

THE
CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN.

No. XXX.—JUNE, 1881.

THE REVISED NEW TESTAMENT.

“The NEW TESTAMENT of Our Lord and Saviour JESUS CHRIST, translated out of the Greek, being the Version set forth, A.D. 1611. Compared with the most ancient authorities, and revised, A.D. 1881.”

THE Church of God, the Book of God, and the Day of God are the three pillars of Christian society and civilisation. Remove them, and Europe and America will relapse into heathenism and barbarism. The Bible is not a book simply, it is an institution, an omnipresent and perennial power in the Church ; it is the voice of the living God, enlightening, converting, warning, and cheering men, and preparing them for usefulness in this world, and eternal happiness in the world to come. It rules from the pulpit, it presides at the family altar, it touches human life at every point from the cradle to the grave. The Bible retains with advancing age the dew and freshness of youth, and re-adapts itself in ever-improving versions to every age in every civilised land. It is now more extensively studied than ever, in 200 languages and dialects, and thereby proves its superiority above all other books.

The history of the Bible is the history of Christianity, and to a considerable extent also the history of language and literature. The English-speaking people of both hemispheres are built upon the English Bible, as the Jewish people are built upon the Hebrew Scriptures. The Bible has moulded our language, laws, habits, and home-life, and inspired all that is best and most enduring in our civilisation and literature. If Christianity has at this day a stronger hold upon the English race than any other, and makes them the chief missionaries of the world, it is due to their regard for the Bible, as the sacred ark of every household and the written conscience of every soul.

In the history of England, the principal epochs are inaugurated by a new version or a revision of the Holy Scriptures for public use. The partial version of the Venerable Bede, in the eighth century, represents

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, June, 1881.]

the Saxon-English and the Saxon period ; Wiclif's version of the entire Latin Vulgate, completed in 1380, represents the Norman-English of the Middle Ages preparatory to the Reformation ; the versions of the Scriptures made from the original Greek and Hebrew, beginning with Tyndale's New Testament in 1526, and culminating in the authorised version of 1611, represent the creative period of the Reformation and the golden age of English literature ; the revision of King James's version, begun in 1870, reflects the language and Biblical learning of Anglo-American Christianity. The New Testament of this revision is now before the public, just 500 years after the issue of the first complete English version of the Scriptures ; and the fate of the New Testament revision will decide the fate of the Old, which may be expected to follow in two or three years.

A work which was made possible only by a rare combination of providential circumstances, and which is the product of ten years' joint labour of Biblical scholars from all denominations using King James's version, must necessarily attract universal attention, and has every prospect of becoming, at no distant time, the generally accepted version in England and the United States. It is, we may say, a republication of the Gospel to the English-speaking races. It will stimulate comparative Bible study for the next few years more than all the Bible Societies could do by the distribution of millions of copies of the old version. Thousands and tens of thousands will buy and read the revision from mere curiosity, if from no higher motive, and many will be led thereby into sympathy with the spirit of the New Testament, and find in it their guide to life and peace. Should this be the only effect, it will be worth all the trouble and care spent upon the revision.

If this movement should fail to meet the popular approval, the whole subject of a common revision for common use must be indefinitely dismissed ; and the task of correcting King James must be left to unauthorised and often incompetent private and sectarian enterprise. But the unquestionable superiority of this last revision over every preceding version as to purity of text, accuracy and consistency of rendering, and catholicity of spirit and aim, is a sufficient reason for its adoption in both countries.

It is too late now to warn scholars against touching the sacred ark and unsettling the faith of the Churches. The public mind is unsettled already. Confidence in King James's version has long been shaken by preachers from the pulpit, by private translation, and by all sorts of commentaries. Even the American Bible Society has done its share in this direction, some twenty years ago, by the appointment of a Committee, which was to secure the purest text of the King James's version, and which discovered no less than twenty-four thousand variations in six editions of the same. The only way to re-settle the public mind and to restore confidence, is the adoption of a new standard version in which all can agree, and which it will require much learning and more presump-

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, June, 1881.]

tion for any preachers with little Greek and less Hebrew to attack and criticise in the pulpit, to the disturbance of the devotion of the congregation.

But there are special reasons why the American Churches should adopt it without hesitation, even without waiting for the action of England: it is the first and the only popular version in which America has had a share; it proceeds, not from royal authority, but from the Churches and from the people; it is not the exclusive product of the Church of England, but of all the other Churches which, since King James's times, have proceeded from that venerable body, and which now constitute more than one-half of English-speaking Christendom. Hereafter, English Dissenters and all the leading denominations of America will be able, as never before, to join with the Church of England in claiming, honouring, and loving the English Bible as their own. The revision will thus not only make the good old Bible clearer to the understanding, but also dearer to the heart of Anglo-American Christendom. And this is the chief practical benefit which we hope from the revision.

The work will no doubt be most carefully scrutinised in every quarter, and pass through a purgatory of criticism before it can be accepted and authorised for public use. Some critics will denounce it as too conservative, others as too radical; some will blame or commend it because it differs so little, others because it differs so much from the old version; some will be agreeably surprised how much it reads like the old familiar book, with all its sacred associations; others will be equally gratified with the innumerable improvements which the ordinary reader and hearer will scarcely perceive, but which a careful comparison with the Greek will at once commend to every scholar, as a better equivalent for the original. God has not promised inspired and infallible translators any more than infallible printers, commentators, and readers, but he expects the Church to employ all her energies and opportunities in the study and application of the inexhaustible truths of His Word. A perfect version cannot be expected from imperfect man. A work made by many and for many must be a compromise, and a compromise implies the sacrifice of individual preferences for the general acceptability of the whole. With these necessary limitations, the revision will be adjudged, by the common sense of the people, to be on the whole the best version for popular use which the combined scholarship of the English and American Churches could produce for our age, as the version which it is intended to supersede was the best which the scholarship the Church of England could produce in the seventeenth century.

But our purpose in this article is not so much to criticise the merits of the work—which can be done better by scholars who had no connection with the Revision Committees—as to furnish the material for forming a just and correct judgment.

The present revision is no new version, but professedly based upon King James's version, and retains its idiom and vocabulary. It simply

resumes the movement of revision which continued during the whole century of the Reformation, and resulted in regular progress from Tyn-dale's New Testament (1526, last revision, 1534), to Coverdale's Bible (1535), Matthew's (John Rogers') Bible (1537), the Great Bible (1539), Cranmer's Bible (1540), the Geneva Bible (1550), and the Bishops' Bible (1568 and 1572), to what is called King James's Bible (1611). The revision will be found to be a greater improvement upon the present authorised version than this was upon its predecessors, and yet as careful and conscientious in retaining the excellences and charms of its parentage, and thus perpetuating the inestimable blessing of the common inheritance of one popular English Bible among the English-speaking Christians.

In an article like this we cannot traverse the whole field. We confine ourselves to pointing out two of the chief advantages which the new revision has over the English version—a purer text and freedom from mistranslations.

THE TEXT.

God has not chosen to preserve the original text of the Bible by a perpetual miracle. He has wisely left room for the pious labour of the Church; but we have an abundance of material for ascertaining the text of the apostolic writers with a greater degree of certainty than is the case with any ancient author. Nor has He provided for infallible copyists any more than for infallible printers. With all our increased facilities, and the combined care of editors, printers, and stereotypers, there are thousands of variations in the editions of the *English* version.*

* The first and second issues of 1611 are disfigured by many serious typographical errors—as “*Judas*” for “*Jesus*” (Matt. xxvi. 36); “*hoops*” for “*hooks*” (Exod. xxxviii. 11); “*ye shall not eat*” for “*ye shall eat*” (Lev. xvii. 14); “*deliver the spoiler*” for “*the spoiled*” (Jer. xxii. 3); “*poured it*” for “*poured it not*” (Ezek. xxiv. 7); “*plaine*” for “*plague*” (Lev. xiii. 56); “*fel*” for “*fetch*” (Jer. xxxvi. 21); “*shewed them*” for “*hewed them*” (Hosea vi. 5); “*some place*” for “*one place*” (1 Cor. xiv. 23). The edition of 1613, while omitting some of the old errors, has some new ones—as “*the fast of the beast*” for “*the fat of the beast*” (Lev. vii. 25); “*water*” for “*matter*” (1 Sam. x. 16); “*were*” for “*year*” (2 Kings xxii. 3); “*in the throne of David*” for “*in the room of David*” (2 Chron. vi. 10); “*shined through darkness*” for “*walked*” (Job. xxix. 3); “*she delighted herself*” for “*she defiled herself*” (Ezek. xxiii. 7); “*I praise you*” for “*I praise you not*” (1 Cor. xi. 17). In many editions “*enticed*” is substituted for “*enriched*,” “*eject*” for “*elect*,” “*leadeth them not*” for “*leadeth them out*.” The edition of Barker & Bill, in 1631, omitted the essential “*not*” in the seventh commandment (Exod. xx. 14), and is therefore called the “*wicked*” Bible. The printer was fined £300 by Archbishop Laud for changing the prohibition of adultery into a command. See, for these and many other errors, Dr. Eadie, “*The English Bible*,” vol. ii. p. 291 sqq., and the instructive “*Report of the Committee on Versions*,” of the American Bible Society, adopted 1st May, 1851 (printed at the American Bible Society's Press, New York), pp. 11 sqq. Dr. Eadie says, “*It would take a goodly volume to contain the misprints of the various editions*.” The late Mr. James Lenox showed me a copy in his possession, printed during the reign of Cromwell, where the “*nurture and admonition of the Lord*” in Eph. vi. 4 is perverted into “*nurture and fornication*.” The so-called “*Vinegar Bible*,” printed at Oxford in 1717, substitutes “*vinegar*” for “*vineyard*” in Luke xiii. 7. The typographical error, “*strain*”

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, June, 1881.]

The autographs of the apostles, like all ancient writings on ordinary paper, are hopelessly lost. We depend upon copies, the oldest of which were made on durable parchment and written in large uncial letters. These copies, and copies of copies, have only gradually been brought to light and examined.

The English version, like all other Protestant versions of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, is made from the *textus receptus* (so called), which was based upon a few late manuscripts before the material for the science of textual criticism was collected. It existed in four printed editions or families of editions of the Greek Testament which do not vary much. These are (1.) The Greek Testament of Erasmus, which was first published in 1516, at Basle, and again, with numerous corrections, in 1519, 1522, 1527 (besides a Venice edition of 1518 and a Paris edition of 1543), 1535. (2.) The Complutensian Polyglott, not published till 1520 at Alcalá in Spain (though printed in 1514). (3.) The Greek Testament of Robert Stephens, issued four times at Paris, 1546, 1549, 1550 (the "royal" edition), 1551. (4.) The Greek Testament of Beza, at Geneva, 1565, 1576, 1582, 1589, 1598. The edition of Beza (1589) was more followed than any other, owing to the great authority which this surviving patriarch of the race of reformers enjoyed at that time in the Church of England. But Beza's edition was based upon Stephens' edition of 1550, and this upon the fourth edition of Erasmus (1527).

Since that time, a large number of MSS., more or less complete, in all about 1760 (according to Scrivener, *Introd.*, p. 269), have been discovered and collated. The oldest and most valuable uncial MSS. have been made accessible only in recent times, as Codex Aleph or Sinaiticus, and Codex B or Vaticanus, which date from the fourth century, and are again based, of course, upon still older MSS. Besides, the ancient versions and the very numerous quotations in the writings of the Greek and Latin Fathers have been compared. From these three sources there has

at a gnat," instead of "strain out a gnat" (Matt. xxiii. 24), is perpetuated to this day in all editions. Truly, the Bible is a patient book, as its author is a God of patience and longsuffering. The number of errors was greatly increased by foreign reprints during the commotions of the Commonwealth, and attracted the attention of the Westminster Assembly. Dr. Blayney's edition of 1769 is the result of three or four years' honest and faithful labour, and was long regarded as a standard, yet, when it was compared for Eyre & Strahan's edition of 1806, it contained no fewer than 116 errors. Eyre & Strahan's quarto edition of 1813, which was endorsed by the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, is by no means faultless, and has such blunders as "about" for "above" (2 Cor. xii. 2); "holy body" for "whole body" (Eph. iv. 16). See Eadie, ii. 305, 306. America, where the publication of the Bible is not protected by copyright as in England, has vastly added to the number of variations. The American Bible Society's Committee on Versions state, in the Report already quoted (p. 31), as the result of their comparison of six editions (the edition of the American Bible Society, the original edition of 1611, and three British editions of Oxford, Cambridge, and Edinburgh), that they found nearly twenty-four thousand variations in the text and punctuation. But they add, "Of all this great number, there is not one which mars the integrity of the text, or affects any doctrine or precept of the Bible."

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, June, 1881.]

been collected an apparatus of various readings, which in the last century amounted to 30,000, and at this present time to about 150,000. The collecting and sifting of this apparatus has been an immense labour, to which many of the ablest and most faithful scholars—as Mill, Wetstein, Bengel, Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Scrivener, Westcott, and Hort—have devoted the best part of their time and industry. The large mass of readings, fortunately, does not affect a single article of faith, and very few materially affect the sense. They are, moreover, a positive advantage for ascertaining the original text, and they supersede the necessity of resorting to conjecture, as in the case of many of the best classical writers of Greece and Rome, of which we have but one or a few copies, filled with all sorts of errors. There has been a gradual approach to substantial unanimity among critical scholars in deciding the original text from the sources at hand, and there is little prospect of material changes to be effected by any new discoveries. The best textual critics are now agreed on the principle first suggested by Bentley and Bengel, and first carried out (though with a limited range of sources) by Lachmann, that the oldest MSS. versions and quotations, being nearest the apostolic age, must be made the basis of the text. In other words, the cursive text must give way to the uncial text, the mediæval to the Nicene or Ante-Nicene, the *textus receptus* to a new text, which is in fact the oldest, though later as to the time of discovery.

The chief advantage of the uncial text is its greater purity and simplicity. The *textus receptus* is encumbered with many words and sentences which were originally explanatory or rubrical glosses on the margin, and gradually found their way into the text, such as parallel words and passages from other writings (especially the gospels), doxologies, liturgical formulas, the repetition of proper names supplied for the reading lessons. Sometimes the uncial reading is more difficult, yet on closer inspection stronger. It is a sound canon of criticism to prefer the difficult to the more easy reading (*lectio difficilior principatum tenet*), because it is more easy to account for a change of an obscure expression into a familiar one than conversely.

The revision is based upon this oldest attainable text, as we find it chiefly in the Vatican and Sinaitic MSS., in the earliest Latin and Syriac versions, and in the Ante-Nicene Fathers of the second and third centuries. No critical edition has been slavishly or exclusively followed; but the Greek Testaments of Lachmann (the large edition of 1850), Tischendorf (the 8th edition of 1876), Tregelles (completed in 1880), and confidential copies of the still unpublished edition of Westcott and Hort (the labour of more than twenty years), have been constantly and conscientiously used.

We may divide the departures of the uncial text of the revision from the "received text" into three classes: omissions, doubtful readings, and changes. We will notice the most important ones in the order of the books.

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, June, 1881.]

1. Omissions.

Matt. vi. 13, the doxology of the Lord's Prayer. It is not found in any of the great uncials (B.D.), nor in the Latin Vulgate, nor in the early expositions of the Fathers (Origen, Tertullian, Cyprian), nor in the parallel passage of Luke xi. 4. On the other hand, it is supported by the Peshito and other Oriental versions, and by Chrysostom (d. 407). For this reason, the revision notices it on the margin. It is, no doubt, a liturgical insertion of the fourth century, borrowed substantially from 1 Chron. xxix. 11 ("Thine, O Lord, is the greatness, and the power, and the glory, and the majesty"), and from the custom of the Christians in the East who prayed the Lord's Prayer with this appropriate conclusion; comp. similar doxologies in 1 Tim. i. 17; 2 Tim. iv. 18. The custom will not be affected by this omission. In the Episcopal Church, the Prayer is used in both ways, with and without the doxology.

John v. 4, and part of verse 3, are omitted, but noticed in the margin. The weight of authority is against these words, though already known to Tertullian, early in the third century. They were, no doubt, first a marginal gloss which expressed a popular superstition from which St. John was free.

Acts viii. 37 is probably inserted from an early baptismal liturgy, and is already quoted by Irenæus in the second century, but missing in all the uncial MSS. of the Acts, except E, and hence relegated to the margin.

1 John v. 7, 8: The passage which speaks of the three heavenly witnesses is not found in any known Greek MS. except two of very late date (one from the fifteenth and one from the sixteenth century), nor in any ancient version except the Latin Vulgate (exclusive of the best MSS.), nor in any of the Greek Fathers, who undoubtedly would have quoted it among their proof-texts in favour of the doctrine of the Holy Trinity. Internal evidence is likewise against it: John would not have written "the Father, *the Word*, and the Holy Ghost," but "the Father, *the Son*, and the Holy Ghost." The case is so clear that the unanimous voice of the critical editors has ruled it out of the text, and the Revision does not even notice the spurious passage. The doctrine of the Trinity loses nothing by this omission, as it rests on far stronger ground, even the whole Trinitarian revelation of God in the works of creation, redemption, and sanctification.

2. *Doubtful Passages*, which are no part of the original text, but nevertheless, of apostolic origin. These are retained in the Revision, with a marginal note stating the facts in the case.

Mark xvi. 9-20: This conclusion of the second Gospel is not contained in the Sinaitic and Vatican MSS. (but the latter has a blank space), and was missing in the best copies, according to the express testimony of Eusebius, Jerome, and other Fathers. It has not the characteristic style of Mark, and contains seventeen words not elsewhere found in his

gospel. On the other hand, the section makes a much better close than ver. 8, and is already quoted by Irenæus (about A.D. 170), without the slightest misgiving. It was possibly added in a posthumous edition of the Gospel, after the first edition had been multiplied by several copies.

John vii. 53–viii. 11, the section regarding the woman taken in adultery. It is enclosed in brackets, with the marginal note: “Most of the ancient authorities omit John vii. 53–viii. 11, Those which contain it vary much from each other.” The internal evidence is likewise against the Johannean origin, for it interrupts the connection between vii. 52 and viii. 12; it presents an unusual number of variations, and it differs from the style of the fourth gospel. On the other hand, the story is truly Christ-like, and was known to Jerome, who found it “in many manuscripts, both Greek and Latin.” Hence it may be concluded that it is a real occurrence, which was handed down orally from the apostolic age, and was afterwards inserted here, or at the end of Luke xxi., or at the close of the gospel of John. Motives of delicacy or prudence would more easily account for the omission than for the insertion. Bishop Lightfoot suggests that it was one of the illustrative anecdotes of Papias, a pupil of John in Asia Minor.

3. *Changes.*

Matt. xix. 1: “Why askest thou me concerning that which is good? One there is who is good.” This gives a clearer sense than the received text.

Mark iii. 29: “Whosoever shall blaspheme against the Holy Spirit hath never forgiveness, but is guilty of an eternal *sin*,” instead of “eternal damnation.” The true reading (*ἀμαρτήματος*) suggests an important clue to the nature of the unpardonable sin—namely, its perpetuity.

Acts xv. 23: “The apostles and the elder brethren,” for “the apostles, and the elders, and the brethren.”

Acts xviii. 5: “Paul was constrained by the word (*τῷ λόγῳ*); instead of “was pressed in spirit” (*τῷ πνεύματι*).

Rom. v. 1: “Let us have (*ἔχωμεν*) peace,” for “we have (*ἔχομεν*) peace.” The better approved reading (the hortative subjunctive) represents the peace which follows the act of justification by faith, as something to be laid hold of, as a treasure to be increased and held fast by our own exertion.

1 Tim. iii. 16: “Who was manifested in the flesh,” for “God,” &c. In the Greek language, the words “God” (*θεός*) and “who” (*ὅς*) sound very much alike, and are often abridged in the MSS. in a way that makes it easy to confound them— $\Theta\bar{\Sigma}$ (*θεός*) and $O\Sigma$ (*ὅς*). The uncials favour *ὅς*, with the doubtful exception of the Alexandrian (A). It is also preferable as the more difficult reading. It is probably a quotation from a Christian hymn, and refers to God or to Christ. It does not affect the doctrine of the Divinity of the Saviour.

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, June, 1881.]

Apoc. xvii. 8 : The beast that thou sawest was, and is not ; and is about to come up. . . . When they behold the beast, how that he was, and is not, and *shall come*" (literally, shall be present, *παρέσται*). Here the Greek version gives the contradictory sentence : "The beast that was, and is not, and yet is" (*καίπερ ἔστιν*).

MIS-TRANSLATIONS.

Mark x. 4 and Mark iii. 18, now read, "Simon the *Canaanæan*" (an Aramaic word meaning "Zealot," comp. Luke vi. 15 ; Acts i. 13), instead of "the Canaanite." None of the apostles belonged to the race of the Canaanites.

Matt. xiv. 8 : "She (the daughter of Herodias) being *put forward* (or urged on, impelled) by her mother ;" instead of "*being before instructed*" (which the Greek *προβιβασθεῖσα* from *προβιβάζω*, to push forward, to investigate, can never mean).

Matt. xv. 27 : "Yea, Lord, *for even* the dogs eat of the crumbs which fall from their master's table ;" instead of "*yet,*" which prevents the meaning and destroys the force of the argument of the woman, who puts in her plea on the very ground of the Lord's words.

Matt. xxviii. 19 : "Baptizing them *into* (*εἰς*) the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost," for "*in* the name," comp. Gal. iii. 27 (baptized *into* Christ) ; 1 Cor. x. 2 (*into* Moses) ; Acts viii. 16 (*into* the name) ; 1 Cor. i. 13 (*into* the name). The Greek preposition denotes motion and direction. Baptism is an introduction into the covenant and communion with the triune God.

Luke iii. 23 : "Jesus Himself, when He began (to teach), was about thirty years of age ;" instead of "Jesus Himself *began to be about* thirty years of age."

John x. 16 : "They shall become one *flock* (*ποίμνη*), one shepherd ;" instead of "There shall be one *fold* (which would require *αἰλή*, occurring in the same verse) *and* one shepherd." There may be many folds (denominations and church organisations) for the one flock under the one shepherd.

Acts ii. 3 : "And there appeared unto them tongues *parting asunder* (or distributing themselves, *διαμεριζόμεναι*), like as of fire," for "*cloven* tongues."

Acts ii. 47 ; "The Lord added to them day by day those that *were being saved*" (in the process of salvation, or "were saved") ; instead of "such as *should be saved,*" which the Greek (*τοὺς σωζομένους*) does not admit. This mistake has been attributed to a Calvinistic bias of King James's revisers, who were certainly very much influenced by Beza.

Acts iii. 19, 20, "*that so seasons of refreshment may come from the presence of the Lord ; and that he may send the Christ,*" for "*when the times of refreshing shall come*" ; and he *shall send* Jesus Christ" ; instead of "*when the times of refreshing shall come,*" &c.

Acts xii. 4 : "*Passover*" for "*Easter*." The well known *Jewish* festival is meant.

Acts xxvi. 28 : "*With but little persuasion* (*ἐν ὀλίγῳ*) thou wouldest fain make me a Christian." The English Vulgate "*Almost* thou persuadedest me to be a Christian," gives very good sense, but is against the Greek.

Rom. iii. 25 : "*Because of the passing over* (or *prætermission* *διὰ τὴν πάρεσιν*) of sins done aforetime," instead of "for the *remission* of sins that are passed." The *prætermission* of sins is an act of God's long-suffering, *remission* (*ἄφεσις*) an act of God's mercy ; the former is a postponement, the latter a granting of pardon.

1 Cor. vi. 4 : "I know nothing *against myself*; yet am I not hereby justified; but he that judgeth me is the Lord," instead of "I know nothing *by myself*." This use of "by" is an obsolete and misleading archaism.

Gal. iv. 13 : "*Because of an infirmity of the flesh* (*δι' ἀσθένειαν τῆς σαρκός*) I preached the gospel unto you," instead of "*through infirmity*." The physical infirmity was the occasion, not the condition of Paul's preaching to the Galatians.

1 Tim vi. 5 : "Supposing that godliness is a *way of gain*," instead of "*gain is godliness*," which turns the subject into the predicate and makes nonsense or bad sense.

Heb. xi. 13 : "Having *greeted* them (the promises) *from afar*" (*ἀσπασάμενοι*), instead of "*embraced* them."

1 Pet. iii. 21 : "The *interrogation* of a good conscience toward God," instead of "the *answer*." The interpretation of *ἐπερώτημα* is doubtful ; yet it cannot mean an *answer*, but inquiry or seeking after God.

The term *Hades* is uniformly (except in one passage) mistranslated *hell* (like *Gehenna*), so that in the English New Testament the fearful word *hell* occurs twenty-two times, while in the Greek Testament the corresponding word (*γέεννα*) occurs only twelve times. *Hades* (*ᾅδης*) is not the place of eternal punishment, but the intermediate state of disembodied spirits, or the place of the departed.

Far more numerous than actual errors are the inaccuracies and inconsistencies of the English version, arising from an imperfect knowledge of the Greek grammar and needless variations. In this respect, the Revision presents to the careful observer improvements in every chapter, which do not materially alter the sense, but bring out the meaning of the writer more clearly and forcibly.

PHILIP SCHAFF.