

overcame them all; and his victory consisted, not simply in retaining his personal integrity, but in retaining and strengthening his confidence in himself as the Messiah, and in repelling with utter loathing and immutable firmness, in full view of his sufferings and death, the proposal to resign his work and serve the world and the devil.

We remark, in conclusion, that although the temptation lies in the sphere of our Lord's Messiahship, it is by no means beyond the reach of human sympathies. True, we are not tempted to doubt our divinity, but how often have the servants of Christ, overwhelmed with the responsibility of following him and carrying on his work, been tempted to doubt the reality of their sacred mission, and their ability, through grace, to perform it. In these hours of darkness and despondency they have been in the wilderness with their Master, and the devil has been beside them to lead them to despair of the success of redemption, and to submit to the world and its prince. Happy are such when they have come off victorious by the help of him who "was tempted in all points like as we are."

ARTICLE VI.

REMARKS ON RENDERINGS OF THE COMMON VERSION (IN THE EPISTLE TO THE GALATIANS).

BY H. B. HACKETT, PROFESSOR IN NEWTON THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

(*Concluded from Vol. XIX. p. 225.*)

As remarked in the former Article, the object here is not to revise the common translation, in course or minutely; but only to point out some of the more obvious changes, which are regarded by interpreters as due to the sense, or to a clearer representation of the sense, of the original text. It will be noticed that the current version of the passage is

given first, and then the corrected one, with brief explanations. The Greek has been cited to some extent; but an occasional reference to the Greek Testament may be necessary, in order to see the force of the criticisms.

CHAPTER IV.

Verse 2. *But is under tutors and governors.* 'But is under guardians and stewards.' The foregoing is now admitted to be the proper distinction between ἐπίτροποι and οἰκονόμοι. The former is a general term and designates those who act in any way (not excluding the παιδαγωγός) as the guardians or overseers of children who are the heirs of property; while the latter, on account of the importance of the particular trust, which that relation involves, singles out those among the overseers who regulate the pecuniary affairs of the estate. See especially Wieseler, *Ueber den Brief an die Galater*, p. 326. The common rendering is also that of the antecedent English versions, except Wiclif's.

Verse 4. *Made of a woman, made under the law.* 'Born of a woman, born under the law.' This use of γενόμενον (strictly *to begin to be, come into existence*), as applied to the birth of persons, is common in the Greek language. See John viii. 58 and Rom i. 3. In the latter passage, as well as in this, our version translates γενόμενον *made*, after Wiclif, and the Geneva and the Rheims versions, instead of *born*, as in Tyndale and Cranmer. It is barely possible that the more obvious rendering was set aside, as less congruous with the miraculous nature of Christ's birth.

Verse 5. *To redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons.* 'That he might redeem those under the law; that we might receive the adoption of sons.' The ἵνα before ἐξαγοράσῃ bears the same relation to ἐξαπέστειλεν, that the ἵνα does before ἀπολάβωμεν. There is no reason, therefore, for employing the infinitive in one case and the finite mood in the other, as in the English version. The sentence represents the redemption and the adoption as parallel results, rather than consecutive; though

in the logical analysis the former, of course, would be the true order.

Verse 7. *And if a son, then an heir of God through Christ.* 'And if a son, also an heir through God.' Two changes should be made here. First, *καί* represents the relations as co-existent, i.e. heir as well as son, and hence means 'also,' and not 'then,' as if it were inferential. Secondly, we must substitute in the text *κληρονόμος διὰ Θεοῦ* for the received *κληρονόμος Θεοῦ διὰ Χριστοῦ*. So Lachmann, Schott, Tischendorf, Meyer, Ellicott. Usteri adheres to *διὰ Χριστοῦ*, because the inheritance is usually said to be through Christ, and not through God; but that circumstance itself accounts probably for the origin of the easier reading. As to the thought, Wieseler remarks very justly: "When a person has become a son of God, he has, in virtue of that relation, a claim also to the Messianic inheritance, which God will bestow on him; in like manner as he who is the son of a man has also, in virtue of that relation, a claim to his father's possessions."

Verse 9. *Whereunto ye desire again to be in bondage.* 'Whereunto ye desire again to be in bondage anew.' The common version treats *ἄνωθεν* as pleonastic. But *πάλιν* and *ἄνωθεν* differ from each other. The former describes the relapse in question, as one to a state of bondage, and the latter, as one to the state of bondage, through which the Galatian converts had already passed. Tyndale and Cranmer retain this significant distinction: 'Whereunto agayne ye desyre afresshe to be in bondage.'

Verse 12. *Brethren, I beseech you be as I am; for I am as ye are.* 'Become as I am; for I also have become as ye are, brethren, I beseech you.' This passage has been treated as needlessly obscure. We have, undoubtedly, the key which unlocks the meaning in 1 Cor. ix. 20, 21. "Unto the Jews," Paul says there, "I became as a Jew, that I might gain the Jews; to them that are without law (I became) as without law, that I might gain them that are without law (*ἄνομοι*)."

We merely repeat *ἐγενόμην* in the

second clause from γίνεσθε in the first, and supply the substantive verb. The sense then is: "*Become* in your relinquishment of Jewish rites as *I* am in that respect; for *I also*, who am a Jew, and consequently attached to such rites by every tie of natural sympathy, have forsaken them, and *become as you* are, i.e. have placed myself upon the Gentile ground, which is that of the non-observance of Jewish law. It is but reasonable, therefore, that I should ask you (δέομαι ἡμῶν) to concur with me, and thus be simply true to your own national position, when I, against every bias of birth and education, have cast aside the forms of Judaism, and assimilate to the Gentiles." Such scholars, among others, as Usteri, Winer, Neander, Fritzsche, De Wette, Meyer, Wieseler, Ellicott, concur in this view of the meaning.

Verse 13. *Ye know how through infirmity of the flesh I preached the gospel unto you at the first.* 'Ye know that by reason of weakness of the flesh I preached to you the gospel the former time.' The expression "through infirmity" seems to mean that it was in a state of weakness, under bodily infirmity, that Paul preached at this time to the Galatians. But the preposition here (διὰ) with the accusative can denote only the ground or occasion of the act. See Winer, *New Test. Gram.*, § 49. c. We must understand that Paul was detained in Galatia by sudden illness, and was thus led to preach there in the first instance, contrary to his original plan. The sickness was such as to render it impossible for him to prosecute his journey, but not such as to incapacitate him for declaring the gospel. Professor Jowett, who regards the New Testament Greek as peculiar, and not subject to the ordinary laws of Greek usage, decides for the other sense. It is better to be on the side of such critics as Fritzsche, Bengel, Meyer, Winer, Ellicott, Wieseler, Alford, Ellicott. Again, the surer meaning of πρότερον is not first, but former. The latter sense adheres more closely to the comparative form, and tallies precisely with the facts of history. We learn from the Acts of the Apos-

ties that Paul visited Galatia twice; first when he planted the churches there, on his first missionary tour (Acts xvi. 6), and the second time when he confirmed the same churches, on his third tour (Acts xviii. 23). He wrote his Epistle to the Galatians, undoubtedly, at Ephesus, soon after his second visit to them.

Verse 17. *They zealously affect you, but not well; yea, they would exclude you, that ye might affect them.* 'They zealously seek you, not well (i.e. not with good intent); but wish to exclude you, that ye may zealously seek them.' The evident alliteration here makes it difficult to find or frame a satisfactory translation of this verse. That of our version may answer very well for the words (*ζηλοῦσι, ζηλοῦτε*) in this place, but misleads the reader entirely in the next verse. Perhaps Ellicott's rendering shows what the difficulty is, rather than how it may be overcome: "They pay you court in no honest way; yea, they desire to exclude you, that ye may pay them court. But it is good to be courted in honesty at all times, and not only when I am present with you." Winer succeeds much better, with the aid of the Latin: "Ambiunt vos non honeste. . . . ut ipsos ambiatis. Honestum est ambiri in re honesta." It is needless to remark that 'exclude' is very ambiguous, to say the least; but the Greek word (*ἐκκλείσαι*) is equally so. It means, probably, that the false teachers wished to detach the Galatians from Paul and his friends, and make them partisans of their own.

Verse. 18. *But it is good to be zealously affected, etc.* 'But it is good to be zealously sought,' etc. The change in the last verse is required here. Very possibly our translators had the right conception; but *ζηλοῦσθαι* as passive corresponds evidently to *ζηλοῦσι ὑμᾶς* as active, and as the latter means to bestow zeal on others, the former must mean to have it bestowed on ourselves; whereas "to be zealously affected," certainly as we use language at present, means to be affected with zeal, to be zealous, and thus comes round again very nearly to the active, so as to confuse utterly the apostle's meaning.

Verse 22. *For it is written, that Abraham had two sons: the one by a bondmaid, the other by a freewoman.* 'For it is written, that Abraham had two sons: one by the bondwoman, and one by the freewoman.' The article represents the women (*τῆς παιδίσκης, τῆς ἐλευθέρας*) as historic persons. All the older English Versions, except the Rhemish, overlook this precision of the language. On the other hand, our version makes *παιδίσκη* definite in the twenty-seventh verse of this chapter, where, instead of "children of the bondwoman" we have in Greek of "a bondwoman," and thus the contrast in that passage between the nobility of one parentage and the degradation of another is greatly weakened. The manner in which our translators insert or omit the article is singularly arbitrary and inconsistent. It is hardly too much to say, that the irregularity in this respect could not well be greater if there were no article at all in the Greek language.¹

Verse 24. *Which things are an allegory; for these are the two covenants.* 'Which things are an allegory; for these women are two covenants.' Unless we insert "women" in this connection, the pronoun also in English might seem to refer to the things (*ἄρτινα*) which form the subject of the allegory. The difference of gender prevents that uncertainty in the Greek.

Verse 25. *For this Agar is mount Sinai in Arabia, etc.* 'For the word Hagar is mount Sinai in Arabia, etc.' In the Greek 'Hagar' is not the personal name directly, and 'this' a feminine pronoun agreeing with it (according to the natural inference from the English), but, as the neuter τὸ Ἄγαρ

¹ The writer on "Versions" in Dr. Smith's Dictionary of the Bible (Vol. III. p. 1681), assigns a reason for the fact, which may be in part the explanation of it: "Grammatical inaccuracy pervades, more or less, the whole extent of the present version of the New Testament. The true force of tenses, cases, prepositions, articles, is continually lost. The translators learnt Greek through the medium of the Latin. Lexicons and grammars were alike in the universal language of scholars, and this language was poorer and less inflected than the Greek, and failed utterly to represent, e. g. the force of its article, or the difference of its aorist and perfect tenses."

shows, it is the expression as such, and not the woman's name, that is meant. The apostle would say: "The word 'Hagar,' which was the name of the bondwoman, is a name also of the mount Sinai, whence the law was given, and hence, on account of that coincidence of the names, such a woman may be taken the more fitly to represent the law." Agar is the Grecised form of אַרְיָ, and should be written alike in the Old Testament and the New. For want of this agreement with reference to proper names, the English reader must be in doubt often whether the same person is meant or a different one.¹

CHAPTER V.

Verse 3. *For I testify again to every man that is circumcised, that he is a debtor to do the whole law.* 'Now I testify again to every one who becomes circumcised, that he is a debtor to keep the whole law.' There is no various reading which justifies "for" (γάρ), which our version adopts here from the Geneva version. The Greek connective (δέ) adds, perhaps, a slightly contrastive idea, and may signify either that the apostle makes the declaration not once merely (see iii. 12), *but* (δέ) now *again* (πάλιν); or, that the Galatians, if they occupied legal ground, would not only gain nothing from Christ, *but* (δέ) must depend for their justification upon a faultless obedience, and thus their cause be hopeless. The force of the participle (περιτεμνομένῳ) should be recognized. The *acumen* of the argument is not whether a person is in the one state (περιτομή) or in the other (ἄκροβυστία), but whether he passes from the latter to the former, whether, being uncircumcised, he submits to that rite because he feels that he cannot otherwise be saved. See Acts xv. 1. The apostle has in view those who take this course from a belief that such acts are meritorious in the sight of God, and entitle them to his favor and the blessings of his kingdom.

¹ For the manner in which the English scriptures deal with proper names, see Wemyss's *Biblical Gleanings*, pp. 241-243. The subject is discussed in one of Dr. Campbell's *Preliminary Dissertations on the Gospels*.

There is a similar turn of thought in the preceding *περιτομῆσθε* (v. 2), which it is not so easy to indicate in our language. The phrase would be, if allowable, "if ye are being circumcised."

Verse 12. *I would they were even cut off who trouble you.* 'Who unsettle you.' The word is a different one from that which our version renders "trouble" in v. 10 and in i. 8. Our translators have a singular partiality for this English term. They employ it for rendering ten different Greek words or phrases, viz. (in addition to the one here) Matt. xxiv. 6; Mark v. 35; Luke i. 29, and x. 41; Acts xv. 19, xvi. 20, and xx. 10; Gal. v. 12; 2 Thess. i. 6; Heb. xii. 15. See Trench's *Authorized Version*, p. 111. Our language has certainly the means of a more exact discrimination than this. Some revisers would correct the verse still further. It may not be certain that the present English form suggests to us the apostle's meaning, but the meaning itself being uncertain, we are not to exchange one doubtful exegesis for another. If *ἀποκόψονται* signifies *get themselves cut off*, i.e. be expelled from the Christian body, as the proper reward of their conduct, our passive *be cut off* would express the meaning. For this passive receptive power as arising out of the receptive reflexive middle, see Jelf's *Greek Gram.*, § 364. 2; and Winer's *New Test. Gram.*, § 38. 4. Wieseler defends at length that explanation. Many of the early versions adopt it. But no doubt the stricter rendering (understand it as we may) would be *cut themselves off*, i.e. from the church, renounce at once and utterly all connection with it (see Ellicott's note, *Com. on Galatians*, p. 109), or *mutilate themselves*, make their *περιτομή* a *κατατομή* (see Philip. iii. 2), since, as the apostle would indignantly say, they were so grossly exaggerating and perverting the true import of that rite. Chrysostom represents the patristic interpretation, which was singularly concurrent in this respect: *εἰ βούλονται, μὴ περιτεμένεσθωσαν μόνον ἀλλὰ περικοπτέσθωσαν*. So also many modern scholars, as Rückert, Usteri, Matthies, Schott, Hilgenfeld, De Wette, Meyer,

Alford, Wordsworth, in their respective commentaries. Winer (*Epist. ad Galatas*, p. 117) inclines to the same view, but admits the possibility of the other sense. This last deserves to be at least a marginal reading in an English Bible.

Verse 13. *Only use not liberty for an occasion to the flesh.* 'Use not the liberty,' etc. We miss here the article of the original, which points out "the liberty" which they were not to abuse as that to which they have been called. Compare the verse which precedes.

Verse 15. *But if ye bite and devour one another, take heed that ye be not consumed one of another.* 'But if ye are biting and devouring one another, take heed that ye be not consumed by one another.' The verbs δάκνετε and κατεσθίετε are present, and represent the act as going on, not as completed. Unless we regard this force of the tense, something like an awkward tautology arises between the protasis (κατεσθίετε) and the apodosis (ἀναλωθήτε).

Verse 17. *And these (the Spirit and the flesh) are contrary the one to the other; so that ye cannot do the things that ye would.* 'Now these are contrary the one to the other, that ye may not do the things that ye would.' The ecbatic sense of ἵνα, *so that*, which our translators adopt, critics at present discard, almost without dissent.¹ Fritzsche (*Com. in Matt.*, p. 836) denies that ἵνα ever has this force in the New Testament. It is so rare, at all events, that no one should ascribe to it that force unless it be absolutely necessary. See Winer's explicit testimony in his *New Test. Gram.*, § 53. 6. It is not necessary in this instance. The apostle predicates the teleological aim here of the σάρξ or sinful principle in man, which according to a correct anthropology is viewed as the ascendant influence before the beginning of a new life, and after that as still striving to maintain its ascendancy. After having said that the two principles are thus arrayed against each other (ταῦτα ἀλλήλοις ἀντίκειται), he goes on to adjust the sequel of the sentence to that posture of the conflict: "They

¹ Tittmann's treatment of this particle (*De usu Particularum*, p. 32, at the end of his *De Synon. in Novo Test.*) is loose and unsatisfactory.

are opposed to each other, I say, and the danger is that you will remain under the old domination — the flesh, in this struggle with the Spirit, striving to bring it about that you should not (*ἵνα μη . . . ποιήτε*) do the things which the Spirit has taught you to approve, and from which it would hold you back." See Rom. xii. 18, 19. Some (but that does not affect the translation) refer the *ἵνα*, or telic activity, to God, as purposely subjecting men to this conflict as a part of their probation or as a means of discipline. It will be seen how gratuitous is the interjected "cannot do" which our version copies from the previous versions (Tyndale, Cranmer, and the Geneva).

Verse 19. The best manuscripts omit *μοσχαία*, at the head of the catalogue, in the common text. The enumeration of the "works of the flesh" was thought to be incomplete, without it. It should be cancelled in the English version. In this same verse "lasciviousness" has too restricted a meaning for *ἀσέλγεια*. See, also, Mark vii. 22; 2 Cor. xii. 21; Eph. iv. 19; 1 Pet. iv. 3; and Jude 4, where our translators render it in the same way. On the contrary, they say "wantonness" in Rom. xiii. 2; 2 Pet. ii. 18. The latter is the proper term in all the passages. The Vulgate in like manner fluctuates between "impudicitia" and "luxuria." Trench has some good remarks on the word (*Synon. of the New Test.*, p. 86); but the passage is too long for quotation. Tittmann says: "*Ἀσέλγεια* est proprie protervitas et impudens petulantia hominis *ἀσελγοῦς*, non obscœnitas aut foeditas lubricitatis." See *Synon. in New Test.*, p. 151. Lewdness is one of the ways in which *ἀσέλγεια* displays itself; but leaves out of sight too much the insolence (*ὑβρις*) and lawlessness (*ἀκολασία*) which the expression more strictly denotes.

CHAPTER VI.

Verse 5. *For every man shall bear his own burden.* 'For each one shall carry his own load.' In the second verse the apostle has just said: 'Bear ye one another's burdens,' and thus the two passages, as they stand in English, seem

to be in spirit and form opposed to each other. In the Greek the word in the second verse is *βάρη*, and in this verse *φορτίον*; and since they differ in meaning a different translation would do away at least the appearance of an inconsistency, and put the reader on a more direct way to the right conclusion. The one precept does not clash with the other. The "burdens" which the apostle urges his readers to "bear," are the faults and offences of others, toward which we are required to be tolerant, charitable, and the "load" which every one has to "carry" is that of his own accountability for all his own sins and deficiencies, be it as it may with others, whether they are more or less guilty than himself.

Verse 11. *You see how large a letter I have written unto you with mine own hand.* 'See with what large letters I have written to you with my own hand.' If we accept the results of the present exegesis, we must translate in this way. It will be seen that the Greek verb (*ἴδετε*) is in the imperative and not indicative. The adjective (*πηλίκους*) refers to magnitude, and not quality, and must describe the size of the letters or written characters, and not the extent of the letter itself, because *ἐπιστολή* is the apostle's invariable word for that sense, and *γράμματα* as plural is never so used in the New Testament. With this latter meaning also, we should expect the accusative, and not the dative *γράμμασι*. For the philology of the passage, Wieseler's note, and especially Meyer's, will be found very full and decisive.

There is a harmony between this verse, as thus correctly understood, and 2 Thess. iii. 17, which may be worth pointing out. In the Epistle to the Thessalonians Paul speaks of the salutation there as added by his own hand, and as being a sign (*σημεῖον*) or attestation of the genuineness of the letter, such, in fact, as he generally inserted in his epistles, and which consisted usually of a few autographic words written by himself. His mode of referring to this mark or sign, *So I write* (*οὕτω γράφω*), shows that it was some peculiarity by which his hand was readily distinguished

from that of the ordinary amanuensis. That peculiarity, as appears from the epithet (*πηλίκοις*) in our epistle, was the size of the written characters or letters, for which (*οὕτω γράφω*) he was well known.¹ Whether Paul wrote the whole epistle with his own hand, or the last verses only; whether he wrote in so peculiar a way from want of practice, and hence with awkwardness; and whether he alludes to the matter because he would authenticate the letter, or to remind the Galatians of his earnestness and painstaking in their behalf, are questions which do not affect the translation, and need not be considered here.

¹ The ground for this inference falls away of course, if Wieseler's singular opinion be correct, that Paul wrote the concluding verses (vi. 11-18) in large letters or capitals, because he would emphasize the contents of that paragraph as peculiarly important. There is no evident reason for making such a distinction between this part of the letter and other parts.