

T H E
Free Presbyterian Magazine
AND MONTHLY RECORD

Vol. LXVI.

June, 1961

No. 2

**THREE HUNDRED AND FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY
OF AUTHORISED VERSION**

It is right and proper that we should, in the pages of the Magazine, place on record our deep and unmoved attachment not only to the Bible as the Word of God but to the Authorised Version of the Bible, when 1961 heralds the 350th Anniversary of its publication and use by the Church of God in this land.

We are publishing in this issue articles by three of our ministers which bear on the subject. We regret, through indisposition, that we are unable to write something that might be suitable as an opening article in this issue. But we may observe, in conclusion, that in England, Scotland, Wales and Ireland, many, many thousands of precious souls were brought to the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ, through reading the Bible in the Authorised Version, and by the preaching of the Gospel by servants of Jesus Christ, whose study, doctrine and preaching were bound up with the Authorised Version of God's holy Word. What is needed today in the Churches is not a new translation of the Bible, but a God-given realisation of the fact that men need a new creation by the power of the Holy Spirit, in order to their salvation from a state of sin into a state of grace.

**THE AUTHORISED VERSION OF THE HOLY BIBLE
1611—1961**

By Rev. M. Macsween, M.A.

As indicated in the title, this year marks the three hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the famous Authorised Version of the English Bible.

Two Versions of the Scriptures were in public use during the reign of Queen Elizabeth and at the beginning of the reign of King James VI of Scotland and I of England. These Versions

were, the Bishops' Bible, which was used at Court and in the Churches, and the Geneva Bible, which was in more common use in the homes of the people.

Neither gave universal satisfaction, and it was felt by all parties that an entirely new Version must be prepared sooner or later. This was brought about in a simple way, as most great undertakings are. A Conference was held at Hampton Court, London, on January 16th, 1604. Certain Church differences and questions were discussed, in which the King took a great interest. In the course of these proceedings, the Puritan, Dr. John Reynolds, proposed a new translation of the Bible.

The King disliked the two Versions then in use, and consented to have the Puritan suggestion carried out, thus silencing the opposition of many of the Conformist party. The hand of the Lord was thus to be seen very early in the proceedings, for the King's hatred of Puritans and Presbyterians is well known.

It will now be necessary, however, to sketch the background a little.

Wycliffe's unprinted Bible, the first ever given to the English people, appeared in 1380.

The first printed English New Testament appeared in 1526 (and the Pentateuch in 1531) from the hands of the godly and learned William Tyndale, who was martyred in 1536.

The first complete printed English Bible—that of Myles Coverdale—appeared in 1535, and a revised edition of it, called Matthew's Bible, appeared in 1537.

In 1540 the Great or Cranmer Bible appeared. This was simply a careful revision of what had gone before. Then, in 1560, the first complete English Bible, translated throughout from the original tongues, was published at Geneva, and was called the Geneva Bible. It was marked by accurate scholarship and fidelity to the original text of Scripture. It had marginal comments and was the first in which words not found in the original texts were printed in italics. This Bible, because of its superiority in translation, showed up the imperfections of the Great Bible, and in large measure displaced it.

The ecclesiastical leaders in England, however, were displeased with the anti-prelatic sentiments of the marginal comments of the Geneva Bible, and they accordingly ordered a revision of the Great Bible. Into this revision—known as the Bishop's Bible—some of the Genevan renderings and external features (such as the division of the whole Bible into verses) were introduced.

The Bishop's Bible first appeared in 1568. A second edition followed in 1572. It did not, however, reach the standard of the Geneva Bible.

In 1602 another edition of the Bishop's Bible was published, and the Authorised Version of 1611 was formally a revision of this edition. All existing English versions, along with every available foreign version, ancient and recent Latin translations, the Peshito, and the Targums lay before the translators, for whose guidance a list of fifteen rules was issued by the King. The translators embraced most of the leading Classical and Oriental scholars in the country.

Fifty-four translators were named by King James, but this number was reduced to forty-seven through death and other causes. Of this number six Committees were formed, two of which sat at Oxford, two at Cambridge, and two at Westminster. Andrewes, Bishop of Winchester, who presided over the whole body of translators, was a man of vast learning in Hebrew, Syriac and Greek. We are told that he was familiar with sixteen other languages. Then there was Lively, Regius Professor of Hebrew at Cambridge; Hardinge, Regius Professor of Hebrew at Oxford; Downes, Regius Professor of Greek at Cambridge; Perin, Regius Professor Greek at Oxford, and Holland, Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford—to name but a few of this illustrious body of men. The translators of the Authorised Version, however, were eminent for piety as well as for scholarship. They were men who feared the Lord and loved His Word. They were men of prayer, who watered their work with prayers for divine help and guidance in every part of their work. That the Holy Spirit abundantly answered their prayers is seen in His blessing their work to untold numbers since 1611. The King insisted that this new translation from the original Hebrew and Greek should be free from all marginal comments, and the Authorised Version was thus received by all non-Roman Catholic English-speaking people as their own Bible above all other Versions. After about seven years of diligent and prayerful labour, this noble and renowned work appeared to crown the work of Bible translation. As each committee finished the particular part of Scripture assigned to them, their work was subjected to the scrutiny and criticism of all the other Committees, one by one. Thus each part of the Bible came before the whole body of the translators. A final Committee then reviewed the whole work when finished. The Preface, entitled "The Translators to the Reader," was composed by Dr. Miles Smith, and is not to be confused with the Epistle Dedicatory, which begins with the words, "To the Most High

and Mighty Prince James." The latter appears in all editions of the Authorised Version, but the former has generally been omitted from most editions. In this Preface, the translators justify the general principle of Bible translations in the vernacular, and in particular the work of translation on which they were themselves engaged. They acknowledge the worth of the earlier English translations and say of their predecessors in this work that "they deserve to be had of us and of posterity in everlasting remembrance. Blessed be they, and most honoured be their name, that break the ice, and give the onset upon that which helpeth forward to the saving of souls." Although printed by His Majesty's special command, and appointed to be read in churches, the Authorised Version was not forced upon the acceptance of church and people by the civil power. On the whole, the wise measures adopted, and the number and character of the translators engaged in the work inspired general confidence, while the translation itself—so accurate and yet so vigorous and elevated in style and diction—commanded love and respect, and has continued to do so for three hundred and fifty years. We may well say that the Authorised Version has established itself as the English Bible by sheer merit. It is not perfect, but its faults are few and unimportant. In more recent editions the spelling has been a good deal modernised and marginal references have been expanded.

We cull the following from the public press of March 24th, 1961. The letter begins as follows, "Sir, May I, an Armenian, be allowed to express my opinion about the adverse criticism which has again been levelled against the Authorised Version of the Bible since the issue of the latest new translation of The New Testament? We are told that the language of the Authorised Version is incomprehensible. What is incomprehensible to me is how men and women whose mother-tongue is English cannot understand its language, whereas I, a foreigner, understand it perfectly. In fact, I learned most of my English from the Authorised Version." The writer, a doctor, goes on to say that for twenty-five years he read a chapter of the Bible every morning and evening. He states that not only has this practice deepened his spiritual life but has also greatly enhanced his knowledge of the English language. He says further, "I have no hesitation whatsoever in asserting that the Authorised Version of the Bible is not only the greatest book in English literature, but that it is also the greatest classic in the world."

Throughout the greater part of the work, and especially in the New Testament, the salutary influence of one man especially is

plainly to be seen. That man is William Tyndale, a man of God, whose great resolve was to give the Bible to the common people in their own tongue. Tyndale was highly skilled in seven languages—Hebrew, Greek, Latin, Italian, French, Spanish, English—and his translations themselves bear abundant evidence of his ability to consult the originals. There is no book existent in English comparable to the New Testament in the Authorised Version for overall accuracy, power and sublimity. When we say this, we remember that Tyndale's 1534 New Testament is—next to the original—the real foundation of the Authorised Version of the New Testament. The Authorised Version is indeed unapproached in all the attempted improvements of more recent scholars, many of whom were quite unsuitable for such work, being men of heterodox views—such as the denial of the plenary inspiration of the Holy Scriptures in the original tongues, and the denial of the Virgin Birth. Among the memorable expressions that have come down from Tyndale into the Authorised Version are the following: Philippians 2: 7—"But made Himself of no reputation"—in that wonderful passage re the Deity, humiliation and exaltation of the Lord Jesus Christ: Matthew 6: 28—"Consider the lilies of the field how they grow:"; and Matthew 7: 27—" . . . and it fell: and great was the fall of it " re the parable of the Two Builders. What a revelation his own words give us of the man who, above all others, has left his mark on the New Testament of the Authorised Version! Tyndale writes as follows in the Preface to his 1534 New Testament Edition: "My part be not in Christ if mine heart be not to follow and live according as I teach, and also if mine heart weep not night and day for mine own sin and other men's indifferently, beseeching God to convert us all, and to take His wrath from us, and to be merciful as well to all other men as to mine own soul, caring for the wealth of the realm I was born in, for the King and all that are thereof, as a tender-hearted mother would do for her only son."

We note with pleasure that the Trinitarian Bible Society this year presents a Commemoration Edition of the 1611 Authorised Version. This Society declares in the third law of its constitution that—"This Society shall circulate the Holy Scriptures as comprised in the Canonical Books of the Old and New Testaments without note or comment to the exclusion of the Apocrypha. The copies in the English language shall be those of the Authorised Version." We are further informed that, "In presenting this Commemoration Edition the Society pays tribute to the excellence of this Version, which is an inestimable part of our Protestant

heritage, has been the means of spiritual enrichment to millions of readers for 350 years, and remains peerless among the English translations of the Bible."

It is for us as a Church to maintain the exclusive use of our noble Authorised Version in our worship in English. "Thy God hath commanded thy strength: strengthen, O God, that which Thou hast wrought for us." Psalm 68: 28.

SOME ENGLISH VERSIONS OF THE BIBLE

By Rev. A. F. MacKay, M.A.

The Authorised Version of the English Bible has enjoyed throughout the three and a half centuries of its existence a transcendent place in the English-speaking world, and Sir Frederic Kenyon rightly says "As a work of literature, the A.V. is unrivalled, and it has been an inestimable benefit to the English people that they received the Bible in a dress of so much dignity and beauty of expression." Many attempts have been made to account for the commanding position the A.V. occupies in our national life. Apart from the unique character of the Bible, the message of salvation it unfolds and the authoritative standard of speech and conduct it sets before men, there is no doubt that what constitutes its appeal are the literary excellence and dignity of its language.

After the Authorised Version

The English Bible is the greatest gift of the Reformation, which has profoundly influenced the history of our people. The work of translating the Scriptures into English goes back many centuries, to the time of the Venerable Bede in the 8th century, King Alfred in the 9th, down to the time of Wycliffe and others who followed him. These translations, however, were made from the Latin Vulgate, itself a translation, from which the first knowledge of the Bible in English came to these shores. This work, completed by Jerome towards the end of the 4th century at the request of Damasus, Bishop of Rome, was a translation direct from Hebrew and also from some Greek MSS into Latin and became the recognised version of Latin Christianity for centuries. The Vulgate is still the standard version of the Roman Catholic Church today. Luther had translated the Bible into German with the aid of the best Hebrew and Greek scholarship of the day, and his Bible became the most powerful weapon in the work of the German Reformation. In this country a big step forward was taken when Erasmus published his Greek N.T. in 1516 from

original Greek MSS, with the hope that some day parts of it would be sung in the fields. This work fired William Tyndale, the true father of the English Bible, with the determination to give his countrymen a worthy translation of the Bible so that the lad who drove the plough might be acquainted with the Word of God in his own tongue. The widespread demand for a pure, uniform translation of the Bible, stimulated by the various editions of the Bible which successively appeared, such as the Great Bible, the Geneva Bible and the Bishops' Bible, was taken up by James I and the royal command bore fruit several years later in the publication of the Authorised Version in 1611, or as it is sometimes called, the 'King James' Version.' This noble translation gathered together the best of the labours of earlier workers, translations of single books as well as complete versions of the Bible, including the Roman Catholic Rheims-Douai Bible, whose influence can still be traced in such Latinised phrases as 'provoke to emulation' (Rom. xi: v.14); 'wise in your own conceits' (Rom. xii: v.16). The impress of William Tyndale's stately and graceful English is present throughout the whole work.

Although the A.V. of the Bible approved itself at once to the people and soon outstripped every competitor as an adequate and authoritative version, the work of translation went steadily on. The next two centuries witnessed at intervals the publication of versions of the Scriptures, mainly of a private nature, designed to promote the religious beliefs of small groups, such as Whitby's Paraphrase and Commentary on the N.T. in 1703, in which the post-millennial view of the Second Advent of Christ is advocated. As the work of evangelising the country proceeded, new translations of the Bible appeared. With the spread of Methodism, John Wesley published in 1755 his translation of the N.T. with notes which was a revised edition of the A.V. intended to make the Word of God clearer to his followers, 'for the plain, unlettered men who understand only their own tongue.' His revision shows that the Greek text had been carefully studied. A few years later a 'New and Literal Translation' of the Bible appeared, the work of a Quaker, Anthony Purver, which came to be known as the "Quaker Bible," in which well-known Scripture phrases were dressed in highly flowery language; 'the flowers appear on the earth,' in Song of Solomon ii: v.12, becomes 'Earth's lap displays her infant flowers.' Later, towards the end of the century, a translation by Gilbert Wakefield, a Unitarian, was published. J. N. Darby, a leader of the Brethren movement who published also translations in both German and French, produced a new translation. Since the appearance of the A.V., the R.C.

Rheims-Douai Bible had undergone from time to time slight alterations, but about the end of the 18th century, Bishop Challoner gave a thorough revision to the Bible for English-speaking Roman Catholics. As Challoner was a pervert from Protestantism, and was familiar with the A.V., his work bears clear traces of his acquaintance with the idiomatic, nervous style of the A.V. It was not until towards the end of the 19th century that the demand arose among scholars for an authoritative revision of the A.V. Individual editions of the N.T. were printed, notably those of such scholars as Dean Alford, Conybeare and Howson who prepared their text from the Greek MSS. Finally, a Revised Version of the complete Bible was published, the N.T. in 1881, and the O.T. in 1884, based upon the A.V. under the title, *The Revised Version of the Holy Bible*.

The Revised Version, 1881 and 1884

This Revision was an Anglican venture. Both Houses of Convocation of York and Canterbury in 1870 appointed a committee to draw up a scheme of revision of the A.V., and finally two companies of biblical scholars were set up to undertake the work, one responsible for the O.T. and the other for the N.T. These companies were composed of scholars from Britain, Scotland being well represented, and all shades of religious belief were enlisted; J. H. Newman, the pervert to Romanism, could not accept, though invited, but Dr. Vance Smith, a pronounced Unitarian, did join the N.T. company. The terms laid down to guide their work made clear that the A.V. and the text underlying that version should be adhered to strictly and every departure and change justified only for the strongest reasons, generous use to be made of marginal references. With this work American scholars were asked to co-operate and eventually from about 1872 American parallel companies were formed, one for the O.T. and the other for the N.T., keeping in close touch with their counterparts in this country. The Apocrypha was set on one side till the completed work was published, then the revisers were formed into committees and the Revised Version of the Apocrypha appeared in 1896. In this work the American revisers took no part. The completed work of the Revised Version of both Old and New Testaments, when it appeared, met with a mixed reception, being assailed by conservative scholars on widely different grounds.

With regard to the work of the O.T. company, the terms of reference given to them were almost literally complied with, but for reasons which lay outside the control of the revisers themselves. With the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 A.D., the

need for preserving the sacred text of Hebrew scripture became pressing and accordingly a body of Hebrew scholars made an intensive study of all the available Hebrew MSS, which dated from the earliest centuries before the Christian era. From these MSS a standard consonantal text was constructed about 100 A.D. Later scholars, to make easier the reading of the text composed entirely of consonants without vowel markings, in the synagogue, added vowel signs; to these notes were inserted before and after the text and longer notes in the margin. It was the practice of the Jewish scholars after fixing the true text of Scripture, to relegate the old MSS, along with those which had become unfit for use or were outdated, to a lumber room to await destruction. Thus one standard Massoretic text came to prevail in the Jewish Church, and the ancient MSS supporting it destroyed. At present archæological research has unearthed some of these documents of a fairly early date, which escaped destruction, but the revisers of the A.V. in 1611 were confined to MSS which dated no earlier than the 9th century, apart from the Massoretic text and the Septuagint, a Greek version of the O.T. made at Alexandria in the 3rd century B.C., which agrees largely with it. Dr. Driver has admitted: "The age and authorship of the books of the O.T. can be determined, so far as is possible, only upon the basis of the internal evidence supplied by the books themselves; no external evidence worthy of credit exists." The Revisers also admitted that the state of their knowledge did not justify any attempt at reconstructing the O.T. text. They were therefore compelled to adopt the Massoretic text and as a result the A.V. has suffered at their hands to a very limited extent; obscurities and ambiguities have been removed, the Hebrew poetical passages, such as the Psalms, Job, etc., have been given poetical form. The text which in the A.V. has been broken up into individual verses has been arranged into larger paragraphs, at the same time retaining the verse numbers; the headings of the chapters and pages have been left untouched, since extended notes would be needed to replace them. To only a small degree also has the high literary standard of the A.V. suffered.

Conditions facing the N.T. company were altogether different. Great advances in the study of the Greek language, especially of the N.T. Koine, had been made in the interval since the A.V. had appeared, and a wealth of ancient Greek documents and manuscripts had come to light, many of these much older than any of those available to the A.V. translators. In particular, Codex Aleph of the 4th century and Codex Alexandrinus of the 5th century, both in the British Museum, contain the greater

part of the Bible; Codex Vaticanus, known as Codex B, about the same date as Codex Aleph, is preserved in the Vatican Library. With these a wealth of papyrus fragments dating from the second century to the tenth, lectionaries used in public worship and other MSS are calculated to amount to about 4,500 in all. While the original books of the N.T. in Greek had perished, these ancient documents had survived which could now be consulted in deciding the true text of Scripture.

The N.T. company who faced this task numbered among its members J. B. Lightfoot, Moulton, W. Milligan, Scrivener, and the two Cambridge scholars, Westcott and Hort. When the company began its work it became apparent that they were divided by two radically opposed views of the methods by which the work of revision should be approached. The conservative view favoured the text of the A.V. while the majority of revisers supported what is known as the Alexandrian text. The A.V. translators of 1611 depended upon a small handful of MSS which underlay the text of Erasmus' Greek N.T. and the later edition of Beza's Greek N.T. printed in 1598, which agreed largely with Erasmus. These Versions followed what came to be termed the Byzantine Text, regarded as the uniform text dating back to the earliest centuries of the Greek Church, adopted as the standard text of the Greek Church through the greater part of her history, the Byzantine period, 312-1453 A.D. This text represents a revision of the N.T. made in the 4th century A.D. The Byzantine text also came to be known as the "received text" which also indicates the Greek text of the A.V. This text received strong advocacy from Dr. Scrivener, who was generally regarded with Hort as the foremost N.T. scholar of his day. The main body of revisers, however, supported the liberal theories of the Westcott and Hort school. Shortly before the work of revision was undertaken, Hort, in collaboration with Westcott, had prepared a Greek N.T. on principles of criticism which he explained in his celebrated Introduction to the Edition. Hort based his principles of textual criticism upon an elaborate theory of families of manuscripts and textual readings, under which he attempted to classify the mass of early documents, which also provided a reference by which he could estimate their value. The Byzantine or Received Text, Hort dismissed as the work of some unknown Greek-speaking Christian who lived in Syria about 150 A.D. who deliberately set himself to re-write the N.T. The Westcott and Hort Edition of the N.T., based largely upon the Alexandrian Text, appeared a few days before the Revised Version, and is reckoned to differ from the Received Text in some 6,000 places. This work was

known to the Revisers who consulted its readings and were greatly influenced by Westcott and Hort. Scrivener was consistently outvoted. The R.V. of the N.T. in many places agrees with the text of Westcott and Hort.

When the Revised Version of the N.T. appeared the work was trenchantly and unsparingly attacked by W. Burgon, Dean of Chichester, a textual scholar of eminence. Burgon had a biting wit and scathing tongue, and as he had already done fine work in critical research, he spoke with assurance and knowledge, and his strictures were never seriously answered. Today, Professor Bruce can say that few scholars of standing support the Received Text. Time has also modified the high estimate of the Alexandrian text so confidently asserted by Westcott and Hort, but such a statement is of little consequence in the unsettled state of N.T. critical studies at present.

The completed Bible in the Revised Version has up to the present failed to supersede the A.V. in the affections of our people, and making every allowance for the obstacles in the way of the R.V. ever doing so, there are reasons which may be mentioned which explain this failure. The glorious doctrines of the Bible demand dignified expression in language worthy of the contents of divine revelation, and unlike the A.V. which is the work of masters of English prose, the R.V. too often, especially in the N.T., falls below this standard. The O.T. fares better as far as dignity of the language is concerned, but the N.T. company were dominated by Westcott and Hort who were both at the time Professors at Cambridge, and a method of translation was adopted which prevailed at Cambridge, by which literary style and grace were sacrificed in favour of close, literal renderings. The result is often stilted, pedantic expressions which contrast strikingly with the N.T. in the A.V. Besides, the companies in both the Old and New Testaments were influenced by critical theories of the text of scripture which were defective. This is especially true of the N.T. scholars who favoured the attitude of the Westcott-Hort school whose principles of criticism were founded upon a mere handful of very ancient but thoroughly unreliable MSS. The discovery of the Sinaitic Codex in romantic circumstances in the St. Catherine Monastery on Mount Sion decided Hort on a completely new translation of the N.T. in the light of this and other ancient discoveries. B. B. Warfield allows his admiration of these scholars to outrun his discretion, but even he has to admit of Hort: "He looked upon B as an infallible voice proceeding from the Vatican, and upon the combination of B Aleph as a manifest deliverance from heaven itself."

In reliance upon these unsafe guides, these passages have been omitted from the N.T. in its Revised Version: "the descent of the angel into the pool" (John v: v.4); "the woman taken in adultery" (John vii: v.53-viii: v.11), placed within brackets as though an interpolation; "the conclusion of the Lord's Prayer" (Matt. vi: v.13); the last twelve verses of Mark (Mark xvi: verses 9-20), added as an appendix; "the Three Heavenly Witnesses" (I John v: v.7), in disregard of context and of ordinary rules of Greek grammar; "the words on the Cross, 'Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do'" (Luke xxiii: v.34) enclosed by Westcott-Hort in double brackets, indicating that in their view these words had no claim to a place in the text, but the Revisers had the good sense to include them. All these passages have satisfactory MS authority in their support, but their rejection was decided by B Aleph MSS from which they are absent. Burgon described these ancient documents as "products of the school of philosophy and teaching which found its vent in semi-arian and homœan opinions; they were among the most corrupt copies in existence." Lastly, the Revisers treated their work in the spirit of pure scholarship with little awareness or reverence for the precious body of truth contained in scripture. Their decisions were taken entirely upon the text by placing documents and texts against others, with no thought of the superintending providence which must be regarded as being exercised by the Lord over the sacred text. Such a purely secular attitude disposes of the truth, for instance, of divine inspiration, for this doctrine is of little value to the Church if the original autographs which alone possess inerrancy and infallibility are lost or corrupted in transmission among a multitude of ancient documents. The handful of documents representing the "Received Text," we believe, have a much better claim to continue the pure line of God's inspired Word than numerous documents from which it must be elicited as a result of the industry, insight and scholarship of textual critics. The Revised Version has, therefore, been consigned a place in public regard subordinate to the A.V. whose supremacy remains unchallenged, and may serve a useful purpose in supplementing the A.V., as today is actually the case, when the R.V. is widely used in schools, colleges and universities.

Recent English Versions

The American Committee under Philip Schaff, an eminent American scholar, in their exchanges with the British revisers in 1872, desired more extensive changes in the A.V. than they were willing to allow, and accordingly when the R.V. appeared, the American revisers held aloof, and brought out their own Revised

Version in 1901, known as the American Standard Version. The work is practically an American edition of the R.V., the differences between them being slight, relating to the divine name in the O.T. which becomes 'Jehovah,' while the British R.V. retains the titles, 'Lord, God'; the Lord's prayer opens with the words: 'Our Father who are in heaven.' The prevailing text in the N.T. is that of the Westcott-Hort Edition, the Alexandrian text. A thorough revision of the work was begun in 1938 at the instance of the churches and theological seminaries in America through the body known as The International Committee of Religious Education. The N.T. appeared in 1946 and the O.T. in 1952, when the complete Bible was published under the name, The Revised Standard Version. The use of the A.V. version of 'Lord' for the divine name is restored instead of 'Jehovah'; the pronoun in the second person, 'thou,' 'thy,' etc., are dropped and replaced by the direct 'you,' 'yours,' etc., except where the divine being is addressed; this change makes for ambiguity, as when Christ before his ascension is addressed as you, but after, as thou. The work was well advertised in advance with favourable public notices which, however, did not save it from severe criticism. From the beginning of the present century, modern English translations of the Bible, no doubt given an impetus by dissatisfaction with the Revised Version, and also arising from the urge to utilise the fresh information and important evidence supplied by manuscript material turned up in the East, have come in a stream from the press. A further attempt of this kind is the Twentieth Century New Testament, published anonymously by a company of 20 translators in 3 parts between 1898 and 1901. The text followed is the Westcott-Hort Greek edition, its purpose being "the desire to mediate the word of God in plainer English idiom."

Among English-speaking Roman Catholics the need was felt for a more adequate and uniform English version of the Latin Bible as a revision of the many corrupt Latin copies of the Vulgate and even a new translation into English were considered to be long overdue. The Council of Trent in 1546 in view of the corrupt state of the Latin versions of Jerome's Vulgate in circulation ordered a new Edition to be prepared which after some delay appeared in 1592, known as the Sixto-Clementine Vulgate, still regarded today as the Authorised Version of the Roman Catholic Church. About the same time, an English translation of the Vulgate was printed, the work on the N.T. carried out at the English College at Rheims in 1582, and the O.T. at the English College at Douai in 1609-10, the well-known Rheims-Douai

Version. The production of this Version was too early to make full use of Sixto-Clementine Latin text, especially in the N.T., but when the whole Bible was revised later by the Bishop Challoner, vicar apostolic of the London district, in 1749, this deficiency was repaired when the N.T. translation was brought into line with the Latin Bible, and a very much improved translation resulted. This is no more than a translation of Jerome's Latin Vulgate which includes, mixed up with the Hebrew canonical books, the apocryphical writings, and the text, where it lends itself with any plausibility to such a purpose, is made to favour the Romanist doctrines of the church. For example, the duty of repenting is usually translated, 'do penance,' as in the words: 'Do penance for the kingdom of heaven is at hand' (Matt. iv: v.18); 'they had long done penance in sackcloth and ashes' (Matt. xi: v.21); Jacob is said to have 'adored the top of his staff' (Heb. xi: v. 21), in support of the sacrament of penance and the adoration of relics; the Greek word for 'mystery' is correctly translated throughout the N.T., but rendered 'sacrament' in Eph. v: v.32 to uphold the view of marriage as a sacrament; copious notes are added, interpreting the text in the light of Roman Catholic doctrine and tradition.

A modern revision of the Rheims-Challoner N.T. was carried out in the United States by the Episcopal Committee of the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine and published under the title, "The New Testament of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ," 1941. The Vulgate Latin text was consulted in this work throughout along with the Greek text, but notes still accompany the text, somewhat modified from previous editions, as where the qualification for a bishop 'married but once' is explained by the information that 'priestly celibacy as a law is of later ecclesiastical institution.' The O.T. has also been under consideration, not as a mere revision of the Douai-Challoner, but a new translation from the original Hebrew text is contemplated. So far Genesis has been done and at periods other books have followed. The Westminster Version of the Sacred Scriptures, prepared under the late Cuthbert Lattey, S.J., is a much more finished production with introductions and commentaries upon the books. The N.T. was completed in 1935, a pocket edition in 1948, and the O.T. is in course of preparation uninterrupted by the death of Lattey in 1945. The Westminster Version is not, however, an official Roman Catholic work, but is independent. A new Latin Psalter has been printed in 1945, which is not a revision of Jerome's work, but a new translation from the Hebrew, carried out by Papal commission and permitted for use in the services of the church.

These activities in the R.C. Church are not confined to these editions, but a greater and deeper interest in the Bible is apparent both on the other side of the Atlantic and in this country.

Individual Versions

There is little difficulty in deciding upon the name, of all the individual translators of the Bible in the twentieth century, that is best known. Professor Jas. Moffatt produced his version of the N.T. in 1913, and after an interval of years followed it with the O.T. version in 1924, and a one volume edition of the whole Bible in 1928, known as "A New Translation of the Bible." In his Preface to the O.T. Dr. Moffatt says that his aim is to "present the books of the O.T. in intelligible and effective English," and in this task calls in the aid of "modern research." Moffatt's higher critical tendencies come out in the very first verse of Genesis which begins 'This is the story of how the universe was formed,' which on a closer look is seen to be transferred from chapter ii: verse 4. The translation of this verse is loose and careless, the clear reference to 'creation' by rendering the word 'formed' avoids the doctrine of God's creation of the world out of nothing. Dr. W. L. Baxter in his pamphlet "The Bible's First Verse: Moses? or Moffatt?" severely criticises Moffatt for this change in the normal order of Genesis. Dr. Baxter was already well known for his unanswerable exposure of German rationalism in "Sanctuary and Sacrifice—A Reply to Wellhausen." Moffatt applies higher critical theories to the authorship of the first five books of the Old Testament, indicating the different sources by a change in the printed type; whole chapters are moved out of their rightful place with no hint of the disturbance to the text; words of uncertain meaning are nevertheless given positive renderings as though correct, as "sacred lots" takes the place of "Urim and Thummim." Moffatt asserts that he does not like 'gaps' in the text, and where the choice may be made, prefers to fill up the empty space with a 'guess.' This careless treatment of the word of God is characteristic of the whole of the O.T. Such words as "barge" for "Noah's Ark," and "the girls are in love with you" for "therefore do the virgins love thee" of the A.V. in Song of Solomon, chapter i: v.3, are by now familiar and degrade by their colloquialisms the Word of God.

Moffatt devoted most of his life to the study of the New Testament as Professor of Church History, and might not be expected to find himself too much at home in the O.T. His treatment of the N.T. shows no improvement on the careless and inconsistent translations of the Old. Dr Oswald T. Allis has

examined Moffatt's work to determine the merits of the N.T. in those quotations in the N.T. taken from the O.T. on which as far as concerns the question of their purity there can be no doubt, since both the Massoretic Text and the Septuagint are in agreement, and concludes that Moffatt shows "a lofty disregard of the high claims of scripture." Dr. Allis goes on to say, "He is a law unto himself. A hundred years ago, even fifty years, such a translation as Dr. Moffatt's would have aroused a storm of protest. How it will be received today is not yet clear. One thing is certain. If the generations that are gone had permitted themselves the same liberties with the Scriptures which Dr. Moffatt and other critics are taking today, there would now be no Old Testament, no Bible to which to appeal." This verdict, we believe, better days will substantiate.

Mention may be made of two translations which have come from the American press and have gained a good deal of popular favour. An American scholar, Dr. Edgar J. Goodspeed of Chicago produced a translation of the N.T. in 1923, aimed at reaching the American public to whom the A.V. though familiar in England and Scotland might be strange. Dr. Goodspeed, being an eminent papyrologist, made use of the most recent results in N.T. studies to cast light upon the Greek N.T. vocabulary. A companion volume of the O.T. under the editorship of Dr. J. M. Powis Smith and a translation of the apocrypha by Dr. Goodspeed in 1938 were added to complete the American Bible. The underlying text of the N.T. is that of Westcott and Hort. The forms of address to the Most High are modernised, but the whole work, though uneven in style since more than one hand was at work in its preparation, is yet without any harsh American expressions, and is pleasant to read. Some passages are rather free as when of the virgin Mary it is said, that she was 'about to become a mother under the influence of the Holy Spirit.'

There issued also from the American press in 1907 the 'Modern Reader's Bible,' by Richard G. Moulton, a Chicago University Professor, based on the English Revised Version. Though not strictly a modern translation, Moulton's Bible was intended as an aid to the study of the Bible, giving marginal readings and accompanied by introductions. His work was printed in 21 separate publications, before being gathered together into a single volume. The Bible is regarded as literature and in form is printed like any ordinary book in which the arrangement of chapters and verses of the A.V. has been changed, on the ground that much of the literary beauty and meaning of the Bible is lost. This freedom in the treatment of the Bible appears also in the selection

and omission of parts of the O.T. according to the value set upon them by the editor. Some of the prophetic passages of Daniel, the narrative of the fish in Jonah are given sceptical handling, and doubt cast upon Christ's reference to this incident in the N.T. as though to show that they are not the words of Christ, showing that Dr. Moulton is not free from the critical views of modernists. To give them better and more connected literary form some of the Psalms, such as Psalm xlv and xlvi are rearranged. Moulton's Reader's Bible is not a safe or reliable guide, however great may be Dr. Moulton's gifts of interpretation, which have been applied with much better success to the works of Shakespeare.

One of the most popular translations to appear this century is the work of a London schoolmaster, Dr. R. F. Weymouth, whose New Testament in Modern Speech was printed in 1902 and was made from the translator's own Resultant Greek Testament, prepared from the best critical editions of the Greek. Dr. Weymouth paid special attention to the correct and exact translation of the tenses of the Greek verb. An American edition was prepared in 1943 revised by Dr. J. A. Robertson of Aberdeen. Dr. Weymouth explains the purpose of his Bible as providing 'a running commentary (not doctrinal) to be used side by side with its elder compeers.' Its purpose and character follows somewhat the lines of Moulton's Bible.

On the Roman Catholic side, the translation of the whole Bible by Ronald Knox, the son of a Church of England bishop who went over to Rome, apart from the skill and literary grace with which it is executed, has a special interest. The Roman Catholic hierarchy asked Ronald Knox in 1939 to undertake the translation of the New Testament from the Latin Vulgate into English, and in view of his notable career as a man of letters and brilliant intellect, his work was awaited with deep interest. In 1944 the edition of the N.T. appeared, and in 1945 a final edition but containing few changes from the 1944 edition, was approved, bearing the official imprimature of the R.C. authorities in England. The O.T. was issued in two volumes in 1949, forming 3 volumes in a uniform edition of the English Roman Catholic Bible. An American edition was published in 1944 with the imprimature of Francis, now Cardinal Spellman of New York. Knox's Version is based on the Clementine Vulgate which is the standard Latin Bible of the R.C. Church. The text of this Latin Version is inferior and corrupt, an instance given by Professor F. F. Bruce points to the words of Acts xvii: v.6, where the Jews of Thessalonica speak of Paul and his companions as "turning the world (orbem) upside down." The original Vulgate of Jerome

has 'orbem' for world, but an error crept into the Clementine text in course of transmission, so that it had the reading 'urbem,' city. Knox sticks to this obviously corrupt reading, compromising to some extent by the rendering, "the men who have turned the state upside down," and elsewhere explains that the translator has no power to alter the original. The same credulity appears in his "Belief of Catholics," where apparently on the authority of his church he is prepared to swallow without question all the absurdities of the papal system. It is interesting also to note that he includes the verse I John v: v.7, 'The Three Heavenly Witnesses' in his text of the N.T. and in a note explains that the Greek MSS evidence is weak, but the Old Latin MSS give strong support. The Bible is eminently readable and rivets the attention, but for all its literary quality, Knox's Bible suffers from the conditions under which it was produced, it is after all the translation of a translation, and gives little real help in determining the correct reading of the original text.

This year another English translation of the Bible has made its appearance, "The New English Bible," which when completed will be in 3 volumes, of which the New Testament has appeared this year. Some 30 years ago Dr. Geo. Milligan in his Baird Lectures asked the question: Is further Revision necessary? and from his extensive knowledge of the many questions of language, grammar, vocabulary of the New Testament which were still unsettled, gave the answer: The time is not yet. The Revisers in their Introduction to the New Testament of the New English Bible confess that there is no general agreement on any one critical text of the N.T. today, which in itself is an admission that the time is still not ripe for another translation of the Bible.

THE NEW ENGLISH BIBLE: NEW TESTAMENT

(First Article)

By Rev. Donald Maclean, Glasgow

As an article has already appeared in the *Magazine* examining the New Testament translation of the New English Bible (N.E.B.) in some detail, we shall endeavour to approach the matter from a rather different angle. In this first article we shall examine some of the principles bound up with the new version, and then in a second article we shall (D.V.) examine some of the more serious theological implications which arise from some of the translations accepted.

As 1961 was to be called Bible Year, and as arrangements had also been made to commemorate the 350th anniversary of the

Authorised Version (A.V.), the publication of the N.E.B. was skilfully timed. It was doubtless appreciated that people generally would have an interest in the Bible when so much was being said and written about it. The shrewd move to have the N.E.B. associated in the commemoration of the A.V. served a two-fold purpose. On the one hand the N.E.B. could be represented as the much improved successor of the A.V., while the undoubted worth of the latter was obscured by the interest created in the former. Accordingly, the N.E.B. was released with a flood of propaganda assuring all of the scholarship, energy and labour which had been put into this new attempt, and, despite allegations to the contrary, it is undoubtedly the hope of its promoters that the N.E.B. will replace the A.V. in the homes and pulpits of this land. It is not clear yet whether or not this move has succeeded. The literary value of the N.E.B. has been widely criticised and the Bishop of Soder and Man has banned it from the churches in his diocese. On the other hand there has been a big sale of the new version on both sides of the Atlantic. The future will declare whether or not this one will go the way of the other Versions which have miserably failed to replace the A.V. in the affections of the English-speaking world. One thing we are quite sure of is that the Lord's people will easily discern in this New Version an attempt to wrest from them and from their children some of the words of God which He commanded to a thousand generations and which He has also commanded to us. This point should be clear enough from the article which has already appeared.

The N.E.B. has, of course, been widely welcomed by the school of the Modernists, who have been agitating for a long time that the A.V. should be set aside. They have been saying that it is inaccurate in translation and that its archaic language makes it difficult for the modern generation to understand. These are not the real reasons for their objections, although they may serve for propaganda purposes. It needs to be remembered that Modernists do not accept the Christian view of the Scriptures. They do not believe that the Bible was inspired by God and that it is therefore infallible and inerrant. Their position has been put most pointedly by one of the most prominent of their number, President John A. MacKay of Princeton Theological Seminary. Dr. MacKay was originally a Free Presbyterian student, but left the Church, and after a period in the Free Church is now among the infidels who profess Christianity while denying the divine inspiration of Scripture. His career should be a warning to those who find the Free Presbyterian Church too narrow for

them and who imagine they can increase their usefulness by leaving a pure testimony for truth to enjoy the adulation of larger numbers. He is not the only case of one making a false step and going down the slippery path to apostacy. Says Dr. MacKay:

"Moreover, being a book about redemption, the Bible is authoritative only in its own particular sphere. As a document with a history, it is to be studied and investigated with the most rigorous historical and scientific criteria."

According to this view the Bible is inspired only when speaking about redemption. When speaking about redemption Dr. MacKay would say that the Bible is inspired. But when it speaks about history and science Dr. MacKay would take the view that the Bible could easily be full of mistakes. But then is not redemption itself bound up with historical events? Are not the coming of Christ, His life and suffering unto death, His resurrection and ascension all historical events? Does Dr. MacKay's view mean that the Bible might be in error about the virgin birth of Christ and his physical resurrection, as these are historical events? Or does he mean, as is more likely, that the virgin birth and physical resurrection cannot be historically investigated as they are in the realm of redemption? But a virgin birth which is not a historical fact is a thing which has no existence. If Christ has not risen as a historical fact then we are yet in our sins. This form of theological split-mindedness is regarded as the fruit of profound thought and mature scholarship by those who belong to the modernist school. In actual fact it is a piece of base hypocrisy and a sad production of the desperate wickedness and deceitfulness of the human heart in things pertaining to the glory of God.

Approaching the Bible as he does the modernist feels no reverence or awe for the words of God. He treats the Bible as he does any other human document which he subjects to the examination of his critical faculty, which is only a reflection of his personal judgment and very often of his personal likes and dislikes. The question which immediately arises is: Are such men fit to translate the Word of God when they are so obviously blind to its glory and strangers to its power? The answer surely must be that no amount of linguistic knowledge can ever supply the deficiency of being without the spiritual mind. "But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them because they are spiritually discerned." (I. Cor. ii: 14)

Dr. W. Barclay of Glasgow University is another of the modernistic school. In giving his approval to the N.E.B. he said

that it would be opposed only by those who had a sentimental attachment to the language of the A.V., and by others whom he described as obscurantists who refuse to accept recently discovered Greek Manuscripts. We shall have something to say about these manuscripts later on, but in the meantime, note this typical expression of the insufferable pride of the "expert." All who disagree must be put in the category of obscurantists. It may never have occurred to Dr. Barclay that serious-minded Christians who read the Bible morning and evening in their families, and in the privacy of their rooms, and who esteem the Word of God more than their necessary food, are amazed that a man such as he can make such a display of his crass ignorance of Christianity in his books. For instance, he has published one book called *The Mind of Jesus*. The publishers inform us that, "For years Dr. Barclay has cherished the ambition to write this life of Jesus," We have a right to expect that we will find here the fruit of mature scholarship and a weight and authority which will give meaning to his right to call others obscurantists. Instead of that, however, we meet with ideas marked by childishness and tainted with heresy.

Speaking of the Lord Jesus before He entered His public ministry Dr. Barclay says:

"To Jesus the name 'father' was the most natural and the most precious name for God and *it was in the home at Nazareth that he must have learned the meaning of that word.*" (p.17) (Italics ours in each case)

"So Jesus could climb the hilltop behind Nazareth, and from there he could see the roads coming and going to the ends of the earth. It was there that *he must have dreamed his dreams*, and it may be that it was there that something first said to him: 'I, when I am lifted up from the earth, will draw all men to myself.'"

Dr. Barclay also seems to hold the view that it was possible for the Lord to sin. Says he:

"There have always been *some who in a mistaken reverence* have held that there was no possibility of Jesus falling into temptation, that he was of such complete goodness and purity, that he was, so to speak, so much God that he could not possibly have fallen into temptation."

The following piece of semi-pelagianism completes the impression that we have in Dr. Barclay, a man of no acquaintance with spiritual realities:

"There is no point in issuing commands, challenges and invitations if there is no possibility of response. Jesus expected

a response from men for he worked on the assumption that every man has a sleeping hero in his soul." (p.128)

We feel that before Dr. Barclay criticises other who are far ahead of him in spiritual attainments, he should make sure that he, himself, understands the Christian religion.

Rather surprising has been the somewhat warm welcome given to the N.E.B. by evangelical scholars. Professor Bruce of Manchester University has approved generally of the translation, although he obviously feels uncomfortable about the exclusion of the word rendered "propitiation" referred to in our second article on this subject. Professor R. V. G. Tasker of London University acted on the panel of translators. Professor Finlayson of the Free Church College, while demurring at some of the translations, describes it as "in every respect a worthy translation" which was "undertaken and accomplished with great competence and undoubted integrity." He expects it to "make the New Testament more intelligible to the general reader." He also says that the presence on the panel of Professor Tasker gives one confidence in the work. On the contrary, the presence of Professor Tasker on the panel gives one very little confidence in the Professor, a remark which can very well be extended to both Professors Bruce and Finlayson. It is very difficult to understand how men who profess allegiance to the doctrine of plenary inspiration can do anything else but sound a warning note about this translation. It is to be feared that their convictions are not very deep and are certainly not firmly held. It is indeed amazing that such men have neither the spiritual discernment nor the shrewd commonsense to understand that a completely new theology can be built and sustained from the N.E.B., and that such a theology will be clean contrary to the orthodox Catholic faith.

The main point to be understood about the N.E.B. is that it is not merely a new translation but a new Bible. The reason for many of the changes in this version arises from the fact that the Greek Text which lies behind the A.V. has been abandoned. This step was taken by the producers of the Revised Version of 1881. The text of the Revised Version was largely the work of two English scholars named Westcott and Hort. It was confidently expected at that time that the Science of Biblical Criticism would very soon, if it had not already done so, restore the form of the text of the original autographs. It was assumed that the discovery of new manuscripts had set aside the Textus Receptus which formed the basic text of the A.V., and Westcott and Hort were hailed as the pioneers in a

new effort to replace the A.V. with the Revised Version of 1881. History has proved that the hopes of replacing the A.V. were entertained in vain. The public never hear of it now.

It would appear also that Biblical Criticism has been getting into difficulties. The Introduction to the N.E.B. states:

“ The problem of restoring a form of text as near as possible to the vanished autographs now appears less simple than it did to our predecessors.”

This naturally leads us to enquire as to what particular methods were adopted to produce the text for the N.E.B. We are told:

“ There is not at the present time any critical text which would command the same degree of acceptance as the Revisors' text did in its day. Nor has the time come in the judgment of competent scholars to construct such a text, since new material constantly comes to light, and the debate continues. The present translators therefore could do no other than consider variant readings on their merits, and having weighed the evidence for themselves, select for translation in each passage the reading which to the best of their judgment seemed most likely to represent what the author wrote.”

It is obvious therefore that the science of Biblical Criticism is in such a state of confusion that the critics themselves cannot agree on the Greek text of the New Testament. This is a direct result of having abandoned the Textus Receptus or Received Text on insufficient grounds. Now every man has to choose the particular reading he may happen to favour. But why try to produce a translation when the critics are in such confusion about the original? Can such a translation be considered in any way trustworthy? Does not the foregoing explanation make it abundantly plain that the N.E.B. is far from being a faithful translation of the original, but is rather in many places a statement of the judgment of the translators as to what the author probably meant. Can the reader of the N.E.B. have then any confidence that he has before him the Word of God concerning which Christ has given us the most solemn assurance, “ The word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him in the last day.”

As we shall show in our next article the doctrine of the Divine Authorship of the Bible is one clearly taught in the Word of God. Since this is the case can anyone believe that the Holy Spirit, Who inspired the Word, would leave it in such chaos that “ competent scholars ” can no longer agree as to the words of Jehovah? The idea can only be entertained by men who have never felt the sense of eternity bearing upon their spirit, and who are completely

ignorant of what it means to be convinced of sin, and to realise that one has a soul laden with iniquity on the way to the Great White Throne. A person who realises that solemnity will need more than a "reading which to the best of their judgment seemed most likely to represent what the author wrote." Such a person feels that God is the Author of Holy Writ and that he can depend on His infallible Word for time and for eternity. Surely the critics are taking leave of their senses when they do not realise how their blind wanderings are leading them into more intense darkness. "For it is written, I will destroy the wisdom of the wise, and will bring to nothing the understanding of the prudent. Where is the wise? Where is the scribe? Where is the disputer of this world? Hath not God made foolish the wisdom of this world." (I. Cor. i: 19, 20). The present writer has a shrewd suspicion that the confusion evidenced above arises from the fact that some of the recently discovered manuscripts are pointing back in the direction of the soundness of the Received Text which lies at the back of the A.V. There is a movement in America to return to the Received Text, which confirms the view that there are strong grounds for returning to it. It is too much to expect that modernistic unbelievers who go under the cloak of ministers of Christ would be willing to admit this fact, but history will yet make their folly manifest to all men. At any rate the panel of translators had no right to make a translation of the New Testament when they cannot even agree on the Greek Text. This fact alone should condemn this work in the eyes of all who love the Word of God most pure.

Another novelty which has been introduced into this Version is a new theory and practice of translation. This is calmly acknowledged in the Introduction. With regard to the translations of other version we are told:

"The older translators, on the whole, considered that fidelity to the original demanded that they should reproduce, as far as possible, characteristic features of the language in which it was written."

This is the principle we would naturally expect to be adopted, especially when men realise they are translating the Word of God. Fidelity to that Word was a prime necessity, as the idea was to put the people in possession of the truths of Divine Revelation. The A.V. followed this principle in a most admirable way and has been claimed again and again by competent believing scholars as the best translation of all from this point of view alone. When a word was inserted to bring out the meaning which was not in the original, that word was printed in italics to indicate this.

Such was the care exercised by men fully conscious that they were dealing with the words of God. The reader also knew the position. The modernist is, of course, not so concerned about such accuracy. His low view of inspiration together with his high view of his own scholarly ability make it an easy matter for him to tamper with the words of Scripture.

Thus we read:

"The present translators were enjoined to replace Greek constructions and idioms by those of contemporary English."

No indication is given when this has been done and the reader is, therefore, at the mercy of the whim of the translators. This paraphrasing has occasioned some concern even among those who otherwise approve of the N.E.B. The following simple example illustrates the point:—

When the soldiers were at the foot of the Cross they proposed to cast lots for the coat of the Lord Jesus Christ. The following are the two translations of John xix: 24:

A.V.

"They said therefore among themselves, Let us not rend it but cast lots for it, whose it shall be: that the Scripture might be fulfilled which saith, They parted my raiment among them and for my vesture they did cast lots. These things therefore the soldiers did."

N.E.B.

"So they said to one another 'We must not tear this: let us toss for it: and thus the text of Scripture came true; They shared my garments among them and cast lots for my clothing. This is what the soldiers did.'"

These words record the fulfilling of a prophecy made concerning the death of Christ. The *therefore* in the last sentence makes it plain that this is the case although it has been missed out of the new translation. The words in the A.V. "Let us not rend it but cast lots for it" are an exact rendering of the Greek and correspond with the prophecy quoted from Ps. xxii: 18. The rendering "Let us toss for it" is not a translation of the Greek but a paraphrasing of the words into idiomatic English which also obscures the fact of prophecy. We have chosen this example not because it is the worst of its kind, for it is not, but because it is a simple one easily grasped by our readers, and serves to illustrate how the reader of the N.E.B. is at the mercy of the whim of the translator. He cannot be sure that he is reading what the Bible says or whether he is reading what the translator thinks people might say now-a-days. This absurd and dangerous practice further condemns this new version in the eyes of those whose great question is, What does God say?

In the second article we shall (D.V.) try to enter more deeply into some of the changes in this translation which have grave theological implications. These do not appear to have received the attention they deserve in articles we have read on the subject. We are persuaded that once they are grasped the N.E.B. will be seen in its true light as one of the most dangerous attempts ever made to rob the people of this land of the glorious gospel of the blessed God.

SEARMONAN

Leis an Urr. Tearlach C. Mac an Tòisich, D.D.

(Air a leantuinn bho t.d. 28)

II. Nis, thugadh-mid fa'n ear, 's e Crìosd a mhàin a ni chùis. Ma bhitheas e air fheorach cìod is ciall do'n ràdh gu'r e Crìosd a mhàin a ni chùis, dh'fhaodadh a cheisd a bhi gu h-ìomchuidh air a freagairt le a ràdh gu'r e Crìosd an Slànuighear cumanta agus an aon Slànuighear.

Tha'n talamh so agus nithean na talmhuinn air beachdachadh orra gle eadar-dhealaichte air neamh bho'n dòigh anns am bheil iad air beachdachadh orra le daoine saoghalta. 'S e'n aon sealladh a tha air a ghabhail air an t-saoghal so air neamh gu'r e saoghal peacach a th'ann, agus an t-àite anns am bheil obair na saorsa a faotainn cleachdadh. Tha gach eadar-dhealachadh bho'n leth a muigh eadar daoine air amharc thairis orra, agus tha gach uile nl a tha cur troimh cheile agus a gluasad inntinnean dhaoine air beachdachadh orra an sin 'n an co-cheangal ri peacadh agus slàinte. An duine, air a chruthachadh naomh agus sona, thuit e, chaill e deadh-ghean agus ìomhaigh Dhé, thainig e gu bhi 'n a fhear iodhal-aoraidh, 'n a neach a tha gràdhachadh a pheacaidh agus an t-saoghail a tha làthair, 'n a chreutair a tha air a dhìteadh agus truagh. Agus bha coltas air gu'n robh balla dà-fhilte nach robh e comasach a dhol thairis air anns an rathad air e bhi air a ghabhail air ais:—cha b'urrain lagh Dhé siubhal air falbh, dh'fheumadh ceartas Dhé riarachadh fhaotainn; agus b' e so staid a pheacaich, na'm b'urrain e dhol as bho thruaigh, cha'n iarradh e gu bràth pilltinn a dh'ionnsuidh an Tighearn. Dh'fheumadh e, uime sin, a bhi air athnuadhachadh 'n a leithid de dhòigh agus gu'm bitheadh a philleadh, am feadh is e toradh cumhachd Dhé a bh'ann, na gnìomh a shaor thoil fein. Nis, cia mar a b'urrain tròcair Dhé a bhi gu ceart a faotainn cleachdadh? Cia mar a b'urrain fìreantachd Dhé a bhi air a foillseachadh air a leithid de dhòigh ann a maitheadh pheacaidhean, agus gu'm bitheadh gliocas, cumhachd, agus gràs Dhé air an cur a mach

ann a bhi togail suas cruthachadh nuadh agus ro-iongantach air làraichean briste an t-seann chruthachadh? Ma tha so 'n ar beachd na ceist a tha furasda a freagairt, is ann a chionn nach do ghabh sinn riamh eolas air fireantachd a Chuspair ris am bheil ar gnothuch, agus air olcas agus droch-thoillteanas a pheacaidh. Tha e air innse dhùinn gu'n robh " comhairle na sìthe eatorra le cheile." An t-Athair a roghnachadh pheacach a chùm na beatha shiorruidh, thug E Dha Mhac iad; agus ghabh Esan os laimh a bhi'n a Urras dhoibh, am Fear-saoraidh dlùth an dàimh, a chùm an toirt air ais gu Dia, a chùm an saoradh ann an rathad a bhitheadh uile-ghlòrmhor do Dhia agus làn do bheannachdan dhoibh-san, ach a gabhail a stigh ann Dhà-san a leithid de fhein-fhthalmachadh agus a leithid de ioraslachadh agus de fhulungasan agus a tha dol thairis air eolas. Thòisich so, an nì is motha agus is luachmhoire ann an rùn diomhair na Diadhachd, air a bhi air fhoillseachadh an deigh do'n duine tuiteam, agus bha e sior-mheaudachadh ann a bhi air fhoillseachadh àl an deigh àil gus an d'fhàinig coimhlionadh na h-aimsir gus an robh am Focal siorruidh air a dheanamh 'n a fheoil. Nochdadh Mac Dhé, a tha faotainn aoradh air neamh, air fhaicinn mar an t-iongantach, ach " air a dhimeas agus air a chur air chùl le daoineibh." Chaidh Iosa o Nàsaret mu'n cuairt a toirt buaidh air olc dhaoine le maith a bha cur thairis, choinnich E agus thug E buaidh air Satan agus air an t-saoghal, choimhlion E agus dh'àrdaich E lagh naomh Dhé le umhlachd iomlan ann an smuaint, focal, agus gnìomh; agus chrùn E obair le E fein a thoirt suas mar lobairt a bha toirt riarachadh do Dhia. Agus is e so an nì sònraicht' a tha r'a fhaicinn 'n a bhàs—cha'n e uile fhulungasaibh bho'n leith a muigh, cha'n e eadhon an spiorad macanta anns an d'fhuiling E, ach gu'n robh E air a " dheanamh 'n a mhallachadh," gu'n do leag Dia " air-san aingidheachd " a shluaigh, agus gu'n d'thug E air freagairt air an son. Ma dh'amhairceas sinn thairis air a so, tha sinn a deanamh crann-ceusaidh Chrìosd gu'n eufachd; oir is ann mar so a thàinig E gu bhi 'n a Shlànuighear.

Air amharc air mar so, ciod e'n solus a tha bàs Chrìosd a tilgeadh air ar doille agus air ar ceannairc, gu'm b'urrain-mid an deigh gach cùis fois a ghabhail ann an timchioll-ghearradh na ann a' neo-thimchioll-ghearradh, ann a' nì air bith ach " Iosa Chrìosd agus esan air a cheusadh." Roimh fhoillseachadh na diomhaireachd ghlòrmhor so, faodaidh sinn smuainteachadh air suidheachadh peacach bochd, air a lot le coguis a tha cur as a leth, agus a faotainn na ceisd, " Ciod leis an tig mi am fianuis an Tighearna? " gun fhreagairt, air dhà muinghin a bhi aig anns an fheoil, agus a strì ri bhi 'n a Shlànuighear dhà fein. Ach leis

an t-solus a tha air a thilgeadh le bàs Chrìosd air cliù agus iomlanachdan an Dé mhòir, gu'm bitheadh mid fathasd a dol mu'n cuairt a chur air chois ar fireantach fein, agus earbsa air bith a bhi againn annain fein—O, cia cho dall, cia cho ceannairceach.

Tha sinn ag ràdh, uime sin, gu'n do choisinn Mac Dhé anns an fheoil mar so slàinte. Agus do-bhrìgh nach e mhàin iomlanachd, ach an luach neo-chrìochnach a thug a Dhiadhachd dha obair, thoill E gu'm bitheadh a shluagh air an tearnadh; choisinn E còir an cur an seilbh air beannachdan na slàinte;—so a dheanamh, cha'n ann 'n a leithid de dhòigh agus gu'm b'urrain na beannachdan so a bhi air an sealbhachadh dealaichte Ris Fein, ach ann an rathad aonaidh r'a Phearsa; a chùim, mar a bha Esan 'n a Fhear-ionaid air an son-san uile, agus am peacaidhean-san uile air an leagadh Air-san, gu'm bitheadh iad cho mòr 'n an aon Ris agus gu'm bitheadh iad a deanamh suas a lànachd-san; a chùim agus gu'm bitheadh, Ann-san, slàinte air a sealbhachadh; ni-headh gu'm bitheadh E Fein air a shealbhachadh leo mar an slàinte.

Do nàdur an aonaidh bheannaichte so, agus mar a tha e air a dheanamh leis an Spiorad Naomh eadar Crìosd agus am peacach creidmheach, cha'n eil mì aig an àm so a dol a stigh. Ach tha mì a toirt fa'n ear gu'm faod e bhi air a ràdh gu'r e Crìosd “ na h-uile ” anns an t-seadh ghlòrmhor a bhi 'n a uile ann an rùn tròcair an Athar—mar an t-eadar-mheadhonair eadar Dia agus duine; mar an cladhan, ann a Phearsa agus 'n a obair, tre'm bheil uile ghràs a sruthadh air adhart; mar Mhac gràdhach an Athar, anns am bheil a mhòr thlachd gu bhi gabhail, a fireanachadh, agus a beannachadh pheacach. Uime sin, ma's a leat-sa Crìosd, dh'fhìreanaich Dia am Breitheamh thù, tha Dia agus Athair Chrìosd 'n a Dhia a tha air a dheanamh reidh riut agus 'n a Athair dhuit.

Uime sin, a rìs, tha Crìosd 'n a uile anns an Fhocal. Is i 'n fhirinn a thaobh Chrìosd a tha ga deanamh na focal tearnaidh. Is i 'n dàimh anns am bheil firinn air bith a seasamh do Chrìosd a tha deanamh firinn air bith 'n a firinn thearnaidh. Ma thuair thu Crìosd anns an fhocal, ma's a h-aithne dhuit am Biobull beannaichte mar fhocal Chrìosd, an sin thuair thù ann na tha thù seasamh ann am feum air air son slàinte t-anama. As eugmhais so faodaidh sinn “ gach uile dhiomhairachdan agus gach uile colas a thuigsinn,” agus gidheadh gun a bhi annain ach “ neo-ni.”

A rìs, uime sin, tha Crìosd 'n a “iule” ann an teagasg agus ann an obair an Spioraid Naoimh. “ Bheir esan glòir dhòmh-sa; oir gabhaidh e de' mo chuid-sa, agus nochdaidh e dhuibh-se.” Bheir e dearbh-shoilleireachd do pheacach air a staid chaillte agus air

fheum air slàinte, agus dùinidh e suas e ri Criosd ann a bhi foillheachadh cia cho luachmhor 's a dh'fheumas an Slànuighear sin a bhi a tha gabhail agus a tha comasach air a bhi tearnadh ceann-feadhna pheacach.

Agus, uime sin, tha Criosd “ ann a uile ” ann am beachd agus ann an roghainn gach peacach a tha creidsinn. Bha e'g iarruidh fois dhà a spiorad buairte ann an iomadh slighe dhiomhanais—O.ciod e nach do dh'fheuch e? gus, air dhà gach ni a chosg agus e ullamh gu toirt thairis, tha e faotainn, tre theagasg a Chomhfhurtair ghràdhaich, sealladh air foghainteachd gràs Chrìosd air a foillseachadh air Calbharai; agus tha e ga dhearbhadh, agus a faotainn gu'm bheil E “ comasach a bhi tearnadh gus a cheum is fhaide mach.” Air son a chiont, tha e faotainn fuil na reite; air son a neo-fhireantachd, fireantachd shiorruidh; air son a chion neart gu bhi cur an aghaidh peacaidh, gràs uile-chumhachdach; air son a dhoille, sàbh-shùl a tha'g aiseag air ais fradharc do'n anam; air son a thruaillidheachd, innigh thròcairean agus iochd; air son a chion dion, cùram a Bhuachaile Mhaith; air son a bhròin, co-fhaireachadh an Ard-Shagairt Mhòir; air son a sheacharain agus a chion seasmhachd, gràdh a Charaid air nach tig caochladh; air son a chridhe, Cuibhrionn a lionas e gu bràth; air son fhalamhachd de gach ni maith, agus a thur neo-airidheachd, Slànuighear gu bhi aige gun airgiod agus gun luach. Agus a nis, na nithean a bha 'n am buannachd dha tha e ga' meas nan call air son Chrìosd. Thuair e neamhnaid ro-luachmhor, agus tha e reic gach ni a bh'aic a chum's gu'm bitheadh i aige fein. Aithne a bhi aig air Criosd; a bhi air aonadh Ris—air aonadh air a leithid de dhòigh, le aonadh nach eil de obair duine, ach de obair an Spioraid Naoimh, agus gu'm bitheadh eufachd Chrìosd air a meas dhà, agus gu'm bitheadh Criosd dhà mar thobar, agus mar fhear-criochnachaidh a bheatha spioradail—'s e so an aon nì a tha e miannachadh bho'n Tighearna.

'S e so, uime sin, a ni chùis—Criosd ga aonadh Fein ris an anam le a Spiorad—Criosd air aonadh ris an anam tre chreidimh, air a leithid de dhòigh agus ann-san gu'm bheil maitheanas aige, e air gabhail ris, air a naomhachadh, agus air a bheannachadh air son na siorruidheachd.

(R'a leantuinn)

NOTES AND COMMENTS

The Trial of Adolf Eichmann

World-wide attention has been focused on the trial of Adolf Eichmann, the former S.S. officer. He is accused of being responsible for the deaths of millions of Jews—the prosecution

has alleged that about 6,000,000 Jews were killed by the Nazis. In the course of the trial, which at the time of writing is still continuing, the question as to why the Jews had been subjected to so much suffering throughout the ages was asked by the defence lawyer, Dr. Servatius. He asked, "Don't you think supernatural reasons beyond man's grasp lie behind the fate of this people?" The reply given by Professor Baron, the prosecution's historical witness, was "Some may regard that as true from a theological point of view . . . but all this cannot justify any man choosing himself as an instrument of God for punishing the Jewish people." One cannot but agree with these sentiments. They passed an awful sentence on themselves in saying, "His blood be on us, and on our children," but, "Hath God cast away His people? God forbid." "Now if the fall of them be the riches of the world, and the diminishing of them the riches of the Gentiles; how much more their fulness?"—D. M. MACL.

Commercial Television comes to the North

It appears that the Highlands of Scotland are soon to have Commercial Television. According to press reports special attention is to be paid to "Sunday" programmes, in accordance with the viewpoint of the various Churches in the North. Our viewpoint is, of course, that there should be no such thing as television programmes on the Lord's Day and, moreover, that many of the week-day programmes should never be permitted. Their baneful influence is rapidly undermining the moral standards of our nation.—D. M. MACL.

CHURCH NOTES

Communions

January—Fifth Sabbath, Inverness. *February*—First Sabbath, Dingwall; third, Stornoway; fourth, North Uist, Kyle of Lochalsh. *March*—First Sabbath, Ullapool; second, Ness and Portree; third, Finsbay, Lochinver; fourth, Kinlochbervie, North Tolsta. *April*—First Sabbath, London, Breasclete, Portnalong and Fort William; third, Greenock; fourth, Glasgow; fifth, Wick. *May*—First Sabbath, Kames and Oban; second, Scourie; third, Edinburgh and Broadford. *June*—First Sabbath, Tarbert, Applecross; second, Shildaig; third, Lochcarron, Glendale, Helmsdale, Dornoch and Uig; fourth, Gairloch and Inverness. *July*—First Sabbath, Lairg, Raasay and Beaulay; second, Staffin, Tomatin and Tain; third, Halkirk, Rogart, Flashadder and Daviot; fourth, Achmore, Bracadale, North Uist and Plockton. *August*—First Sabbath, Dingwall and Vancouver (Canada); second, Portree and Stratherrick; third, Bonar, Finsbay and Laide; fourth, Vatten, Thurso and Stornoway. *September*—First Sabbath, Ullapool and Breasclete; second, Strathy; third, Tarbert and Stoer; fourth, Applecross. *October*—First Sabbath, Tolsta, Lochcarron,

Fort-William; second, Gairloch and Ness; fourth, Greenock, Lochinver; fifth, Wick. *November*—First Sabbath, Oban and Raasay; second, Glasgow and Halkirk; third, Edinburgh, Dornoch and Uig. *December*—First Sabbath, London.

Obituary of Mr Norman MacLeod

In the recent issue of the Magazine, the closing paragraph of the obituary notice on the late worthy Norman MacLeod is missing. The substance of it was that "he and his beloved partner suffered sore bereavements in the loss by death of two sons,—also that we desire to offer our deep sympathy to his widow, and daughter and relatives." Rev. D. A. Macfarlane sent us the above note.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF DONATIONS

The General Treasurer, Mr W. D. Fraser, 34 Dunearn Street (Ground Flat), Glasgow, C.4, acknowledges with sincere thanks:—

Sustentation Fund.—Anon, California, £10; Miss G. MacKay, Farr, Bettyhill, per Mr J. G., £2.

Home Mission Fund.—Miss G. MacKay, Farr, Bettyhill, per Mr J. G., £1.

Foreign Mission Fund.—Adherent, Glasgow, £1; Friend, Ullapool, for publishing Psalms in Zulu, £5; Phil. 4, v. 4, for Mission Transport, £11 16s 5d; the following per Mr J. G.: Friend of the Cause, £45; Anon, Harris postmark, £5; D. Nicolson, Innellan, 11/7; Friend of the Cause, Inverness, £1 10/-; R. D. Nicolson, Penifiler, £2; M. Macaulay, Baintown, £3 6s 9d; Miss G. MacKay, Farr, Bettyhill, £1; Ontario Friends for New Testaments for Mpilo Hospital, 8/11.

For Mboma Mission Hospital, the following donations—Mrs Brochie, Armadale, £1; Mr and Mrs Raynor, £20; Miss Shaw, Grafton, per Mr J. G., 15/6; Greenock Congregation, £30.

Aged and Infirm Ministers, etc., Fund.—Adherent, Glasgow postmark, £1; Phil. 4, v. 4, £11 16s 5d.

Organisation Fund.—Adherent, Glasgow postmark, £1.

Home of Rest Fund.—Adherent, Glasgow postmark, £1; Phil. 4, v. 4, £11 16s 5d.

Mission to the Jews Fund.—Thankoffering, per Mr J. G., £1.

Mr J. Grant, Publications Treasurer, 4 Millburn Road, Inverness, acknowledges with many thanks:—

Publications Fund.—Friend, Edinburgh, 5/-; Mr A. Shaw, Queanbeyan, Australia, £1 5/-; Mr J. McNeill, Crieff, 10/-; Mrs A. M., Oban, £5; Miss McKintosh, Dundee, 10/-; Philippians 4, v. 4, £7; the following for sending books to hospital libraries: Mr T. MacDonald, Eston, Sask., Canada, £1 5/-; Anon, N.Z., £1 5/-.

On behalf of the Trinitarian Bible Society.—Shieldaig Friend, £1; R. D. Nicolson, Penifiler, £1; M. MacLeod, Glenhinisdale, 18/7.

Welfare of Youth Fund.—Ontario Friends, 8/11; Miss R. MacLean, Northton, £1; Miss M. Martin, Northton, £1; Philippians 4, v. 4, £5.

Free Distribution and Magazine.—Mr C. B. van Woerden, Akkrum, Holland, £1; Mr Jas. McP., Knockandhu, Tomatin, 4/-; Mrs A. McG., Ullapool, 5/-; Miss G. McK., Bettyhill, 10/-; Mr M. McL., Snizort, 15/-; Mrs C. McD., 16 Skigersta, 5/-; Mr R. K. Clashnessie, 5/-; H. MacR., Kelwood, Canada, £2 16s 5d; M. G., 41, Inverarish, 5/-; Mr C. F., Toronto, £1 4s 4d; Philippians 4, v. 4, £6 5s 3d; Mr T. McD., Eston, Canada, £2 10s 4d.

The following lists sent in for publication:—

Applecross Congregation.—Mr C. Gillies, Treasurer, acknowledges with grateful thanks, 50 dollars from Mr John Morrison, Vancouver, in loving memory of Bella MacLeod.

Bayhead, North Uist, Church and Manse Repairs Fund.—Mr A. Macdonald, Treasurer, acknowledges with sincere thanks, £5 from Mrs Robertson, Columbia Street, Vancouver (4th donation); £3 from "Friend," North Uist, per Rev. A. Morrison.

Dingwall New Church Building Fund.—Mr D. S. Kelly, 4 Davidson Drive, gratefully acknowledges Friend, Evanton, further £1; Muir-of-Ord postmark, £5; Friend, Glasgow, per Rev. D. A. MacF., £5; Friend, Stornoway, per Mrs Tallach, £1; C.M., £1; Phil. 4, v. 4, £8.

Fort William Church Building Fund.—Mr I. Matheson, Treasurer, acknowledges with sincere thanks, "Friend," Skye, £5; N. McLeod, Rannoch, £1.

Bracadale Manse Extension Fund.—Mr D. Morrison, Treasurer, acknowledges with grateful thanks, Wellwisher, Staffin, £1; J. G., 10/-; Gairloch Friend, per Rev. D. A. MacL., £5; Friend at Communion, £2; Friend, £3; Passer-by, £1, per Mr D. MacAskill.

Glendale Church Repairs Fund.—The Treasurer acknowledges with grateful thanks, F. Matheson, Gairloch, £1; Friend, Portree, £5; Anon, £1; J. M., London, £4; all per Rev. J. C. Wellwisher, 10/- for Foreign Mission.

Kinlochervie and Scourie Manse Purchase Fund.—Mr D. A. MacLeod, Treasurer, acknowledges with sincere thanks, A Sincere Friend, £1; M. M., Stornoway, £2; Dornoch postmark, £2; Mrs Catherine MacKenzie, Leckmeln, Garve, £5. The following per Rev. D. B. MacLeod: Mrs Macaskill, Melvich, £3; Mrs A. MacRae, Shieldaig, £1; A Friend, Gairloch, £3; Mrs J. M. Lewis, £2 6/-; A Friend, Plockton, £1; "A Friend in Caithness," £2; Miss Deborah Sinclair, Harrogate, £5; "Friends," Glendale, £18.

Lairg Congregation.—Rev. D. M. MacLeod acknowledges with grateful thanks, £2 for Sustentation Fund and £3 for Foreign Mission Fund from Mrs A. MacLeod, Brora.

Lochcarron Congregation.—Mr R. MacRae, Treasurer, thankfully acknowledges, Miss MacColl, Ballachulish, £2, per Rev. D. J. M.; A Friend, £1, per K. MacR., both for Sustentation Fund.

London Church Building Fund.—Rev. J. P. MacQueen acknowledges with sincere thanks, £2 from a Friend, Edinburgh.

Ness Congregation, Skigersta Church Repairs.—Mr M. Finlayson, Treasurer, acknowledges with sincere thanks, Friend, £2 2/-; Friend, £3, both per Rev. W. M.; Two Stornoway Sisters, £2, and a Friend, North Tolsta, £1, both per D. MacD.; Mr and Mrs MacKenzie, Kyle, £5; D. Gunn, Eurodale, £1; Special Collection in the Congregation, £194 15/-. It is intimated that the Repairs are now completed and are free from debt, and sincere thanks to all who subscribed to the Fund.

Ness F.P., £2 for Manse Repairs; Captain J. MacLeod, Ness, £5, and "Grateful," Swainbost, £5, both for Congregational Funds.

St. Jude's South African Clothing Fund.—The Treasurer acknowledges with many thanks contributions amounting to £36 7s 8d, also £1 from A. C. M., Ardrishaig.

St. Jude's Manse Fund.—Mr D. MacPhail, Treasurer, acknowledges with sincere thanks, Adherent, Glasgow postmark, per W. F., £1; In memory of my beloved sisters, per A. N., £5; Dumbarton Congregation, per A. E. A., £20.

Gairloch Congregation.—Mr M. Fraser, Treasurer, acknowledges with sincere thanks, Mr F. MacDonald, Kinlochewe, £2, for Foreign Missions; Miss R. MacLean, Northton, Harris, £7 for Sustentation Fund and £3 for Home Mission Fund. Correction—In April magazine, Mr C. Urquhart, Achnasheen, £7, should have been £8 for Sustentation Fund.

South African Mission.—Rev. A. Macdonald acknowledges with sincere thanks the following donations sent out by the General Treasurer: Donations for Mbuma Mission Hospital, £633 15s 9d; Donations for Mission Transport, £282 2s 10d.