

Bible. N. T. English. 1872.

THE

NEW TESTAMENT:

NEWLY TRANSLATED,

FROM THE TEXT OF TREGELLES;

AND

CRITICALLY EMPHASISED,

ACCORDING TO THE LOGICAL IDIOM OF THE ORIGINAL;

WITH

AN INTRODUCTION AND OCCASIONAL NOTES.

BY

JOSEPH B. ROTHERHAM.



LONDON:

SAMUEL BAGSTER AND SONS,

15, PATERNOSTER ROW.

1872.

INTRODUCTION.

CHAPTER I.—THE EMPHASIS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

SECTION 1.—THE IMPORTANCE OF EMPHASIS.

THE nature of Emphasis reveals its importance. It is a special stress on certain words, enhancing their significance. It is hence of no small value in determining the point and aim of what is uttered. Unemphasised discourse is comparatively useless: it is, in fact, a mere wilderness of words. Children can emphasise as soon as they can speak; and peasants, unable to spell their own names, can lay emphatic stress on the words that reveal their emotions and make known their wants. A universal attribute of living speech, emphasis belongs to all languages and all ages. When living speech is transferred to paper, the attempt is made to preserve the significances of vocal utterance; and when the written signs are re-vocalised, they need to be re-animated by the appreciative and interpretive voice. Of all living speech, that of the Sacred Scriptures is most living; for here, both human and divine voices are heard; and great thoughts, tremulous emotions, and mighty passions find expression. Hence, to read the Word of God without emphasis, is to bind about it the bands of death.

"Why, Sir, it is exposition!" said a Christian teacher, after hearing a few specimens of emphasised translation. This witness is true, and its truth springs from the very nature of the case. Only let two things be borne in mind, and the expository value of emphasis must be perceived by all. *First*, emphasis gives point to a sentence, and so determines which out of several possible meanings is the real one. *Second*, emphasis always implies contrast; thus conveying, as by an undertone, a hint which, in many cases, is not otherwise expressed.

Example: "STRIKE! but HEAR me." (*Ancient Orator, to enraged multitude.*)

"STRIKE! but hear ME." (*Britannia, with "LAW" under her arm, to British workman.*)

SECTION 2.—THE DISCOVERY OF EMPHASIS.

It is, in many cases, easy to discover on which words the emphatic stress of the voice should be laid. Many obvious indications afford us their assistance. We remember who is speaking, and to whom. We mark the current of the discourse, and are borne along by it. We feel the force of what has been said, and can almost anticipate what will follow. We perceive how a certain point *tells*, and naturally conclude that that point was intended to be "made." In a word, we ourselves enter into the circumstances of the case, and to such a degree catch the spirit of our author that his voice seems uttered in our own.

But it is not always quite so simple a thing to decipher an author's emphatic intentions; and how to "render" a famous passage has often been looked upon as worthy of prolonged study. The more remote the scene and circumstances, the more obscure the spirit and aim, the more unusual and sacred the thoughts and feelings associated with any composition, proportionably the more difficult must it be to give it appropriate vocalisation. To "make" a certain "point" in reading a passage may be ingenious enough on *your* part,—but did your *author* intend it to be made? With reflections such as these, we may mitigate our surprise that much public reading of the Bible is almost entirely destitute of

expression. "Why should I add meanings of my own to the words of God?" the reader may well ask himself when not so happy as to be sure of the Divine intent. "If, only, the Sacred Writers had here and there underlined a word, what a gain it would have been!"

SECTION 3.—THE IDIOMATIC INDICATION OF EMPHASIS IN THE ORIGINAL.

The Sacred writers did not underline their emphatic words, but they did better. They idiomatically indicated them. Principally by the arrangement of their words, they made those prominent on which they intended *stress* to be laid. The language in which they wrote enabled them to do this to an extent quite impracticable in our English tongue. And yet, even in our own language, emphatic arrangement finds sufficient scope to render an allusion to it, not only interesting on its own merits, but really illustrative of the more marked and uniform idiom of the Greek New Testament.

"Thus," says CLYDE (*Greek Syntax*, p. 169), "we perceive a difference between 'Great is Diana of the Ephesians,' and 'Diana of the Ephesians is great;' and although these sentences differ only in collocation, yet they so differ, that the latter is merely a proposition, while the former is an outcry of passion as well." "The student may aid his conceptions of this matter," says the same author (p. 170, note), "by trying in how many ways, according to the *animus loquentis*, he can collocate a sentence of ordinary English. Thus, 'I have been so engaged to-day writing letters, that I could not attend to the Committee;' this is the natural order; but, if the *day* were important, as in the case of a man who had not missed a day till this one, he would say, '*To-day*, I have been' etc. If, again, he wanted to make the reason of his non-attendance prominent, he would begin, '*So engaged* have I been,' etc.; and, again, if he had been annoyed by the particular *mode* of his occupation, he might, in the impotence of English to completely invert the sentence, betake himself to repetition, and say, '*Letters, letters*, I have been so engaged to-day writing letters,' etc. Here are four different collocations of the same sentence even in English."

The foregoing are, in fact, idiomatic indications of emphasis. But "the impotence of English to completely invert the sentence" soon reveals itself. By reason of our paucity of *case-endings*, *tense-forms*, etc., if we venture to transpose our words beyond a moderate degree, our meaning is obscured if not perverted. Thus, "Elijah calls this man" would appear to reverse the meaning of the corresponding Greek words, thus arranged without ambiguity in Matt. xxvii. 47; and, "A cheerful giver loves God," in 2 Cor. ix. 7, could scarcely be trusted to inform the English reader that "God loves a cheerful giver," however clearly the completely inverted words of the original say this and nothing else. Hence, only to a limited extent can we, in English, mark emphasis by the mere arrangement of our words; and this is only another way of saying that our idiom, as a whole, is not a logical idiom. It is otherwise with the Greek tongue and with the Greek New Testament. The original language of the Apostles and Evangelists of our Lord everywhere bears the impress of a most significant and valuable logical idiom, of which we now offer a more exact explanation.

By the Logical Idiom of the Greek Original is meant that peculiar style of composition which results from the arrangement of its words and clauses, with pervading regard to the precise *thought* meant to be expressed. It is a fact that the words and clauses of the original have been arranged in such an order as, by that very order, to indicate their relative importance for unfolding the thought intended to be conveyed. In its leading feature, logical arrangement is not confined to the Greek tongue, but pervades the Latin, and—which is still more to our purpose—the Hebrew. It is only as contrasted with the feebleness of logical determinateness of our own language that this feature of the Greek New Testament needs be termed an Idiom. To the English ear, however, it does seem so peculiar and yet pervading as to suggest the term Idiom; and at the same time so clearly evinces its value in marking the emphasis of words, and thereby the current of thought, as to make good its claim to be considered a Logical Idiom.

This Logical Idiom is the result of one simple law, as admirable in principle as it is delicate and ready in application. The law is, that words are rendered emphatic by being placed earlier than usual in the sentence. The expression of emphasis by this means is so constant as to obtain all the force of law. The richness of the original in inflexions renders the law of very extensive availability.

Beyond most languages rich in etymology, beyond all others flexible in syntax, —the Greek is susceptible of almost unlimited transposition, and thus is pre-eminent in its capability for becoming a vehicle of clear and precise thought. The ordinary unemphatic arrangement of the leading words of a sentence in Greek is, in the main, the same as in English; for instance, the nominative stands before its verb, the objective (dative and accusative) after. In subordinate details it differs: as in placing adjectives after their nouns, etc.; still the customary position of these subordinate words can be ascertained. Here, then, are the elements of ordinary arrangement, *departure from which* throws special emphasis on the words to which the advantage of priority is in this way given. Does a verb precede its nominative instead of following it? That verb is emphatic. Does an accusative noun precede its verb? That noun is emphatic, —etc., etc. The law is one: unwonted priority of position gives rise to emphasis. The law is pervading: it rules throughout the composition, its pulsations are everywhere felt. It can scarcely be said to admit of exceptions, though it might do so, and still remain a law. It is doubtless subject to limitations: rather, it is modified in its results by collateral influences. The very extent to which the law is operative, is significant. If an adjective placed before instead of after its noun is slightly emphatic, an adjective placed another remove earlier has an additional degree of emphasis. This is not arbitrary, but is the result of principle. As the law weaves itself into an idiom having the stamp of mental philosophy upon it, it would be arbitrary to deny it. When the mind has had sufficient commerce with the facts, it is impossible to deny it. The first word, like the first comer, has an advantage of which only exceptional circumstances can deprive it. Uttered with unspent breath, entering the unoccupied ear, seizing and leading the attentive mind,—the early word most naturally becomes the prominent and so the emphatic word;—at all events in a language formed for highest subserviency to the movements of mind. For proof, we appeal to the facts spread out in the following translation; but meantime it may be permitted us strongly to assert the child-like naturalness, the philosophic beauty, and the commanding force of the law which these facts so thoroughly establish.

So far, we have confined our attention to one aspect only of the idiom of the Greek New Testament; namely, that of its arrangement of words. But there is another aspect of it which requires a passing notice—that of its suppression or expression of the separate nominative pronoun. An illustration, in English, will make our allusion intelligible. Suppose that, after the fashion of some existing provincial dialects, we propose the question, "Dost think I hate thee?" every one perceives that the question is addressed to the second person singular number. The termination, "st," in "Dost," renders this as certain as though the separate nominative pronoun "thou" had been expressed. But suppose, further, that our verbs were rich enough in terminations, invariably, of themselves, to indicate the pronoun; we might then form the *habit* of regularly omitting the separate expression of the latter, falling back on their occasional use for the sake of emphasis; and so, for example, "Dost thou think I hate thee," might be understood to throw a contrasting force on the pronoun, such as would now require a resort to emphatic type, "Dost **thou** think I hate thee?" "(thou," supply—"who hast had proofs of love which *to others* have been denied"). Such an emphatic use of the separate nominative pronoun, *supposed* in English, *exists* in Greek, and runs like a line of light and beauty all through the Greek New Testament. It is evident that this is a species of Emphasis by Fulness: it is Emphatic repetition. Trep-o, trep-eis, trep-ei, are of themselves equivalent to turn-I, turnest-thou, turns-he; and, therefore, ego trep-o, su trep-eis, autos trep-ei, give the advantage of repetition to the pronominal idea. And the beauty of this device is that it is *independent of arrangement*, the separate nominative pronoun being emphatic wherever placed. Set at the very end of a sentence, it is still emphatic; not because it is at the end, but because it is there at all. Not that it has not an additional advantage when standing in an early position; but that, able to hold its own in any case, it can afford to give to every other word the local advantage of being emphatically placed before it, and yet retain a special force of its own. And, in this way, by a most admirable felicity, it occasionally happens that every word in a clause possesses a positively marked emphatic power. For a striking instance or two, see Matt. x. 31; 2 Cor. xi. 21 (end); 1 Tim. i. 15. It does, indeed, follow from what has just been said, as well as from other grammatical niceties which need not here be explained, that the emphasis on the separate nominative

pronouns is not the same in amount in every instance; but the utmost demands of candour are met by the simple statement that these pronouns "are always emphatic, more or less."

The foregoing paragraph has anticipated the objection, that sometimes the emphatic word is placed at the *end* of a sentence. As regards the separate nominative pronouns, the fact is admitted; but its force, as an objection to the law of arrangement, is denied. For example, in the final clause of 1 Tim. i. 15, "of whom A CHIEF AM I" (our English rendering exactly following the Greek order), it is obvious that, whereas adjective and verb are *by position* emphatic, the pronoun is emphatic on an entirely different principle,—as before explained, on the principle of repetition, which is independent of arrangement, and, *as a principle*, is common to all languages. In all such cases, therefore, the final word is emphatic by the operation of a *SECOND* law, not conflicting with the first, but supplementing it, and affording it freer scope.

That the Greek Rhetoricians did sometimes artificially reserve the important word to the close of their "flight of oratory,"¹ may be granted without damage to the great law of idiomatic emphasis, whose almost unlimited sway cannot be disputed; and it may even be that, in a single instance, or so (Luke i. 1.4), a New Testament writer has copied their example; although here, too, we have underscored according to the pervading law of emphatic *priority*. The interesting circumstance is, that critics, with one voice, pronounce this very passage to be unique in style, standing apart in a dress of classic refinement to which the accomplished Luke himself never returns. There is, *PERHAPS*, a further exception of one solitary verb in a few of its occurrences in the Gospels; which, however, have here been emphasised in the usual way, and which may be left for the critic to detect. But no law of language works with an absolutely mathematical precision, and, "the exception proves the rule." It is *certain* that, as a *rule*, the unemphatic, not emphatic, word is left to the close of the sentence. If any law of language is susceptible of proof, this law is set at rest by the following translation. Let an induction of clause and sentence endings be made! If the present translator is in error, then his unflinching application of one law throughout ought to be continually yielding deplorable results; for, in the nature of things, a false law of emphasis cannot be systematically applied with impunity. Let the doubter go to work, on the assumption that the terminations of sentences form a complete class of exceptions to the general rule, and the havoc made on every page will open his eyes. Happily, no respectable doubt has been raised against the existence and *general* operation of the one great law which, regardless of subjective taste and prepossessions, has been wrought out in this New Testament.

SECTION 4.—THE PRESERVATION OF EMPHASIS IN THIS TRANSLATION.

The plan adopted in this Translation for the Preservation of the Emphasis of the Original is quite simple. *First: All words emphatic by position in the Greek are underscored in English.* The only exception to this rule has respect to entire clauses. Where the prominent position of entire clauses could not easily be overlooked by the reader, liberty has, sometimes, been taken to leave them unmarked, for the sake of relief to the eye. But in no case has this freedom been used with *words within clauses*; every emphatic word, standing within a clause, has been systematically underlined. *Second: The separate nominative pronouns uniformly appear in thicker type.* Only the thick pronoun *I* will be in any danger of passing unnoticed; but the heedful reader will soon recognise it with ease. The whole notation of Emphasis, therefore, stands thus:

Two lines under a word denote slight emphasis, as: "all the generations."—

Matt. i. 17.

Three lines under a word denote decided emphasis, as: "Out of Egypt called

I my son."—Matt. ii. 15.

Pronouns in thicker type are always emphatic, more or less, as: "**he** will save his people," etc.—Matt. i. 21.

¹ CLYDE, *Greek Syntax*, p. 169.

The circumstance that, besides being Artificially Marked, the Emphasis of the Original is also, to some extent, Idiomatically Imitated, needs not complicate the above explanation, which, as far as it goes, is complete. The emphatic result of the Greek idiom has always been given: the Greek Idiom itself, sometimes. The Translator has endeavoured to preserve as much of the Logical Idiom of the Greek in his Translation as he believed would ultimately commend itself to careful readers. To those who are capable of perceiving, beneath a certain ruggedness of English phrasing, the essential beauty of a logical unfolding of the sense, no apology is needed; and for such alone is this Translation designed. The only solicitude felt is that the first impression of comparative stiffness should not be indulged to the extent of a prejudice deterring from further perusal. The Idiom will gradually become familiar; its expository force will soon be intuitively felt; its skilful method of letting in light upon the mind will be increasingly valued; till, in the end, it is not impossible that, instead of complaint being heard that the Greek idiom has been too much regarded, regret may arise in the accustomed mind, that more of its essentially philosophic grace has not been preserved.

The Translator indulges the hope that the brief Notes accompanying the Text of this New Testament will prove serviceable in suggesting to the reader how wide a field of precious hints is here thrown open to his enterprise.

CHAPTER II.—THE GREEK ARTICLE.

SECTION I.—THE POWER OF THE ARTICLE.

The Greek Article is a *sign of logical definiteness*. To *define* a thing is so to draw a line around it as to distinguish it from others bearing the same designation. {To be *able* to define a thing we must know enough about it, must be familiar with it. The *process* of defining an object is not carried on by the Definite Article, but by another means, viz., the statement of discriminating facts. For example, "wise men" (indefinite) come to Jerusalem, Matt. ii. The facts communicated respecting these wise men define them—mark them off from all other wise men. Then the Definite Article comes in as a symbol of the definiteness occasioned by the facts. They are then "*the* wise men," verses 7, 16. The Article *stands for*, or *represents*, a definiteness already known or assumed. We say "or assumed," because the defining facts may be known by the writer only: he may, not communicate, but *only* assume them. Thus, the Apostle John (Gos. ch. xiii. 5) tells us that the Lord poured water into "*the* basin,"—some definite basin. What makes it definite? The defining facts have not been communicated. This is the first time we read of a basin in the context. But John had the defining fact or facts before him: say, he knew of the custom of placing a basin in the guest-chamber for the use of the guests. At any rate, to John's mind, the basin used by the Lord was a definite basin. Assuming the defining facts as either well known or of no consequence, taking for granted that his readers will be quite willing to accept his representation of the matter, he says, "*the* basin;" he does *not* *define* the basin, but he assumes its definiteness, and applies to it the sign of definiteness,—the Greek Definite Article. The Article thus appears as an instrument of *thought*: it is related to the *conceptions of the mind*; and as such must be studied. It is not so immediately with objects themselves that it deals, as with the light in which those objects are, at the time, viewed by the mind. From the logical character of the Definite Article may be derived the following observations. OBS. 1. *The same thing may be definite to one mind and indefinite to another*. For instance,—the same medical man may be to one "*the* doctor," to another only "*a* doctor." OBS. 2. *The same object may be viewed by the same mind at one time as definite, at another as indefinite*. A man may say even of the wife of his bosom,—She is an affectionate wife. The Greek Article is a sign of logical definiteness, and is used or not according to the thought of the speaker or writer. As a rule, if his thought requires it, he uses it; if not, he dispenses with it. "In the language of living intercourse, it is

utterly impossible that the Article should be omitted where it is decidedly necessary, or employed where it is quite superfluous or preposterous." (*Winer, Gram. N. T. Diction*, p. 127.)

SECTION 2.—THE IDIOMS OF THE ARTICLE.

Still, every language has its idioms,—its peculiarities, its own private habits,—many of which will not be transferable to other languages. For example, the Greek tongue allows the employment of its Article before proper names. This may be called a Greek Idiom: it is decidedly un-English. But foreign idioms require skilful handling. It must not be assumed that they are *unmeaning*; still less, that they are used *in defiance* of the laws of correct thinking. Peculiarities of *language* express peculiarities of *thought*. Hence, in translating works of importance, great care should be exercised lest by undue fear of foreign idioms we lose valuable shades of thought. Moreover, we may hesitate before we dignify as idioms common *licences* of speech. There are *licences*—arising from familiarity, haste, and other causes—which are common to all languages. These are most readily found in connection with the great objects of nature, the members of the human body, etc. Besides these, there are *idioms* in the Greek New Testament which nevertheless are not *Greek* idioms. They are *Christian* idioms, offspring of the Christian Faith itself. Peculiarities of speech, denoting peculiarities of conception proper to Christian writers, they are the heritage of believers of all nations, and should be transferred, as far as possible, into all tongues.

But the Greek Article *has* intransferable idioms. Of these, a summary may be given. (1.) In the *INSERTION* of the Greek Article, the following decided idioms may be named:—

I. Before *proper* names; as, "*the* Abraham."

II. Before *generic* nouns; as, "*the* man" = "man," "mankind."

III. Before *abstract* nouns; as, "*the* sin" = "sin."

IV. In *addition* to pronouns; as, "*this the* man" = "this man;" "*the* son of me," or "*the* my son" = "my son;" etc.

V. Prefixed to Adjectives as well as their nouns; as, "*the* ground *the* good."

VI. After nouns; as, "*through* faith *the* [that] in Christ Jesus."

In advancing to (2) the *OMISSION* of the Article, we must proceed cautiously. It may be questioned whether there are *any* omissions which can properly be called Greek *idioms*. Undoubtedly the Article is in *many* cases omitted where, had strict propriety been demanded, it would have appeared. But perhaps it will be found that these omissions are rather *licences* than idioms,—licences more or less common to nearly all languages. Thus, for instance, there are,—the licence of poetry, the licence of familiar-expression, the licence of translation, etc. etc. (a) By the licence of *poetry* we may, in Greek or English, speak of "*sun, moon, and stars,*" when otherwise we should say "*the sun, the moon, and the stars:*" and in our fruitful imaginations we suffer kind Mother "Earth" to set the laws of prose at defiance; until, our poetic fervour being past, these objects all dutifully return to their wonted obedience to the laws of syntax. (b) By the licence of *familiar-expression* a similar result follows; e. g., in the days of the Apostles the significant definite appellation "*the* Christ, through being so often on men's lips, came to be not unfrequently abbreviated to "Christ" alone, so as to assume *almost* the aspect of a proper name. (c) By the licence of translation, "*Lord*" (*κύριος*), without the Article, appears in the Septuagint for JEHOVAH, and in the same form reappears in the New Testament (as in Matt. iii. 3; iv. 7, 10). Nevertheless, many of the omissions of the Greek Article likely to attract attention are neither Greek idioms nor common licences of speech, but are appropriate expressions of accurate though unusual thoughts; requiring, firstly, a scrupulous translator; and, secondly, *readers* willing to subordinate their preconceived opinions to the results of further enquiry.

SECTION 3.—THE PRESENCE OF THE ARTICLE.

It cannot be too strongly affirmed that the Greek Article is never present without possessing its legitimate force. It is never superfluous. It cannot

always be translated; but the translator is in all cases bound to take it into account. No known idiom forbidding, it should be translated. In several ways, however, may its force be preserved:—

I. Generally, it will reappear as the English Definite Article “the.”

II. Sometimes, it will require a pronoun to preserve its force.

SECTION 4.—THE ABSENCE OF THE ARTICLE.

It is here that an accurate version will make the largest demand on the candid and patient thoughtfulness of the reader. He will be apt to think that the *English* Definite Article *should* have been used, where in truth no sufficient warrant for it exists. Even though aware that the Article is not present in the Greek, he will be in some danger of resorting to the ready conjecture that its absence from the original arises from some peculiarity in that language which has no counterpart in his own. The reader may become *scrupulous*: his scruples may not be altogether divorced from *intelligence*: they certainly may be closely allied to *reverence for sacred things*. But to such a reader, it may in the *first* place be suggested, that a scruple is possible on the other side,—“May I *dare*, in this case, to put in the English Definite Article?” In the *second* place, that a satisfactory answer has to be given to the enquiry, *WHY, in the Greek, is the Article absent?* In the *third* place, that reverence itself may ultimately be gratified just where dissatisfaction was first feared. Certainly there is no necessary connection between definiteness and reverence. As well say, that inasmuch as to define is to *limit*, definiteness is *irreverent*! In fact, the less definite is sometimes the more reverent. As the pious and sagacious Bengel remarks (on 1 Pet. i. 10): “The omission of the Article gives weight to the sentence, as is often the case with the Germans; for it has the effect of calling away the attention of the hearer from the particular consideration of individuals to the genus itself.” But let us adduce an example or two:—

In Hebrews i. 5 we read, “I will be to him for a Father, and he shall be to me for a Son.” Is there any irreverence here? If not, why should there be, in following as closely the equally indefinite wording of the first verse of the same chapter? “God having, in many parts and in many ways, of old, spoken to the fathers in the prophets, at a last stage of these days spoke to us in a Son?” The simple fact is that, in both these verses, only the indefinite form is suited to the grandeur of the conception. It is no question of how many Fathers or how many Sons; but purely a question of relationship: ‘I will sustain to him the relation of a Father, and he shall sustain to me the relation of a Son.’ ‘God spoke to us in One who sustained to Himself the relation of a Son.’ ‘God had a Son—He sent Him—He spoke in Him,—in One so near, so dear, so like, so loyal:—A Son!’ This sublime relation of sonship, in its abstract essential force, so fills the devout reader’s mind that no thought of enumeration or mere identification (how *many* sons? *which* son?) can enter. To use the Definite Article, in this case, would be to lower and weaken and even to mar the thought. It would be to reduce the meaning of the phrase to one of identification,—‘the well-known Son of God.’ The truth is, we are beginning to realise the value of the word ‘logical’ in our definition. The conception of the mind at the time of speaking must be steadily kept in view.

Take another illustration from Rom. i. 17. In the Good-tidings “a righteousness of God is revealed.” Reverence or irreverence is here quite beside the mark. But this is certain: the use of the English Definite Article positively obscures, if it does not wholly conceal, the thought intended. Had Paul meant “*THE* righteousness of God,” he could have said so: he had the appropriate form of speech at command. But he does not say “*THE* righteousness of God,”—he does not *intend* that: his *thought* is different. In this most original and logical Epistle he thoroughly treats his main theme: he takes nothing, of the special Christian element, for granted: he goes to the beginning of things, especially at the beginning of the Epistle. At this point in particular, he has a new thing to unfold,—new, at least so far as logical development is concerned. In the Gospel, a *righteousness* is revealed for man’s acceptance. It is ‘*A* righteousness,’ or GOD,—DIVINE in its character and source. The Definite Article would wrong the thought. It must do one of two things: either carry the mind of the reader away to the divine attribute of righteousness, God’s own subjective righteousness,—against the scope of the paragraph; or, assume as definite, without defining

facts previously supplied, that which the writer begins with as indefinite, on purpose that he may communicate facts about it which shall define it—shall mark it off from all other righteousnesses of man's devising and wearing. Afterwards, indeed, in Chap. x., the Apostle definitely names the same divinely provided righteousness: as much as to say, 'THE herein-before-named-and-discussed righteousness, revealed for faith, received by faith.' Similar observations apply to the following passages, 2 Cor. v. 19; Phil. iii. 20; Col. i. 15; 1 Thess. i. 10; Heb. x. 31; Rev. i. 13; and many others.

Only let the reader remember that, in very many instances, the Article is dispensed with *in order that the mind may be thrown directly upon the NATURE or QUALITY of the noun* which is marked by its absence, and he will not be likely to form a rash judgment in this matter. The Article assumes familiarity; hence it is frequently removed from objects, which are, indeed, familiar, but which the writer wishes to be considered *anew*, as though no such familiarity existed. This borne in mind, and allowance being made for such occasional 'licences' as are common to our own tongue, the careful and delicate propriety with which the Article is generally used in the New Testament will become a source of constant instruction and delight. The strong persuasion of this prompted the expedient of representing the Greek Article *by the degree-mark (°)* in *all* instances in which the former could not well be rendered by our English "the." By this means, the reader is enabled to discriminate between, *e.g.*, "the Son of me" = "my °Son," and "a Son of me" = "my Son." It may be impossible to mark, by translation proper, the presumable difference between these forms of speech; but that is not the slightest reason why the difference should not exist in Greek. On the other hand, wherever "the" was needed in translation, otherwise than for translating the Greek Article, such a "the" was either hyphenated-on to another word, or formally acknowledged as supplied, in the usual way, by square brackets. *Thus, in this New Testament, every recurrence of the Greek Article can be readily traced.*

CHAPTER III.—THE FORCES OF THE VARIOUS TENSES.

SECTION I.—THE TREATMENT OF THE TENSES HEREIN ATTEMPTED.

The method of treating the tenses of the Greek New Testament attempted in the following Translation will not be denied the merit of simplicity. It consists in keeping a steady eye on the one ascertained force of each tense, and making small account of exceptions. The great mass of exceptions are deemed unworthy of existence. The principles of the Translator, as to rules and exceptions, are the following:—

I. The rule should always be assumed, never the exception.

II. The exception must either be proved or be self-evident; and should never otherwise be granted.

III. The exception, when manifest, should be regarded as a modification or extension of the rule, and be treated as an outgrowth.

Many apparent exceptions, instead of being such, are merely *figures of speech* whose very existence springs from the force of the rule. For example: Is the Present tense sometimes applied to things conceived of as *taking place or being done* in the past or future? These applications do not in the least degree change the force of the tense. The Present tense applied to past time may be said to create a figure of speech. By it, a speaker pictures a thing as going on at the time of speaking, though in literal truth it is not. But what is not in fact true, in figure may be so. The truth lies in this, that the speaker transfers his own mind and those of his hearers into the midst of the scenes he describes. The form of speech corresponds to the form of thought: change the one, and you change the other. A similar remark may be made as to the application of the Present tense to future

things. This is either the result of transferring the mind into the future, or else means no more than that there *now actually exists* a 'fixed arrangement' or 'intention' as to the future. Other illustrations will arise as we proceed. Meanwhile we may with confidence affirm that, in such cases as those just named, to change the tense in translating is to wipe out the vivid, life-like touches that appear in the original.

SECTION 2.—THE PRINCIPAL TENSES CONSIDERED.

(I.) THE AORIST.

(1) *Its Force in all the Moods.* The Aorist tense expresses complete action. It may cover a single act, or a series of acts. If the former, it denotes the act not as in progress but as complete. If the latter, it represents the series as concluded, rounded off, wound up, condensed to a point. The Aorist always denotes a point in contradistinction from a line. This force is essential to it in all the Moods.

(2) *Its Force in the Indicative Mood.* In the principal Mood—the Indicative—the Aorist expresses complete action in *time past indefinite*. To what precise point of time it carries the mind, must be learned from context and circumstance. But it always expresses past time. The time may be *really* past or *ideally* past: in other words, it may denote fact or figure. If fact, then it is *historical*: if figure, then it is *illustrative* or *prophetic*.

(a) The *Historical* Aorist occurs on every page of the New Testament, from the first, Matt. i. 2, "Abraham begat Isaac," to the last, Rev. xxii. 16, "I, Jesus, sent my messenger."

(b) The *Illustrative* Aorist occurs, e.g., in James i. 11, "Up rose the sun . . . its flower fell out," etc. The case is supposed as one having actually occurred.

(c) The *Prophetic* Aorist abounds, as might have been expected, in the "Revelation;" e.g., xxi. 4, "Because the first things departed." The mind is transferred to a point beyond the event, whence it looks back on it as past. The effect is often very striking!

In these and all such cases the Indicative Aorist is true to itself: its force is required either by fact or by figure—the conception is uniform.

* Again, the time may be either remote or recent. It may be *remote*, as John i. 3, "All things through him came into existence;" or *recent*, as John i. 50, "Because I said to thee, that I saw thee under the fig-tree, believest thou?" So recent may it be that the temptation may arise to render it as a Perfect, or even as a Present. This temptation must be resisted!

(3) *Not to be confounded with the Perfect.* The Aorist never has the force of the Perfect. Take as an illustration, Luke vii. 45, "She, from the time I came in, did not cease tenderly kissing my feet." Here some attention may be required to perceive the propriety of the Aoristic idea. Many may judge the Perfect, "has not ceased," to be as good or even better. "Has not ceased," however, is certainly incorrect. It is not only unfaithful to the original tense-form, but is untrue to the delicate propriety of the facts. The strictly proper force of the Perfect brings the thing spoken of into the very time of speaking. Now, every instinct of new-born modesty must have deterred the penitent woman from continuing her caressing of the Lord's feet *while he was speaking about her to the Pharisee*. "She did not cease tenderly kissing my feet"—*supply*: "until just now her ministries of grateful love were interrupted by my drawing from her behaviour a much-needed lesson for thee, Simon!"—For a beautiful instance of the juxtaposition of the Aorist and the Perfect, see 2 Cor. v. 17: "The old things went away"—"some little ago—the fact is now a matter of history—a blessed interval since then has elapsed," "behold!"—"what are *THESE* things around, within? *THESE* things aforesaid had no existence!"—"THERE HAVE COME INTO EXISTENCE new things," "and these new things abide." (Comp. 1 Cor. xv. 3, 4, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 20.)

(4) *Nor is it to be confounded with the Present.* The Present denotes a line running on at the time of speaking: this the Aorist never signifies. Alleged proofs of the coincidence of the two Tenses are inconclusive. One of the first

likely to be adduced is Matt. iii. 17,—“This is my Son, the Beloved, in whom I delighted.” Now, be it observed that the question here is not whether the Father was, *in fact*, taking delight in Jesus at the time He uttered these words; but—Why, had *that* been the thought to be expressed, was not the appropriate tense-form for expressing it employed? This question clears the way for another, entering further into the heart of the matter: Can the Aorist-form, used on this solemn occasion, be *forbidden* its accustomed force? This is the vital question. If it cannot—if no exception can be proved, if none is self-evident—then we are bound by one of the first laws of translation to concede it its usual significance. Now, no exception is self-evident—none can be proved. There is no sufficient reason for demurring to the common meaning of the Aorist Indicative in this passage. What reason *can* there be? Is there anything *inappropriate* in “the indefinite past”? Is it inappropriate to ground a *present* installation into office on a *past* approval. Surely not. But it may be said that the usual force of the Aorist would convey, by implication, the inadmissible thought that the Father no longer took delight in his beloved Son! This is incorrect. The Greek Aorist—the English indefinite Past—never of itself conveys that idea. Context and circumstance may convey it: context and circumstance may *forbid* it! “God so loved (Aorist) the world that,” etc. Has God *ceased* to love the world? If the Aorist, by any inherent force of its own, implies discontinuance, then has God ceased loving the world. The Aorist implies no such thing: though it does not express continuance, neither does it imply discontinuance. The fact that it does not express continuance, may allow us sometimes, from other considerations, to infer discontinuance. But there may be other reasons for using the Aorist than to permit the idea of discontinuance. It may be desired by the Speaker to send the hearer’s thought away from the present. The reference *e.g.* may be to some *past* act resulting from the *past* GOOD PLEASURE. It is actually so in this case. We know this from a parallel place,—Matt. xii. 18: “Behold my servant whom I selected: my beloved in whom my soul delighted.” The primary exposition—all that the *translator* needs—is simple enough. The Father delighted in his Son, therefore he selected him. True, this throws the selecting into the past;—and why not? Nothing but a foregone conclusion in theology can complain of this. But a translator has nothing to do with foregone conclusions in theology. The *expositor* is at liberty to go wherever by legitimate considerations he may be led in endeavouring to determine to *what* point of past time the “delighted” and “selected” refer. But what right has the translator to hide from the expositor the true question which remains to be settled? The truth is—and it assumes a serious aspect—if this first temptation to render the Aorist as a Present be not resisted, no one can tell where the mischief will end. Translate it as a Present here, and of necessity the same word in the same form must be rendered in the same way in Matt. xii. 18, xvii. 5, Mark i. 11, Luke iii. 22, and 2 Pet. i. 17. But will the mischief end here? How can that be expected? Will the “were delivered” of Matt. xi. 27 be permitted to appear? Will the “was given” of Matt. xxviii. 18 be suffered to shew itself? It is very unlikely. In fact, the inaccuracy will be carried to the very gates of the past eternity, and will hide the primal counsels of God. I find in my Greek Testament passage after passage which in an instant sends my mind away to a point prior to the foundation of the world; when, so to speak, all plans were deposited, and all potencies made to dwell—mediatorially—in Him through whom Creation and Redemption alike were to be accomplished. I may be wrong in this application of the passages; but I turn my face to the world of reverent scholars, and firmly ask by what right the mere English reader is not to know of the precise turn these solemn passages have in the Greek original.—We find the Present and the Aorist with most telling discrimination brought together in 1 Cor. xv. 11: “Thus are we proclaiming”—the *line* of faithful testimony was still running on: “and thus did ye believe,”—here the line is significantly dropped, and the past point of former believing reception is all that is assumed. Can *this* have been undesigned? Note also, in Rom. vii. 6, the *summary* “release” and the *protracted* “service.”

(II.) THE PERFECT TENSE.

(1) *The Force of the Perfect.* The peculiarity of the Perfect consists in its combining past and present time. It describes a line bringing the past up to the present. What it brings up from the past may be either the act, or the

result of the act; but in every case it expresses the combination of past and present. Matt. ii. 5, "It has been written:" *i.e.*, "it was written and the writing remains." John xi. 27, "I have believed:" *i.e.*, "I did believe and do so still;" xiii. 10, "He who has bathed himself:" *i.e.*, "he who, having been to the bath, is still in the bathed state, cleansed, refreshed." Rom. vi. 7, "has been declared righteous:" *i.e.*, "was declared righteous, and still continues under the sentence of vindication." Col. iii. 3, "has become hid:" *i.e.*, "was hid, and remains hidden now." See also Heb. xi. 5.

"Those who wish frequently to translate Greek Perfects by English *Presents*, may include *one part* of the meaning, but they thoroughly exclude the *full force*." 'By grace ye have been saved,' *ἐστε σσσωμένοι*, Eph. ii. 8, here 'are saved' would only express one part of the truth; whereas the notion to be included is, 'ye were saved, and are so still.' (Tregelles, *The Revelation from Ancient Authorities*, pp. vi. vii.)

(2) *In English, sometimes a little formal.* It may be granted that occasionally the Greek Perfect is used where our English Perfect sounds a little precise and ungraceful. Many ears might prefer "is written" in the first illustration above given. But there are few who will not readily leave such occurrences in charge of custom for being made smooth, in consideration of the greater exactness and more constant fidelity ensured by the uniform bringing out of the full force of the Perfect tense.

(3) *The Imperative Perfect difficult to render.* In the Imperative Mood it may generally be impossible, with due regard to the idiom of our own language, to render the original word as a Perfect. Still it is not difficult to seize the true conception. On the word rendered "be still" in Mark iv. 39, a lamented friend once acutely and pleasantly wrote: "I cannot put *πεφιλοσο* into English as a Perfect. It is just the tense that should have been used. The Present would have implied, 'be in the act of being muzzled or controlled.' The Aorist would have duly commanded the act of stillment to be done without conveying the idea of *when*. I can only illustrate the use of the Perfect by an illustration of which I believe you are personally ignorant. It is as when a poor wife, teased and exhausted by the petulancy and corroding complaints of her husband, in the moment of her anguish stamps her foot, and says, 'Have done with you!'"

(4) *The Perfect dramatically used in narrative.* Sometimes, with beautiful effect, the Perfect is used in narrative to set forth that, so to speak, before one can record it, a thing *has been done*! Thus, in 2 Cor. xii. 8, 9: "Thrice besought I (Aorist) the Lord. . . And he has said (Perfect) to me." (Comp. Isa. lxx. 24.) Was Abraham tried? He "has," already, in intention, "offered up Isaac." Heb. xi. 17. Was the Passover commanded? By faith *it has been brought about*; and Moses, entrenched within the *result* of his obedient act, is calmly awaiting the issue. Heb. xi. 23. See also Rev. vii. 14. The beauty of these examples springs from the primary significance of the Perfect.

(III.) THE IMPERFECT TENSE.

(1) *Its invariable Force.* The Greek Imperfect expresses action or condition going on in past time. It is like the Present in extending along a line, and like the Aorist and Pluperfect in needing to have its time defined.

(2) *Alternates with the Aorist.* In narrative, the Imperfect frequently alternates with the Aorist. In such cases, with the Imperfect the story becomes more vivid, with the Aorist it relapses into a more sober condensation. Thus, in Luke xv. 15-17, we read: "And, taking his journey (Aorist), he joined himself (Aorist) to one of the citizens of that land, and he sent (Aorist) him into his fields to be feeding (Imperfect) swine. And he was longing (Imperfect) to fill (Aorist) his belly from the pods which the swine were eating (Imperfect), and no one was giving (Imperfect) to him. And coming (Aorist) to himself, he said (Aorist)," etc. Comp. Luke i. 62, 63; viii. 23; Acts ii. 4, 41, 42. But though thus used in close connection with the Aorist, it is by no means to be confounded with it. Sometimes the difference between them is indicative of an important distinction in the acts they severally represent. Even when otherwise,—when, *e.g.*, in narrating one and the same fact, one Evangelist employs the Aorist and

another the Imperfect,—the choice is not strictly speaking arbitrary: the fact of the difference simply proves that the one narrates more vividly than the other.

(3) *Can commonly be rendered as such.* In many cases there is no difficulty in putting the full force of the Greek Imperfect into acceptable English. It is easy to say, e.g., Matt. xiii. 1, "He **WAS SITTING** by the lake:" xxviii. 6, "Come! see the place where the Lord **WAS LYING!**" Acts ii. 47, "The Lord **WAS ADDING**," etc. The reader will be well repaid for his trouble, if he trace the frequency and mark the pictorial vividness with which *Luke*, both in his Gospel and in the Acts, employs this tense.

(4) *Sometimes the exact rendering appears a little uncouth.* Always to find a comely English dress for the Greek Imperfect is not so easy as one could desire. Acts ii. 47, "those being saved" is not so pleasant to the ear as the phrase "was adding." At the same time, though perhaps not classic English, this mode of expressing the passive Imperfect (and Present) is now extensively employed, and has the primary quality of perspicuity. It unmistakeably represents the act or process as going on at the time to which the narrative refers. The reader of this Version will find this form of the Imperfect more frequently employed than a regard to mere elegance would have permitted.

(5) *Sometimes cannot be expressed in English.* Our best endeavours to communicate all the force of the original will occasionally fail, as in other respects so in this. One could greatly wish to bring out more fully the *continuative* force of the verb *to be* in John i. 1, "Originally **was** the Word, and the Word **was** with God, and the Word **was** God. The same **was** originally with God." It is not easy to see how this could be done without running the risk of overdoing the translation. Certainly it will be found that, whether by reason of our paucity of verb-inflexions or from other causes, we must, so far as exact rendering goes, now and then let the full force of the Imperfect escape us.

(IV.) THE PRESENT TENSE.

(1) *The Force of the Present.* The Greek Present tense may be represented as a line running through the moment of speaking. This is the conception it suggests. Whether that conception be in accord with literal truth, or only with figurative, affects not the force of the tense. Some of the *functions* which this tense fills are worthy of attention.

(2) *The Functions of the Present tense.* The following view of the *uses* to which this tense is applied in the New Testament may furnish the reader with hints for exposition:—

(a) *The Historical Present*: descriptive of past events as if transpiring at the time of speaking (p. viii., last par.). John iii. 4: "Nicodemus **says** unto him,"—the reader is invited to hear the conversation. iv. 7: "There **comes** a woman out of Samaria,"—the reader is told to open his eyes and see the woman approaching, etc. The Present applied to this use is frequently to be found interchanged with past tenses,—in some cases, not infrequent in the Gospels, where the Aorist or Imperfect might seem to have been more suited for preserving the time-sequence of the narrative. These may be described as abrupt snatches of vividness which it is *not* the translator's duty to conceal.

(b) *The Customary Present*: setting forth what is wont to be done. Heb. vi. 16: "Men by the greater one **swear**,"—they are in the habit of doing so. 1 John v. 9, "If the witness of men **we are receiving**,"—as is our wont.

(c) *The Progressive Present*: declarative of what is in the process of being done at the time of speaking. Rom. x. 2, "I **bear** them witness,"—'am now in the act of bearing them witness.' 1 John ii. 1, "These things **am I writing** to you,"—'am now engaged in writing to you.'

(d) *The Prospective Present*: indicative of a present arrangement as to the Future. Matt. ii. 4, "Where is the Christ (to be) **born?**" 'where is it ordained and written that he shall be born?' viii. 31, "If thou dost cast us out:" 'if thou art resolved that thou wilt cast us out.' John xiv. 2, "I **am going** away to prepare a place for you:" 'It is in the plan of my Father that I shall go.'

Sometimes this application of the Greek Present seems well rendered in English by a form which gives it distinct expression; as in John iii. 18; 1 Cor. xv. 35; Gal. vi. 7; 1 Thess. i. 10.

Which of these functions the Present tense performs in a given place, it may tax the reader's discernment to discover. The Present tense-form is not decisive, and it is well to know this. Regard must be paid to the context, the nature of the case, parallel passages, etc. The present translator cannot hope that he has always made the happy choice; and therefore begs the reader to use his own judgment in any doubtful case. Only let him keep to the *line*,—the line of *pictured history* (a), the line of *habit* (b), the line of *actual process* (c), the line of *fixed arrangement* and settled expectation (d).

(V.) THE FUTURE TENSE.

(1) *The Force of the Future.* The Greek Futures set forth action or condition to be brought about at a time subsequent to the moment of speaking. This occasions no difficulty, and requires no discussion.

(5) *A Twofold application of the Future in Greek.* The Greek Futures are applied indifferently to Future action as it may be viewed in one or other of two aspects. They set forth either Eventuality or Ordainment; *i. e.*, they either simply state what will in the *event* come to pass, or they speak of what is ordained (appointed, promised, threatened) to come to pass. The future of Eventuality involves the Speaker's knowledge only; whereas the future of Ordainment involves his faithfulness and power. The future of Eventuality does not convey the idea that the Speaker is responsible for bringing to pass what he foretells: on the contrary, the future of Ordainment does convey that idea,—the speaker is understood to promise or threaten as the case may be,—his power or faithfulness, or both, are at stake. These different notions have not in Greek each its own *form* of expression. The same standing future-form conveys either conception. Which is the intended thought in a given case, the law of context and circumstance alone can determine.

(3) *Two distinct Forms of the Future in English.* It is not more strange than true that in our English Future we have a refinement which the Greeks did not possess. We distinguish, by different forms, the Futures of Eventuality and Ordainment. Our auxiliaries "will" and "shall" have the honour of preserving this distinction. The fact cannot be doubted. As, however, north and south the Tweed some diversity of usage is to be found, and as a literary controversy has been waged respecting the right application of these words, it may appear becoming in the present translator if he name the rule for applying "will" and "shall" by which he has been guided. He feels himself happy in being able to quote from a venerable Scotch authority,¹ a memorial verse which certainly expresses the distinction usually observed *south* of the Tweed:—

"In the first Person simply **SHALL** foretells:

In **WILL** a Threat or else a Promise dwells.

SHALL in the Second and the Third does threat;

WILL simply then foretells the future Fate."

For some readers, it may be acceptable to throw this distinction into another form, thus:

Future of Eventuality:	{ I shall,	We shall,
	{ Thou wilt,	Ye will,
	{ He, she, or it will,	They will.

Future of Ordainment:	{ I will,	We will,
	{ Thou shalt,	Ye shall,
	{ He, she, or it shall,	They shall.

It should be distinctly understood that the above outline is by no means designed as a literary challenge. The translator's single aim is to explain clearly the principle on which he has acted in executing the following translation. It will now be the reader's fault if any misapprehension arise in respect of what the translation was intended to convey. What the *English* means may thus be

considered as set at rest, so far as this work is concerned. As much cannot be assumed as to the Greek.

(4) *The Difficulty resulting.* Had the Greek used different forms to express the futures of Eventuality and Ordainment, no difficulty would have existed; or had the English *not* used different forms to express them, still no difficulty would have arisen. In the former case the translator would have had the easy task of following his original, form for form. In the latter, the difficulty would not have concerned the translator at all, it would have been transferred unshared to the reader. On him would have been devolved the entire obligation of determining whether in a particular instance the Future should be regarded as that of Eventuality or that of Ordainment.

(5) *Liberty of judgment reserved.* As it is,—while, under the circumstances, the translator could not evade the use of his discretion as to which form of the English Future he should in each instance employ,—the reader's liberty of judgment has not been taken from him. He can still judge for himself as to which conception is the more becoming. One thing, however, he will please remember,—he must base no argument on either “will” or “shall” in using this translation. Any argument so based, in employing *any* translation of the New Testament, is utterly worthless. The obvious demands of propriety, as arising from the position of the speaker, his known or presumptive intention, etc.—in one word, the law of context and circumstance—alone can decide between the rival claims of “shall” and “will.” The translator has used his best discretion: let the reader be aware of his own liberty, and wisely employ it in *revising*, and—if he find a ‘needs be’—in *reversing* the translator's choice.

SECTION 3.—CONDENSED VIEW OF THE VARIOUS TENSES.

It will doubtless please the reader to have at hand for reference a brief view of the Various Tenses as explained in the foregoing section. The following epitome will serve to refresh his memory:—

<i>Tense.</i>	<i>Force.</i>	<i>Functions.</i>	<i>Example.</i>
THE AORIST, INDICATIVE.	{ Complete Action, in time past indefinite. }	{ Historical. Illustrative. }	I loved.
PERFECT.	{ Past Action brought up to the Present Time in itself or its effects. }		{ I have loved.
IMPERFECT.	{ Past Action in Pro- gress, or Customary Action, in indefinite past time. }		{ I was loving; or, I used to love.
PRESENT.	{ Action passing through the time of speaking. }	{ Historical. Customary. Progressive. Prospective. }	{ I love, am loving, or, am to love.
FUTURE.	{ Action yet to be begun at the time of speaking. }	Eventuality..... Ordainment.....	I shall—thou wilt—love, etc. I will—thou shalt—love, etc.

SECTION 4.—ONE TENSE NOT USED FOR ANOTHER.

It has been the burden of the foregoing observations on the Tenses that strictly speaking one tense is not used for another. If the Tense changes, the Conception also changes. The writers of the New Testament were not, as witnesses, compelled to observe facts from one point of view; nor were they, as thinkers, condemned to monotony of thought. Our duty is to follow, not to lead them; to learn from them, not to instruct them. No doubt there is to be found, especially in the Gospels, a Non-Sequence of Tenses; *e. g.*, a Present, abrupt and alone, in the midst of Pasts, etc. The translator wishes it to be once for all distinctly understood that in no case has he felt himself called upon to try to mend the style of the Apostles and Evangelists. Their partial want of polish, their occasional mixing of tenses, etc., he has looked upon as marks of genuineness far too precious to be for an instant concealed.