men to be so over-eager for the comparatively few, as to lose sight of those whose very salvation may be endangered by this precipitancy of literary credulity?

At any rate, let us make our contrast. Let us state succinctly on the one side what we have termed the rectified Traditional view of the composition and authorship of the Old Testament, and, on the other side, the modern Analytical view; and then, further, those modifications of it which English Churchmen of earnestness and piety

advise us to accept as helpful to weakened faith, and as that which, to use the words of one of these writers, may "legitimately and without real loss be conceded."¹ Conceded, and to whom? To Edward Reuss and to Graf, to Kuenen and to Wellhausen, and to their followers in this country who adopt, in a greater or less degree, their conclusions. When the contrast has been completed, we will, without entering into any technicalities, let common sense be brought to bear upon the contrast, and endeavour to make a rough but equitable estimate of the preponderance of the probability which the Traditional view may claim over the Analytical view, and the real insufficiency of the arguments on which this latter view appears principally to rely. This done, we will then make our appeal to far higher and more conclusive authority.

¹ *Lux Mundi*, p. 362.

Some Minor Gains of the Revised Version of the New Testament, and some the Reverse.

BY THE REV. PRINCIPAL BROWN, D.D., ABERDEEN.

I.

THE A.V. abounds in italics where the verb, though not required in Greek, is needed to make a complete sentence in English; it ought not to have been printed in italics. Also, where the idiom of the English language requires more words than the Greek, the indispensable words should not have been printed in italics, as in Matt. ii. 18, "Rachel weeping *for* her children"—where the R.V. prints "for" properly in Roman.

Such superfluities, however, are harmless, but not where they give the wrong sense. Thus in John viii. 6, the A.V. has a long exposition of the sense of an action of our Lord's, which, even if the correct one, translators have no right to do. The case was that of the woman taken in adultery, whom the hypocritical scribes and Pharisees brought to Jesus, wanting to ensnare Him by asking what He would do in such a case. Instead of answering them, Jesus stooped down, and "with his finger wrote on the ground, *as though He heard*

them not" (adds the A.V.). On their persisting in demanding an answer, "Jesus lifted up Himself, and said unto them, He that is without sin among you, let him first cast a stone at her." Now observe what follows: "And again He stooped down, and wrote on the ground. And they which heard it, being convicted by their own conscience, went out one by one, . . . and Jesus was left alone." Beyond doubt, then, His stooping down and writing on the ground was to allow those *holy hypocrites* to slink away, unobserved by Him, and so not be put to shame in His presence. Anyhow, the explanation given in the A.V. should have been left to the expositor.

In Acts vii. 59, "They stoned Stephen, calling upon *God*, and saying, Lord Jesus, receive my spirit." It is a pity that King James' translators or revisers inserted or left (for I have not the previous versions at hand) the italic word "*God*." For though it expresses what is true, it does not

convey the sense of the original, which reads thus : "Calling upon, and saying, Lord Jesus;" that is to say, addressing his prayer *to Christ*, his words were, "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit." Our own revisers have inserted the right supplement, "calling upon *the Lord*, and saying," etc. They might have put it, "calling upon *Jesus*, and saying," etc. But they have done better, I think, to use the first word of the two. Such clear testimonies to the Divinity of Christ as that prayer addressed to Him by a man full of the Holy Ghost, and with his dying breath, ought not to be clouded so in our A.V.

A similar insertion of a wrong supplement the A.V. makes in John iii. 16, "Herein perceive we the love of God, because He laid down His life for us." The statement, read without the italics, is a beautiful one: "Hereby know we love, because He laid down His life for us," as if for the first time was revealed to men what love is, when He laid down His life for us; till then it was unknown. Indeed, another apostle expresses the same thing when he prays that the Ephesians might be made able to comprehend the depth, and height, and length, and breadth, and *know* the love of Christ, which *passeth knowledge*." This, by the way, is one of the cases where to leave the principal word in a verse unexpressed in words is only the more emphatically to express it to the heart. Thus, 2 Tim. i. 12, "For I know whom I have believed;" but who is that? He doesn't say,—he supposes you to know that without his telling you, "and I am persuaded that He is able to keep that which I have committed unto him." But what is that? He doesn't say; for that also he supposes you to know well enough. And once more: "able to keep it against that day." But what day? He thinks he doesn't need to tell you that. These, he presumes, are household words among Christians, and it is beautiful to think of them in this light.

Highland Christians have a beautiful way of marking the places where (as in this, John iii. 16) the Lord Jesus is spoken of simply as HE." They say, "That's the great HE."

One other case of italics, not only not required, but giving the wrong sense, in the A.V., and unfortunately retained by our own revisers. I refer to Heb. xii. 2, "the author and finisher of *our* faith" (A.V.)—"the author and perfecter of *our* faith." One may see at a glance that it is Christ's own faith that is here held forth for us to follow. The preceding chapter had given us a glowing catalogue of ancient worthies who through faith had proved invincible. But from them the great author of this Epistle bids his readers "look away (*ἀφορῶντες*) to Jesus, who for the joy that was set before Him (the prize for which He ran the race of the work given Him to do, of 'opening the kingdom of heaven to all believers') endured the Cross, despising the shame, and hath sat down at the right hand of the throne of God." Clearly, then, it is not *our* faith which Christ is here said to originate and complete (however true that is in itself), but that faith of His own which so transcends that of all other believers, that it is like "looking away" from a candle to the sun, when we turn from them to Him. The only difficulty is to express this in English, which ears familiar with the words as we hear them will relish. Instead of "Author," which does not give the true sense, "Captain" (as in chap. ii. 10) is better. And instead of "Finisher," which also fails to express the true sense, the word adopted by our own revisers, "Perfecter," seems best. So if thus rendered, "Looking (away) to Jesus, the Captain and Perfecter of faith," would express the very idea of the original. Old Abraham Booth wrote a book, which I read when a student, entitled *The Life, Walk, and Triumph of Faith*. Christ, I understand, is here said to be at once the Instaurator and, in His example, the Perfecter of "the Life, Walk, and Triumph of Faith"—the Leader of the van and the Bringer-up of the rear of the army of faith.

In another paper I will give one or two cases in which, by the insertion of a single word or two words, our revisers have made clear what without them is in English not clear at all.