# Theology on the Web.org.uk

### Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:

Buy me a coffee — https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology

PATREON — https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb

*PayPal* — https://paypal.me/robbradshaw

A table of contents for *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php

scribed on its very pages evidence that at the time it was written Jewish enemies were still arrogant and active, and the city in which our Lord was crucified, and the temple and altar in it were still standing, we need no date from early antiquity, nor even from the hand of the author himself, to inform us that he wrote before that great historical event and prophetical epoch, the destruction of Jerusalem.

# ARTICLE IV.

## THE ENGLISH VERSION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT, AND THE MARGINAL READINGS.

BY REV. CHARLES F. SCHAEFFER, D.D., PROFESSOR IN THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY OF THE EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH, PHILADELPHIA.

THE history both of the ancient, and of the modern versions of the Greek Testament, is deeply interesting. It furnishes us with new views of " the grace of God that bringeth salvation, and hath appeared to all men," and teaches us to admire the ways of the Providence of Him " who will have all men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth." After the Gospel had been proclaimed in lands in which other languages than the Greek prevailed, various translations of the New Testament were successively made, in order to supply a want which the believing heart deeply felt. Similar causes rendered a translation into the English language absolutely necessary. It is true that Popery almost invariably placed impediments in the way of a translation of the Holy Scriptures into a modern language ; but a higher power defeated its unholy plans, and the work of translating the Bible into various tongues is still continued with wonderful success.

All those who have attempted to produce a faithful translation of the Scriptures in a modern language, have complained of the extraordinary difficulties which they en-

countered, far surpassing those with which the translator of a Latin or Greek classic author must contend. These embarrassments of the translators of the Old or New Testament are well known, and need here no special statement. But the position of the later translators presented advantages which their predecessors could not possibly enjoy. When, for instance, the German version of the New Testament, now in common use, and published at Wittenberg in 1522, was made by Luther, he struggled with difficulties, of which some had ceased to be equally formidable, and others had almost entirely disappeared, eighty-nine years afterwards, when, in 1611, our present "Authorized Version" first appeared. A comparison of the text of the latter with that of Tyndale's first edition of 1526 discloses the fact that the grammatical structure and other features of the English language had, during the intervening eighty-five years, acquired a stability and wealth which time and unusually propitious circumstances alone could furnish.

The English translators of the reign of king James were also fortunate in other respects. The ancient languages were studied with unusual success in their day, and many eminent scholars afforded them substantial aid. They had, moreover, the " former translations," mentioned on their title-page, before them in their own language, and thereby found their labors greatly facilitated. Nevertheless, they were often embarrassed in deciding on the rendering of a Hebrew or Greek word or phrase, not so much by the " Instructions " which king James had given them for their guidance, as by philological, exegetical, and other obscurities, which they could not remove, and which have not even yet been removed in every case. One of the expedients to which they sometimes resorted when such circumstances occurred, was to assign a position in the text to one word, and place the other rendering in the margin, although the king's instructions, to which we shall advert below, did not expressly grant this privilege. These " marginal readings " are of far greater importance than many ordinary readers of the Bible might possibly sup-

pose them to be. They were formerly omitted in the common editions of the English Bible. But our noble American Bible Society now furnishes various correct and cheap editions in which they are faithfully inserted, so that the number of those whose attention is directed to them is increasing.

There are several classes of these marginal notes. Some refer to the different versions of which a word or phrase is capable, sometimes introduced by the word " or," e.g. Gen. ii. 7 ; sometimes by " Heb." or " Gr." e.g. Gen. i. 20 ; Matt. i. 20. The latter mode of designation is adopted, when a word, for any particular reason, does not admit of a direct or literal translation, e.g. Gen. i. 4 ; Matt. v. 15. Various readings in the case of the text of the Greek Testament, are rarely noted by the introduction of Greek letters, as in Acts xiii. 18 ; usually, the various reading is thus indicated : " Some — Some copies — read," etc., e.g. Matt. i. 11 ; James ii. 18. The Hebrew is reproduced in English characters, e.g. Gen. ii. 23; iii. 20. Uncertainty with respect to the grammatical construction is noted, e.g. 2 Cor. iii. 18 generally introduced by " or." Sometimes the original word is translated, or explained, or other information is given, e.g. Gen. iv. 1 ; v. 21 ; Matt. i. 21. Many of the marginal notes refer to chronological points, e.g. Matt. i. 16.

We propose to illustrate the general subject by selecting some one book of the New Testament, and noticing not all (for which we would not have space), but the more important marginal readings, and we take the Epistle to the Romans for this purpose, as it will, as far as we can judge, shed light on the subject as fairly as any other.

Dr. Trench remarks that, while a revision of the English version " ought to come," nevertheless, " we are not as yet in any respect prepared for it " (On the Authorized Version of the New Testament, etc., chap. i.). He proceeds in the chapters which follow, to exhibit numerous imperfections of the version, and unquestionably demonstrates that certain inaccuracies may be found in it. Others, before his day, and

many of his contemporaries, have demanded such a revision.
All attempts, however, to meet the demand have hitherto
been at least partial failures, and Trench's hope that the day
of the proposed revision will long be deferred, is no doubt
entertained by the large majority of British and American
theologians.   The criticism to which our English Bible has
been subjected, might weaken our confidence in the ability
of the venerable translators appointed by king James, and
diminish the reverence with which we read it.   But a care-
ful examination of the whole subject must produce the con-
viction in every unprejudiced mind, that our translators were
not only very faithful and conscientious men, but were also
possessed of eminent philological ability.   They were sub-
jected to many perplexities, the painful character of which
none but a professed translator or reviser can understand;
they could not act with entire independence, as their work
did not consist in furnishing a new translation ; they were
required to perform the far more unpleasant work of revising
and correcting a version, or rather several versions, which
already existed, and which were not to be altered without
weighty reasons.   An examination of the marginal readings
which any one should institute, would, as we believe, result in
increasing his admiration of these men, and in giving him ad-
ditional confidence and enjoyment when he reads their version.

Let us take a view of the position which they occupied.
With all the perplexities to which they were subjected, as we
have just remarked, they were, at the same time, far more
highly favored than the authors of the German version now
commonly received, and of the earlier English versions.   The
German language in the days of Luther was, as it is well
known, in a comparatively rude and undeveloped state ;
German scholars concur in according to him the honor of
having been the first who understood the capacities of that
language, and developed and demonstrated them by his
version.[1]   A familiar illustration of the somewhat uncouth,

[1] E. Reuss, one of the most eminent and accomplished critics of our day,
remarks : " Luther's Bible, with all the faults which, in special cases, have since

heavy, and obscure German of his day, may be found in the
German Preface of the Augsburg Confession (1530), in
which the Protestants address themselves to Charles V.,
while Melanchthon's Latin text exhibits all the elegance for
which his diction is distinguished.  At that period Henry
VIII. occupied the throne of England; during his reign
Tyndale, the first publisher of an English version of the
Bible, died as a martyr.  Henry was succeeded by Edward
VI. ; it was in his reign that the English Liturgy, to which
our religious language owes much of its precision, was com-
pleted and established by act of Parliament.  After the dark
period of the reign of "bloody Mary," Elizabeth ascended
the throne.  During her reign (1558–1603), Shakspeare,
Ben. Jonson, Spenser, and Buchanan, flourished as poets,
Camden as an historian.  Then, too, Sir Philip Sidney, Sir
Walter Raleigh, R. Hooker, Carey, Earl of Monmouth, and
Napier, the inventor of logarithms, also distinguished them-
selves.  After the queen's death, James I. succeeded to the
throne.  When, therefore, the translators were appointed by
him, they found already a comparatively rich English litera-
ture in existence, and this circumstance will in part explain
the admirable diction which they were enabled to employ in
their version.

The critical apparatus to which they had access was also
comparatively ample.  They say in their preface : "Neither
did we think much to consult the translators or commenta-
tors, Chaldee, Hebrew, Syrian, Greek, or Latin ; no, nor the
Spanish, French, Italian, or Dutch ; neither did we disdain
to revise that which we had done, and to bring back to the
anvil that which we had hammered."  Selden says : "At
their meetings one read the translation, the rest holding in
their hands some Bible, either of the learned tongues, or

been set forth, was nevertheless a miracle of science for that age.  Its language,
which successfully struggled to rise above the old German coarseness, was the
best which Luther ever employed, and was surpassed by that of none of his con-
temporaries.  Its tones were like those of a prophecy of a golden age of litera-
ture ; and in manly power and the unction of the Holy Ghost it is a model
which has never been equalled." — Gesch. d. h. S. N. T. § 471.

French, Spanish, Italian, etc." (Table-Talk, article *Bible*.)
The "Dutch" version of which the translators speak, was
the *German* version of Luther in particular, to which they
were pre-eminently indebted in deciding on appropriate
terms, when the original presented difficulties. Trench re-
marks: "Till late in the seventeenth century 'Dutch'
(deutsch or teutsch, theotiscus), meant generally 'German,'
and a 'Dutchman,' a native of Germany, while what we
should now term a Dutchman would have been named then
a Hollander" (Select Glossary, article *Dutch*). He then
quotes from Howell and Fuller, in order to substantiate his
assertion. The former says in the preface to his *Lexicon
Tetraglotton*, published in 1660 : "Though the root of the
English language be *Dutch*, yet she may be said to have been
inoculated afterwards upon a French stock." Trench recurs
to the same subject in another work (English Past and Pres-
ent, Lect. vii.), and there furnishes additional evidence, that
"Dutch" was the designation, in the age of the translators,
of those who spoke the *German* (High-Dutch), as contra-
distinguished from Hollanders who used the Low-Dutch lan-
guage. (On these subjects the reader will find some interest-
ing statements in Prof. Whitney's recent work, Language
and the Study of Language, pp. 164, 210.)

Besides these aids in other languages, our translators
had as guides, the "former translations," mentioned on the
title-page of every ordinary edition of the English Bible.
To these the king directed their special attention in his in-
structions, which we shall afterwards quote. A rapid survey
of the versions or editions mentioned by him, and of several
others, will enable us to form a clear judgment respecting
the true character of the "marginal readings."

Various portions of the Scriptures had been translated
into the language employed in England, both before and
after the Norman conquest. Similar efforts continued to be
made during the transition-period, which terminated in the
adoption of the present idiom. Several manuscripts of this
character are preserved in the British Museum, and in the

libraries of other institutions in England. It has been ascertained that while these remains possess great historical and philological value, they afford little or no aid in the department of Biblical Criticism. The corypheus of English translators of the whole Bible, was unquestionably JOHN WICLIF (Wickliffe, Wicklif, Wycliffe, Wyclef, etc.), who was born in 1324, and received his name from that of a small village in Yorkshire. Very careful investigations of the history of his version fully demonstrate that he was the first who translated the *entire* Bible into English. The date assigned by some to his New Testament is, A.D. 1378 ; by others, A.D. 1380. He translated from the Latin Vulgate, and faithfully adhered to that version as he found it. But its text was far from being settled at that comparatively early period, which preceded the invention of printing. The copies varied considerably, and Wiclif's Latin manuscript doubtless exhibited corruptions of the text, like many others. Hence his version does not correspond in all cases to the present text of the Vulgate, as found in any modern reprint of the Clementine or normal edition of the year 1593. It would have been impossible for Wiclif to produce a version directly from the Greek New Testament at a period when he would probably not have found access to any Greek or Hebrew manuscript, even if he had acquired a knowledge of these languages. His version, accordingly, with all its other merits, could not possess the character of a critical authority in the eyes of our translators, when they arranged the marginal readings. As it does not appear to have exercised any influence on the subsequent English versions, although it is given in Bagster's Hexapla, we have not quoted from it in the illustrations furnished below from the Epistle to the Romans. His New Testament performed good service, however, in a dark age. That it was extensively circulated in manuscript (not having been printed before 1731), is attested by facts still preserved in history ; the spread of the doctrines of Wiclif, or Lollardism (a term of reproach imported from the continent), caused many of the papists to tremble. Providence

had raised up this great and good man at a time when popish superstition and ignorance threatened to destroy all traces of the truth.    He, at least, if not other translators, was allowed to die in peace.    He suffered no harm from the exhumation and burning of his bones many years afterwards, by order of the same unholy council of Constance, which condemned Huss and Jerome of Prague to a cruel death.

A new era opened on Europe when the art of printing was invented.[1]    Thereby divine Providence furnished new facilities for the circulation of the Holy Scriptures in the language of the people.    But before England availed itself of these facilities, several versions in different languages had been printed on the continent.    A bright period commenced in England when WILLIAM TYNDALE (Tindal) was raised up to do a good and glorious work.    He was born about the year 1484 ; the precise date of his birth, and the names of his parents have not been definitely determined.    His labors, his success, and his sufferings, render him one of the most interesting personages in the history of the Christian Church.    If it were appropriate to furnish biographical details in this Article, it would be an easy and delightful task to exhibit his singular merit.    He surveyed with profound interest the work which Luther had commenced, adopted the principles of the Reformation, and, at length, proceeded to London, where he hoped to find facilities in performing the great work which he had contemplated — a translation of the Scriptures into English.    He had already at that time had considerable experience as a translator, having rendered large portions of the Greek classic writers into the vernacular.    His learned friend, John Frith (Fryth), who was burned as a heretic in Smithfield, 1552, had been led to open his eyes to the light of the Gospel by the study of the New Testament (the Greek

---

[1] The dates which Anderson (Annals of the English Bible) presents in his Introduction, are probably not strictly correct.    The first printed Bible, which was the Vulgate, did not appear until the year 1462, at Mentz or Mayence (Mainz, Maguntiacum). — Herzog, Encyk. xvii. p. 439.

edition of Erasmus) ; he greatly encouraged Tyndale's heart, and, in connection with their common friend, Humphrey Monmouth, furnished him with pecuniary means.    According to some accounts (Herzog, Encyk. xix. 508), he afterwards assisted Tyndale, at Antwerp, in completing the version.    The latter was thus enabled to proceed to Hamburg in the early part of the year 1524.    From that place he went, according to some earlier accounts, to Wittenberg, where he met Luther.    This interesting fact is stated by the able writer of the Introduction to Bagster's Hexapla, p. 29.    The same authorities on which he relies, further state that Tyndale's first edition was printed in 1526, at Wittenberg (Herzog, Encyk. iv. pp. 36, 55).    Luther's own version had been published in the same place four years previously, September, 1522.    The stern silence which history observes on so many subjects, is maintained also in this case.    The general fact is reported, but no details respecting the personal intercourse of these two remarkable men seem to have been preserved.

This " common tradition " of Tyndale's visit to Luther is regarded as unfounded in fact by Anderson (Annals of the English Bible, Book i. sect. ii.) and by Westcott, the most recent writer on the subject (General View of the History of the English Bible, London and Cambridge, 1868, p. 36). According to these two writers, who, however, differ widely on several other points, Tyndale went from Hamburg to Cologne in 1525, and there began to print his first edition of the New Testament.    From this place he was driven by popish machinations and escaped to Worms, where, four years previously (in 1521), Luther had borne witness before the emperor.    During these four years this city had, according to the writers quoted by Anderson (Cochlaeus and Seckendorf), " become wholly Lutheran."    Here, as it is alleged, Tyndale remained till the year 1527, and was enabled to prepare two editions of his New Testament.    But the " common tradition," as Westcott terms it, of the personal intercourse of two men like Luther and Tyndale, so con-

genial in spirit, and so earnestly laboring in precisely the same work, seems to have some foundation in fact, especially when we consider the geographical proximity of the two men.   Westcott, who says that " Luther's name was indeed at the time identified with the idea of vernacular versions of scripture," admits (p. 172) that Luther's version was "*possibly* accessible to Tyndale."   Further, Westcott says :  " The famous Prologue [of Tyndale] to the Romans (1526), is, as is well known, for the most part a paraphrase of a translation of Luther's Preface.   Like the Preface to the New Testament, this writing of Luther had been translated into Latin (1523) ; Tyndale's version seems at one time to follow the German and at another time the Latin text " (p. 194). All this shows, as Westcott adds, that " Tyndale could not have been unacquainted with the German " (p. 195).   The same writer makes the following statement on the next page: " The coincidences between Tyndale's exposition of the Sermon on the Mount and that of Luther, though fewer, are even more worthy of notice.   Luther's expository sermons were delivered in 1530 and printed in 1532, but they were not translated into Latin till 1533.   On the other hand, Tyndale's exposition was printed in 1532.   He must, then, have used the German edition of Luther, or perhaps even notes taken by some friend or by himself,"   Westcott, who concedes the probability of a personal meeting of Luther and Tyndale by the words " or by himself," next exhibits in parallel columns the German of Luther and the English of Tyndale.

Anderson remarks (Book i. sect. vi.) that in the year 1529, or, at most only three years after the publication of Tyndale's first edition, Frith, his friend, published an English translation from the German of a small work, entitled, " The Revelation of ·Antichrist."   It was printed, he says, " at Malborow, in the land of Hesse, the 12th day of July, 1529, by me Hans Luft."   Now it is well known that Hans (diminutive of Johannes) Luft (Lufft), who established a printing-office at Wittenberg in 1525, distinguished himself as the printer·

of various works of Luther. The latter frequently mentions
him in his letters as his "chalcographus" (de Wette, Luther's
Briefe, ii. 42, 506, 530; v. 712); he informs Melanchthon
and Spalatin of Luft's serious illness and subsequent recov-
ery (de Wette, iii. 189, 193), and states in a letter to Chan-
cellor Brück, written in September, 1539 (de Wette, vi. 248),
that Luft had informed him that he was now ready to com-
mence the printing of a new edition of the German Bible, in
a superior style.[1] The text of this edition had been care-
fully revised by Luther, with the assistance of Melanchthon,
Bugenhagen, Jonas, Cruciger, and Aurogallus. It was issued
in 1541 in two volumes, folio. The title-page says, in Ger-
man: "Biblia, that is, the entire Holy Scripture, German,
prepared anew. D[oct]. Mart. Luth., etc. Printed by Hans
Lufft at Wittenberg, 1541" (M. Meurer: Luther's Leben,
etc. 1861, p. 285). This employment by Frith of Luther's
printer, is another link in the chain of evidence that the first
German and the first English translator of the Holy Scrip-
tures were at least not strangers to each other.

Much internal evidence of Tyndale's acquaintance with
Luther's version may be obtained by comparing their respec-
tive productions with the original Greek. If it is no dis-
credit to Luther that he carefully consulted the Septuagint

---

[1] Luft died in the year 1584. He was well known in his day as the "Bible-
printer." It is said that in the period of about fifty years, nearly 100,000 copies
of the Scriptures were issued from his office. While he was still a journeyman,
he was repeatedly sent by his employer to other towns, in order to attend to the
printing of manuscripts of limited extent. He may have adopted the same
course with some of his journeymen, when he had established himself as a
printer. It is only in this way that we can explain the circumstance mentioned
above, as quoted from Anderson, that he was the printer of Frith's book. There
is no German town or city named "Malborow;" possibly *Marburg* is meant, the
place in which the celebrated interview of Luther and Zwingli took place, Oct.
1-3, 1529, for that city *did* belong to the "land of Hesse." Luft acquired wealth
and distinction, and was invested in 1563, with the office of Burgomaster of
Wittenberg. Zeltner published in 1727 an account of Luther's publications,
and there furnished a biographical sketch of Luft, from which the above details
are taken. We have before us a folio, tolerably well preserved — a copy of
Luther's German Bible, printed about fourteen years before the death of the
great Reformer. The lower part of the title-page exhibits the following:
"Wittenberg. Gedruckt durch (printed by) Hans Lufft. 1532."

and the Vulgate when he prepared the German version, it can as little be discreditable to Tyndale, himself an accomplished scholar, that, in addition to the same ancient versions, he consulted also the eminently successful translation of Luther. Our space allows us to furnish only one illustration, derived from the beginning of the Epistle, to which we shall revert below, in examining the "marginal readings" of our present English version. The instance will also show that, if our translators at all adopted the principle of submitting a different version in the margin, they could with propriety have more frequently observed it than they have done. In Rom. i. 4, Luther translates ἐξ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν thus: "Seit der Zeit er auferstanden ist von den Todten" [since the time when he arose from the dead]. Robinson also (Lex. N. T. p. 223) regards ἐξ as here referring to *time*, and translates, "after"; and Stuart (Com. *ad loc.*) adduces many passages in which this preposition is equivalent to *after*. Now Tyndale, both in the first edition of 1526, and also in that of 1534, strictly followed Luther in translating this, exegetically considered, somewhat difficult phrase, and exhibited the following: "sence the tyme that Jesus Christ oure Lorde rose agayne from deeth." The Cranmer Bible of 1539 exhibits the same version; the Geneva of 1557 has, "sence that he rose agayne from the dead." Rheim's, of 1582, on the other hand, presents precisely the rendering which the authorized version subsequently adopted, namely "by the resurrection," etc.

But even if the place in which Tyndale's first edition appeared is doubtful, it is certain that the correct date of it is the year 1526. Copies of it were at once transmitted from the continent to England in such numbers and with such marked effect, that towards the close of the year, Bishop Tonstall (Tunstal), at the instigation of Cardinal Wolsey, and with the approbation of the chancellor, Sir Thomas More, publicly and officially prohibited the importation of additional copies, and commanded that the "maintainers of Luther's sect" and all others who had obtained copies,

should (like the *traditores* at the beginning of the fourth
century) surrender them to the ecclesiastical authorities.
Some of the copies were collected and burned at St. Paul's
Cross in the year 1528; but many more were retained by
faithful men, and industriously circulated.   The demand for
the Scriptures was so great that two surreptitious editions
were printed in Holland in 1527 and 1528, as a mere busi-
ness speculation.   During the succeeding years, Tyndale,
who remained on the continent, was occupied with the trans-
lation of the Old Testament; in this work he was aided,
according to some accounts, by Myles Coverdale.

In the early part of the year 1534, while Tyndale was the
guest of an English merchant who resided in Antwerp, he
carefully revised his translation of the New Testament, and
besides correcting errors which had crept into the editions
published in Holland, he also materially improved the style.
This revised translation was published in 1534.   When the
printers of Holland, who had previously issued several
editions, ascertained that Tyndale intended to publish one
under his own personal supervision, they resolved to an-
ticipate him.   They applied to an English refugee named
George Joye, who had already published a translation of
Isaiah from the Latin.   This man, whose knowledge of the
dead languages seems to have been confined to the Latin,
after making many strange and unwarrantable alterations
of Tyndale's text, suggested chiefly by the Vulgate, but
never by the original Greek, was sufficiently dishonest to
publish his edition under the name of that venerable man.
In answer to Tyndale's complaints, Joye published an unsat-
isfactory apology.   His own productions were deservedly
discarded by the public.

After Tyndale had thus accomplished the great work, for
the successful performance of which divine Providence had
singularly qualified him, the time of his departure was at
hand.   Bigotry and treachery induced the authorities of
Brussels to arrest and condemn him to death as a heretic.
After having been confined for some time at Vilvord (Vil-

vorden, Villefort), about seven miles distant from that city, he was led forth from his dungeon to the place of execution. After being first strangled, his corpse was consigned to the flames, towards the close of the year 1536. Even his adversary, the Procurator-General of the emperor Charles V., who had a personal knowledge of him, said : *Homo fuit doctus, pius, et bonus.*

The man whom Providence employed to continue the great work of translating and circulating the Scriptures in English, which had been so nobly commenced by Tyndale, was MYLES COVERDALE. He was born in Yorkshire, 1488, was an eminently learned and devout man, was enlightened by the truth of the Gospel, which he diligently studied, and was ardent in the performance of his duties. Religious persecution compelled him to proceed as an exile to the continent; according to some accounts he found Tyndale in Hamburg, and was temporarily his companion and fellow-laborer. About this period, or soon afterwards, two men, Cranmer (ultimately archbishop of Canterbury) and Cromwell (Crumwell) who had been Wolsey's secretary, who were both friends of the principles of the Reformation, and advocates of the diffusion of the Scriptures, assumed a prominent position. Their agreement with Henry VIII., not only in the matter of his divorce from queen Catharine, but generally, in his opposition to the arrogance of the pope, had secured for them a high degree of political influence, and they were powerfully aided by the new queen, Anne Boleyn (Bullen),[1] who was an ardent friend of the Reformation. Her death in May, 1536, was regarded

---

[1] Shakspeare represents Cardinal Wolsey as speaking of the queen and Cranmer in the following terms :

> " What though I know her virtuous,
> And well deserving, yet I know her for
> A spleeny Lutheran ; and not wholesome to
> Our cause, that she should lie i' the bosom of
> Our hard-rul'd king.  Again, there is sprung up
> An heretic, an arch one, Cranmer ; one
> Hath crawl'd into the favor of the king,
> And is his oracle." — (King Henry VIII., Act III. Sc. II).

as a serious calamity by those who were friendly to the circulation of the Scriptures. A happier state of things, at least in this respect, existed when her daughter Elizabeth ascended the throne.

Cranmer brought the subject of the publication of the Scriptures before his clergy (Dec. 19, 1534), but the concessions which they made, virtually prohibited the use of the English version already in existence. Still, these proceedings were, comparatively speaking, so favorable, that after Tyndale's imprisonment had commenced, Coverdale resolved to prepare a new version for the press, probably during the year 1535. The labors of his great predecessor, Tyndale, the aid afforded by the German version, which Coverdale gratefully acknowledges (Coverdale's Remains, p. 12), as well as by the Zurich (Swiss-German) version (Westcott, p. 212 sq.), his familiarity with the work, his own abilities, and, above all, the aid which divine grace afforded, enabled him to complete his task, as it is said, in the space of eleven months. Without such advantages the stupendous work (although it was not a new and independent version) could not have been performed in such a brief period. The version was printed in October, 1535.

It has not been satisfactorily determined in what place Coverdale's Bible was printed; Zurich, Frankfort, and Cologne have been suggested, but the evidence which has been adduced is conflicting, and no solution of the historical problem has been found. The volume was a small folio. The text of the Pentateuch, the Book of Job, etc., was that of Tyndale, carefully revised, and the same remark applies to that of the New Testament. In the case of the latter, Coverdale sometimes followed the edition of 1526, sometimes that of 1534, and in other instances deviated from both. That he proceeded in a somewhat independent manner, will appear from the following cases. Tyndale translated Matt. iii. 2, in 1526, thus: " Repent, the kyngdome of heven is at honde." Coverdale, in 1535, translates : " Amende your selves, the kyngdome of heven is at hande." The former

renders verse 8: "Brynge forthe therefore the frutes belong-
ynge to repentaunce"; the latter; "Beuarre, bringe forth
due frutes of pennaunce."   The former renders Mark vi. 12
thus: "And they went out and preached that they shulde
repent"; Coverdale exhibits: "And they went forthe and
preached that men should amende themselfes."

Coverdale's version was doubtless made with a constant
reference to the original languages, with the assistance of
"five sundry interpreters," whose names, however, he does
not furnish.   On this obscure point, Westcott, the latest
writer, remarks: "In the main his [Coverdale's] version is
based on the Swiss-German version of Zwingli and Leo Juda
[Judae], Zurich (1524–29, 1539, etc.), and on the Latin of
Pagninus.   He made use also of Luther and the Vulgate.
His fifth version may have been the Worms German Bible
of 1529, or the Latin Bible of Rudelius with marginal ren-
derings from the Hebrew (1527, 1529), or (as is most likely),
for he does not specify that his "five interpreters" are all
Latin or German, the published English translations of
Tyndale, to which he elsewhere refers" (Westcott, General
View, etc., p. 213, 214).[1]

Coverdale's version, whatever its "basis," or rather *bases*,
may have been, was soon conveyed to England, and was at
first favorably received by Henry VIII.   A contemporary
writer, the learned antiquarian Camden, states that, "through
the intercession of queen Anne, the king at last granted that
English Bibles might be printed and placed in every church
where the people might read them."

Coverdale's Bible was, however, subjected to the charge of
containing numerous errors; and many of the bishops, di-
rectly or indirectly, sustained the charge.   This circum-

[1] It is not here necessary to refer to the occasional crudities in Westcott's new
work.   He *guesses*, for instance, that Coverdale may have used the Latin Bible
of the papist Rudelius, but does not inquire and ascertain that this translation
is substantially a mere reprint of the translation made from the original by the
Protestant, Andreas Osiander, which was published in 1522 and 1523.   See the
very instructive Article of O. F. Fritzsche, "Vulgata," in Herzog, Encyk.
Vol. xvii.

stance, in addition to others, led Archbishop Cranmer to
project a new translation, which he proposed to make with
the assistance of his brother prelates.  But before his active
personal efforts were crowned with success, a new English
Bible was published (1537) with his approbation, and under
the royal sanction, known as " Matthew's Bible."  It seems to
have been intended to meet the immediate and urgent de-
mand for the English Scriptures, until a more perfect version
could be prepared.  It is now almost unanimously stated
that it issued from a German press ; but the place in which
it was printed (Hamburg, Marburg, Lubec, Antwerp) is not
positively known.  The text of the Old Testament is partly
a new version, partly that of Tyndale, partly that of Cover-
dale, while the New Testament is a reprint of the last edition
published by Tyndale ; the whole work is said to have been
superintended by John Rogers the martyr (burned alive at
Smithfield, January 4th, 1555, during the reign of " bloody
Mary ").  The name " Thomas Matthew," which this Bible
bears on the title-page, has been supposed by some to be a
fictitious appellation, adopted by Rogers from prudential
considerations.  Anderson (p. 238) concedes the possibility
of the existence of a Thomas Matthew, " at whose instance,
*perhaps*, the undertaking may have commenced."  Westcott
(pp. 88, 223) is disposed to believe that he was a real per-
sonage, and defrayed the expenses of the publication.  But
he does not furnish any important facts corroborative of his
opinion.

Copies of Matthew's Bible reached England in August
1537.  The book was favorably received by Cranmer, who
declared that " he liked it better than any other translation
heretofore made."  It was chiefly through Cromwell's influ-
ence that the public sale of the copies was allowed.  This
book was afterwards reprinted in England, and acquired
such popularity as to supersede the version of Coverdale.
But the latter, who had zealously continued his labors, now
published (1538) a new version, or a revision of the former
text of the New Testament.  It differed from the text of

1535, and more decidedly conformed to the Vulgate. The numerous typographical and other inaccuracies which characterized this edition and its reprints, concur in assigning a very subordinate rank to it.

Matthew's Bible contained prologues and notes which were offensive to many of the clergy, who, while they conceded the general principle of the free circulation of the Scriptures, had not yet seen any edition which fully corresponded to their expectations. A new version was accordingly ordered by Henry VIII., and, through Cromwell's influence, the editorship was assigned to Coverdale. The basis was Matthew's Bible, which Coverdale, with characteristic self-abnegation, consented to take in place of his own. Of this circumstance, it must however be added, the evidence is not decisive. As Paris then excelled in the typographical facilities which it afforded, it was chosen as the place of publication.[1] The Inquisition, however, interfered, as the book was in a language which *the people* of England understood ; when the printing had been nearly finished the great mass of the printed work was consigned to the flames. Still certain portions were rescued, the presses, types, and even the workmen, were transported to England with a degree of energy that claims all our admiration, and the volume was actually completed in April, 1540. In the course of that year and the next six editions were published.

This Bible — a goodly folio, furnished with a prologue written by Cranmer, and known as the " Great Bible " — was a revision of Matthew's Bible, but exhibited many variations, preferring, for instance, in some cases, the renderings of

[1] The Stephens family of printers at Paris, occupied a high rank during the sixteenth century, and the earlier decades of the seventeenth. The successive heads of the family were eminent not only for their skill as printers, but also for their classical learning. Robert Estienne (latinized *Stephanus*, and anglicized *Stephens*), the French king's printer at Paris, while still a youth, in 1523, printed and corrected the proofs of a Latin New Testament. The typographical facilities which these enterprising and learned printers gradually introduced, fully justified the choice of Paris as the place of publication of the English Bible.

Tyndale's edition of 1534, and, in others, those of Coverdale's earlier revision. Although this edition with its immediate reprints is often called "Cranmer's Bible," there is no evidence whatever to be found that the Archbishop was personally connected with the preparation of the text itself. It is also to be carefully distinguished from another Bible also dated April, 1540, but printed by Petyt and Redman, and not by Grafton or Whitchurch ; little is now known of it.

While this "Great Bible" was in the course of preparation at Paris, "Taverner's Bible," that is, his "recognition" of the English Bible, was issued from the London press (1539). This singular man sustained many different characters ; he was a learned Greek scholar, a courtier, a clerk or lawyer, a lay preacher, a licensed preacher, a justice of the peace, and, ultimately, a high sheriff. His Bible was simply a revision of that of Thomas Matthew. It was reprinted several times, but its publication ceased after the year 1549, when it fell into complete neglect. It is not regarded as possessing any critical value, and does not appear to have exercised any influence whatever on the later revisions.

The text of a new edition of the "Great Bible," published also in 1540, varied in some passages from that of the former edition, and the entire work of revision was probably superintended by Cranmer himself. This edition is the true "Cranmer's Bible." It was reprinted in the course of the following year, together with Cranmer's prologue. Indeed, careful investigations show that four editions of this large folio Bible exhibited 1541 as the date of their appearance.

The inaccuracies which still marred the English text, and the continued opposition of the Papists to all existing translations of the Bible in the vernacular, had the effect of maintaining a strong desire that a new version should be prepared which would not be liable to reproach. A want of unanimity as to the details of the work, as well as the vacillation of Henry VIII., long defeated the wishes of the friends of the Bible. But the land was delivered from the tyranny of this king, January 28th, 1547, and all classes hailed with

joy the accession of the youthful Edward to the throne.
During his brief reign of six years and five months, the
" Great Bible " continued to be the authorized version.  At
least thirty-five editions of the New Testament, and fourteen
of the whole Bible were published during that period ; these
numbers, however, include reprints of the Bibles of Cover-
dale, Taverner, Matthew, and Cranmer.

But the gloomy period of " bloody Mary's " reign of some-
what more than five years now commenced, Edward VI.
having died July 6, 1553.   No English Bibles were printed
during her reign, and those who had aided in the prepara-
tion and publication of any edition were mercilessly perse-
cuted, cast into dungeons, or burned alive at the stake.
Before the death of Mary, which occurred November 17th,
1558, some friends of the Bible, who lived as exiles in Geneva,
continued the good work of supplying their countrymen with
the word of God in their own language.   After having taken
the " Great Bible " as a basis, and carefully consulted several
Latin versions (Erasmus, Beza, Chastillon, better known by
his Latinized name, Castalio, etc.) they first published the
New Testament in 1557, and then the whole Bible in 1560,
a little more than a year after the accession of Queen Eliza-
beth, November, 1558.   The former, the " Genevan (Anglo-
Genevese) New Testament," was confessedly prepared by only
one person, although his name is not known with absolute
certainty.   It is quite possible, however, that it was William
Whittingham, who was one of the chief translators, in addi-
tion to Anthony Gilby and Thomas Sampson, by whom the
edition of the whole Bible of 1560 was prepared.   This con-
jecture is supported by the fact that Calvin (whose sister
Catharine was married to Whittingham, then pastor of the
English congregation at Geneva) furnished an introductory
Epistle as a preface for the volume.   The text has greater
claims to be considered as an original one than any of the
preceding versions since Tyndale's, for these were all, to a
greater or less extent, revisions of his text.   Still, it is not
a new and independent version ; while Tyndale's version

exercised considerable influence on it, the terms employed
in Cranmer's Bible are often preferred. There is one fea-
ture of this Geneva New Testament which is specially in-
teresting — it was the first in which all words supplied by
the translators, in order to complete the sense, appear in a
peculiar type. This feature has been retained in all of our
English Bibles. The italics used in the latter are said to
have been first employed by Arias Montanus, who died in
1598; but the original idea is usually credited to Aldo
Manuzio, who died in 1516.

The labors of the exiles at Geneva were fully appreciated
in England, and their version became very popular. It was
indeed reprinted several times, even after king James's ver-
sion had been published and "authorized," and retained its
popularity during a period of nearly eighty years. But after
Elizabeth commenced to reign, Cranmer's Bible was rein-
stated in its former dignity, as the authorized version. New
editions of it were accordingly published in 1562, 1566, and
1568, while the several versions of Tyndale, Coverdale, etc.,
continued also to be printed. Still, no party was perfectly
satisfied. The Puritans preferred the Geneva Bible, the
translators of which (among whom was John Knox, accord-
ing to some accounts) were known as having been warmly
attached to Calvin's doctrinal system; the dignitaries and
clergy of the established church objected to all of the exist-
ing versions, as exhibiting many inaccuracies; all judicious
men deplored the fact that so many different English texts
were simultaneously used, which occasioned inconvenience
and confusion. A new authorized version which could
meet the just expectations of all parties was imperatively
demanded, if the preparation of precisely such a text was at
all possible. Matthew Parker, Archbishop of Canterbury,
undertook to forward the work. The Old Testament and
the Apocrypha were divided into eleven parts, which were
assigned to eminent and learned men, among whom were at
least eight bishops of the established church. A similar
distribution was made of the portions into which the New

Testament was divided. After the several translators had completed their respective tasks, the whole work was carefully revised by Parker, with the assistance of other learned men, and was then authoritatively pronounced to have been successfully performed. This Bible was variously termed the " Great English Bible," " Parker's Bible," and also the " Bishops' Bible," as the dignitaries of the church had performed a principal part in preparing it. It was first published in 1568, in a volume which was magnificent for that age, and was furnished with numerous marginal notes and references, many useful tables, engravings, wood-cuts, and maps. The revisers or authors of this Bible departed as little as possible from the text of the " Great Bible," sometimes availing themselves of terms found in the Geneva Bible, and often dropping or altering words which the former translations had taken from the Vulgate. Several editions were subsequently published without important alterations of the text, except in that of 1572, which slightly altered the renderings in some cases. It is this edition which was especially denominated " Matthew Parker's Bible." This Bible, however, never became very popular, nor was it, like Cranmer's Bible, specially appointed " to be read in churches." The Geneva version retained its place in the household and the closet.

A new edition of the Geneva New Testament was published in 1576 by Lawrence Tomson. He followed the Geneva version of 1560, but altered the text in some passages by conforming them to the Latin translation of Beza, while in many other cases he discarded the peculiar renderings of the latter.

As the Protestant exiles at Geneva in the reign of Mary provided a version of the Scriptures for their fellow-countrymen, so the popish exiles at Rheims (Reims, Rhemes — the ancient capital of the Remi of Caesar's age) produced a version for English-speaking papists, in the reign of Elizabeth. The principal persons engaged in this work were Gregory Martin, William (afterwards cardinal) Allen, and Richard

Bristow ; of these the first two were especially distinguished for their learning. The New Testament was first printed at " Rhemes " in 1582. The Rhemists, however, did not allow the Greek text to influence their work, but adhered strictly to the Latin of the Vulgate, which they represented in their preface as being almost faultless ; they attempt to prove that it is as good as the original Greek text of the inspired writers, and, indeed, preferable to it. Such was the popish doctrine as fixed by one of the decrees of the Council of Trent, passed at the fourth session (1546), according to which the Vulgate, although the texts of the existing manuscripts confessedly abounded at that time in errors, was made the authoritative and sole standard of faith and morals, to the neglect of the original Hebrew and Greek Scriptures. The boastful language of the Rhemish translators respecting the almost immaculate purity of the Latin text was put to shame only a few years afterwards. Pope Sixtus V. issued in 1590 his professedly correct edition ; but this publication was found by his successor, Clement VIII., to be marred by so many errors that it was suppressed, and a new and again professedly correct edition appeared with the papal sanction in 1592. The two texts vary in numerous cases, and exhibit many contradictions ; nevertheless, each is declared by " infallible " authority to be correct. The Rhemists, from whom this translation was extorted by the numerous issues of Protestant versions, and for which it was intended to be the antidote, have succeeded in making many passages perfectly unintelligible, both by the introduction of words unknown to the mere English reader, such as *impudicitie, ebrieties, commessations* (Gal. v. 19–21), and by transferring Greek words without any necessity, such as *parasceue, azumes*. Further, they sometimes translate so literally as to become obscure. They render 2 Cor. i. 17–20 thus : " Vvereas then I vvas thus minded, did I vse lighteness? Or the things that I minde, do I minde according to the flesh, that there be vvith me *It is* and *It is not?* But God is faithful, because our preaching vvich vvas to you, there is not in it, *It is*, and

*It is not.* For the Sonne of God Jesus Christ, vvho by vs vvas preached among you by me and Syluanus and Timothee, vvas not, *It is,* and *It is not,* but *It is,* vvas in him. For al the promises of God that arc, in him *It is;* therefore also by him, Amen to God, vnto our glorie." The original is: τὸ ναὶ ναί, καὶ τὸ οὐ οὔ ... ναὶ καὶ οὔ, etc. It is true that Wiclif (1380) also translated " it is ... it is not, etc.," but the Rhemists cannot be suspected of entertaining any reverence for him. The Vulgate gave: *Est et Non.* Luther, with his admirable tact, skill, and conscientiousness, gave: *Ja Ja, und Nein ist Nein.* Tyndale (1526 and 1534) imitated his example (*ye ye, and naye naye*) as well as Cranmer (1539): " yee, yee, and naye naye." Geneva of 1557 exhibits: "Yea Yea, and Nay, Nay."

So, too, the Rhemists translate: "do penance," instead of " repent " (μετανοέω), e.g. Matt. iii. 2 ; Mark vi. 12 ; Acts xxvi. 20 ; Rev. iii. 19. If they vary in Mark i. 15 and translate, " be penitent," they are careful to prevent the reader from supposing that *penitence* is a process in the heart, and not a mere outward mechanical act, by appending the explanatory note : " He (John the Baptist) doth not preach belief, or faith only, but penance also." (The decrees of the Council of Trent on the subject of " the sacrament of Penance," were adopted at the fourteenth session, Nov. 25, 1551.) The Rhemish translators did not publish the Old Testament in English until the year 1609, when it was printed at Douay (Doway, Douai — formerly belonging to Flanders, but since 1714 to France), and hence their complete version is called the " Douay Bible." The editors state in their preface to the New Testament, in this edition, that they had adapted the text to the Clementine revision. Their New Testament is important on account of the fact that it furnished a large proportion of the Latin words which King James's translators adopted. These papists, however, had not the candor to express their obligations to the earlier English versions, which really furnished the ground-work of their own version.

Soon after James I. ascended the throne, he received with

much interest and favor the requests which were addressed to him, that he would authorize the preparation of a new version — a standard English Bible. Even after all the revisions of the earlier versions, the English text still retained various erroneous renderings, and none of the editions that had hitherto appeared were satisfactory to all. The king ultimately resolved to employ in this great work all the talent and learning which the bench of bishops, the universities, and the clergy in general, could supply. The result of the labors of his translators demonstrates that the king (whose personal character, especially since the appearance of some of the " Waverly novels," is not greatly admired) was eminently successful in the selection and appointment of the divines to whom the work was entrusted. The biographical details of these venerable men are, in many cases, very meagre. The researches of A. W. McClure (" The Translators Revived ; a biographical memoir of the authors of the English Version," etc.) furnish us with the fullest information respecting their personal history, to which we have had access.

It is usually represented that James I. gave the translators *fourteen* rules or " Instructions " which they were required to observe. Anderson (Book iii. sect. iv.) speaks with some doubt of the historical accuracy of this statement, but furnishes no decisive evidence that the usual opinion on this subject is unfounded. If an account of the work was given to the Synod of Dort (November 20th, 1618), and the number of the rules " ultimately prescribed " was stated to have been " only seven," some alterations in the details may have virtually reduced the number. Indeed, the obscurities, contradictions, and inconsistencies which we have found in the several authors whom we have consulted in preparing this Article, have sometimes made us feel as if we were treating of persons and events belonging to a mythical or pre-historic period.

Among the " Instructions " which the king gave to the translators (assuming the historical truth of the usual ac-

count), were the following: "1. The ordinary Bible read in the church, commonly called the Bishops' Bible, to be followed, and as little altered as the original will permit. 3. The old ecclesiastical words to be kept; as the word *church* not to be translated *congregation*, etc.   6. No marginal notes at all to be affixed, but only for the explanation of the Hebrew or Greek words, which cannot without some circumlocution, so briefly and fitly be expressed in the text. 7. Such quotations of places to be marginally set down as shall serve for the fit reference of one scripture to another. 14. These translations to be used when they agree better with the text than the Bishops' Bible; namely, Tyndale's, Coverdale's, Matthew's, Whitchurch's, Geneva."

The fourteenth or last of these "Instructions," directs the attention of the translators to several of the Bibles described above, and also mentions "Whitchurch's," by which is meant simply Cranmer's Bible. The title-page of the first edition of it, 1539, exhibited the following at the bottom: "Prynted by Rychard Grafton and Edward Whitchurch. Cum privilegio ad imprimendum solum." The title-page of the edition of 1540 sets forth that "Richard Grafton" was the printer. But the reprint of Cranmer's Bible of the year 1541, besides stating that this Bible had been "oversene and perused" by Cuthbert and Nicolas,[1] respectively the bishops of Duresme (Durham) and Rochester, adds also that the printer was "Edward Whitchurch." Possibly the superior typographical beauty or accuracy of this edition of Cranmer's Bible, may have permanently connected the printer's name with the version itself.

It is obvious from the king's "Instructions" that they do not give full and unrestricted liberty of translation; still, they are so framed as not to embarrass seriously a competent

---

[1] That is, Cuthbert Tonstal and Nicolas Heath. — *Duresme* is not a Norman-French name. Antiquarians like Camden (whose first publication on the subject of British Antiquities appeared in 1586), inform us that Durham derives its name from its situation; the term is a corruption of two combined Saxon words, *dur*, a hill, and *holme*, a river-island. By the Latins, observes Camden, "it is called Dunelmus; and by the common people, Durham or Duresme."

and conscientious man. Now all those who were honored with an appointment to aid in the great work, besides the forty-seven who were originally commissioned by the king, seem to have been both eminently competent and strictly conscientious.[1] The work which they performed was of such magnitude, the details of the history of it are so numerous and important, and the general facts are now so widely known, that we cannot, in justice to the subject, repeat them here, without exceeding all due limits of this Article. These venerable men probably commenced their labors before the year 1607, and the Bible was at length issued from the press of R. Barker in 1611. The book professes "to be newly translated out of the original tongues, and with the former translations diligently compared and revised, by his Majesty's special command." A part of this announcement appears on the title-page of every edition of the American Bible Society. While they found many facilities which had been inaccessible to their predecessors, and while too the occasional inaccuracies and infelicities of expression in their version are not denied, it must be conceded that the result of their labors is truly wonderful, and that they have honestly earned all the praise which scholars and devout men of all classes have bestowed upon them.

The "Instructions" of the king authorized the translators to employ the margin in certain cases. They wisely gave a liberal interpretation to the terms in which this privilege was conferred. Their marginal readings or renderings, which are often overlooked, are not usually better than the terms employed in the text, but are nevertheless highly interesting. We select the first of the Pauline Epistles for the purpose of illustrating the subject, but shall omit such renderings as

[1] All the information respecting them as individuals, that is now accessible, appears to have been collected by A. W. McClure, in the work to which we have referred above. Trench (On the Authorized Version of the New Test. chap. x.) declares that the charge of a "Calvinistic leaning as against Arminism," is entirely without foundation, and is, indeed, unfounded, if his explanation be accepted as satisfactory. The charge refers chiefly to the version of Acts ii. 47, and Heb. x. 38.

are of minor interest or importance ; our space does not allow a more extended survey. We omit Wiclif's version which is furnished in Bagster's Hexapla, but exhibit the readings of some of the other " former translations," including the Bishops' Bible, which that Hexapla fails to introduce ; we combine with these the commonly received Latin (Vulgate), German (Luther) and French (Martin and Ostervald) versions. The editions of Tyndale of 1534, Cranmer of 1539, Geneva of 1557, Rheims of 1582, and of one of the earliest black-letter editions of the Bishops' Bible, are those from which we generally quote.

Romans. i. 4: ὁρισθέντος ; Vulg. *praedestinatus* (The Vulgate here appears from the prefix *prae-* to have been influenced by an inferior *var. lect.*, προορισθέντος, which is found in some Greek fathers and some cursive manuscripts ; other Greek fathers, some of the Latins (*destinatus*) and the uncial manuscripts, including Cod. Sin.[1] sustain the reading of the *textus receptus*) ; English version, *declared* — marginal reading, " Gr. *determined* "; German, *erwiesen* (equivalent to *shown, evinced*) ; Tyndale, Cranmer, Geneva, Bishops', *declared;* Rheims, *who was predestinate ;* Erasmus, *declaratus ;* Martin and Ostervald, *declaré.* The original word occurs eight times in the New Testament, and is translated *determined* (Luke xxii. 22 ; Acts xi. 29 ; xvii. 26), *determinate* (Acts ii. 23), *ordained* (Acts x. 42 ; xvii. 31), *declared* (Rom. i. 4), *limiteth* (ὁρίζει, Heb. iv. 7). Several of these renderings are unfortunate, inasmuch as *praedestinatus, declaratus,* etc., might be applicable to an ordinary mortal, such as John the Baptist or Paul, to whom a special office was assigned, but would not be so appropriate in the case of Him who was the eternal " Son of God." The same objection applies to the word " decreed " which Stuart (Comment.), after an elaborate discussion prefers. Chrysostom, who is high authority

---

[1] When Dr. Schaff, in 1865, commenced the publication of the English translation of Lange's Commentary, the proposed designation of *Codex Sinaiticus* by ℵ, had not been unanimously admitted. But Tischendorf has decided to employ Aleph, and it is, accordingly, found in the eighth edition of his Greek New Testament now in the course of publication. — Lange, Vol. i. p. 567.

in such a case, takes the word as equivalent to δειχθέντος, that is, *shown, manifested*. Theophylact gives three equivalent terms : ἀποδειχθέντος, βεβαιωθέντος, κριθέντος. Lange translates *festgestellt (established)*. He remarks that the term does not refer to the Son of God, as such absolutely, but to the Son of God who was exalted to celestial majesty. If we understand him correctly, he holds that this expression, like the Lord's own words in Matt. xxviii. 18, or those of Paul in Eph. i. 20–23, refers to the exaltation of Christ's *human* nature, and its participation in the exercise of the attributes of his divine nature, seeing that the two natures are indissolubly united in one Person. The word admits of different interpretations. But as the " resurrection from the dead " (ver. 4) refers to the Saviour's human nature, it may be assumed that Paul's meaning is the following : He who was from all eternity the Son of God, the Λόγος, and who, on assuming human nature (John i. 14 ; Heb. ii. 14), appeared on earth as a man (1 Tim. ii. 5), and who was God-man, was *marked out, declared* (so Robinson, Lex.) or *manifestly shown* as being the Son of God (two natures, one Person), the circumstances attending and following the resurrection furnishing the evidence. If this is a correct view the textual is preferable to the marginal rendering.

Romans i. 5 : εἰς ὑπακοὴν πίστεως ; Vulg. *ad obediendum fidei ;* E. V., *for obedience to the faith* — margin, *to the obedience of faith ;* Germ., *den Gehorsam des Glaubens*. (In the English text πίστις is taken in an objective sense, as the form of doctrine or creed of Christians, or the εὐαγγέλιον, as the object — see Robinson's Lex. *ad. verb.* ii. 4.) The margin and the German version take πίστις in a subjective sense, that is, the obedience which a true and living faith produces. (On the important distinction between *Genitivus objecti*, and *Gen. subjecti*, see Winer, Gram. New Test. § 30. 1) ; Tynd., *should obey to the faith which is in his name* (1526) ; *unto the obedience of the faith that is in his name* (1534 — both subjective, like the margin, and Luther) ; Cranm., Gen, *that obedience might be given unto the faith in his name*; Rheims, *for obedi-*

*ence to the faith* (adopted in the English text); Erasmus, *ut obediatur fidei*; Martin, *afin de porter tous les Gentils à croire en son nom*; Ostervald, *afin d'amener tous les Gentils à l'obéissance de la foi en son nom.* The question to be decided is, whether πίστις here means *fides quae creditur* (objective, E. V.) or *fides quâ creditur* (subjective, *margin*). De Wette, who says that εἰς before ὑπακ. designates the purpose, object, or end, namely, to produce faith, maintains that we have here not a *Gen. subj.* (as if faith produced obedience), but a *Gen. obj.* (namely that obedience conforms to the faith, i.e. creed). Thus πίστις, he continues, in Acts vi. 7 is to be understood objectively. He accordingly sustains the English textual reading. Fritzsche, who takes the same view, refers to 2 Cor. x. 5, and 1 Pet. i. 22, where ὑπακοή is confessedly followed by a *Gen. obj.* Tholuck, on the contrary, is inclined to adopt the view of Chrysostom, who takes πίστις in a subjective sense. Stuart, who concurs, and thus adopts the marginal rendering, thinks it " probable that the apostle meant to designate the *obedience of faith* as contradistinguished from *legal obedience.*" Like him, Olshausen takes πίστις here in the sense of *Glaubenszustand*, not in that of *Glaubenslehre*, that is, in a subjective sense — a state or condition which faith produces, not the particular Christian form or system of doctrine. The latest important commentator, Lange, after carefully examining the two views and admitting that πίστις can here be taken subjectively in a good sense, concludes ultimately (in opposition to Meyer, who holds that the word always occurs in a subjective sense in the New Testament) that here it ought to be understood objectively, that is, according to the text of the E. V. This statement will sufficiently explain the reason for which our translators appended a marginal rendering; in a case of such importance they would not decide absolutely.

Romans i. 19: ἐν αὐτοῖς; Vulg. and Erasm. *in illis;* E. V., *in them* — margin, *to them;* Germ. *ihnen* (i.e. to them); Tynd., Cranm., Bish., *among;* Gen., Rheims, *unto;* Mart., *en eux* (in them); Osterv., *parmi eux* (among them). The

textual version is somewhat indefinite, unless, as Stuart and others understand the phrase, it is equivalent to, *in their minds, hearts, or consciences.* The other interpretation of ἐν, namely *among*, as de Wette prefers, is sustained by the obvious meaning of ἐν in v. 6 of the same chapter (Matt. ii. 6; Acts iv. 12; 1 Cor. xi. 19), that is, " manifest among them, or generally known." The marginal interpretation, *to them*, assumes that ἐν αὐτοῖς is equivalent to a dative of the person, or to αὐτοῖς. Winer decidedly rejects this view; he will not admit that ἐν ἐμοί in 1 Cor. xiv. 11 is simply a dative (Gram. New Test. § 31. 8; § 48 a.). Nevertheless in that passage the simple dative τῷ λαλοῦντι seems to demand imperatively that ἐν ἐμοί in the latter part of the verse should be understood correlatively as equivalent to a simple dative. If this is correct, then the apostle says in the passage before us, *manifest to them*, and the simple αὐτοῖς follows in the next clause of the same verse, with a conjugate verb in the same sense. In that case the marginal rendering is the more exact.

Romans i. 20: εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτοὺς ἀναπολογήτους; Vulg., *ita ut sint;* Erasm., *in hoc ut sint;* E. V., *so that they are* — margin, *that they may be;* Germ., *also dass sie keine Entschuldigung haben* (so that they have no excuse); Tynd., Cranm., Rheims, Bish., *so that they are;* Geneva, *to the intent that they should be;* Mart. and Osterv., *de sorte qu'ils sont* (insomuch that they are). A very grave doctrinal question is here presented. " Alii *Dei consilium* declarari consent—alii, *rei eventum* " (Fritzsche). If we adopt the interpretation as set forth by Beza, the Geneva version, and our marginal rendering, then the apostle teaches that the object of God in manifesting himself to the heathen in the works of creation was that they might be inexcusable; that is, their inexcusableness was the end for which God manifested himself. But the most recent commentator, Lange (Bibelwerk), says that such an interpretation leads to a conception of the design or end of the creation that is " monstrous." According to him the sin consists in " holding the truth in unrighteousness " (v. 18). This sin renders them inexcusable; the reason for

which (διότι) they are inexcusable is specially stated in v. 21. Lange, accordingly, with most commentators, denies that the formula εἰς τό with the infinitive is here to be taken in a *telic* sense, and regards it as *ecbatic*, like the English textual version, the German, and the French. (For εἰς τό in a telic sense see Rom. iv. 10. The distinction between the *telic* and the *ecbatic* usage is illustrated by Winer (§ 44. 8 ; 53. 6) and by Robinson (Lex. art. ἵνα, I. τελικῶς II. ἐκβατικῶς, with the " Note ") ; the elaborate article of Wahl (Lex. ἵνα) also deserves attention.) Tholuck, who here takes εἰς τό as equivalent to ὥστε (in an ecbatic sense), explains that God taught men by his works, not by any means for the purpose of depriving them of all excuse, but in order that they might thus learn to know him. Winer (§ 44. 6) refers to the Greek idiom, according to which a preposition with the article in any oblique case often precedes the infinitive, and remarks (note 3) that of the several prepositions illustrated, εἰς is used to designate as well the effect or *result* as the end or *design*. Of this twofold use of εἰς many illustrations may be found in Robinson's Lexicon (εἰς, 3 a. and d.). In 1 Cor. x. 6, εἰς τό is rendered *to the intent* (telic), but in 2 Cor. viii. 6 it is unquestionably found in an ecbatic sense, namely *insomuch that*, or is equivalent to ὥστε. According to this view of the passage, which is generally entertained, the marginal rendering misrepresents the apostle's meaning, which the textual version alone correctly expresses.

Romans i. 28: οὐκ ἐδοκίμασαν τὸν θεὸν ἔχειν ἐν ἐπιγνώσει ; Vulg., *non probaverunt Deum habere in notitia* (Cod. Amiatinus, *in notitiam*) ; E. V., *they did not like to retain God in their knowledge* — margin, *they did not like to acknowledge God ;* Germ., *gleichwie sie nicht geachtet haben, dass sie Gott erkenneten ;* Tynd., *it seemed not good unto them to be aknown of God ;* Cranm., Gen., Bish., *they regarded not to know God ;* Rheims, *they liked not to have God in knowledge ;* Erasm., *non probaverunt ut Deum agnoscereat ;* Mart. and Osterv., *ils ne se sont pas souciés de connaître Dieu* (lit. they did not care to know God). What was it that they declined to do?

Did they deliberately and consciously refrain from doing it?
The reader will observe a considerable diversity of opinions
manifested in these several versions.   Lange takes δοκιμάζειν
as equivalent to δόκιμον ἡγεῖσθαι, and holds that ἐχ. ἐν ἐπιγ.
is stronger than the simple γινώσκειν; he translates: "They
did not regard God as worthy to appropriate him to them-
selves in knowledge."   Some interpreters, however, hold
that δοκιμάζω may here be taken as essentially equivalent to
the phrase, to think it worth while (fere i.q. operae pretium
non duxerunt. Wahl. Lex.), and so Seiler and van Ess trans-
late (der Muehe werth) much as the two French versions
do; a contemptuous indifference on their part is, in that case,
indicated by the apostle.   Tyndale's version implies a judg-
ment of the mind rather than a corrupt feeling of the heart.
The marginal rendering obviously leans on that of Erasmus.
We might be uncertain whether his agnosco is here equiva-
to the simple nosco, or to the compound cognosco, or whether
he uses the word in its etymological sense, as equivalent to
ad se noscere, that is, to know an object in its relation to us;
but his own comment, which Tholuck quotes with approba-
tion, explains the sense in which he uses the word, namely
non visum est illis deum quem cognoscebant, agnoscere et
venerari.   He assumes apparently that they did know God,
but would not acknowledge (own, recognise) and revere him.
Still this interpretation is not perfectly satisfactory.   The
persons who are meant are " men who hold the truth in un-
righteousness " (v. 18).   Gentiles are usually assumed to
be indicated, in contra distinction from the Jews.   The Eng-
lish version, text, agrees with Erasmus in assuming that the
Gentiles did have a knowledge of God, but would not retain
it.   But ἔχειν with a verb like δοκιμάζω, may be taken in a
desiderative sense, indicating a desire to have or obtain that
which was lost, as well as to "retain" that which is still held.
In the former sense, the Gentiles had already lost the knowl-
edge of the true God ("who in times past suffered all nations
to walk in their own ways," Acts xiv. 16); now, although
they had a certain consciousness of having sustained such a

loss, yet after "their foolish heart was darkened" (v. 21)
they had not the inclination, the sense, or the judgment, to
seek to *regain* that knowledge.   Herein their sin consisted —
a stupid indifference, inexcusable for the reasons stated in
v. 20.   Therefore, "God gave them over," etc. (v. 28).
Neither the textual nor the marginal rendering seems to be
successful.   It will be observed that our English version
partially adopts the phraseology of Rheims, rejecting that of
the other "former translations."

Romans i. 28: εἰς ἀδόκιμον νοῦν; Vulg., *in reprobum sen-
sum*; E. V., *a reprobate mind* — margin, *a mind void of
judgment*; Germ., *in verkehrten Sinn* (i.e. a perverted mind);
Tynd., Cranm., Gen., Bish., *a lewd mind*; Rheims, *a repro-
bate sense*; Erasm., *in reprobam mentem*; Mart., *à un esprit
dépourvu de tout jugement* (a mind, spirit, void of all judg-
ment); Osterv., *à un esprit dépravé* (a depraved mind).
Some of these versions, such as the margin, and Martin,
soften the force of ἀδόκιμον.   So Beza renders *judicii expers;*
like the margin, which adopts his terms, he virtually assigns
an active sense to the word, equivalent to *qui judicare nequit.*
Calvin paraphrases, perversam mentem, *quae nihil jam pro-
bare posset.*   Lange gives to the expression the force only
of a *mean* or *base* or *worthless mind.*   Stuart, who agrees
with de Wette, assigns to the word a decidedly passive
sense, namely *rejectaneus*, or, that which is to be rejected,
unapproved; "the meaning is, *wicked* or *vile*, deserving of
condemnation or execration."   There is a great difference
between the softened version of the margin and that of the
text, if "reprobate" be taken in the sense of *abandoned,
depraved, hardened.*   In six of the eight passages in which
the Greek word occurs in the New Testament, it is translated
*reprobate*, once *castaway* (1 Cor. ix. 27), and once *rejected*
(Heb. vi. 8).   If, as some commentators assume, Paul here
intentionally introduced a paronomasia (ἐδοκίμασαν, ἀδόκι-
μον), and if the one, the verb, is equivalent simply to, "they
did not think fit, did not desire to, had not the sense to,"
etc., then ἀδόκιμον must, according to a familiar hermeneu-

tical principle. be equivalent to *senseless, foolish, worthless, mens inconsulta.* This view is sustained by the Septuagint, in which, besides Prov. xxv. 4, adduced by Robinson (Greek Lex.), the word occurs also in Isa. i. 22. In both places it represents the Hebrew word סִיגִים, that is, *scoriae, dross,* in the English version. If this interpretation be admitted, the marginal rendering is preferable to that of the text.

Romans i. 32: συνευδοκοῦσι; Vulg., *consentiunt;* E. V., *have pleasure in them* — margin, *consent with them;* Germ., *haben Gefallen an* (i.e. have pleasure in, are pleased with); Tynd., Cranm., Bish., *have pleasure in;* Gen., *favor them;* Rheims, *consent to;* Erasm., *assentiuntur;* Mart., *ils favori-sent ceux;* Osterv., *approuvent encore ceux.* There is un-questionably a great difference between an *assent* or *consent* to a certain course of action on the one hand, and, on the other, the *pleasure* or *favor* with which such a course is regarded. Robinson is undecided (Lex.), and hence defines the original in this passage, " to approve, to assent to," the former definition sustaining the English text, the latter the margin. The different degrees of turpitude ascribed to the persons here meant, which commentators, in addition to the versions above, discover in Paul's expression, are such as these: Tholuck, *billigen* (to allow or approve); de Wette and Lange, *Beifall geben* (a more decided approbation); Stuart, *commend* (not only approve, but also encourage); Olshausen, *Wohlgefallen haben.* This last version, which fully agrees with the text of the English Version, very prob-ably reproduces the emphatic remark which Paul here in-tended to make, and is hence a better version than the softened term found in the margin.

Romans ii. 9, 10: "Ελληνος, "Ελληνι; Vulg. and Erasm., *Graeci, Graeco;* E. V., *Gentile* — margin, " Gr. *Greek*"; Germ., *Griechen;* Tynd., Cranm., *Gentile;* Wiclif, Gen., Bish., Rheims, *Greek;* Mart., Osterv., *Grec.* In the Old Testament גּוֹיִם, signifying *nations* (e.g. Gen. x. 32; xiv. 1; 1 Sam. viii. 5, and frequently) was also employed emphatically in the sense of non-Israelites (e.g. Gen. x. 5; Judg. iv. 2, and frequently),

that is, pagan or heathen nations (E. V., *Gentiles*), and this *usus loquendi* reappears in ἔθνος in the New Testament. Our translators usually render this word (in the plural) *nations*, only when it was not possible to find even a remote allusion to the distinction between Jews and pagans, (e.g. Matt. xxiv. 9, 14) ; elsewhere, the same word is reproduced as *Gentiles*, e.g. Matt. vi. 32, and very frequently. But they are singularly inconsistent with themselves, not only in the Hebrew (e.g. Gen. x. 5, 32, just adduced), but also in rendering the word Ἕλλην, even when a distinction is obviously made between Jews and pagans. Thus, in Acts xiv. 1 ; xviii. 4 ; xix. 10, 17 ; xx. 21 ; Rom. i. 16 ; x. 12 ; 1 Cor. i. 24 ; Gal. iii. 28 ; Col. iii. 11, in which Ἰουδαῖος and Ἕλλην are both mentioned, the latter is translated *Greek*, whereas in Rom. ii. 9, 10 ; iii. 9 ; 1 Cor. x. 32 ; xii. 13, where the same names also occur in juxtaposition, the latter is translated *Gentile*. This inconsistency had previously appeared in the Vulgate, in the same juxtaposition of the two names ; Ἕλλην is *Graecus* in Acts xiv. 1 ; xviii. 4 ; Rom. i. 16 ; ii. 9, 10 ; iii. 9 ; x. 12 ; 1 Cor. i. 24 ; Gal. iii. 28, while the word *Gentilis* is used in precisely the same formula in Acts xix. 10, 17 ; xx. 21 ; 1 Cor. x. 32 ; xii. 13 ; Col. iii. 11. The translators would have been more consistent if they had in the present passage and elsewhere adhered to the Bishops' Bible, and inserted "Greek" in the text.

Romans ii. 15 : μεταξύ ; Vulg., *inter se invicem ;* E. V., *the mean while* — margin., *between themselves ;* Germ., *sich unter einander* (i.e. among themselves) ; Tynd., Cranm., Gen., Bish., *their thoughts accusing one another or excusing ;* Rheims, *among themselves mutually their thoughts accusing, or also defending ;* Erasm., *inter se ;* Mart., *leurs pensées s'accusant entre elles, ou aussi s'excusant ;* Osterv., *leurs pensées les accusent ou les défendent.* The question here is, whether μεταξύ (occurring nine times in the New Testament) is in this passage an adverb of time equivalent to *the mean while* of the English text (compare John iv. 31 ; Acts xiii. 42), or is a preposition governing the Genitive, of which instances

occur in Matt. xviii. 15; xxiii. 35; Luke xi. 51; Acts xv. 9, with or without the article. The English text treats the word as an adverb of time; the margin and the other versions, with Robinson (Lex.), obviously regard it as a preposition governing ἀλλήλων. Stuart concurs, and translates μετ. ἀλλ. *alternately* (between each other). Olshausen, *unter einander* (i.e. among themselves). E. Köllner had, in his Commentary on the Romans, published in 1834, like the English text, taken μεταξύ in the sense of *während dem* (i.e. while, during, in the mean time); de Wette rejects this version, and renders the word in connection with ἀλλήλων *unter einander* (i.e. among themselves). Tholuck, who adopts the exegesis of the Vulgate, and holds that μεταξύ is here equivalent to ἐναλλάξ (i.e. alternately), regards the apostle as meaning that before the tribunal of the individual's conscience (*eleganter, per prosopopoeiam*, says Fritzsche, *ad loc.*) an accusation is brought by the one party, which the other endeavors to repel. He, too, sustains the marginal English version. The most recent commentator, Lange, translates μετ. ἀλλ. *zwischen ihnen wechselsweise* (i.e. between themselves alternately). In this case the weight of authority is decidedly in favor of the marginal rendering, and the words in the English text obviously detract from the force of the apostle's words.

Romans ii. 18: δοκιμάζεις τὰ διαφέροντα; Vulg., *probas utiliora;* E. V., *thou approvest the things that are more excellent* — margin, *thou triest the things that differ;* Germ., *du prüfest was das Beste zu thun sei* (i.e. thou provest, triest what it is best to do); Tynd., *hast experience of good and bad;* Cranm., Bish., *allowest the things that be excellent;* Gen., *allowest the things that are excellent;* Rheims, *approvest the more profitable things;* Erasm., *probas eximia;* Calvin, *probas eximia* (in the translation), but *probas utilia* (in the commentary); Mart., and Osterv., *tu sais discerner ce qui est contraire.* There is a striking resemblance between this French translation and the German of Lange (Bibelwerk): *du beurtheilest die widerstreitenden Dinge* (thou judgest —

formest a judgment respecting — the conflicting things ; French, that which is contrary).   This version may be traced to the exposition of Theodoret, quoted by de Wette : ἐναντία ἀλλήλοις, δικαιοσύνην καί ἀδικίαν.   With the present passage we combine Phil. i. 10, in which precisely the same Greek words occur, namely εἰς τὸ δοκιμάζειν ὑμᾶς τὰ διαφέροντα ; Vulg., *ut probetis potiora ;* E. V., *that ye may approve things that are excellent* — margin, *that ye may try things that differ.* It is obvious that very great diversities of opinion respecting the true meaning of Paul's words, or at least the degree of emphasis with which he employs them, are presented by these several versions.   It is true that in this case both the English text and the margin may appeal successfully for support to the *usus loquendi* of the New Testament ; for not only is τὰ διαφέροντα a *vox πολυσήμαντος,* as Fritzsche observes (*ad loc.*), but the other term also is of the same character.   Δοκιμάζω, (a) to distinguish, try, examine, *discerno, non confundo,* Luke xii. 56 ; xiv. 19 ; 1 Cor. xi. 28 ; 1 Thess. v. 21 ; 1 John iv. 1 ; (b) to approve, commend, *probo,* 1 Cor. xvi. 3 ; 1 Thess. ii. 4.   Διαφέροντα ; (a) things different, *quae differunt, quae discrepant,* 1 Cor. xv. 41 ; Gal. ii. 6 ; (b) things eminent, better, *praestantia, meliora,* Matt. vi. 26 ; x. 31 ; xii. 12 ; Luke xii. 7.

This statement shows that on merely philological grounds, both the version of the text and that of the margin, with the other versions which they respectively represent, may be sustained.   Under these circumstances we are compelled to decide between the two solely on exegetical grounds.   Now in Rom. ii. 17–20, Paul freely admits the high value of the law as claimed by the Jew — it made the latter acquainted with the divine will ; its instructions (v. 18) enabled him, not only, as the margin says, somewhat unmeaningly, to " try the things that differ," but the law, as vs. 19, 20 show, also enabled the Jew to discern that knowledge is better than ignorance, and wisdom more to be desired than folly. Hence the terms before us must mean : Thou art in a position which enables thee to choose of two things that one which is really of superior value.

In the other passage (Phil. i. 10) Paul specifies the spirit-
ual gifts which he besought God to grant to the Philippians,
namely a more intelligent love (vs. 9), and that wisdom
which would enable them to. prefer the better to the worse,
in spiritual things.

Calvin's admirable remarks on the passage before us (Rom.
ii. 18), claim a special notice.  " *Nosti voluntatem, et probas
utilia.* Paul now concedes [to the Jews] the understanding
of the divine will, and the approval of useful things, for which
they were indebted to the teaching of the law.   But there is
a twofold approval ; the one is that of the [actual] choice,
namely when we adopt that good thing of which we approve;
the other is that [merely] of the judgment, when we indeed
discern the difference between an evil and a good thing, but
do not in practice at all attempt to attain the latter.   Thus
the Jews were instructed in the law, so that they could form
a judgment on points relating to morals ; but they exhibited
little solicitude to conform their conduct to that judgment "
(Tholuck's edition v. 29).   According to this view, the cor-
rectness of which does not seem to be successfully denied
by any later commentator, the translation in the text of
the English Version is far superior, in point of significance
and harmony with the context, to that which we find in the
margin.

Romans iii. 9 : προῃτιασάμεθα ; Vulg. (as usually printed),
*causati sumus* (Some manuscripts exhibit *praecausati ;* the
form *causati* depends on a various reading, ῃτιασάμεθα,
found in D G, some minuscules and Greek Fathers, but not
sanctioned by the uncial manuscripts, including Cod. Sin.) ;
E. V., *we have before proved* — margin, *we have before charged;*
Germ., *wir haben droben bewiesen* (i.e. *we have proved above*,
taking the preposition in the sense of *supra*, as Fritzsche
does, *supra argui*) ; Tynd., Cranm., Gen., *proved ;* Bish.,
*accused;* Rheims, *argued;* Erasm., *ante causis redditis ostendi-
mus ;* Mart., *nous avous ci-devant convaincu* (we have before
this established) ; Osterv. *nous avous déjà fait voir* (we have
already shown).   It is obvious that a mere *charge*, which the

margin represents Paul as saying that he had made, is very different from the assertion of the textual rendering, stating that he had actually furnished the proof. The reader will observe the want of agreement in the several versions exhibited above. Luther, Tynd., Cranm., Gen., Erasm., Mart., and Osterv., sustain the English text; the Vulg. (*causor*, to plead, accuse, defend), Bish., Rheims, seem to prefer the less positive statement which the margin furnishes. The decision depends on two points: first, does the preposition πρό here assert its usual force in compounds (place, time), or is it pleonastic (Passow, Lex. art. πρό, iii. 5 Herm., Vig , p. 860, note 417) ?   We shall doubtless not err by claiming for the preposition in this case its temporal force.   Secondly, what is the force of the simple verb ?   Now it means even in its most emphatic use, simply *to charge, to accuse*, and the compound cannot imply more than a *previous* charge or accusation.   The simple verb does not occur at all in the New Testament, with the exception of the *var. lectio* in the present passage as mentioned above, and the compound also is found only here.   Robinson assigns to it the meaning *to accuse or charge beforehand*, and here *to have already accused or charged*, referring to the two preceding chapters of the Epistle, or rather to i. 24 ; ii. 24.   Wahl's definition is somewhat stronger than Robinson's ; *ante arguo, argumentis supra allatis doceo et evinco ;* but he produces no authority for this augmented force of the word (*evinco* sustaining the English textual version), and only refers to ii. 1–5, 17–29. Bretschneider (Lex. Man. Nov. Test.) furnishes an exegetical definition, *antea accuso ;* aor. 1 *supra* i.e. in antecedentibus *accusavi seu argui*, referring, like Wahl, to chapter ii.   Grotius assigns to the word the meaning *charge* or *accuse*, rather than that of *prove ;* accusationem praestruximus, nempe i. 17, de gentibus ; ii. 9, et deinceps de Judaeis ; Tholuck, on the contrary, prefers the explanation of Ambrose, namely, *probare*.   Stuart hesitates ; on the one hand, he declares that he cannot find any evidence in the best lexicons that the Greek word in question means directly *to prove*, and

accordingly translates in his commentary, " we have already made the charge." But, on the other hand, he adds that προῃτιασάμεθα may here mean, and probably does mean, *we have shown reason why*, or, *we have supported the charge that*, etc., and in his translation of the entire Epistle appended to the commentary, he renders, " we have already made good the charge"; such a version scarcely differs, except in words, from " we have proved." De Wette, *wir haben angeklagt* (accused) ; Lange, *wir haben vorhin . . . der Schuld geziehen* (we have before accused...of being guilty). Here, too, Calvin appears to have been successful in fixing the sense of the original word with precision. He translates it, *ante consti- tuimus*, because, as he remarks, the word αἰτιᾶσθαι is, strictly speaking, a judicial term. " An accuser," he adds, " is said *crimen in actione constituere* [to present or frame an indict- ment] which he is prepared to establish by testimony and other proofs. But the apostle had summoned the whole human race to appear before the tribunal of God, so that one and the same sentence of condemnation might comprehend the whole race. It is in vain to object that the apostle here does not merely *accuse*, but that he rather *proves*," etc. Un- doubtedly, any declaration of the inspired apostle is already *per se* a proof, for he is the medium or the agent through whom the unerring God addresses us. It is not, however, probable that Paul here specially refers to his previous state- ments in chapters i. and ii., when unsupported by any facts or testimony at the same time adduced by him as being *per se* equivalent to a demonstration. His object in the present passage is to state that he concedes no higher degree of moral purity to the Jews than to the Gentiles, for, adds he, we have in the foregoing statements charged " that they are all under sin." If we have here correctly understood him, our translators, who adopted *proved* from some of the earlier ver- sions, have placed a better word — *charged* — in the margin.

Romans iii. 25 : προέθετο ; Vulg. and Erasm., *proposuit ;* E. V. *set forth* — margin, *fore-ordained* ; Germ., *hat vorge- stellet* (substantially the same as *set forth*) ; Tynd., *whom God*

*hath made;* Cranm., Gen., Bish., *set forth;* Rheims. *proposed;*
Mart., *lequel Dieu a établi* (not *established,* but *set up, set
forth*) ; Osterv., *que Dieu avait destiné (designed, intended
to be,* rather than *destined* or *decreed*) ; Olshausen adopts
Luther's word, prefixing " to men," but does not specially
explain it.  Tholuck regards *exhibere* as by far the most
appropriate definition of the original word, while Fritzsche
prefers *esse voluit,* in the sense of *destinavit.*  Stuart, who
adopts *set forth* (in medium proferre) in his translation, ex-
hibits the classical usage of the word as presented by Passow,
and then adds : " In the New Testament προτίθημι is some-
times used in the sense of *purposing, decreeing, constituting;*
e.g. Rom. i. 13 ; Eph. i. 9." But his word " sometimes "
might be understood to imply that the original term occurs
elsewhere, besides the two passages to which he here refers,
and the other which is at present under review, whereas that
term occurs only in these three passages.  Harless (Eph.
i. 9) doubts whether the Greek word ever means *praefinire,
ante constituere,* certainly not so in Rom. i. 13 and iii. 25,
and least of all in Eph. i. 9.  Here he assigns to it the mean-
ing *to purpose to one's self, to resolve on, sich vornehmen.*
Lange (see his Com. *ad loc.*) prefers the translation *to set
forth publicly,* not only on account of its affinity with classic
usage, but also on account of the correlative phrase in the
same verse, εἰς ἔνδειξιν.  Undoubtedly the marginal version
*fore-ordained,* at least in the sense of *predestinated,* is un-
supported by any good authority.  The English word "fore-
ordain," occurs only once in the text of the English version,
namely, 1 Pet. i. 20, where it represents a different Greek
word, προγινώσκω.  This latter word is elsewhere (Acts
xxvi. 5 ; Rom. viii. 29 ; xi. 2 ; 2 Pet. iii. 17) translated sim-
ply *to know, foreknow, know before.*  Under these circum-
stances the marginal version is here to be unconditionally
rejected.

Romans v. 11 : An interesting question is here presented
respecting the precise meaning of one of the *termini technici*
employed in reference to the work of Christ, — καταλλαγήν ;

Vulg. and Erasm., *reconciliationem ;* E. V., *atonement —*
margin, *reconciliation ;* Germ., *Versöhnung* (reconciliation);
Tynd., Cranm., Gen., Bish., *atonement ;* Rheims, *reconcilia-*
*tion ;* Mart. and Osterv., *réconciliation.* The Greek word
occurs four times in the New Testament ; in two cases
(2 Cor. v. 18, 19) it is rendered *reconciliation ;* in one (Rom.
xi. 15) *reconciling,* and only once, in the passage before us,
*atonement.* The verb καταλλάσσω occurs six times, and is
uniformly rendered *to reconcile.* Our translators seem here
to have been somewhat unduly influenced by the "former
translations," which, as we have just seen, adopt the word
"atonement." Now καταλλαγή, as Liddon observes in his re-
cent Bampton Lectures (2d ed., p. 478, note *n.*), "presupposes
the existence of an enmity between God and man, which is
done away," etc.    It means "*reconciliation,* specially, resto-
ration to the divine favor" (Rob. Lex.).    "The fundamental
conception connected with the word is that of an *enmity*
which is removed" (Olsh. Com., Rom. iii. 24, 25).    But the
word "atonement" is at present frequently employed to desig-
nate an *expiation* or a *satisfaction* for an offence, or an act
intended to make it good by undergoing a penalty, or mak-
ing a payment in any form that satisfactorily corresponds to
the offence.    In this sense it refers to a certain act of the
offender, without directly expressing the effect thereby pro-
duced on the state of feeling of the offended party.    Here,
however, a very satisfactory explanation of the apparent
inaccuracy of our translators may be given.    Whether or not
the word to "atone" be originally derived from *at one,* that
is, to set *at one,* or to *unite, reconcile* two parties, it is certain
that "when our translation was made it [*atonement*] signified,
as innumerable examples prove, *reconciliation,* or the mak-
ing up of a foregoing enmity — 'atonement' is 'at-one-
ment'" (Trench, Synonyms, etc., Second Part, § xxvii.).
Trench furnishes the evidence in his "Select Glossary" by
quoting from several of the earlier English writers.    Fuller,
for instance, remarks that Moses designed "to *atone* two
Israelites at variance."    Hence the *marginal* rendering, not

virtually differing from the textual, but more conformable to modern usage, is sustained not only by the Latin, German, and French versions, but also by irresistible philological evidence. We may yet add that the conjugate verb and participle, occurring in the preceding verse, had already been translated *reconciled;* consistency would require that the noun should be rendered *reconciliation.* The apostle, accordingly, does not here imply by καταλ. the *whole* mediatorial work of Christ, but exhibits the latter only in one aspect; namely, "We had been enemies but are now reconciled to God (v. 10); we can now joy in God since our *reconciliation* to God has been effected through the death of his Son."[1]

Romans v. 12: ἐφ' ᾧ; Vulg., *in quo;* E. V., *for that* — margin, *in whom;* Germ., *dieweil* (because, inasmuch as); Tynd., *in so much that;* Cranm., Gen., Bish., *in so much as;* Rheims, *in which;* Erasm., *quatenus;* Mart. and Osterv., *parce que.* This case is of special importance, as it was precisely here that Augustine found the main proof of his doctrine of the imputation of Adam's sin. Before any doctrinal influence is allowed to act, the philological question ought to be answered, whether the relative ᾧ, which constitutes a part of the phrase refers to ἀνθρώπου as the antecedent, or whether the two words, the preposition and the relative pronoun, virtually constitute one word or express one thought like διότι, καθό, ἀνθ' ὧν, etc. If we first of all investigate the *usus loquendi* of the New Testament, ἐφ' ᾧ is used in the sense of *because* or *for that* in 2 Cor. v. 4; Phil. iii. 12 (E.V.) even by the confession of the Vulgate *(eo quod);* 2 Cor. v. 4 (Winer, § 48 c. ἐπί, d. *weshalb, weil.* Rob. Lex. ἐπί ii. sq.). Fritzsche quotes a number of Greek classic writers, who employ the term in the sense of *propter id quod.* Tholuck, like almost all commentators, regards the phrase

[1] On Titmann's alleged distinction in sense between διαλλάσσειν and καταλλάσσειν, as well as on the whole passage, vs. 10, 11, Fritzsche's elaborate article (Pauli ad Rom. Ep. recensuit, etc.), presents, as usual, a vast amount of philological learning. He furnished Winer with very valuable materials for the earlier editions of the invaluable Grammar of the latter.

as one of a comparatively large class, to which ἀνθ᾽ ὧν, δι᾽ ὧν, etc. belong, and takes it in the sense of "because" or "in so far as" (deshalb weil, insofern als) for reasons which he states in full. Stuart, who fully adopts Tholuck's view, and translates *because that*, remarks in his extended philological investigation of the term, that ἐφ᾽ ᾧ does not mean *in whom* (Vulg., *in quo*); for if that had been Paul's thought he would naturally have said ἐν ᾧ; he adds that *in quo* of Augustine and some other Fathers "appears to be the result of their *theology* rather than of their philology." Even Calvin translates ἐφ᾽ ᾧ by *quandoquidem* (forasmuch as, because) in the text, and by *quoniam* (since that, because) in the commentary. He explains the words "all have sinned" as referring, not to the actual sins of men, but to their inherited or connate corruption or natural depravity, that is, original sin, which is in truth sin in the sight of God, meriting, as he adds, a divine punishment. Here, too, the version of the English text is decidedly better sustained than that of the margin.

Romans vi. 7 : δεδικαίωται; Vulg. and Erasm., *justificatus est*; E. V., *freed*—margin, " Gr. *justified*"; Germ., *gerechtfertiget* (justified); Tynd., Cranm., Rheims, Bish., *justified*; Gen., *freed*; Mart., *est quitte* (free, clear from); Osterv., *est affranchi* (freed, delivered from). It is generally conceded that δικαιόω, in its passive form, is not here employed in the special Pauline sense, *to declare or treat any one as righteous*, but rather in the sense, *to absolve, clear from*. Tholuck, who refers to 1 Pet. iv. 1, Stuart, etc., regard the word as here equivalent to ἐλευθεροῦσθαι, which occurs in v. 18 below. So too, Lange, in his translation gives as an equivalent term *losgesprochen* (acquitted, absolved, released). Δικαιόω is found nearly forty times in the New Testament, and is uniformly translated *to justify*, except in this passage and Rev. xxii. 11. As justification by faith is not meant here, our translators are fully sustained in preferring *freed* of the Genevese translation to *justified* of the other "former translations." See Lange on the whole passage.

Romans vi. 13 : ὅπλα; Vulg. and Erasm., *arma*; E. V.,

*instruments* — margin, " Gr. *arms* or *weapons* "; Germ., *Waffen* (arms, weapons) ; Tynd., Cranm., Rheims, Bish., *in-struments;* Gen., *weapons;* Mart. and Osterv., *instrumens.* This case shows very satisfactorily that our translators who in vi. 7 retained the rendering of Geneva, but here re-ject it, exercised their own independent judgment. The original word ὅπλον, by no means refers originally or specifi-cally to a *weapon,* but designates in general any object which is used as an instrument or means, e.g. the ropes, sails, etc., of a ship, the tools of a mechanic, etc.   It is true that the word was most frequently, but not exclusively, ap-plied to the instruments or weapons used by a soldier.   Now as Paul does not here prominently introduce the figure of a contest, and as παριστάνετε (*yield,* E. V.) is here equivalent simply to the word *present* or *exhibit* (Vulg. *exhibeatis*), the translators were eminently happy in adopting the word which they inserted in the text; but it must at the same time be conceded that eminent authorities have preferred the rendering *weapons.*

Romans vii. 5 : παθήματα ; Vulg., *passiones ;* E. V., *mo-tions* — margin, *passions ;* Germ, *Lüste* (lusts.   But the Ger-man *Lust* in the singular, although the case is somewhat different in the plural, as here, does not, like the modern English *Lust,* indicate at once an irregular, carnal, etc., de-sire.   The German says, for instance, that he has a *Lust* to take a walk, to sing, etc.   So Luther renders Phil. i. 23 *I have* " Lust " *to depart,* etc.) ; Tynd., Cranm., Bish., *Lusts ;* Gen., *motions ;* Rheims, *passions ;* Erasm., *affectus ;* Mart., *affections ;* Osterv., *passions.*   The original word occurs six-teen times in the New Testament ; in eleven cases it is trans-lated *suffering* (sing. and plur.) ; in three *afflictions ;* once (Gal. v. 24) *affections,* and only in this verse *motions.*   The Greek noun is passive in its form or character, or is like other nouns in -μα (Winer, § 16. 2), expressing mostly a result produced, or a condition ; *motions,* on the contrary is active.   The definition assigned by Robinson to the word here and in Gal. v. 24, is " passion, an affection of mind,

emotion." Olshausen takes it in the sense of *Triebe* (impulses, tendencies), but like de Wette, Tholuck, and Lange, translates *Leidenschaften* (passions) ; Stuart also, *passions*. Fritzsche translates with Erasmus, *affectus*, but paraphrases *appetitus peccata gignentes*. The translators had the choice of one of four words, presented by the several versions which they had before them: *passions, affections* (as in Gal. v. 24), *lusts*, and *motions*. The one which they decided to employ in the text obviously fails to reproduce with entire precision the thought which Paul connected with the word chosen by him.

Romans vii. 6 : ἀποθανόντες (text. rec. ; var. lect. ἀποθανόντες) ; Vulg., *soluti sumus a lege mortis* (in accordance with Beza's reading, τοῦ θανάτου ; this word is found in some uncial manuscripts (D E F G) ; but others of greater antiquity (A B C K L, and now Cod. Sin.), exhibit the nom. pl. of the participle, in place of Beza's word) ; E. V., *that being dead* (gen. sing.) — margin, *being dead to that* (nom. plur.). The gen. sing. is not adopted even by Calvin, *sumus . . . mortui*. The nom. plur. is represented in the following versions : Germ., *wir sind . . . ihm abgestorben* (Luther here follows the reading of Erasmus, from whose second edition, 1519, his version was originally made). Tynd., Cranm., Bish., *now are we . . . dead ;* Gen., *we . . . being dead ;* Mart. and Osterv., *nous . . . étant morts*. But Rheims, depending on the Vulgate, as a matter of course, exhibits, *we are loosed from the law of death*. Wiclif, governed by the same authority, translated (A.D. 1380) thus : *now we ben unbounden from the lawe of deeth*. The nom. pl. is now generally preferred by editors and commentators, both on account of the superior manuscript authority adduced in its favor, and of the grammatical aptness with which it appears in the Greek text. Hence our translators, who followed an inferior reading, placed in this case the better version in the margin.

Romans vii. 7 : ἐπιθυμίαν ; Vulg. and Erasm., *concupiscentiam ;* E. V., *lust* — margin, *concupiscence ;* Germ., *Lust ;* Tynd., Cranm., Gen., Bish., *lust ;* Rheims, *concupiscence ;*

Mart. and Osterv., *convoitise* (always in a more or less unfavorable sense). Our translators have not here observed the law of uniformity, and have been in this respect specially unfortunate in their rendering of the original word. It is not indeed always (comp. Phil. i. 23, and see above on chap. vii. 5) but usually (Rob. Lex.) employed in the New Testament in an unfavorable sense, as *prava cupiditas* in the thirty-seven cases in which it occurs, indicating, like the French word chosen by Martin and retained by Ostervald, an irregular, inordinate, or morally evil desire. Such is the force of the verb in the Septuagint, Exod. xx. 17 : οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις (Decalogue). Our translators render it thirty times, *lust, lusts;* thrice *desire;* thrice *concupiscence* (Rom. vii. 8 ; Col. iii. 5 ; 1 Thess. iv. 5). Now in the verse before us the English reader finds *lust* in the text, but in the very next verse *concupiscence,* while in both cases Paul employed the same word. So, on the other hand, ἡδονή in two out of five cases, is rendered *lusts* (plural — elsewhere *pleasures*) ; ὄρεξις, found only in Rom. i. 27, is again *lust.* Πάθος appears as *affection* in Rom. i. 26 ; Col. iii. 5 ; but as it is intimately united with the word before us in 1 Thess iv. 5 (ἐν πάθει ἐπιθυμίας), it is now rendered, " the *lust* of concupiscence." The concurrent testimony of the former non-Catholic versions probably aided in influencing them to insert *lust* in the text of the passage before us.

Romans viii. 3: περὶ ἁμαρτίας κατέκρινε; Vulg., *de peccato, damnavit* (Cod. Amiatinus, however, exhibits *propter peccatum*) ; E. V., *for sin, condemned* — margin, *by a sacrifice for sin, condemned;* Germ., *verdammete die Sünde — durch Sünde;* Tynd., Cranm., *by sin damned;* Gen., *for sin condemned;* Rheims, *of sin damned;* Bish., *by sin, condemned;* Erasm., *de peccato condemnavit;* Mart., *pour le péché, a condamné;* Osterv., *et pour le péché, et il a condamné.* This verse presents several difficulties connected both with its punctuation and with its exegesis. It will be observed that our English version follows Gen. and Bish. by placing a comma before the verb. Independently of the general punc-

tuation and exegesis of the entire verse, which points are
not germane to the matter of this Article, the marginal ren-
dering of περὶ ἁμαρτίας is specially noteworthy, on account
of the very decided exegetical character which it assumes.
The two Greek words may, according to Tholuck, mean
either *on account of*, *in reference to*, *sin*, or else, taking ἁμαρ-
τίας here in the sense of *sin-offering*, *sacrifice for sin*, they
mean *for a sacrifice for sin*, that is, God sent his Son for, or,
in order to be (περὶ) a sacrifice for sin.    This interpretation
is as old at least as Origen, who, according to Rufinus, un-
derstood the word in the sense of *piaculare sacrificium*.
Tholuck prefers the former meaning, in accordance with the
exegesis of Theophylact and Oecumenius, both of whom
understood περὶ in the sense of ἕνεκα, although eminent
commentators (Augustine, Calvin, Melanchthon, etc.) prefer
the second or metonymical sense as expressed in the margin.
Tholuck admits that ἁμαρτίαν bears this metonymical sense
in 2 Cor. v. 21, where our translators give simply " sin,"
without any marginal note.    He adds, first, that Philo, when
he employs the phrase περὶ ἁμαρ., which is now before us,
really means ἡ θυσία περὶ ἁμ. (comp. Heb. v. 1) ; and sec-
ondly, that the Septuagint translates אָשָׁם by περὶ ἁμ.    This
Hebrew word undoubtedly does mean in various passages, a
sacrifice for fault or guilt, E. V., a trespass-offering (Rob.
Heb. Lex., p. 95), and, accordingly, one of the definitions
of ἁμαρτία given by Schleusner (Nov. Thes. sive Lex. in
LXX) is *sacrificium piaculare*.    We find, for instance, in
Isa. liii. 10, that this Hebrew word is employed according to
some interpreters, not in its primitive sense of *fault*, *guilt*, as
in Gen. xxvi. 10, but in that of *piaculum*, that is, *a sacrifice
by which an expiation is made for a sin*.    Rosenmüller (Scho-
lia in Vet. Test. ii. 697, *ad loc.*) says : Nomen אָשָׁם proprie
*delictum*, *culpam* notare constat, hinc *sacrificium quo delic-
tum expiatur*, *piaculum*, etc.    Hence the English version
renders it there *an offering for sin*, but in the margin simply
*an offering;* the Sept. περὶ ἁμαρτίας ; Vulg., *pro peccato;*
Germ., *Schuldopper*, which in English is *trespass-offering*.

Stuart regards the phrase περὶ ἁμ. as equivalent to the fuller
form προσφορὰ περὶ ἁμ. (found in Heb. x. 18), and as cor-
responding to the Hebrew חַטָּאת, sin-offering; so it is ren-
dered in Exod. xxix. 14, 36 in the English version, while
the Sept. gives only ἁμαρτία, Vulg., pro peccato.  The same
word in Lev. v. 7 is again translated sin-offering (following
Luther's Sündopfer), but the Sept. now renders περὶ τῆς
ἁμαρτίας, while the Vulg. adheres to pro peccato.  But the
trespass-offering of Tholuck and the sin-offering of Stuart
are very carefully distinguished in the Mosaic law (see the
passages in Rob. Lex. אָשָׁם), so that the terms cannot be used
interchangeably.  (On this interesting and somewhat obscure
subject, see Keil: Handb. d. Bibl. Archaeol. § 45 sqq. ; J. H.
Kurtz: Alttest. Opfercultus, §§ 93–105 ; Kliefoth : Gottes-
dienst-Ordnung i. 47 sqq., 70 sqq., and the references in
Herzog, Encyk. xxii. 350, 370, Schuldopfer, Sündopfer.)
When Stuart prepared the second edition of his Commentary
he found great difficulty in determining the sense of the
preposition περί, and ultimately concluded, after modifying
his former statement, to translate simply "on account of sin,
condemned."   Calvin translates de peccato, but explains the
Greek as being used pro expiatrice victima, quae אָשָׁם dicitur
Hebraeis; he takes περί in a causal sense.  To his view
Olshausen decidedly objects; he translates on account of sin,
that is, sin was the cause or occasion.  He says that ἁμαρτία
cannot possibly be shown to be equivalent to אָשָׁם, and holds
that the apostle here sets forth in unequivocal terms the
vicarious and atoning death of Christ.  Lange, who quotes
the opinions of various commentators, translates like Ols-
hausen, um der Sünde willen (on account of him).  Here
de Wette substantially agrees with them, and translates
wegen der Sünde, understanding, however, this phrase (on
account of sin) to mean, " namely, in order to free men from
sin."   In view of the doubtful interpretation of ἁμαρτία here
in any other than the usual sense, our translators have wisely
retained in the text the simple translation " sin."

Romans viii. 22: πᾶσα ἡ κτίσις ; Vulg. and Erasm., omnis

creatura; E. V., the whole creation — margin, every creature; Germ., alle Creatur; Tynd., Cranm., Gen., Rheims, Bish., every creature; Mart. and Osterv., toutes les créatures (plur. all creatures). This passage is certainly one of the most difficult which can be found in the Pauline writings, mainly on account of the word κτίσις, which occurs four times in vs. 19–22. Our translators were obviously embarrassed in this case. They rendered the word thrice (vs. 19–21) by creature; but in v. 22 they find πᾶσα with the article prefixed to it, and now we read creation.[1] Undoubtedly in such a case πᾶς may be taken as equivalent to ὅλος. In Matt. xvi. 26 we read τὸν κόσμον ὅλον; in 1 John ii. 2, ὅλου τοῦ κόσμου; in both cases the English version renders the whole world; but in Matt. viii. 32, the whole herd, for πᾶσα ἡ ἀγέλη. In the present case our translators depart in the text not only from all the "former translations," but also from their own rendering of κτίσις in the preceding three verses. They were doubtless perplexed by the vast variety of interpretations given to the word. We have no room to recapitulate these; indeed, nearly all of the more recent commentators (Thol., Ols., Stu., Lange, etc.) have performed that task. We state simply, in order to furnish an illustration of the uncommonly wide divergence of views, even where no doctrinal system is directly involved, that while κτίσις. according to Stuart, means exclusively mankind in general, gens humana, it means, according to de Wette, precisely the opposite, namely, animate and inanimate nature, exclusive of the human race. Robinson (Lex.) assigns to the word in the four connected verses the meaning creation in general, the universe. We are probably not wrong in wishing that our translators had reversed the positions assigned respectively to the textual and the marginal renderings.

[1] Trench (On the Authorized Version, etc., chap. iv. ult.), gives a list of several Greek verbs, for which respectively the translators have given many English equivalents. On the same subject, see Angus's Hand-Book, § 118. We may here add that in the nineteen cases in which κτίσις occurs in the N. T., it is rendered creation six times, creature eleven times, building once (Heb. ix. 11), and ordinance once (1 Pet. ii. 13).

Romans ix. 3 : ἀνάθεμα ; Vulg. and Erasm., *anathema ;* E. V., *accursed* — margin, *separated ;* Germ., *verbannet ;* Tynd., Cranm., Bish., *cursed ;* Gen., *separate* ; Rheims, *anathema ;* Mart. *séparé ;* Osterv., *anathéme à cause de Christ.* Calvin exhibits in his Latin version *anathema esse à Christo,* and explains : allusit ad nomen anathematis, quum dixit, A Christo : nam a segregando dictum est. He under stands Paul as here expressing a willingness to suffer even " eternal death " if he could thereby secure the salvation of his kinsmen according to the flesh. But as Paul, according to Calvin's own statement here, already knew that his salva-tion was established on the election of God, which could in no wise fail or be annulled (salutem suam Dei electione fun-datam esse noverat), the actual meaning of Paul is not satis-factorily explained . by Calvin. Tholuck demonstrates the great extent of his philological and patristic learning, in an elaborate investigation of the sense of this passage ; the result is found in his version, *geschieden* (separated). Fritzsche, who expended even more time and labor on this passage than Tholuck, and who exhibits the immense wealth of his learning in examining it, gives the following as the result : Hoc igitur Paulus dicit : nempe optarem *me ipsum (non solum alium quemplam Judaeorum amicum,* quo voto non summum erga Judaeos amorem declararem) hominem esse divinae irae subjectum et a Christo avulsum *in hominum qui mihi fratrum loco sunt emolumentum,* i.e. *ut popularibus meis prodessem.* Olshausen translates *verflucht* (cursed). Stuart translates ἀνάθεμα by *devoted to destruction by Christ.* His extended remarks on the passage are founded mainly on the matter presented by Calvin and Tholuck. De Wette, who explains the passage in his usual terse but lucid manner, supposes that Paul here understood " destruction (bodily and spiritual) afar from Christ." Lange, whose Commen-tary deserves special attention here, translates : " I did (at one time) make the vow to be a devoted one (or, accursed, *Verbannter*)." The passage undoubtedly admits of a great diversity of interpretations, and for exegetical purposes the

various readings connected with the whole verse ought to be consulted. Our translators, who rendered ἀνάθεμα *accursed* in 1 Cor. xii. 3 ; Gal. i. 8, 9, retain this word in the present case, and assigned the weaker *separated* to the margin.

Romans ix. 4 : διαθῆκαι ; Vulg., *testamentum* (but some manuscripts, followed by Erasm., exhibit testamenta) ; E. V., *covenants* — margin, *testaments ;* Germ., *der Bund* (the covenant. Luther here followed the reading of B D E F J, namely, διαθήκη, and Lachmann retained it, but Tischendorf and other editors, influenced by A C K and now by Cod., Sin., exhibit the plural) ; Tynd., Cranm., Gen., Bish., *covenants ;* Rheims, *testament ;* Mart. and Osterv., *les alliances* (but we find the word " pactions" in an earlier revision of the French Bible, which was printed by Robert Estienne in 1553, and with which Calvin is said to have been connected). The Greek word appears to have embarrassed the translators as much as the Hebrew שְׁאוֹל. The latter they often translated " hell" (e.g. Job xxvi. 6 ; Isa. v. 14), whereas the all-devouring *Sheol* is the " grave" in 1 Sam. ii. 6 ; 1 Kings ii. 9 ; Prov. i. 12 ; xxx. 16 ; but in Numb. xvi. 30, 33 ; Job xvii. 16, it is the "pit." In many of these cases no marginal version gives a choice to the reader. In Ps. xlix. 15, *grave* appears in the text, but *hell* in the margin. In Hos. xiii. 14, on the other hand, we read *grave* twice, without any indication that a different version is possible ; but when this passage is quoted in 1 Cor. xv. 55, while *grave* occurs in the text for the corresponding Greek word ᾅδης, *hell* is exhibited in the margin. In an analogous case, Ps. xvi. 10, and Acts ii. 27, 31, the margin exhibits no various rendering. The word διαθήκη is treated nearly in the same manner. It occurs (sing. and plur.) thirty-three times in the New Testament ; in thirteen passages it is translated *testament*, in twenty it appears in the character of a *covenant*. The embarrassment of the translators is strikingly exhibited in Heb. vii. 22 and viii. 6, in both of which passages precisely the same words occur, namely κρείττονος διαθήκης. In the former the phrase is rendered *better testament ;* in the latter we find a

*better covenant*, but now the margin offers *testament*. There can be little doubt that while a *testament*, in the sense of a person's " will respecting the disposition of his property after death," is very different from a " covenant between two parties," the rendering of διαθήκη in the New Testament as a *covenant*, corresponding to the usual sense of בְּרִית (for instance, in Exod. xxiv. 7), is exegetically admissible in every case in which it occurs in the New Testament, except, as some interpreters believe, in Heb. ix. 16, 17. It is here only that Wahl assigns to the word the meaning of *testamentum*, while he elsewhere takes the word as equivalent to *foedus*, and Robinson adopts the same course. The classic *usus loquendi* has no more right to determine the *Christian* sense of the word, than it has to inform us of the apostolical meaning of words like πίστις, ζωή, μετάνοια, etc. Tholuck, Stuart, Lange, etc., translate in Rom. ix. 4 *covenants*. Ebrard (continuation of Olshausen) follows several earlier commentators in recognizing only *covenant* as the true translation even in Heb. ix. 16, 17 (on the whole passage, ix. 15–23), and adduces strong evidence to show that no other than this usual sense can consistently be found in it. The objections of Moll (Lange's Bibelwerk) to the results of Ebrard's renewed investigation, do not seem to invalidate the arguments of the latter; at least, even while the word διαθέμενος is not entirely cleared from difficulty by Ebrard's exegesis, at least Moll leaves several of Ebrard's positions in all their strength. The circumstance that the Vulgate exhibits *testamentum* instead of *foedus* has no force here, inasmuch as it habitually so renders the Greek word, even where no necessity for it existed, e.g. Acts vii. 8; Gal. iv. 24; Heb. ix. 4. Our translators have doubtless decided wisely by placing *testaments* in the margin, at least in the passage before us.

Romans xii. 16 : τοῖς ταπεινοῖς συναπαγόμενοι ; Vulg., *humilibus consentientes* ; E. V., *condescend to men of low estate* — margin, *be contented with mean things* ; Germ., *haltet euch herunter zu den Niedrigen* (keep yourselves down with, or, attach yourselves to, lowly persons) ; Tynd., Cranm., Gen.,

Bish., *make yourselves equal to them of the lower sort* ; Rheims, *consenting to the humble* ; Mart., *vous accommodant aux choses basses* (things) ; Osterv., *marchez avec les humbles* (persons). The point here is, whether, on the one hand, ταπεινοῖς is a neuter adjective like ὑψηλά in the same verse, as Robinson decides ("led away by lowly things") and Martin translates; or whether, on the other hand, it is an adjective of the masculine gender, as most interpreters and the text of the English version determine.    The difficulty attending the interpretation is increased by the circumstance that it is doubtful whether συναπαγ. is here used in a favorable or an unfavorable sense ; the latter is the case in the other two passages in which the word occurs (Gal. ii. 13 ; 2 Pet. iii. 17). This difficulty is evaded, but not overcome, by those commentators who take the word in the sense of συμπορεύομαι.    Some who take ταπ. as a neut. adj. (Calv., de Wette, Stuart, etc.) are led to do so by the preceding apparently antithetic ὑψηλά. But Lange, who translates *dem zug der Geringen hingegeben* (yielding or submitting to the drawing of the lowly) very successfully destroys the force of this argument, by observing that the introduction of an entirely different word, συναπ., which does not correspond to φρονοῦντες, at least modifies the supposed antithesis, so that the correspondence assumed to exist between the two adjectives, does not really exist. If he is right *men* in the English text is better than *things* in the margin, even if neither *condescend* in the former nor *be contented* in the latter, should precisely represent the true meaning of the original term.

We had originally intended to introduce *all* the marginal renderings of at least one Epistle, for the purpose of illustrating the general subject ; but the large space which this plan would require made it necessary for us to exclude several of the less important renderings which the margin exhibits. Our object will be fully attained if this Article should happily influence any reader to give renewed attention to this interesting subject.