

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

ELEMENTS OF INTERPRETATION IN THE TRANSLATION  
OF THE ENGLISH NEW TESTAMENT

A DISSERTATION  
SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE DIVINITY SCHOOL  
IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF  
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

BY

A. GRAHAM MAXWELL

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

MARCH, 1959

4526

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

DATE March 10, 19 59

Maxwell, A. Graham  
Author

July 18, 1921  
Birth Date

Elements of Interpretation in the Translation of the English  
Title of Dissertation

New Testament

Divinity School  
Department or School

Ph.D.  
Degree

March 1959  
Convocation

Permission is herewith granted to the University of Chicago to make copies of the above title, at its discretion, upon the request of individuals or institutions and at their expense.

14<sup>th</sup> March 1959  
Date filmed

272  
Number of pages

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of writer

Extensive Quotation or Further Reproduction of This Material by Persons or Agencies Other than the University of Chicago May Not Be Made without the Express Permission of the Writer.

SHORT TITLE: MAXWELL-INTERPRETATION IN NEW TESTAMENT TRANSLATION

IRREGULAR NUMBERING

OVERSIZED SHEETS

PAID { By cash   
/ By thesis deposit

DATE BILLED \_\_\_\_\_

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The preparation of this dissertation required research in a number of libraries, particularly those of the University of Chicago, the Pacific School of Religion, the San Francisco Theological Seminary, and the Henry E. Huntington Library, in San Marino, California. I am glad to express appreciation for the generous assistance received from the librarians in these institutions.

I especially wish to acknowledge the help and encouragement of my adviser, Professor Allen P. Wikgren, in whose classes in New Testament translation and interpretation I received the initial stimulus to enter upon this research.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS . . . . .	ii
LIST OF TABLES . . . . .	iv
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
Purpose of the Study . . . . .	1
Further Limitations of the Study . . . . .	15
Method Employed in the Study . . . . .	17
II. A COMPARISON OF TRANSLATIONS OF PROBLEM PASSAGES IN ROMANS . . . . .	19
III. SUMMARY OF THE COMPARISON OF PROBLEM PASSAGES IN ROMANS . . . . .	211
General Summary . . . . .	211
Notes on the Individual Versions . . . . .	217
Theological Bias in Translation . . . . .	234
The Need for a More Fully "Representative" Version	250
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	254

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. A Summary of the Various Types of Translation Given by Thirty-six Versions and Editions to Fifty-one Problem Passages in the Book of Romans . . . . .	212, 213
2. The Versions and Editions Listed in Order from the Most to the Least Interpretative . . . . .	215
3. The Versions and Editions Listed in Descending Order According to the Number of Interpretative Translations Offered for Which No Alternatives Are Given . . . . .	216
4. The Number of Passages in Each of the Versions Agreeing or Disagreeing with the 1769 Blayney Edition of the King James Version in the Interpretation of the Fifty- one Passages in Romans . . . . .	244
5. The Number of Passages in Each of the Versions Agreeing or Disagreeing with the 1769 Blayney Edition of the King James Version in the Interpretation of the Eleven Ambiguous Passages in Romans of Special Theological Concern . . . . .	246

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

#### Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this investigation has been to discover how and to what extent interpretation has entered into the translation of the major English versions of the New Testament.

There are many words, phrases, and sentences of doctrinal or exegetical significance in the Greek New Testament which are capable of more than one meaning. Often the immediate context provides no clear indication as to what the correct translation should be. The versions have differed widely in their treatment of these problem passages and in the solutions they have presented.

Some versions have tended to offer more or less literal renderings of such passages, thereby frequently only increasing the obscurity or actually misleading the reader. In some of these versions an attempt has been made to remedy this deficiency by providing interpretative helps in the margin and elsewhere. In others the English reader has been left to complete the work of translation and interpretation himself, usually without the benefit of access to the original text from which his version was prepared.

Other versions indicate that attempts have occasionally been made to preserve the ambiguity of some of these Greek passages in the translation English. But the results are usually difficult to distinguish from

merely literal renderings.

In a few versions efforts have been made to assist the reader in interpreting some of these obscure passages by presenting one interpretative translation in the text and one or more alternatives in the margin. Other versions have quite consistently offered idiomatic interpretations without suggesting that any alternative meanings are possible.

The more interpretative versions have been especially open to accusations of doctrinal bias, though in actuality even the more literal translations have not escaped the charge of prejudiced distortion of the text. On the popular level it seems that the majority of uncritical Bible readers still decry interpretative translations and have confidence only in what they believe to be a strictly literal version, meanwhile unaware of the fact that the literal rendering often suggests only one of two or more possible meanings--the version, in effect, being interpretative to that extent. Even in ecclesiastical circles it would appear that many of the charges of doctrinal bias levelled against some versions have been based on little more than a superficial check of the critics' own favorite "keytexts." It is hoped that the material here presented may provide a more adequate basis for evaluating and characterizing any particular Bible translation in this respect.

The problem of whether or not obscure and ambiguous passages should be interpreted in translation and, if so, whether or not alternative interpretations should be offered in the margin has been the source of considerable difference of opinion among New Testament translators and expositors. Their divergent views represent the various ways in which these problem passages have been treated in the versions.

That there are obscurities and ambiguities in the Greek text is generally recognized. John Eadie has observed that even "the punctuation always depends ultimately on the exegesis."<sup>1</sup> Some have urged that these obscurities and ambiguities should be preserved in the translation English. Such, for example, is the position taken by Morton Smith in his criticism of E. J. Goodspeed's Problems of New Testament Translation. Regarding the problems of translating οὐ λέγεις and χαίρετε, he asserts that:

It will have been noticed that in these last two cases . . . the translator's problem was to preserve in English the ambiguity of the Greek, for it is only fair to the unlearned reader that the English text should present the same opportunities for misunderstanding as does the Greek. Only such a translation will enable the unlearned to appreciate the great wealth of traditional exegesis, to understand the development of that science, and above all to experience for themselves the intellectual confusion of the original authors. But such a translation is, of all sorts, that which scholars are most reluctant to produce. They have neat, analytical minds which, in dealing with texts, are forever imposing order and diminishing chaos, deciding what the author meant to say, and saying it for him: Fiat lux! Yet not only is the limited clarity they produce less valuable as literature and for religion but it is also false as a translation--it misrepresents an original the suggestive obscurity of which was characteristic.<sup>2</sup>

Again, referring to the problem of καταλαμβάνω in John 1:5:

Now the careless translator would here be apt to suppose it his task to determine which one of these various meanings was intended by the author, and to render that one with unmistakable, exclusive clarity. But the author's intention can probably never be determined (and whatever his intention it led him to use a word with such ambiguities) and if his thought was verbal, as thought often is, he may have intended this word in all its several meanings at once. The real problem is therefore to get an English word which also has them all.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>John Eadie, The English Bible (London: Macmillan Co., 1876), Vol. II, p. 381.

<sup>2</sup>Morton Smith, "Notes on Goodspeed's 'Problems of New Testament Translation,'" Journal of Biblical Literature, Vol. LXIV (Dec., 1945), p. 510.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 511.



Thomas F. Ford, one of the translators of the 1948 Letchworth New Testament, is likewise opposed to the interpretative translation of such passages. He argues that "wherever the original text is capable of more than one interpretation, this quality is lost once paraphrase is allowed, as this must almost inevitably give one meaning only, and that the particular one which appeals most to the translator."<sup>1</sup> R. F. Henderson agrees that "a good translation will retain the ambiguity or the vagueness if it is at all possible to do so. Failing this, the translator becomes a dogmatic expositor."<sup>2</sup> G. Ch. Aalders likewise recommends that "if the text to be rendered shows a certain ambiguity; and if the text to be rendered leaves us with some uncertainty, the same must be the case in our translation."<sup>3</sup>

J. A. Beet, in his criticism of the English Revised Version, was of the opinion that even that literal translation is too interpretative. He maintained that:

Translators have no right to compel their readers to learn from a single verse that which they would not themselves have known but for their study of other . . . portions of the Bible. They ought as far as possible so to put the Scriptures before their readers that the same passages shall proclaim the same truths to learned and unlearned alike. Even the ambiguities of Scripture should, if possible, be reproduced.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Thomas F. Ford, "Need for a Revision of the English Bible," a paper read before the Ecclesiological Society in London on June 23, 1945, and printed in the appendix of T. F. Ford, and R. E. Ford, The New Testament of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ: The Letchworth Version (Letchworth: Letchworth Printers Ltd., 1948).

<sup>2</sup>R. F. Henderson, "Problems of Bible Translation," The Bible Translator, Vol. VI (July, 1955), p. 134.

<sup>3</sup>G. Ch. Aalders, "Some Aspects of Bible Translation Concerning the Old Testament," The Bible Translator, Vol. IV (July, 1953), p. 98.

<sup>4</sup>J. A. Beet, "The Revised Version of the New Testament," The Expositor, Vol. III (1882), p. 381.

He did allow, however, that this is sometimes impossible.

In these cases, the translator is compelled, in spite of himself, to become an expositor. He ought, therefore, to put in the margin the rendering required by the exposition he rejects; so that his readers may know that an alternative is grammatically allowable, and therefore open to the expositor's choice.<sup>1</sup>

C. J. Ellicott, in anticipating the same 1881 revision, took the opposite view.

It is very doubtful how far such a principle as this can be justified, viz., of leaving the English translation in the same state of ambiguity as the Greek, so that, if two meanings should be fairly compatible with the words of the original, they should be equally so with the words of the translation. It may be urged that it is literally faithful; but, on the other hand, it must be felt to be an evasion.<sup>2</sup>

At the same time he warns that:

The translator must be careful not to pass into the province of the interpreter, and to give a paraphrase instead of a faithful rendering. All that he can or ought to do is, by some words in italics, or some happy choice of expression or subtle change of collocation, to make the probable meaning of the Greek as clear and appreciable as the nature of the passage will admit. Secondly, if there be difference of opinion as to the meaning of the words, one or more of the alternative renderings should be placed in the margin.<sup>3</sup>

John Eadie agreed that "a version ought never, if possible, to present to the ordinary reader a doubtful sense, but an alternative rendering may go into the margin."<sup>4</sup>

Evidently the translators of the English Revised Version were generally of this same opinion, for they state in the preface: "It has

<sup>1</sup>Ibid.

<sup>2</sup>C. J. Ellicott, Considerations of the Revision of the English Version of the New Testament (New York: Harper and Bros., 1873), footnote, p. 102.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 103.

<sup>4</sup>Eadie, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 367.

been our principle not to leave any translation, or any arrangement of words, which could adapt itself to one or other of two interpretations, but rather to express as plainly as was possible that interpretation which seemed best to deserve a place in the text, and to put the other in the margin."<sup>1</sup> An approach to this point of view even appeared in the preface to the King James Version.

Some peradventure would haue no varietie of senses to be set in the margine, lest the authoritie of the Scriptures for deciding of controuersies by that shew of vncertaintie, should somewhat be shaken. but we hold their iudgment not to be so sound in this point . . . . Therefore as S. Augustine saith, that varietie of Translations is profitable for the finding out of the sense of the Scriptures: so diuersitie of signification and sense in the margine, where the text is not so cleare, must needes doe good, yea, is necessary, as we are perswaded.<sup>2</sup>

Earlier, the Rheims translators had explained their reasons for leaving such obscure passages equally ambiguous and obscure in the English.

Moreover, we presume not in hard places to mollifie the speeches or phrases, but religiously keepe them word for word, and point for point, for fear of missing, or restraining the sense of the Holy Ghost to our phantasie, as Eph. 6, "Against the spirituals of wickedness in the celestials," and, "What to me and thee woman?" and 1 Pet. 2, "As infants even now borne, reasonable, milke without guile desireye." We do so place, "reasonable," of purpose, that it may be indifferent both to infants going before, as in our Latin text: or to milke that followeth after, as in other Latin copies and in the Greeke.<sup>3</sup>

The hazards and inadequacies of excessively literal and uninterpretative translation have been emphasized by "modern speech" translators.

<sup>1</sup>Preface to the New Testament of the English Revised Version (1881), p. xiii. The evidence of this study shows that they were about 80 per cent successful in following this principle in the translation of the book of Romans.

<sup>2</sup>Myles Smith (?), "The Translators to the Reader," Preface to the King James Version (1611).

<sup>3</sup>Preface to the Rheims New Testament (1582).

R. F. Weymouth has warned that "a literal rendering into English cannot but partially veil, and in some degree distort, the true sense, even if it does not totally obscure it . . . . It follows that the reader who is bent upon getting a literal rendering, such as he can commonly find in the R. V. . . . should always be on his guard against its strong tendency to mislead."<sup>1</sup>

The preface to The Twentieth Century New Testament points out that "no purely verbal rendering can ever adequately represent the thoughts conveyed in the idioms of another language."<sup>2</sup> Goodspeed has deplored "this devotion to word after word with never a glance at the line of thought" as "the bane of Bible translation, from Tyndale to the revised versions."<sup>3</sup> "The fault of the first English versions was their word-for-word method, coupled with the evident conviction that the translator need not understand the text he was at work upon in order to translate it."<sup>4</sup> James Moffatt agrees by concluding that "a real translation is in the main an interpretation."<sup>5</sup> The same position is taken by R. A. Knox,<sup>6</sup> and

---

<sup>1</sup>R. F. Weymouth, The New Testament in Modern Speech (5th ed. rev.; Boston: Pilgrim Press, 1929), p. xi.

<sup>2</sup>The Twentieth Century New Testament (rev. ed.; New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1904), p. iv.

<sup>3</sup>E. J. Goodspeed, Problems of New Testament Translation (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1945), p. 2.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid. See also, by the same author, New Chapters in New Testament Study (New York: Macmillan Co., 1937), pp. 102-126.

<sup>5</sup>James Moffatt, The Bible, A New Translation (rev. and final ed.; New York: Harper and Bros., 1937), p. vii.

<sup>6</sup>R. A. Knox, The Trials of a Translator (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1949), pp. 4, 14, 29, 75, 77, 82.

W. Schwarz.<sup>1</sup>

More recently, Eugene A. Nida, American Bible Society secretary for versions, has stated and analysed some of the principles and procedures of Bible translation recommended by the Society.<sup>2</sup> Society rule number 12 states that "versions and revisions should be faithful translations, in a style easily understood by the people . . . . Paraphrase should be avoided as far as practicable. Every version should be as literal as the idiom of the language will permit."<sup>3</sup> In his analysis, however, Nida is not opposed to "legitimate" paraphrase.

In the strict sense of the term many of the expressions which translators are called upon to use in rendering the sense of the Bible text are simply paraphrases. But the fact that we acknowledge them as paraphrases does not mean that we should regard them as any less correct. In fact, we should attempt to discard from our minds the prejudice that has been built up in the distinction between translation and paraphrase. There are legitimate and illegitimate paraphrases. The literal word-for-word translation cannot be justified purely by calling it a "translation." Nor must a paraphrase be rejected simply by contending that it is such. There are literal, blind translations, biased translations, and excessively free translations--all of which are to be rejected. Similarly, one must emphatically reject paraphrases which are made for the sake of novelty of expression or designed to satisfy the translator's private whim . . . .

Our objective must be in finding the closest equivalence in meaning. The insistence upon the principle of closest semantic equivalence actually renders obsolete the meaningless discussions which go on between the defenders of "translation" and the advocates of "paraphrase."<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>W. Schwarz, Principles and Problems of Biblical Translation (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1955), p. 1.

<sup>2</sup>Eugene A. Nida, Bible Translating (New York: American Bible Society, 1947).

<sup>3</sup>A Guide for Translators, Revisers, and Editors Working in Connection with the American Bible Society (New York: American Bible Society, 1932), reprinted in the appendix of Nida, op. cit., p. 296.

<sup>4</sup>Eugene A. Nida, "Translation or Paraphrase," The Bible Translator, Vol. I (July, 1950), pp. 105-106.

Nida also warns against the dangers of excessively literal translation.

Some Bible students have attempted to translate in what they feel is a consistent manner by always rendering the same Hebrew or Greek word by the same English word, and similarly for many types of grammatical constructions. This type of translation, which has been called "concordant," makes an immediate appeal to those uninformed about the problems and principles of linguistic usage. But no two languages correspond throughout in their words or grammatical usages, and such a literal type of translation actually distorts the facts of a language rather than reveals them.<sup>1</sup>

On the other hand, Nida is equally critical of excessively free translation.

Some translators have adopted as a basic principle a formula which may be stated as follows: "What would the author have said if he had been using English instead of Greek or Hebrew?" . . . . Such a translation is likely to be based on the translator's idea of the "gist" of the text and consequently reflects his personal interpretation of it.<sup>2</sup>

It is interesting to note Hilaire Belloc's advice to the contrary: "We should say to ourselves, not 'How shall I make this foreigner talk English?', but 'What would an Englishman have said to express the same?' That is translation. That is the very essence of the art."<sup>3</sup>

William A. McLoughlin, in his review of Knox's New Testament translation, seems to condemn such freedom.

There must be, and it seems to me that it is the most important of all, a high degree of accuracy, by which I mean fidelity to the original. A translation ought to reproduce as closely as is possible within the limits of the newer language, the thought and expression of the original . . . . When that is not true, we have no translation but a paraphrase or a commentary.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Nida, Bible Translating, pp. 11-12.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 12.

<sup>3</sup>Hilaire Belloc, Selected Essays (London and Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott, 1936), pp. 310-311.

<sup>4</sup>William A. McLoughlin, review of the Knox New Testament translation, The Thomist, Vol. VIII (April, 1945), p. 285.

Knox himself, however, advises that "the translator must never be frightened of the word 'paraphrase'; it is a bogey of the half-educated . . . It is almost impossible to translate a sentence without paraphrasing."<sup>1</sup> J. B. Phillips agrees and urges that "when necessary the translator should feel free to expand or explain, while preserving the original meaning as nearly as can be ascertained."<sup>2</sup> E. V. Rieu, in a recent debate with Phillips on the subject of Bible translation, took the position that paraphrase "is permissible only when literal translation is liable to obscure the original meaning." But he added that "on such occasions it is not only permissible, but it is imperative, and therefore becomes good translation."<sup>3</sup>

As a solution to the problem, Nida recommends a translation based upon the closest semantic equivalents in the two languages as representing a middle ground between the two extremes of "awkward literalness" on the one hand and "unjustified interpretations" on the other. He recognizes that "every translation will to some extent represent the theological views of the translator. It is impossible to avoid this. But such features should be kept at a minimum." Since "the Bible is the heritage of the entire church" it "should not be made the means of propogandizing one's own special theories of interpretation."<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Knox, op. cit., p. 20.

<sup>2</sup>J. B. Phillips, Letters to Young Churches (New York: Macmillan Co., 1947), p. xi.

<sup>3</sup>E. V. Rieu, "Translating the Gospels," reprint of an interview between Rieu and Phillips on the BBC, Dec. 3, 1953, The Bible Translator, Vol. VI (Oct., 1955), pp. 150-159.

<sup>4</sup>Nida, Bible Translating, p. 21.

The safest guide is to eliminate all additions which are not expressly in the text from which one is translating. There will be a greater number of obscure passages, but if they are obscure in the text itself their clarification should be left to teaching and to a commentary . . . .

Note the translation of 1 Cor. 11:10 by Goodspeed: "She ought to wear upon her head something to symbolize her subjection, out of respect to the angels, if to nobody else." The last phrase helps to make the meaning plainer, and yet this phrase is not in the original text. Such an addition should be avoided, even at the expense of less clarity.<sup>1</sup>

Yet Nida also cautions that "the translator must constantly be on guard against meaningless or totally obscure phrases."<sup>2</sup>

In a review of the Revised Standard Version, J. Y. Campbell questions the value of preserving obscurity in translation. "Is it really good enough to give an almost meaningless translation, and leave the ordinary reader to make what he can of it, without even a footnote to tell him that we simply do not know what the meaning is?" Criticizing the 1946 revision he suggests that it would have been better to give the interpretation accepted by the best scholars. "Then in a note they could have indicated that this interpretation is far from being certainly right."<sup>3</sup>

Translators have not agreed on whether or not alternative interpretations should be offered in the margin. Rule number 13 (b) of the American Bible Society states that "in important passages where the original admits of more than one meaning, or where the meaning cannot be expressed adequately in one word or phrase, translators may put preferred renderings in the text and alternatives in the margin."<sup>4</sup> Goodspeed, however, chose

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 53.    <sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 20.

<sup>3</sup>J. Y. Campbell, "The New Testament: Revised Standard Version," The Journal of Theological Studies, Vol. XLIX (1948), p. 121.

<sup>4</sup>A Guide for Translators, Revisers, and Editors (New York: American Bible Society, 1932), reprinted in the appendix of Nida, Bible Translating, p. 297.



to include no notes whatsoever, with this brief explanation: "The translator has not interspersed the text with footnotes or captions of his own devising, preferring to leave it to make its own impression upon the reader."<sup>1</sup> Moffatt followed a similar policy of providing a minimum of notes.

I have added a few notes . . . But they are deliberately few. Surely nothing is more calculated to deaden the interest of the public in any classic than the cult of various readings. There is a place for them, but their place is in technical works for scholars. The text of any classic, whether ancient or modern, ought to be presented without notes upon differences in reading, except where these are absolutely needful. This applies in a special degree to translation.<sup>2</sup>

These remarks were primarily concerning textual variants, but evidently Moffatt applied the same rule to alternative interpretations.

On the contrary, Allen P. Wikgren, in a criticism of the 1946 Revised Standard Version, has urged that "where free and interpretative renderings of the Greek are adopted in the text itself on almost every page there can hardly be any valid objection to the marginal notation of at least such alternative interpretations of the Greek text as have highly commended themselves to scholars and translators."<sup>3</sup> In an article on "The Use of Marginal Notes in the English Bible," Wikgren has further argued that:

The right of the reader to understand what he reads will doubtless make a certain number of explanatory marginalia necessary so long as portions of the text are rendered in an antiquated and often unintelligible idiom. But even in a translation into modern speech a convincing argument might be made especially for comment on passages

---

<sup>1</sup>E. J. Goodspeed, The New Testament: An American Translation (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1923), pp. vi-vii.

<sup>2</sup>Moffatt, op. cit., p. xliii.

<sup>3</sup>A. P. Wikgren, "The Revised Standard New Testament," The Journal of Religion, Vol. XXVII (April, 1947), p. 124.

where legitimate and important differences of interpretation still exist. When such go unmarked it means that one opinion or viewpoint may be imposed upon the unsuspecting reader without his being aware of an alternative. As Miles Smith put it, he may "be captivated to one, when it may be the other."<sup>1</sup>

Perhaps it might be argued that there is greater need for such marginal notation in church supported, "authorized" versions than in those prepared by individual translators, for as Craig has observed, "an official translation must stand in the tradition of the church and offer a consensus rather than the opinions of any one man."<sup>2</sup>

The opinions noted above indicate the divergence of viewpoint there has been regarding the proper treatment of obscure and ambiguous passages. The actual translation of these problem passages in the versions will illustrate the extent to which such principles have affected New Testament translation. Few of the major English versions of the New Testament appear to have been the product of translators who have consistently followed any one of the above methods. Hence the purpose of this investigation has been to discover how and to what extent interpretation has entered into the translation of the New Testament text in each of the selected versions.

Although there are many references to this question in works dealing with the history of the English Bible, it appears that as yet there have been but few special studies of the problem, none of them comprehensive. Books and papers have been written in criticism or defence of some particular version, but most of these are polemical and deal with matters

---

<sup>1</sup>Allen P. Wikgren, "The Use of Marginal Notes in the English Bible," The Crozer Quarterly, Vol. XXVII (April, 1950), p. 153.

<sup>2</sup>C. T. Craig, "The Revised Standard Version," Journal of Bible and Religion, Vol. XIV (Feb. 1946), p. 33.

of dogma rather than principles of translation. Such, for instance, have been Gregory Martin's famous 1582 A discovery of the manifold Corruptions of the Holy Scriptures by the Heretics of our Day, especially by the English Sectaries, and of their foul dealing herein by partial and false Translations, to the advantage of their Heresies, in their English Bibles used and authorized since the Time of Schism; and William Fulke's vigorous reply, in 1583, Defence of the Sincere and True Translation of the Holy Scriptures into the English Tongue, followed by The Text of the New Testament of Jesus Christ, translated out of the vulgar Latine by the Papists of the traitorous Seminarie at Rhemes, in 1589, in which he criticized the Catholic translation verse by verse; Thomas Cartwright's 1618 A Confutation of the Rhemists Translation, Glosses and Annotations on the New Testament; and Thomas Ward's 1810 Errata of the Protestant Bible. Through the centuries of Bible revision and translation each new major version has provoked dogmatic censure and opposition, culminating more recently in the barrage of criticism hurled at the Revised Standard Version. One critic was even moved to publish a pamphlet with the unambiguous title, Wresting the Scriptures: The Revised Standard Version Satan's Subtle, Subversive Masterpiece. The Most Dangerous Book of the Twentieth Century.<sup>1</sup> A number of other publications charging the Revised Standard Version with serious doctrinal bias are listed in the bibliography.

Other more significant studies of some aspects of the problem have been presented by John Eadie in The English Bible, 1876;<sup>2</sup> by Archdeacon

---

<sup>1</sup>James Cowan, James, Wresting the Scriptures (Prince Albert: By the author, n.d.).

<sup>2</sup>Eadie, op. cit., Vol. II. He discusses charges of bias brought against a number of the older versions.

Farrar in "Fidelity and Bias in Versions of the Bible," 1882;<sup>1</sup> and by R. C. Trench in a chapter entitled "On Some Charges Unjustly Brought against the Authorized Version," 1873.<sup>2</sup>

#### Further Limitations of the Study

The investigation has been confined to the main-stream of English and American translations and versions from Wycliffe to the Revised Standard of 1946, including the Geneva and Rheims versions, and to a number of the more important and popular translations of the Twentieth century.<sup>3</sup>

The versions included are as follows: Wycliffe, 1382; Tyndale, 1525; Coverdale, 1535; Rogers, 1537; the Great Bible, 1539; Taverner, 1539; the Geneva, 1560; the Bishops', 1568; the Rheims, 1582; the King James, 1611; the English Revised, 1881; the Twentieth Century, 1900 (the date of publication of Part II, Paul's Letters to the Churches, in the first and tentative edition); the American Standard, 1901; Weymouth, 1903; Moffatt, 1913; the Westminster, 1920 (the date of publication of Vol. III, St. Paul's Epistles to the Churches); Goodspeed, 1923; Ballantine, 1923; Montgomery, 1924; Williams, 1937; Spencer, 1937; the Confraternity, 1941; the Basic English, 1941; Knox, 1944; Verkuyl, 1945; the Revised Standard, 1946; Phillips, 1947; Schonfield, 1955; and Lilly, 1956.

---

<sup>1</sup>F. W. Farrar, "Fidelity and Bias in Versions of the Bible," The Expositor, Vol. III (1882), pp. 280ff.

<sup>2</sup>R. C. Trench, On the Authorized Version of the New Testament (New York: Harper and Bros., 1873), pp. 163-174. He deals particularly with the problem of bias in translation.

<sup>3</sup>Although Wycliffe's translation is from the Latin, and although the influence of his version and Purvey's revision upon later translation is doubtful, it has been included as representing the major beginnings of English New Testament translation. The other translations from the Latin have been included because of their wide use and influence.

Later editions of some of these versions have also been included, in order to take note of significant and interesting modifications of renderings in the first editions.

All but the first two of the older versions were examined at first hand in the collections of the University of Chicago; the Henry E. Huntington Library, in San Marino, California; the Pacific School of Religion; and the San Francisco Theological Seminary. The texts of Wycliffe and Tyndale were studied in the facsimiles of Forshall and Madden, and Francis Fry respectively.

Inasmuch as the most important elements of interpretation are those which have entered into the translation of the text itself, only brief mention has been made of the interpretation present in the margins and other accessories to the text. These must occasionally be noted in order to determine the intent of the translators in an obscure rendering or to see if the translators have attempted to avoid the appearance of doctrinal bias by presenting alternative interpretations.

A preliminary survey of the entire Greek New Testament produced so large a collection of problem passages that to include them all in this study would necessitate too bulky a report. Therefore, it has been assumed reasonable to suppose that a careful study of the various translations of problem passages in one of the longer and more difficult New Testament documents would provide sufficient evidence for comparing the principles and methods of translation employed in each of the versions. The epistle to the Romans has been selected as the document likely to produce the most significant results.

Method Employed in the Study

The method employed has been to compile a list of the passages of doctrinal or exegetical significance in Romans which are sufficiently obscure and ambiguous to have resulted in important differences of opinion among translators and commentators and to find how each of the selected versions has translated them. The translations have been grouped under four classifications: (1) literal, obscure, and ambiguous; (2) literal, but actually suggesting only one interpretation; (3) interpretative, with at least one alternative and/or the literal translation of the Greek in the margin; (4) interpretative, but with no alternative in the margin. Occasionally it has been necessary to use a fifth classification to include translations which avoid the problem of interpretation by translating in some other way.

It might seem desirable to have an additional classification entitled, perhaps, "representative: that is, purposely preserving in the translation English the ambiguity of the Greek." But it is usually too difficult to determine whether the translator has purposely attempted to preserve the ambiguity or has simply offered a literal rendering. Only rarely does a version seem to present a clearly "representative" translation, as, for example, Goodspeed's translation of ἕνα θετέλειοι in Matt. 5:48, "You are to be perfect" (Is it a command or a promise?), or Knox's translation of προεχόμεθα in Rom. 3:9, "Has either side the advantage?"

The results of the study have been arranged as follows: First, the problem passage is quoted in the Greek of Nestle's twenty-first edition of 1952. Where necessary, textual variants are noted. The translation possibilities of the passage are briefly discussed to show its ambi-

guity. In order to illustrate further the important differences of opinion that exist with respect to the translation and interpretation of the passage, the opinions of various representative grammarians, commentators, lexicographers, and translators are cited. Then the translations offered by the versions and editions are listed and grouped under the four or five classifications. The results are then summarized and discussed and evidence of doctrinal bias considered.

## CHAPTER II

### A COMPARISON OF TRANSLATIONS OF PROBLEM PASSAGES IN ROMANS

Romans 1:4.--ὁρισθέντος υἱοῦ Θεοῦ

The ambiguity of this phrase is generally recognized. The participle ὁρισθέντος may be interpreted to mean "proved to be," "marked out as being," or "installed," "appointed," "constituted." Is Paul referring here to the declaration or announcement of Christ's already existing status or relationship, or to the exaltation of Christ to a new status or relationship? The decision is somewhat dependent upon the interpretation of the equally ambiguous following phrase, ἐν δυνάμει, as discussed later.

Sanday and Headlam<sup>1</sup> admit that ὁρισθέντος "itself does not determine the meaning either way: it must be determined by the context. But here the particular context is also neutral." They observe that "most modern commentators" have adopted the interpretation "appointed," "instituted," "installed." Sanday and Headlam explain, however, that since Paul did not believe that Christ became Son of God at or by the resurrection, yet at the same time he did seem to regard the resurrection as making a difference--"if not in the transcendental relations of the Father to the Son . . . yet in the visible manifestation of Sonship as addressed to the understanding of men"--therefore, the meaning of ὁρισθέντος is "sufficient-

---

<sup>1</sup>Unless otherwise indicated, all references in this chapter are to the appropriate pages in the commentaries, grammars, lexicons, or word studies prepared by the scholars named, as listed in the bibliography.



ly expressed by our word 'designated.'" John Knox also regards the translation "designated" as "well chosen," since it is "equally ambiguous with the original." He adds that the solution to the problem of the passage depends upon the decision as to whether Paul followed the earlier adoptionist Christology or the later Johannine full incarnationism--"or an intermediate stage."

Schaff claims that *ἔρισθέντος* here can only mean "to fix," "to appoint," "to constitute." He lists Chrysostom, Luther, Fritzsche, Olshausen, Philippi, Alford, Hodge, and Meyer as interpreting the participle as "a mere declaration, or a subjective manifestation and recognition of Christ as the Son of God in the hearts of men" but concludes definitely that "Christ was divinely decreed and objectively fixed, constituted, and inaugurated as the Son of God in power or majesty at His resurrection." Lange interprets that Christ is "absolutely destined to be the Son of God in majesty." Gifford admits the ambiguity of *ἔρισθέντος* but states that "designated," in the sense of "instituted," "appointed," "ordained," is the "only sense which the word has in the New Testament."

Barrett observes that the translation "defined," or "declared to be," has the "evident advantage that it avoids the charge of adoptionism which can be brought against 'appointed,' but there is little else to be said for it. Hellenistic evidence and New Testament usage both favour 'appointed.'" Lagrange takes the same view. Kittel and Bauer translate, "eingesetzt." Lietzmann explains that "jemanden zu etwas bestellen" is "the only meaning of *ἐρίξεν* that makes sense here."

Thayer translates "appointed," meaning that the pre-existent Son of God was "openly appointed . . . such among men" by the resurrection.

Garvie prefers "installed," "ordained," explaining that by this Paul does not mean that Christ became Son of God at his resurrection but rather that at his resurrection he was exalted "into the full possession and free exercise of the dignity and authority . . . conferred on him as Son of God as the reward of his obedience and death." He claims that "we empty Paul's argument in the Epistle to the Philippians of its distinctive significance, as well as the passage here of its more probable meaning, if we assume that Christ's exaltation at his resurrection was merely a return to his pre-existent state."

Denney, on the other hand, while recognizing the ambiguity of *ὁμοθεύτος*, states that "the resurrection only declared Him to be what He truly was." Cremer explains that this does not mean "declared that He was to be" but "declared that He is." Boylan translates "marked out," "declared," and refers to the resurrection as "proof or declaration of Christ's divinity." Parry recommends "distinguished"; Arndt and Gingrich, "declared to be."

The versions have translated as follows:

Wycliffe (1382), "predestynat, or bifore ordeyned bi grace, the sone of God" (Vulgate: "praedestinatus," evidently based on an early corruption of the Greek text to *προοροθεύτος*);

Tyndale (1525), "declared to be the sonne of God" (Luther, 1524: "erweiset");<sup>1</sup>

Coverdale (1535), same as Tyndale;

Rogers (1537), same as Tyndale;

Taverner (1539), same as Tyndale;

---

<sup>1</sup>It is being assumed that Luther's third Wittenberg edition of 1524 was the one used by Tyndale. See L. F. Gruber, The First English New Testament and Luther (Burlington: The Lutheran Literary Board, 1928), p. 104.

Great (1539), same as Tyndale;

Geneva (1560), same as Tyndale;

Bishops' (1568), same as Tyndale;

Rheims (1582), "predestinate the sonne of God" (cf. Latin);

King James (1611), same as Tyndale (margin: "Gr. determined");

English Revised (1881), same as Tyndale (margin: "Gr. determined");

Twentieth Century (1900), "proved to be the Son of God" (changed to "designated Son of God" in the 1904 final edition);

American Standard (1901), same as Tyndale (margin: "Gr. determined");

Weymouth (1903), same as Twentieth Century (1900) (changed to "marked out as Son of God" in the 1929 fifth edition);

Moffatt (1913), "installed as Son of God";

Westminster (1920), "marked out Son of God" (margin: "not, of course, that the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity was not always God . . . but probably with emphasis on the full and final glorification of the Sacred Humanity.");

Goodspeed (1923), "declared Son of God";

Ballantine (1923), same as Twentieth Century (1900);

Montgomery (1924), "instated as Son of God";

Williams (1937), "proved to be God's Son";

Spencer (1937), "marked out to be Son of God" (margin: "Vulg. predes-  
tined");

Confraternity (1941), "foreordained Son of God" (the marginal note giving the Greek and translating it as "constituted," "manifested");

Basic English (1941), "marked out as Son of God";

Knox (1944), "marked out . . . as the Son of God";

Verkuyl (1945), "openly designated as the Son of God";

Revised Standard (1946), same as Twentieth Century (1904);

Phillips (1947), "patently marked out as the Son of God";

Schonfield (1955), "demonstrated to be God's Son";

Lilly (1956), "constituted the . . . Son of God."

The translations seem to come under the four classifications as follows:

1. Literal, obscure, and ambiguous: Twentieth Century (1904), Verkuyl, and Revised Standard. As observed by J. Knox, "designated" may by definition mean either "declared as being" or "appointed to be." This translation, adopted by these three versions, may represent a deliberate attempt to preserve the ambiguity of the Greek.

2. Literal, but equivalent to an interpretation: Wycliffe and Rheims, following the Vulgate "praedestinatus."

3. Interpretative, with at least one alternative: King James, English Revised, American Standard, Spencer, and Confraternity.

4. Interpretative, with no alternative: Tyndale, Coverdale, Rogers, Taverner, Great, Geneva, Bishops', Twentieth Century (1900), Weymouth, Moffatt, Westminster, Goodspeed, Ballantine, Montgomery, Williams, Basic English, Knox, Phillips, Schonfield, and Lilly.

Of the versions offering deliberately interpretative translations, *ἔργον θεῶν υἱοῦ θεοῦ* has been understood as expressing the declaration or proof of an already existing position by Tyndale, Coverdale, Rogers, Taverner, Great, Geneva, Bishops', King James, English Revised, Twentieth Century, American Standard, Weymouth, Westminster, Goodspeed, Ballantine, Williams, Spencer, Basic English, Knox, Phillips, and Schonfield. It is interpreted as expressing "appointment," "installation," or "ordination" to a new or changed position by Wycliffe, Rheims, King James (margin), English Revised (margin), American Standard (margin), Moffatt, Montgomery, Spencer (margin), and Lilly.

Romans 1:4.--ὀριθέντος υἱοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν δυνάμει

The prepositional phrase ἐν δυνάμει may be connected adverbially with ὀριθέντος or adjectivally with υἱοῦ Θεοῦ. Taken adverbially the passage would mean that Jesus was "decisively" or "miraculously" designated Son of God by or since the resurrection. Taken adjectivally the passage would refer rather to the exalted state of Christ at or since the resurrection. The context does not clearly indicate the choice to be made.

Denney admits that the connection is "doubtful" and ventures no opinion. Lietzmann expresses the same uncertainty. Garvie suggests that the adverbial connection is "the more probable." But Sanday and Headlam argue definitely for the adverbial construction: "Not with υἱοῦ Θεοῦ . . . 'Son of God in power,' opposed to the present state of humiliation, but rather adverbially . . . 'declared with might to be Son of God.'" Stephens paraphrases, "by a glorious act of power."<sup>1</sup> Abel translates, "efficacement," "puissamment." Robertson explains that the resurrection of Christ as the "miracle of miracles" "gave God's seal 'with power.'" Meyer, Gifford, Thayer, Vincent, Dummelow, Parry, and Boylan also interpret adverbially.

On the other hand, Kittel states that ἐν δυνάμει is not to be connected adverbially with ὀριθέντος but rather attributively with υἱοῦ Θεοῦ. Dodd also prefers the adjectival construction and explains that "by His resurrection He was invested with the full power and glory of His divine status as Lord of all." Nygren interprets, "from that hour He is

---

<sup>1</sup>George B. Stevens, "A Paraphrase of the Epistle to the Romans," The Biblical World, Vol. VIII (July-Dec., 1896), pp. 299-309. All subsequent references to Stephens are to the appropriate pages in this same work.

the Son of God in a new sense. He is the Son of God 'in power.'" J. Knox agrees that "the words in power emphasize the contrast of Christ's present postresurrection status with the weakness and humiliation of the earthly life."

Barrett admits that "it seems impossible" to decide between the two alternatives but is inclined toward the adjectival connection. "Christ was, after the resurrection, appointed Son of God in power." Bauer translates, "the powerful son of God." Cremer interprets, "the resurrection accomplished the exaltation of the man Christ Jesus." Essentially the same view is taken by Lange, Schaff, Weiss, Bosworth, Lagrange, and Theissen.

The versions have translated as follows:

- Wycliffe (1382), "predestynat . . . the sone of God in uertu" (Vulgate: "in virtute");
- Tyndale (1525), "declared to be the sonne of God with power [of the Holy goost]";
- Coverdale (1535), "mightely declared to be the sonne of God" (Luther, 1524: "krefftiglich");
- Rogers (1537), "declared to be the sonne of God, with power [of the holy goost]";
- Taverner (1539), same as Rogers;
- Great (1539), "declared to be the sonne of God wyth power [after the sprete]";
- Geneva (1560), "declared mightely to be the Sonne of God";
- Bishops' (1568), "declared to be the sonne of God, with power [after the sprete]" (The marginal note shows that the translators understood this adverbially.);
- Rheims (1582), "predestinate the sonne of God in power" (The 1914 printing of Challoner's 1749 revision has a marginal note explaining that this is to be understood adverbially.);
- King James (1611), "declared to be the Sonne of God, with power," (Blayney's edition of 1769 omits the first comma.);

English Revised (1881), "declared to be the Son of God with power" (margin: "Or, in");

Twentieth Century (1900), "miraculously proved to be the Son of God";

American Standard (1901), same as English Revised (margin: "Or, in");

Weymouth (1903), "decisively proved . . . to be the Son of God" (changed to "miraculously marked out a Son of God" in the 1929 fifth edition);

Moffatt (1913), "installed as Son of God with power";

Westminster (1920), "by an act of power . . . was marked out Son of God";

Goodspeed (1923), "decisively declared Son of God";

Ballantine (1923), "with power proved to be the Son of God";

Montgomery (1924), "instated as Son of God, with power,";

Williams (1937), "proved to be God's Son in power";

Spencer (1937), "in power was marked out to be Son of God";

Confraternity (1941), "foreordained Son of God by an act of power";

Basic English (1941), "marked out as Son of God in power";

Knox (1944), "marked out miraculously as the Son of God";

Verkuyl (1945), "openly designated as the Son of God with power";

Revised Standard (1946), "designated Son of God in power";

Phillips (1947), "patently marked out as the Son of God by the power [of the Holy Spirit]";

Schonfield (1955), "potently demonstrated to be God's Son";

Lilly (1956), "constituted the mighty Son of God" (the marginal note explaining in what way Christ was so constituted and recognizing his eternal sonship).

The translations seem to come under the four classifications as follows:

1. Literal, obscure, and ambiguous: Wycliffe, Tyndale, Rogers, Taverner, Great, Bishops', Rheims, King James, English Revised, American Standard, Moffatt, Montgomery, Williams, Basic English, Verkuyl, and

Revised Standard. It is possible that a number of these versions intended the literal "in power," or "with power," to be interpreted adjectivally. However, the wording is none the less ambiguous.

2. Literal, but equivalent to an interpretation: None.

3. Interpretative, with at least one alternative: None. Even though the English Revised and American Standard have offered "with" in the text and "in" in the margin, their translations are classified nevertheless as literal, obscure, and ambiguous, for "in power" or "with power" can both be understood adverbially or adjectivally, as shown by the marginal notes of the Bishops' and Rheims.

4. Interpretative, with no alternative: Coverdale, Geneva, Twentieth Century, Weymouth, Westminster, Goodspeed, Ballantine, Spencer, Confraternity, Knox, Phillips, Schonfield, and Lilly.

All but one of the versions offering an interpretative translation have preferred the adverbial construction. Lilly alone has clearly interpreted *ἐν δυνάμει* adjectivally, with his translation "the mighty Son of God."

Romans 1:4.--κατὰ πνεῦμα ἁγιοῦ ὄντος

The literal English translation of this phrase is as obscure and ambiguous as the Greek. It has been interpreted as referring to the Holy Spirit (*πνεῦμα ἅγιον*), or to the divine nature in Christ, or to the holiness of Christ's human spirit.

J. Knox considers these words "the most difficult phrase in this whole section." However, he regards it as "on the whole more probable" that Paul is speaking here of "the divine nature, conferred through, perhaps identical with, the Holy Spirit."



Boylan argues for the interpretation "Holy Spirit," a view held generally by the patristic writers. He denies that this may refer to Christ's divinity as if balanced against *κατὰ σάρκα*. Lietzmann explains that there is no distinction in meaning between *πνεῦμα ἁγιωσύνης* and *πνεῦμα ἁγίου*. Bauer lists the same interpretation, describing the phrase as "ein verstärktes *πνεῦμα ἁγίου*. Barrett translates, "in the sphere of the Holy Spirit."

On the contrary, Kittel asserts that *πνεῦμα ἁγιωσύνης* is not "ein verstärktes *πνεῦμα ἁγίου*," evidently alluding to Bauer's interpretation. He emphasizes that the expression refers to Christ's deity. Garvie agrees that this cannot refer to the Holy Spirit, nor to the holiness of Christ's human spirit, but rather to his divinity. Schaff also prefers to interpret as Christ's divinity, "which is all Spirit, and intrinsically holy." Parry explains that the phrase refers to "the divine nature of Jesus, in contrast with *σάρξ*." Grimm takes the same view, but his explanation is later marked questionable by Thayer, who seems to agree rather with Gifford that this refers to the holiness of Christ's human spirit, "at once Divine and human." Vincent and Dummelow also interpret as Christ's human spirit, which is "the seat of his divine nature."

Sanday and Headlam oppose the idea that this may refer to the divine nature in Christ, "as if the Human Nature were coextensive with the *σάρξ* and the Divine Nature coextensive with the *πνεῦμα*." They state that this is "the human *πνεῦμα*, like the human *σάρξ*, distinguished however from that of ordinary humanity by an exceptional and transcendent Holiness." Robertson accepts Denny's explanation, "not the Holy Spirit, but a description of Christ ethically as *κατὰ σάρκα* describes him physically." Cremer

agrees that Paul is not speaking of the Holy Spirit but adds that, since the subject of this passage is not "the contrast of natural and moral qualities, but of human and divine relationship," this must refer to "the holiness of God . . . manifested in and by Christ."

The versions have translated as follows:

- Wycliffe (1382), "aftir the spirit of halewyng" (Vulgate: "secundum spiritum sanctificationis");
- Tyndale (1525), "of the holy goost that sanctifieth" (Luther, 1524: "nach dem Geist, der da heilige");
- Coverdale (1535), "after the sprete which sanctifieth";
- Rogers (1537), same as Tyndale;
- Great (1539), "after the sprete that sanctifyeth";
- Geneva (1560), "touching the Spirit of sanctification" (margin: "By the Spirit he declareth that Christ is God." Changed from "touching the Spirite that sanctifieth" in Whittingham, 1557, a more interpretative rendering);
- Bishops' (1568), same as Great (A marginal note shows that the translators understood this to be the Holy Spirit.);
- Rheims (1582), "according to the spirit of sanctification" (The 1914 printing of Challoner's 1749 revision explains that this is to be understood as Christ's "infinite sanctity.");
- King James (1611), "according to the Spirit of holiness" (Blayney, 1769, does not capitalize "spirit," although he consistently capitalizes "Holy Spirit.");
- English Revised (1881), same as Blayney (although the English Revised also consistently capitalizes "Holy Spirit");
- Twentieth Century (1900), "as regards the Spirit of holiness which was in him" (changed to "as to the spirit of holiness within him" in the 1904 final edition);
- American Standard (1901), same as Blayney (although the American Standard also consistently capitalizes "Holy Spirit");
- Weymouth (1903), "as regards the holiness of His Spirit" (changed to "by His Spirit of Holiness" in the 1929 fifth edition);
- Moffatt (1913), "[installed . . .] by the Spirit of holiness" (the context

indicating that Moffatt understood this as referring to the Holy Spirit);

- Westminster (1920), "in accordance with the holiness of his spirit";
- Goodspeed (1923), "in his holiness of spirit";
- Ballantine (1923), same as King James (1611);
- Montgomery (1924), "in respect of his spirit of holiness";
- Williams (1937), "on the holy spiritual side" (margin: "Grk., according to the spirit of holiness");
- Spencer (1937), "by the Spirit of sanctification";
- Confraternity (1941), "in keeping with the holiness of his spirit";
- Basic English (1941), "by the Holy Spirit";
- Knox (1944), "in respect of the sanctified spirit that was his";
- Verkuyl (1945), "according to the Spirit of Holiness";
- Revised Standard (1946), same as King James (1611);
- Phillips (1947), "by [the power of] that Spirit of holiness [which raised Him to life again from the dead]";
- Schonfield (1955), "in the sanctified spiritual sense";
- Lilly (1956), same as Blayney.

The translations seem to come under the four classifications as follows:

1. Literal, obscure, and ambiguous: Wycliffe, Geneva, Rheims, King James, Ballantine, Spencer, Verkuyl, Revised Standard, and Phillips. Spencer's reading is similar to that of Moffatt, but the context leaves it ambiguous. Verkuyl's capitalized rendering is perhaps intended to be understood as referring to the Holy Spirit, but this meaning is not certain. In versions that consistently capitalize "Holy Spirit," the literal translation "the spirit of holiness," with "spirit" not capitalized, is evidently to be regarded as an interpretation. It is clear that these

versions do not interpret the phrase as a reference to the Holy Spirit.

2. Literal, but equivalent to an interpretation: None.
3. Interpretative, with at least one alternative: None.
4. Interpretative, with no alternative: Tyndale, Coverdale, Rogers, Taverner, Great, Whittingham, Bishops', Blayney, English Revised, Twentieth Century, American Standard, Weymouth, Moffatt, Westminster, Goodspeed, Montgomery, Williams, Confraternity, Basic English, Knox, Schonfield, and Lilly.

Of the versions which have offered interpretative translations, Tyndale, Coverdale, Rogers, Taverner, Great, Whittingham, Bishops', Moffatt, and Basic English interpret as the Holy Spirit. It is difficult to tell whether the Blayney, English Revised, Twentieth Century, American Standard, Weymouth, Westminster, Goodspeed, Montgomery, Williams, Confraternity, Knox, Schonfield, and Lilly translations refer to Christ's divine nature or to the holiness of his human nature, or both. However, they evidently do not mean the Holy Spirit but rather the holiness of Christ's own spirit.

Romans 1:4.--ἐξ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν

There are two ambiguities in this phrase. Some choose to regard the genitive case of νεκρῶν as ablatival in force and thus translate ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν "the resurrection from the dead." In this case the passage is referred to Christ's own resurrection. Others prefer to take the case of νεκρῶν as "genitive of description" and translate "the resurrection of the dead." The passage is thus understood more broadly as a reference to the resurrection of the dead in a generic or absolute sense. Is Paul emphasizing that the proof of Christ's sonship (or his appointment to son-

ship in majesty) is provided by his own resurrection or by the general resurrection, of which his own was the first example?

Most of the versions included in this study seem to refer the passage more or less exclusively to Christ's own resurrection and translate, "the resurrection from the dead" or, more specifically, "his resurrection from the dead." Parry translates, "resurrection from death" and states that "the raising of Christ is the testimony of God to his nature." Sanday and Headlam also refer the passage only to Christ's resurrection. They explain that this "remarkable phrase" may have much the force of a compound word, "a dead-rising," the equivalent of "Todtenauferstehung"-- "a resurrection such as that when dead persons rise." Lietzmann also interprets as Christ's own resurrection.

Vincent, however, states that the phrase signifies "the resurrection of the dead absolutely and generically--of all the dead." Lightfoot agrees that "the general resurrection of the dead is meant," implied in that of Christ. Nygren urges the importance of translating, "the resurrection of the dead," since "for Paul the resurrection of Christ is the beginning of the resurrection of the dead." Garvie claims that Paul "never uses the expression 'resurrection from the dead,' but 'of the dead.'" "Christ's rising was a 'resurrection of the dead' (plural), because in Him the general hope of mankind received a first fulfilment." Denney explains that Christ's resurrection was not from but of the dead, since it was "exemplifying, and so guaranteeing, that of others." Robertson takes the same view.

The second problem in this phrase involves the interpretation of the ambiguous preposition ἐξ. It can be understood as causal or temporal.

Is Paul emphasizing that Christ was "designated Son of God" by or since the time of the resurrection?

C. F. D. Moule recognizes the ambiguity by just citing the two choices: "Is ἐξ 'temporal,' meaning 'from the time of,' or 'causal,' meaning, 'on the ground of?'" Lightfoot prefers "owing to, by reason of." Thayer and Dummelow suggest simply "by." Parry explains that "the raising of Christ is the testimony of God to His nature." Robertson agrees that "it was the Resurrection . . . that definitely marked Jesus off as God's Son because of his claims about himself as God's Son and his prophecy that he would rise on the third day."

On the other hand, Boylan claims that "Paul is not thinking here of the Resurrection as a proof of Christ's divinity. Neither can he mean that Christ was 'set up' or 'established' by the Resurrection as Son of God. He is thinking rather . . . of the striking declaration of the divine Sonship of Christ contained in the works wrought by the Holy Spirit since the Resurrection." Dodd seems to stress the temporal significance of the preposition in his explanation, "The statement . . . attests the facts that . . . after His resurrection, though not before, He was worshipped as Son of God." Barrett translates, "after his resurrection from the dead," explaining that "the resurrection of Christ must . . . have preceded his appointment" as the Son of God. Lietzmann also prefers the temporal "since his resurrection" and argues that the causal "by his resurrection" introduces "einen fremden und falschen Gedanken" into this context.

The versions have translated as follows:

Wycliffe (1382), "of the azenrisynge of deed men" (Vulgate: "ex resurrectione mortuorum," as ambiguous as the Greek);

- Tyndale (1525), "sence the tyme that [Jesus Christ our lorde] rose agayne from deeth" (Luther, 1524: "syt der zeit er aufferstanden ist von den todten");
- Coverdale (1535), "sense the tyme that he rose agayne from the deed" (cf. Luther, cited above);
- Rogers (1537), same as Tyndale;
- Taverner (1539), same as Tyndale;
- Great (1539), same as Tyndale;
- Geneva (1560), "by the resurrection from the dead" (changed from "sence that he rose agayne from the dead" in Whittingham, 1557);
- Bishops' (1568), same as Geneva;
- Rheims (1582), "by the resurrection [of our Lord Jesus Christ] from the dead (cf. Tyndale);
- King James (1611), same as Geneva;
- English Revised (1881), "by the resurrection of the dead";
- Twentieth Century (1900), "by his resurrection from the dead";
- American Standard (1901), same as Geneva (margin: "Or, of the dead");
- Weymouth (1903), "by the Resurrection" (changed to "by resurrection of the dead" in the 1929 fifth edition);
- Moffatt (1913), "when he was raised from the dead";
- Westminster (1920), "by resurrection from death";
- Goodspeed (1923), "by being raised from the dead";
- Ballantine (1923), same as Twentieth Century;
- Montgomery (1924), same as Twentieth Century;
- Williams (1937), same as Geneva;
- Spencer (1937), "through His resurrection from the dead";
- Confraternity (1941), "by resurrection from the dead";
- Basic English (1941), "through the coming to life again of the dead";
- Knox (1944), same as Twentieth Century;

Verkuy1 (1945), "when He was raised from the dead" (cf. Moffatt);

Revised Standard (1946), same as Twentieth Century;

Phillips (1947), "[by the power of that Spirit of holiness] which raised Him to life again from the dead";

Schonfield (1955), same as Confraternity;

Lilly (1956), same as Twentieth Century.

The translations of ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν seem to come under the four classifications as follows:

1. Literal, obscure, and ambiguous: None.
2. Literal, but equivalent to an interpretation: Wycliffe, English Revised, Weymouth (1929), and Basic English. The translators of at least the last three versions were undoubtedly aware of the significance of their literal translation.
3. Interpretative, with at least one alternative: American Standard.
4. Interpretative, without an alternative: All versions except Wycliffe, English Revised, American Standard, Weymouth (1929), and Basic English.

Of the versions offering deliberately interpretative translations, ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν is interpreted as referring more or less exclusively to Christ's own resurrection by all except the American Standard (margin), which interprets as the general resurrection of the dead. The latter interpretation, however, is also represented by the literal translations of Wycliffe, English Revised, Weymouth (1929), and Basic English, and they were probably intended to be so understood. It is being assumed that the capitalized Weymouth (1903) rendering "Resurrection" is intended to be



taken as a reference to Christ's own resurrection.

The translations of εἰς seem to come under the four classifications as follows:

1. Literal, obscure, and ambiguous: Wycliffe.
2. Literal, but equivalent to an interpretation: None.
3. Interpretative, with at least one alternative: None.
4. Interpretative, without an alternative: All versions except Wycliffe.

Of the versions offering interpretative translations, εἰς is interpreted as temporal by Tyndale, Coverdale, Rogers, Taverner, Great, Whittingham, Moffatt, and Verkuyl. The preposition is interpreted as causal by Geneva, Bishops', Rheims, King James, English Revised, Twentieth Century, American Standard, Weymouth, Westminster, Goodspeed, Ballantine, Montgomery, Williams, Spencer, Confraternity, Basic English, Knox, Revised Standard, Phillips, Schonfield, and Lilly.

Romans 1:5.--εἰς ὑπακοὴν πίστεως ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς ἔθνεσιν

The genitive case of πίστεως may be taken as either subjective or objective, or as genitive of apposition, or epexegetic genitive, or genitive of description or quality (attributive). The phrase ὑπακοὴν πίστεως has been interpreted to mean "obedience that springs from faith," "obedience that consists in faith," "faithful obedience," or "obedience to faith" (as a principle), or "obedience to the faith" (as the gospel or a body of doctrine). As Blass observes, with Robertson's approval (in his Grammar), the exact shade of the genitive idea is often a matter of theological rather than grammatical interpretation.

Sanday and Headlam favor the objective genitive, provided that

*πίστις* "is not hardened too much into the sense which it afterwards acquired of a body of doctrine." Kirk prefers "obedience to the faith"-- "the faith' being regarded as a synonym for 'the Christian gospel.'" Dodd and theissen take the same view in their comments on the identical phrase in Rom. 16:26. But Gifford explains, "Not 'to the faith'--as the doctrine of the faith." "'Obedience to faith,' is man's surrender of himself . . . to faith as the principle and power . . . of the new life in Christ." Garvie agrees that faith does not mean here "a creed claiming acceptance." Thayer translates, "obedience rendered to faith." Abel also interprets as the objective genitive. Lietzmann explains that the genitive of *πίστεως* is neither subjective nor epexegetic but rather objective. He understands *πίστις* here as meaning "die neue Religion."

Abbott-Smith lists this phrase as an example of the use of ὑπακοή with the objective genitive in the New Testament. But Parry observes on the contrary that "with ὑπακοή the genitive seems never to be objective" in the New Testament. Stephens, Lightfoot, and Robertson take this as subjective genitive and interpret, "the obedience which springs from faith." Vincent translates, "obedience which characterizes and proceeds from faith"; Denney, "the obedience which consists in faith"; Dummelow, "that obedience which is connected with faith"; Barrett, "believing obedience."

J. Knox admits that the meaning of this phrase is somewhat obscure but favors "obedience which comes from faith." He objects to the Revised Standard translation "the faith" in that "it involves an objective, almost external, meaning for the word 'faith' which is certainly not characteristic of Paul." Boylan sees the possibility of the phrase meaning either

"obedience to the truths of Faith" or "obedience consisting in faith" but prefers the latter in view of the absence of the article.

Bauer, in his comments on πίστις, cites Rom. 1:5 as an example of the early objectivizing of the faith-concept. But in his comments on ὑπακοή, as used in Rom. 1:5 and 16:26, he admits uncertainty as to whether Paul is speaking of "obedience to the message of faith" or "obedience which springs from faith."

The versions have translated as follows:

- Wycliffe (1382), "to obeische to the feith in alle folkis" (Vulgate: "ad oboediendum fidei," which is equally ambiguous with the Greek);
- Tyndale (1525), "thatt all gentiles shulde obeye to the faith" (changed in the 1534 edition to "to bring all maner hethen people unto obedience of the fayth"; Luther, 1524: "under alle heiden den gehorsam dess glaubens auffzurichten");
- Coverdale (1535), "amonge all Heythen, to set up the obedience of faith" (cf. Luther);
- Rogers (1537), "to bring all manner hethen people unto the obeyence of the fayth";
- Taverner (1539), same as Rogers;
- Great (1539), "that obedience might be geven unto the faith . . . amonge all the Heathen";
- Geneva (1560), "that obedience might be given unto the faith . . . among all heithen";
- Bishops' (1568), same as Great;
- Rheims (1582), "for obedience to the faith in al Nations";
- King James (1611), "for obedience to the faith among all nations" (margin: "Or to the obedience of faith");
- English Revised (1881), "unto obedience of faith among all the nations" (margin: "Or, to the faith");
- Twentieth Century (1900), "to secure . . . submission to the Faith among all nations";
- American Standard (1901), same as English Revised (margin: "Or, to the faith");

- Weymouth (1903), "to win men to obedience to the faith, among all Gentile peoples" (margin: "Lit. simply 'to obedience of faith.'" This was changed in the 1929 fifth edition to "to win men to the obedience that springs from faith among all the Gentiles," with the marginal note, "Or perhaps 'obedience to the faith'; lit. 'unto obedience of faith.'");
- Moffatt (1913), "to promote obedience to the faith . . . among all the Gentiles";
- Westminster (1920), "we should win all nations unto obedience of faith";
- Goodspeed (1923), "to urge obedience and faith upon all the heathen";
- Ballantine (1923), "to promote obedience of faith . . . among all the Gentiles";
- Montgomery (1924), "to promote obedience to the faith among all the Gentiles";
- Williams (1937), "to urge upon all the heathen obedience inspired by faith";
- Spencer (1937), "in all the nations to subdue them to faith";
- Confraternity (1941), "to bring about obedience to faith among all the nations";
- Basic English (1941), "to make disciples to the faith among all nations";
- Knox (1944), "all over the world men must be taught [to honour his name] by paying him the homage of their faith";
- Verkuyl (1945), "to promote among all the gentiles a yielding in faith to His name";
- Revised Standard (1946), "to bring about obedience to the faith among all the Gentiles";
- Phillips (1947), "to forward obedience to the Faith in all nations";
- Schonfield (1955), "to procure loyal submission";
- Lilly (1956), "to bring men of all nations [to honor his name] by the submission of faith."

The translations seem to come under the four classifications as follows:

1. Literal, obscure, and ambiguous: Tyndale (1534), Coverdale, Rogers, Taverner, Westminster, and Ballantine. It is possible that the

translations offered in each of these versions, and especially in Coverdale, Westminster, and Ballantine, were intended to be understood as interpreting *πίστεως* in the subjective sense, or as epexegetic or attributive. Evidence for this may be the reappearance of the Coverdale rendering in the margin of the King James and in the text of the English Revised and American Standard as an alternative to the objective interpretation, "obedience to the faith." However, the translations could also be understood in the objective sense, and consequently they seem to belong in this classification as literal, obscure, and ambiguous.

2. Literal, but equivalent to an interpretation: None.

3. Interpretative, with at least one alternative: King James, English Revised, American Standard, and Weymouth. The translation offered in the margin of the King James and Weymouth (1903) and in the text of the English Revised and American Standard is literal, obscure, and ambiguous. However, these versions are included in this classification since they have not only offered one clear translation in text or margin but have also at least suggested the possibility of a different interpretation. Only the 1929 fifth edition of Weymouth offers two clear alternative interpretations.

4. Interpretative, without an alternative: Wycliffe, Tyndale (1525), Great, Geneva, Bishops', Rheims, Twentieth Century, Moffatt, Goodspeed, Montgomery, Williams, Spencer, Confraternity, Basic English, Knox, Verkuyl, Revised Standard, Phillips, Schonfield, and Lilly.

Of the versions offering interpretative translations, Weymouth (1929) and Williams have preferred to take the genitive of *πίστεως* as subjective; Knox and, apparently, Lilly have interpreted as genitive of

apposition; Verkuyl and Schonfield have interpreted as genitive of description or quality. Goodspeed's translation "obedience and faith" is difficult to place grammatically, but he clearly rejects the objective interpretation.

The genitive is interpreted as objective by Wycliffe, Tyndale (1525), Great, Geneva, Bishops', Rheims, King James, English Revised (margin), Weymouth (1903), American Standard (margin), Moffatt, Montgomery, Spencer, Confraternity, Basic English, Revised Standard, and Phillips. Of this latter group, all but Spencer and the Confraternity have interpreted πίστεις as "the faith" with the definite article.

Romans 1:6.--κλητοὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ

The genitive case of Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ is ambiguous. It has been interpreted as genitive of possession, or "predicate genitive" (Robertson), making the passage mean, "Jesus Christ's by calling"; or "called to belong to Jesus Christ" (Robertson regards this as predicate genitive); or "called by Jesus Christ" (a use of the genitive explained by Smyth as a form of the genitive of possession used with verbal adjectives "to denote the personal origin of an action").<sup>1</sup> It has also been taken as ablatival genitive, meaning "called from Jesus Christ," or "having received a call from Jesus Christ." The solution rests largely upon the translator's decision as to whether Paul customarily ascribes the act of calling to God the Father or to Christ.

Robertson seems to prefer to interpret Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ as "predicate genitive, meaning "called to be Jesus Christ's," though he also ad-

---

<sup>1</sup>H. W. Smyth, A Greek Grammar (New York: American Book Co., 1920), p. 328, par. 1390.

mits it "possible to consider it the ablative case, 'called of (or from) Jesus Christ.'" In his Grammar he advises that "it is probably best" to take *Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ* as ablatival here in Rom. 1:6. Gifford translates, "Jesus Christ's called ones" and explains that they are "called by God the Father, to whom the act of calling is always ascribed." Barrett takes the same view. Lange claims that the phrase may not mean "whom Christ has called," for "Paul refers the call to God." Schaff agrees that the call of believers is "uniformly referred to the Father." Lightfoot translates "called to be Jesus Christ's," on the basis that "the call is always ascribed to God the Father." Sanday and Headlam likewise interpret, "called ones of Jesus Christ"; Thayer, "devoted to Christ and united to him"; Bosworth, "called by God to be Jesus Christ's"; Boylan, "as called by God they belong to Jesus Christ"; Denney, "Jesus Christ's called." Lagrange and J. Knox take the same position. Parry translates "called to belong to Jesus Christ" and explains that the genitive "stands for an adjective," the equivalent of "*Χριστιανός*."

On the other hand, Abel states that "called by Jesus Christ" is the "proper meaning." Alford, Kittel, and Lietzmann support the same translation. "Called by Jesus Christ" is the interpretation offered in a number of the versions--Luther (1524), Twentieth Century (1900), Fenton (1905), Ballantine (1923), Verkuy1 (1945), Ford (1948), and Schonfield (1955).

The versions have translated as follows:

Wycliffe (1382), "clepid of Ihesu Crist" (Some manuscripts have "the called." Vulgate: "uocati Jesu Christi," which is as ambiguous as the Greek);

Tyndale (1525), "Jesus Christes by vocacion";

- Coverdale (1535), "called of Jesu Christ" (Luther, 1524: "beruffen seind von Jesu Christo");
- Rogers (1537), same as Tyndale;
- Taverner (1539), "Jesus Chrystes by callynge";
- Great (1539), same as Coverdale;
- Geneva (1560), "the called of Jesus Christ" (changed from "Jesus Christes by vocacion" in the 1557 Whittingham edition);
- Bishops' (1568), same as Geneva;
- Rheims (1582), same as Geneva;
- King James (1611), same as Geneva;
- English Revised (1881), "called to be Jesus Christ's";
- Twentieth Century (1900), "having received a Call from Jesus Christ" (changed to "called to belong to Jesus Christ" in the 1904 final edition);
- American Standard (1901), same as English Revised;
- Weymouth (1903), "Called, as you have been, to belong to Jesus Christ" (changed to the same as Twentieth Century, 1904, in the 1929 fifth edition);
- Moffatt (1913), same as Twentieth Century (1904);
- Westminster (1920), "being the called of Jesus Christ";
- Goodspeed (1923), same as Twentieth Century (1904);
- Ballantine (1923), "called by Jesus Christ";
- Montgomery (1924), "called to be Jesus Christ's";
- Williams (1937), "as called ones belong to Jesus Christ";
- Spencer (1937), "called to be Jesus Christ's own";
- Confraternity (1941), same as Montgomery;
- Basic English (1941), "marked out to be disciples of Jesus Christ";
- Knox (1944), same as Twentieth Century (1904);
- Verkuyl (1945), "invited as you are of Jesus Christ";



Revised Standard (1946), same as Twentieth Century (1904);  
 Phillips (1947), "called to belong to Him";  
 Schonfield (1955), "summoned by Jesus Christ";  
 Lilly (1956), same as Twentieth Century (1904).

The translations seem to come under the four classifications as follows:

1. Literal, obscure, and ambiguous: Geneva, Bishops', Rheims, King James, and Westminster. It seems likely that the translation offered in these versions, "the called of Jesus Christ," may represent an attempt to preserve the ambiguity of the original, inasmuch as both possible interpretations had already appeared in previous versions.

2. Literal, but equivalent to an interpretation: Wycliffe, Coverdale, and Great. It is being assumed that the literal "called of Jesus Christ" was readily understood in the idiom of the day to mean, "called by Jesus Christ."

3. Interpretative, with at least one alternative: None.

4. Interpretative, with no alternative: Tyndale, Rogers, Taverner, English Revised, Twentieth Century, American Standard, Weymouth, Moffatt, Goodspeed, Ballantine, Montgomery, Williams, Spencer, Confraternity, Basic English, Knox, Verkuyl, Revised Standard, Phillips, Schonfield, and Lilly.

Of the versions offering deliberately interpretative translations, the call is ascribed to Christ himself by the Twentieth Century (1900), Ballantine, Verkuyl, and Schonfield. Tyndale, Rogers, Taverner, Whittingham, English Revised, Twentieth Century (1904), American Standard, Weymouth, Moffatt, Goodspeed, Montgomery, Williams, Spencer, Confraternity,

Basic English, Knox, Revised Standard, Phillips, and Lilly all take the genitive as possessive (or predicate genitive), resulting in such translations as "Jesus Christ's by calling," "called to be Jesus Christ's," "called to belong to Jesus Christ." These translations do not indicate specifically that the act of calling is not to be referred to Christ, but the implication is there.

Romans 1:17.--δικαιοσύνη γὰρ θεοῦ

The genitive case of θεοῦ may be interpreted as genitive of possession (God's righteousness), of description (a God-kind of righteousness), or of source (the righteousness which comes from God). The omission of the article makes possible another alternative, "a righteousness of God," as a particular phase of God's righteousness, though the literal translation "a righteousness of God" is still obscure.

The word δικαιοσύνη is also ambiguous in this context and may be taken as a description of intrinsic character or of an outgoing activity. Compare the use of δικαιοσύνη in Rom. 3:22. If the case of θεοῦ is assumed to be genitive of possession, the whole phrase may be interpreted either as referring to the righteousness of God's own character or to God's way of making men righteous.

The problem has been discussed at considerable length by the commentators. Some recommend that the translation be left sufficiently ambiguous to include two or more of the possible meanings. Sanday and Headlam interpret the phrase as meaning both "a righteousness of which God is the author and man the recipient" and "God's own righteousness." "The very cogency of the arguments on both sides is enough to show that the two views . . . are not mutually exclusive but rather inclusive."

Abbott-Smith defines similarly as "a righteousness divine in its character and origin" that "includes the idea of God's personal righteousness."

Barrett explains that "God's righteousness" here is not only his property or attribute of being right, or righteous, but also his activity in doing right, and (as we say) seeing right done; thus his righteousness issues in his vindicating--those whom it is proper that he should vindicate."

Denney also regards the expression as of the "utmost generality." But he denies that it may refer to God's own righteousness as an attribute of character and sees rather three other meanings: "the justification of man," "a righteousness which proceeds from God," and the righteousness "that is valid before God." He prefers "a Divine righteousness" to cover broadly all three. Dodd interprets as an attribute both of God and of men "as saved of God." Robertson recommends "a God kind of righteousness." In his Grammar he had earlier described this as "the righteousness which God has and wishes to bestow on us." Thayer translates, "what God declares to be righteousness." Lietzmann states non-committally that this may mean either God's own righteousness or that which he imputes.

Kittel claims that "there can be no doubt that  $\theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$  is to be understood as a subjective genitive. God's righteousness is exclusively his own, and man is brought into it and given a place within it." Parry states that the phrase should not be translated "a righteousness of God," but "God's righteousness," that is, "righteousness as belonging to the character of God." Barmby agrees that in all cases this means "God's own eternal righteousness."

Vincent takes the view that "this does not mean righteousness as

an attribute of God . . . but righteousness as bestowed on man by God." Bauer translates, "the righteousness bestowed by God." J. Knox agrees with Lightfoot, Dummelow, Boylan, Lagrange, Nygren, and Theissen that this is righteousness which comes from God, "not so much God's own righteousness as an act of God on behalf of men." Abel states that this is genitive of source and translates, "righteousness given by God to man."

Stephens understands the words to mean "a way . . . in which sinful man may be accepted before God and may stand in his presence approved and forgiven." In apparent agreement Phillips translates, "God's plan for imparting righteousness to men," and Goodspeed, "God's way of uprightness." By this Goodspeed evidently does not mean God's own righteousness, for where this is clearly the meaning of *θεοῦ δικαιοσύνην* in Rom. 3:5 he translates, "the uprightness of God."

The versions have translated as follows:

- Wycliffe (1382), "the riztwysnesse of God" (Vulgate: "Iustitia enim Dei");
- Tyndale (1525), "the rightwesness which commeth of god";
- Coverdale (1535), "the righteousnes that is of value before God" (Luther, 1524: "die gerechtigkeit die vor gott gilt");
- Rogers (1537), same as Tyndale (The marginal note shows that Rogers understood this to mean "imputed" righteousness.);
- Taverner (1539), same as Wycliffe;
- Great (1539), same as Wycliffe;
- Geneva (1560), same as Wycliffe (The marginal note shows that the translators understood this to mean the righteousness "which God approveth" and is to be "apprehended by faith.");
- Bishops' (1568), same as Wycliffe;
- Rheims (1582), "the justice of God" (Latin: "iustitia." The marginal note explains that this is "not Gods owne iustice in him self, but

- that iustice wherwith God endueth man.");
- King James (1611), same as Wycliffe;
- English Revised (1881), "a righteousness of God";
- Twentieth Century (1900), "a righteousness which comes from God" (changed in the 1904 final edition to "the Divine Righteousness");
- American Standard (1901), same as English Revised;
- Weymouth (1903), "a righteousness which comes from God" (margin: "Or 'the righteousness'");
- Moffatt (1913), "God's righteousness";
- Westminster (1920), "the justness of God";
- Goodspeed (1923), "God's way of uprightness";
- Ballantine (1923), "a righteousness of God";
- Montgomery (1924), "a righteousness which proceeds from God";
- Williams (1937), "God's Way of man's right standing with Him" (A marginal note gives the literal Greek and explains that this means in Paul "right standing with God, or God's way for men to be in right standing with Him.");
- Spencer (1937), "justification from God" (A marginal note cites the interpretation of Augustine: "The justice of God here is not that by which He is just, but that wherewith He clothes man when He justifies the impious.");
- Confraternity (1941), same as Rheims (A marginal note explains that this is the "justice that God imparts to man.");
- Basic English (1941), same as Wycliffe;
- Knox (1944), "God's way of justifying us";
- Verkuyl (1945), same as Moffatt;
- Revised Standard (1946), same as Wycliffe;
- Phillips (1947), "God's plan for imparting righteousness to men";
- Schonfield (1955), "God's justice";
- Lilly (1956), "God's way of sanctifying" (margin: "literally, 'of justifying'").

The translations seem to come under the four classifications as follows:

1. Literal, obscure, and ambiguous: Wycliffe, Taverner, Great, Geneva, Bishops', Rheims, King James, English Revised, American Standard, Westminster, Ballantine, Confraternity, Basic English, and Revised Standard. It might seem that the translation "the righteousness of God," or "the justice of God," would be most readily understood to mean "God's own righteousness," the literal translation therefore being equivalent to an interpretation. However, the marginal notes in Geneva, Rheims, and Confraternity illustrate the ambiguity of the literal rendering.

2. Literal, but equivalent to an interpretation: None.

3. Interpretative, with at least one alternative: None.

4. Interpretative, with no alternative: Tyndale, Coverdale, Rogers, Twentieth Century, Weymouth, Moffatt, Goodspeed, Montgomery, Williams, Spencer, Knox, Verkuyl, Phillips, Schonfield, and Lilly.

Of the versions which have offered interpretative translations, Moffatt, Goodspeed, Williams, Knox, Verkuyl, Phillips, Schonfield, and Lilly have taken the case of  $\theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$  as genitive of possession; Coverdale and the 1904 final edition of the Twentieth Century have interpreted as genitive of description; Tyndale, Rogers, Twentieth Century (1900), Weymouth, Montgomery, and Spencer as genitive of source.

Of this same group of versions, Goodspeed, Williams, Spencer, Knox, Phillips, and Lilly have interpreted  $\delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\omicron\sigma\upsilon\acute{\nu}\eta$  as an outgoing act of God in man's behalf. The rest have translated simply as "righteousness." The English Revised, Twentieth Century (1900), American Standard, Ballantine, and Montgomery translate, "a righteousness" with the indefi-

nite article.

Romans 1:17.--ὁ δὲ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται

The prepositional phrase ἐκ πίστεως may be connected adverbially with ζήσεται or adverbially with ὁ δίκαιος. In the former case the passage would mean that the righteous person will live by faith, or will have life as a result of his faith, his faith being a manifestation of his righteousness. In the latter case it would mean that the person who by faith is righteous will live, or will have life, the equivalent of ὁ δὲ ἐκ πίστεως δίκαιος ζήσεται.

Lightfoot states that he "cannot doubt" that ἐκ πίστεως is to be taken with ζήσεται. Sanday and Headlam argue that the meaning of Habakkuk 2:4 determines this connection, for if Paul had intended otherwise "it lay very near at hand to write ὁ δὲ ἐκ πίστεως δίκαιος, and so remove all ambiguity." Denney explains that to connect ἐκ πίστεως with δίκαιος would imply a contrast to another mode of being righteous, that is by works, "which there is nothing in the text to suggest." The traditional interpretation is preferred also by Cremer, Zahn, and Kittel and is the one followed by most modern versions.

On the contrary, however, regarding Paul's quotation of Habakkuk, Garvie explains that "the thought of the prophet and the apostle are not quite the same" and that in this case ἐκ πίστεως should "probably" be connected with δίκαιος. Boylan concludes more definitely that "δίκαιος is obviously to be joined here immediately with ἐκ πίστεως." F. C. Grant states his judgment that "the older theological interpretation" of this passage is "not quite adequate. Paul is thinking of one who through

faith is righteous."<sup>1</sup> Nygren is strongly for this position:

What reason have we for coupling ἐκ πίστεως with ὁ δίκαιος? We reply that the reason is not merely good enough to be persuasive; it is decisive. First and foremost, the context demands that the words be thus coupled . . . .

The very structure of Romans and the letter as a whole are proof that in its theme ἐκ πίστεως is connected with ὁ δίκαιος and not with ἕσεται.

Thayer, Kühn, Bosworth, Abel, and Lietzmann also prefer this interpretation.

Barrett argues that the translation of this passage should be left ambiguous, since the "position" of ἐκ πίστεως is "indecisive." He recommends "he that is righteous by faith shall live," meaning that "man (if righteous at all) is righteous by faith; he also lives by faith." Bauer also translates somewhat ambiguously, "he that is just through faith will have life."

The versions have translated as follows:

Wycliffe (1382), "for a just man lyueth of feith" (Vulgate: "Iustus autem ex fide uiuit," a literal and ambiguous translation of the ambiguous Greek);

Tyndale (1525), "The just shall live by fayth";

Coverdale (1535), "the iust shal lyve by his faith" (Luther, 1524: "Der gerecht wirt leben auss seinem glauben");

Rogers (1537), same as Tyndale;

Taverner (1539), same as Tyndale;

Great (1539), same as Tyndale;

Geneva (1560), same as Tyndale;

Bishops' (1568), same as Tyndale;

---

<sup>1</sup>F. C. Grant, "Notes on Translating the New Testament," The Bible Translator, Vol. I (Oct., 1950), p. 149.



- Rheims (1582), "And the iust liveth by faith";
- King James (1611), same as Tyndale;
- English Revised (1881), "But the righteous shall live by faith" (margin: "Gr. from");
- Twentieth Century (1900), "Those who stand right with God will find Life as the result of faith" (changed in the 1904 final edition to "Through faith the righteous man shall find Life.");
- American Standard (1901), same as English Revised (margin: "Gr. from");
- Weymouth (1903), "The righteous man shall live by faith" (margin: "Or 'The man who is righteous by faith shall live.'");
- Moffatt (1913), "By faith shall the righteous live";
- Westminster (1920), "The just man shall live by faith";
- Goodspeed (1923), "The upright will have life because of his faith";
- Ballantine (1923), "He who is righteous by faith shall live" (cf. Weymouth margin);
- Montgomery (1924), "Now by faith shall the righteous live";
- Williams (1937), "The upright man must live by faith";
- Spencer (1937), same as Westminster;
- Confraternity (1941), "He who is just lives by faith";
- Basic English (1941), "The man who does righteousness will be living by his faith";
- Knox (1944), "It is faith that brings life to the just man";
- Verkuyl (1945), "But the just shall live by faith";
- Revised Standard (1946), "He who through faith is righteous shall live" (margin: "Or The righteous shall live by faith.");
- Phillips (1947), "The righteous shall live by faith";
- Schonfield (1955), "By faith the just shall live";
- Lilly (1956), "The holy man lives by faith."

The translations seem to come under the four classifications as follows:

1. Literal, obscure, and ambiguous: Ballantine. The translation "he who is righteous by faith shall live" may represent a deliberate attempt to preserve the ambiguity of the Greek.

2. Literal, but equivalent to an interpretation: None.

3. Interpretative, with at least one alternative: Weymouth and the Revised Standard.

4. Interpretative, with no alternative: All other versions besides Ballantine, Weymouth, and the Revised Standard.

Of the versions offering interpretative translations, only the Revised Standard and perhaps Weymouth (margin) connect ἐκ πίστεως with ὁ δὲ δίκαιος. All others make the traditional connection with γίνεταί.

Romans 1:18.--τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἐν ἀδικίᾳ κατεχόντων

The verb κατέχω may mean either "hold fast," "possess," or "restrain," "suppress," "withhold." The particular meaning intended in this phrase is not immediately apparent. Is Paul saying that the wicked are in possession of the truth, yet are living unrighteous lives? Or does he mean that they are hindering or suppressing the truth by their unrighteousness?

Parry recognizes the two possibilities but insists that here "the sequence of thought is "decisive" in favor of the meaning "possess." "It is essential to the argument that the primary condition which makes an act or state sinful should be set down here; namely, that the sinner knows what he is doing." Lightfoot also opposes the meaning "restrain" or "keep down" and favors "possess," "grasp." Abbott-Smith lists the meaning of κατέχω in this verse as "possess," "hold fast."

On the other hand, Lange considers the interpretation "who sin

against better knowledge" as "odd." Vincent states that  $\kappa\alpha\tau\epsilon\chi\omega$  here may not mean "hold," "possess," but "hinder," "suppress." Denney cites both interpretations as possible but prefers "suppress." Garvie also recognizes the two possibilities but favors "hinder," "keep back." Robertson interprets, "conceal"; Sanday and Headlam, "stifle and suppress"; Bauer, "hold down," "suppress"; Thayer, "restrain," "hinder"; Stephens, "prevent." The same view is held by Gifford, Dummelow, Dodd, Nygren, Cragg, Barrett, and Lietzmann.

The versions have translated as follows:

Wycliffe (1382), "withholde, or holden a bac, the treuthe of God in un-  
rirtwysnesse" (Vulgate: "ueritatem Dei in iniustitia detinent");

Tyndale (1525), "withhole the trueth in unrightwesness" (Luther, 1524:  
"die warheit gottes uffhalten im unrechten," changed in the 1534  
edition to "die warheit inn untugent auffhalten");

Coverdale (1535), "witholde the trueth of God in unrighteousnes" (cf. the  
Vulgate and Luther, 1524);

Rogers (1537), same as Tyndale;

Taverner (1539), same as Tyndale;

Great (1539), same as Tyndale;

Geneva (1560), same as Tyndale;

Bishops' (1568), same as Tyndale (margin: "They hold the trueth in un-  
ryghteousness, ye whiche understande the trueth, and do not expresse  
the same in their deedes and lyfe");

Rheims (1582), "deteine the veritie of God in iniustice" (Vulgate: "ueri-  
tatem Dei in iniustitia detinent");

King James (1611), "hold the truth in unrighteousness" (following the in-  
terpretation given in the Bishops' marginal note);

English Revised (1881), "hold down the truth in unrighteousness (margin:  
"Or, hold the truth");

Twentieth Century (1900), "by wrong-doing, suppressing the Truth";

American Standard (1901), "hinder the truth in unrighteousness" (margin: "Or, hold the truth");

Weymouth (1903), "through iniquity suppress the truth";

Moffatt (1913), "hinder the Truth by their wickedness";

Westminster (1920), "in wickedness are repressing the truth";

Goodspeed (1923), "in their wickedness are suppressing the truth";

Ballantine (1923), "hold the truth but practice unrighteousness";

Montgomery (1924), "smother the truth by their unrighteousness";

Williams (1937), same as Goodspeed;

Spencer (1937), "impede the truth by their unrighteous conduct (margin: "Or, hold");

Confraternity (1941), "in wickedness hold back the truth of God";

Basic English (1941), "keep down what is true by wrongdoing";

Knox (1944), "wrong-doing denies his truth its full scope";

Verkuyl (1945), "through their wicked ways suppress the truth";

Revised Standard (1946), "by their wickedness suppress the truth";

Phillips (1947), "render Truth dumb and inoperative by their wickedness";

Schonfield (1955), "wilfully suppress the truth";

Lilly (1956), "in wickedness stifle the truth of God."

The translations seem to come under the four classifications as follows:

1. Literal, obscure, and ambiguous: None.
2. Literal, but equivalent to an interpretation: Wycliffe, Rheims, Confraternity, and Knox, all following the Vulgate interpretation, "detinent."
3. Interpretative, with at least one alternative: English Revised, American Standard, and Spencer. The marginal note in the Bishops'

presents the alternative interpretation but seems to be offering it, not as an alternative, but as an explanation of the translation "with-holde" given in the text.

4. Interpretative, with no alternative. All other versions besides Wycliffe, Rheims, English Revised, American Standard, Confraternity, Spencer, and Knox.

Among the versions offering interpretative translations, the participle *κατεχόντων* is interpreted as "holding," "possessing," by the Bishops' (margin), King James, English Revised (margin), American Standard (margin), Ballantine, and Spencer (margin). All remaining versions interpret as "suppressing," "hindering," "holding back."

Romans 1:30.--*θεοστυγεῖς*

The force of the adjective *θεοστυγεῖς* may be either active, the equivalent of *τοὺς τὸν θεὸν μισοῦντας*, or passive, the equivalent of *στυγητοὶ τῷ θεῷ*. Some have ventured as a third possibility that the word may mean "exceptionally impious and wicked" (Thayer) or may be a "strong and pregnant synonym for ἄθεος" (Cremer).

Lightfoot prefers "hateful to God" and states that there is "no authority for the active meaning." Robertson explains that "all the ancient examples take it in the passive sense and so probably here." Denney, Vincent, Bosworth, Lietzmann, Abbott-Smith, and Liddell and Scott all prefer the passive for Rom. 1:30.

On the contrary, Cremer argues that "this passive meaning cannot be given to the word here in Rom. 1:30, where heinous crimes and vices are enumerated." Gifford agrees that "this active sense is undoubtedly better suited to a catalogue of sins, and the position of the word is

most striking at the head of a descending series of the forms of arrogance, first towards God and then towards men." Sanday and Headlam prefer the active as giving the "more pointed sense" in this context--"unless we might suppose that *θεοοτυγείς* had come to have a meaning like our "desperadoes."

Bauer admits that in ancient Greek *θεοοτυγείς* occurred only in the passive sense, "hated by a god," then "godforsaken." However, he is of the opinion that in this particular list of vices the active meaning, "hating God," seems to be more appropriate. Boylan also considers "God-hating" more in place here.

Barrett suggests that *θεοοτυγείς* should be regarded as an adjective qualifying the preceding *καταλάλους* and translates, "God-hated slanderers."

The versions have translated as follows:

- Wycliffe (1382), "hateful to God" (Vulgate: "Deo odibiles");
- Tyndale (1525), "haters off God" (Luther, 1524: "den gott feynd ist"; changed in the 1534 edition to "Gottes verachter");
- Coverdale (1535), "despysers of God" (cf. Luther, 1534);
- Rogers (1537), same as Tyndale;
- Taverner (1539), same as Tyndale;
- Great (1539), same as Tyndale;
- Geneva (1560), same as Tyndale;
- Bishops' (1568), same as Tyndale;
- Rheims (1582), "odible to God" (Latin: "Deo odibiles");
- King James (1611), same as Tyndale;
- English Revised (1881), same as Wycliffe (margin: "Or, haters of God");
- Twentieth Century (1900), "impious";

American Standard (1901), same as Wycliffe (margin: "Or, haters of God");

Weymouth (1903), same as Wycliffe (margin: "Or perhaps 'haters of God.'");

Moffatt (1913), "loathed by God";

Westminster (1920), "God-haters";

Goodspeed (1923), "abhorrent to God";

Ballantine (1923), same as Wycliffe;

Montgomery (1924), "hated of God";

Williams (1937), same as Wycliffe;

Spencer (1937), same as Tyndale;

Confraternity (1941), same as Wycliffe (margin: "In the Greek, rather 'hating God.'");

Basic English (1941), "hated by God";

Knox (1944), "God's enemies";

Verkuyl (1945), same as Westminster;

Revised Standard (1946), same as Tyndale;

Phillips (1947), same as Westminster;

Schonfield (1955), "anti-theistic";

Lilly (1956), "they hate God."

The translations seem to come under the four classifications as follows:

1. Literal, obscure, and ambiguous: Knox. The rendering 'God's enemies' perhaps qualifies as a deliberate attempt to represent in the translation English the ambiguity of the original.

2. Literal, but equivalent to an interpretation: Wycliffe and Rheims. These two versions have given literal translations of the Latin, but in each case this has resulted in a rendering which is in effect an

interpretation of the ambiguous Greek.

3. Interpretative, with at least one alternative: English Revised, American Standard, Weymouth, and Confraternity.

4. Interpretative, with no alternative: Tyndale, Coverdale, Rogers, Taverner, Great, Geneva, Bishops', King James, Twentieth Century, Moffatt, Westminster, Goodspeed, Ballantine, Montgomery, Williams, Spencer, Basic English, Verkuyl, Revised Standard, Phillips, Schonfield, and Lilly.

Of the versions offering deliberately interpretative translations, the passive sense of  $\theta\epsilon\omicron\sigma\tau\upsilon\gamma\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$  is preferred by the English Revised, American Standard, Weymouth, Moffatt, Goodspeed, Ballantine, Montgomery, Williams, Confraternity, and Basic English. The active sense is preferred by Tyndale, Coverdale, Rogers, Taverner, Great, Geneva, Bishops', King James, English Revised (margin), Twentieth Century, American Standard (margin), Weymouth (margin), Westminster, Spencer, Confraternity (margin), Verkuyl, Revised Standard, Phillips, Schonfield, and Lilly. Among this second group, the Twentieth Century and perhaps Schonfield seem to take  $\theta\epsilon\omicron\sigma\tau\upsilon\gamma\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$  as the equivalent of  $\acute{\alpha}\theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$  or  $\acute{\alpha}\sigma\epsilon\beta\acute{\eta}\varsigma$ .

Romans 2:13.-- $\delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\omega\theta\acute{\eta}\sigma\omicron\nu\tau\alpha\iota$

The correct interpretation of this important term has been the subject of lengthy debate, and the decision seems to depend largely upon theological as well as philological considerations. The basic question is whether or not in the New Testament, and especially for Paul,  $\delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\omicron\omega$  means a mere forensic justification or an actual making righteous of the believer. Should it be translated accordingly as "declare righteous," "count as righteous," "prove to be righteous," "acquit," or "make right-



eous"? The forensic interpretation involves a further decision as to whether it denotes the acknowledging as righteous of a person who actually is righteous, or the pronouncing as righteous of a person who actually is not so.

Thayer admits that the "proper" meaning of  $\delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\acute{o}\omega$  is "to make  $\delta\acute{\iota}\kappa\alpha\iota\omicron\varsigma$ " but prefers "judge, declare, pronounce righteous" in this context. Lange similarly concedes that  $\delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\acute{o}\omega$  "means properly, it is true, according to the etymology . . . to make just." But he argues that, "as the Septuagint and the New Testament usage shows, we must supply, by declaration." Schaff agrees that this is "the true evangelical or Pauline view of justification, in opposition to the interpretation of Roman Catholics and Rationalists, who, from opposite standpoints, agree in taking  $\delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\acute{o}\omega$  in the sense of making just, or sanctifying."

Hastings states unequivocally:

There are two, and only two, possible meanings to be attached to the word which we translate "justify" in Paul's writings. It may mean either make righteous or count righteous . . . . It is the latter sense only which he uses. With him the term is a purely forensic one, and means to count or reckon as righteous. In spite of much opposition this meaning has gradually vindicated itself against the other, and is now almost unanimously held by all scholars who have a right to speak on the subject.

Sanday and Headlam explain carefully that  $\delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\acute{o}\omega$  "cannot mean 'to make righteous,'" adding with finality that "we content ourselves for the present with stating this result as a philological fact." J. Knox is equally convinced of the forensic sense of  $\delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\acute{o}\omega$  and goes so far as to claim that the interpretation "make righteous" can be sustained "only by a rather violent exegesis." The forensic interpretation is supported also by Cremer, Denney, Garvie, Parry, Barth, Robertson, Kittel, Abbott-Smith, Nygren, and Bauer.

On the contrary, however, no less a scholar than Goodspeed continues to maintain against much criticism that *δικαίω* does indeed mean to "make upright." On philological grounds he argues that the analogy of verbs ending in *ώ* shows that the meaning of *δικαίω* cannot be merely forensic. On theological grounds he urges that *δικαίω* means much more than to forgive. It involves also the experience of rebirth, the creation of a new heart in the believer, so that he actually becomes *δίκαιος* and *ἄγιος*. He pictures theologians as "clinging grimly" to the old forensic interpretation in spite of the evidence to the contrary. He blames them, not the lexicographers, for establishing the commonly held view that "the plain Greek word 'You have been made upright' is subtly transformed into meaning 'You have been declared upright, though you are not.'" And he looks forward to the day when the Bible will be fully "rescued" from "clerics and theologians" who resort to such "antique" and "equivocal Vulgate evasions" as "justify" and "justification."<sup>1</sup>

One of Goodspeed's most outspoken critics has been Bruce M. Metzger, who took up the cudgels soon after the appearance of Goodspeed's Problems of New Testament Translation, containing a defence of his interpretation of *δικαίω*. Metzger observes:

It may be that Goodspeed prefers the merit-religion of the Middle Ages to the Protestant doctrine of justification by faith, but it is past comprehension how he can go against the unmistakable evidence of the meaning of this verb in the Pauline epistles. The fact . . . . is that Paul simply does not use this verb to mean "to be made upright or righteous." Indeed it is extremely doubtful whether it ever bore this meaning in the Greek of any period or author. On the con-

---

<sup>1</sup>E. J. Goodspeed, "Some Greek Notes," Journal of Biblical Literature, Vol. LXXIII (June, 1954), pp. 86-91. See also, by the same author, Problems of New Testament Translation (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1945), pp. 143-146.

trary in the Pauline epistles it means "to be pronounced or declared or treated as righteous or upright." Goodspeed's translation . . . is far from being faithful to the original and introduces aberrant and contradictory ideas into the Pauline theology.<sup>1</sup>

To this Goodspeed retorts in kind that "if there is aberrancy among us, it is on his [Metzger's] part, for to sustain a dogma, he is shown to oppose the greatest affirmations in Paul and also in Paul's great interpreter and disciple John."<sup>2</sup>

Gifford also believes that δικαιόω may be interpreted "make righteous" where the context so indicates. He translates "acknowledged and declared just" here in Rom. 2:13, on the basis that the ones referred to are already actually just. But he explains that in chapter three the believer is "both declared and made righteous." He states further, on Rom. 5:19, that believers are "not merely declared righteous, or put into the position of righteous men, and treated as such, but constituted righteous . . . . Union with Christ . . . constitutes us essentially and formally righteous." Dodd also, as J. Knox puts it, has sought to "relieve" Paul's theology of the forensic idea of justification by explaining that "the vindication of right involves a real righteousness of the people on whose behalf it is wrought."

Recently Barrett has come out in support of the translation "make righteous," though in a sense different from that of Goodspeed. He agrees first that verbs in ὄω normally have a factitive, or causative, meaning and points out that this meaning of δικαιόω is confirmed by the fact that behind Paul's use of the term is the Hebrew פְּרָשָׁה. Since this is

---

<sup>1</sup>Bruce M. Metzger, a review of Goodspeed's Problems of New Testament Translation in Theology Today, Vol. II (Jan., 1946), p. 562.

<sup>2</sup>Goodspeed, "Some Greek Notes," loc. cit., p. 89.

in the High'il, it is clearly causative and "cannot possibly be weakened so far as to mean 'to treat as righteous.'" He also objects to the forensic interpretation on the doctrinal ground that "not even God may pretend that black is white." He concludes:

It is far better, and more in harmony with Paul's teaching as a whole, to suppose that "to justify" (*δικαιῶν*) does mean "to make righteous," but at the same time to recognize that "righteous" does not mean "virtuous," but "right," "clear," "acquitted" in God's court. Justification then means no legal fiction but an act of forgiveness on God's part, described in terms of the proceedings of a law court. Far from being a legal fiction, this is a creative act in the field of divine-human relations.

Boylan and Theissen both maintain the Roman Catholic position that *δικαιῶν* means "no mere forensic thing."

The versions have translated as follows:

Wycliffe (1382), "maad iust" (Vulgate: "iustificabuntur," an ambiguous term. Wycliffe uses the translation "iustified" in Rom. 3:4 and 28);

Tyndale (1525), "iustified" (Luther, 1524: "werden rechtfertige sein"; changed in the 1534 edition to "werden gerecht sein");

Coverdale (1535), same as Tyndale;

Rogers (1537), same as Tyndale;

Taverner (1539), same as Tyndale;

Great (1539), same as Tyndale;

Geneva (1560), same as Tyndale;

Bishops' (1568), same as Tyndale;

Rheims (1582), same as Tyndale (margin: "Of al other Articles deceitfully handled by Heretikes, they use most guile in this of iustification: and specially by the equivocation of certaine wordes, which is proper to all contentious wranglers, and namely in this word, iustifie, which because they find sometime to signifie the acquitting of a guilty man of some crime whereof he is in deede guilty, and for which he ought to be condemned . . . they falsly make it so signifie in this place and the like, wheresoever man is said to be iustified of God for his workes or otherwise: as though it were said, that God iustifieth man, that is to say, imputeth to him the iustice of Christ,

though he be not in deede iust: or of favour reputeth him as iust, when in deede he is wicked, impious, and uniust. Which is a most blasphemous doctrine against God . . . . The word doth here signifie, to esteeme and approve for iust in deede, him that by his grace keepeth his law and commandments.");

King James (1611), same as Tyndale;

English Revised (1881), same as Tyndale (margin: "Or, accounted righteous");

Twentieth Century (1900), "stand right with God" (changed to "pronounced righteous" in the 1904 final edition);

American Standard (1901), same as Tyndale (margin: "Or, accounted righteous");

Weymouth (1903), "pronounced righteous";

Moffatt (1913), "acquitted";

Westminster (1920), same as Tyndale;

Goodspeed (1923), "make upright";

Ballantine (1923), same as Weymouth;

Montgomery (1924), same as English Revised (margin);

Williams (1937), "recognized as upright";

Spencer (1937), same as Tyndale;

Confraternity (1941), same as Tyndale;

Basic English (1941), "judged as having righteousness";

Knox (1944), same as Tyndale;

Verkuyl (1945), same as Weymouth;

Revised Standard (1946), same as Tyndale;

Phillips (1947), "justifies";

Schonfield (1955), "exonerated";

Lilly (1956), "sanctified."

The translations seem to come under the four classifications as follows:

1. Literal, obscure, and ambiguous: Tyndale, Coverdale, Rogers, Taverner, Great, Geneva, Bishops', Rheims, King James, Westminster, Spencer, Confraternity, Knox, Revised Standard, and Phillips.

2. Literal, but equivalent to an interpretation: None.

3. Interpretative, with at least one alternative: None. The English Revised and American Standard offer "justified" in the text and "accounted righteous" in the margin, but in this case the margin would probably be taken as an explanation of the obscure term "justified," thus in effect only one interpretation being represented.

4. Interpretative, with no alternative: Wycliffe, English Revised, Twentieth Century, American Standard, Weymouth, Moffatt, Goodspeed, Ballantine, Montgomery, Williams, Basic English, Verkuyl, Schonfield, and Lilly.

Of the versions offering interpretative translations, *δικαιώω* is interpreted in the sense of "make righteous" by Wycliffe, Goodspeed, and Lilly. The remaining versions interpret *δικαιώω* in the forensic sense.

Romans 2:15.--τὸ ἔργον τοῦ νόμου

In this phrase, the case of τὸ νόμου may be interpreted as genitive of possession (or origin), or as subjective genitive. Thus τὸ ἔργον may be understood as the work required by the law, or as the work, function, effect, of the law itself.

Denney takes this to mean "the work which the law prescribes." Sanday and Headlam explain it as the work, or course of conduct, "required by" or "in accordance with" the law. Lietzmann, Thayer, Boylan, Kirk, and Nygren present similar interpretations. Cremer translates, "all that the law demands" and explains that since the more active meaning "effi-

ciency, activity" is "against the N. T. usage, and especially the Pauline," this meaning is "inadmissible."

On the contrary, however, Parry interprets the phrase to mean not "the course of conduct prescribed by the law" but rather "that effect which is produced by the law in those who have it." Garvie agrees that Paul is speaking here of the "practical effect of the law." Dummelow takes the same view. Barrett explains that the genitive is "probably subjective" and also translates "the effect of the law." Bauer translates as the "manifestation, practical proof" of the law.

The versions have translated as follows:

Wycliffe (1382), "the work of lawe" (changed by Purvey, in 1388, to "the work of the lawe"; Vulgate: "opus legis," as ambiguous as the Greek);

Tyndale (1525), "the dede off the lawe" (Luther, 1524: "dess gesetzs werck");

Coverdale (1535), same as Purvey;

Rogers (1537), same as Tyndale;

Taverner (1539), same as Tyndale;

Great (1539), same as Tyndale;

Geneva (1560), "the effect of the Lawe";

Bishops' (1568), "the workes of the lawe";

Rheims (1582), same as Purvey;

King James (1611), same as Purvey;

English Revised (1881), same as Purvey;

Twentieth Century (1900), "what the Law demands" (changed in the 1904 final edition to "the demands of the law");

American Standard (1901), same as Purvey;

Weymouth (1903), "a knowledge of the conduct which the Law requires" (mar-

gin: "Lit. 'the work of the Law.'" This was changed in the 1929 fifth edition to "the action of the Law.");

Moffatt (1913), same as Geneva:

Westminster (1920), "the demands of the Law";

Goodspeed (1923), "what the law demands";

Ballantine (1923), "the requirements of the Law";

Montgomery (1924), "the work of the Law";

Williams (1937), "the deeds the law demands";

Spencer (1937), same as Montgomery;

Confraternity (1941), same as Purvey;

Basic English (1941), same as Purvey;

Knox (1944), "the obligation of the law";

Verkuyl (1945), same as Geneva:

Revised Standard (1946), "what the law requires";

Phillips (1947), "the effect of a law";

Schonfield (1955), "the operation of that law";

Lilly (1956), same as Ballantine.

The translations seem to come under the four classifications as follows:

1. Literal, obscure, and ambiguous: Wycliffe, Tyndale, Coverdale, Rogers, Taverner, Bishops', Rheims, King James, English Revised, American Standard, Montgomery, Spencer, Confraternity, and Basic English. Tyndale, Rogers, Taverner, and the Great Bible may have intended that their translation, "the dede off the lawe," should be understood as equivalent to the interpretation "the effect of the law." Likewise, the Bishops' translators, by their plural rendering of τὸ ἔργον in "the workes of the lawe," may have intended that their translation should be



taken to mean "the works required by the law." However, both translations remain sufficiently obscure and ambiguous to warrant their inclusion in this first classification.

2. Literal, but equivalent to an interpretation: None.

3. Interpretative, with at least one alternative: Weymouth (1903). The margin does not offer a clear alternative interpretation, but the possibility of different interpretations is at least suggested.

4. Interpretative, with no alternative: Geneva, Twentieth Century, Weymouth (1929), Moffatt, Westminster, Goodspeed, Ballantine, Williams, Knox, Verkuyl, Revised Standard, Phillips, Schonfield, and Lilly.

Of the versions which have offered interpretative translations, the Twentieth Century, Weymouth (1903), Westminster, Goodspeed, Ballantine, Williams, Knox, Revised Standard, and Lilly have preferred to interpret τὸ ἔργον τοῦ νόμου as meaning "the work required by the law." Geneva, Weymouth (1929), Moffatt, Verkuyl, Phillips, and Schonfield have preferred to interpret as "the effect of the law."

Romans 3:3---ἠπίστησαν

This verb may be translated "did not believe" or "were unfaithful." Is Paul referring to the unwillingness of the Jews to believe in the Old Testament promises, especially as fulfilled in the gospel? Or is he speaking rather of their general unfaithfulness to God in the covenant relationship?

Sanday and Headlam list a number of commentators on either side of the question and then cautiously state that "probably, on the whole" ἠπίστησαν refers to "unbelief." They base this decision on the argument

that "unbelief is the constant sense of the word" and that "the main point in the context is the disbelief in the promises of the O. T. and the refusal to accept them as fulfilled in Christ." Parry affirms more definitely that ἀπιστίω "always" means "disbelieve" and explains that the aorist tense of ἠπίστησαν "refers to the definite act of the rejection of the Gospel." Stephens likewise interprets the passage to mean that "many of the Jews have not accepted the Messiah." Vincent also prefers "were without faith" and claims that "were unfaithful" is "contrary to New Testament usage." Denney similarly favors "did disbelieve" and rejects the alternative "proved faithless to their trust." The same position is taken by Meyer, Gifford, Garvie, Dummelow, and Barrett.

On the contrary, however, Hodge maintains that "to understand the passage as referring to want of faith in Christ, seems inconsistent with the whole context." Lightfoot translates "were untrue to their trust," adding that this means "unfaithful, not just unbelieving." J. Knox explains that Paul is speaking of the "faithlessness" of the Jews, "their failure to keep their obligations under the covenant." Boylan likewise prefers "were disloyal" to "were unbelieving." The same view is held by Thayer, Lietzmann, Bauer, and Theissen.

Robertson cites both alternatives and suggests that "either makes sense here and both ideas are true of some of the Jews."

The versions have translated as follows:

Wycliffe (1382), "bileueden not" (Vulgate: "non crediderunt");  
 Tyndale (1525), "did not beleve" (Luther, 1524: "Nit glauben");  
 Coverdale (1535), same as Tyndale;  
 Rogers (1537), same as Tyndale;

Taverner (1539), same as Tyndale;  
 Great (1539), same as Tyndale;  
 Geneva (1560), same as Tyndale;  
 Bishops' (1568), same as Tyndale;  
 Rheims (1582), "have not beleevd";  
 King James (1611), same as Tyndale;  
 English Revised (1881), "were without faith";  
 Twentieth Century (1900), "showed a want of faith";  
 American Standard (1901), same as English Revised;  
 Weymouth (1903), "have proved unfaithful" (margin: "Or 'unbelieving.'"  
 Changed to "were unfaithful"; margin: "Or 'unbelieving'" in the  
 1929 fifth edition);  
 Moffatt (1913), "have proved untrustworthy";  
 Westminster (1920), "lacked faith";  
 Goodspeed (1923), "have shown a lack of faith";  
 Ballantine (1923), "were faithless";  
 Montgomery (1924), "have proved faithless";  
 Williams (1937), same as Weymouth (1903);  
 Spencer (1937), same as Tyndale;  
 Confraternity (1941), same as Rheims;  
 Basic English (1941), "have no faith";  
 Knox (1944), "shewed unfaithfulness";  
 Verkuyl (1945), "failed to believe";  
 Revised Standard (1946), same as Weymouth (1929);  
 Phillips (1947), "were undoubtedly faithless";  
 Schonfield (1955), "untrustworthiness";  
 Lilly (1956), "have not been faithful."

The translations seem to come under the four classifications as follows:

1. Literal, obscure, and ambiguous: Ballantine, Montgomery, and Phillips. The translation "faithless," offered in these versions, may by definition mean either "unbelieving" or "disloyal," "unfaithful." It is impossible to tell if the translators intended this to be understood in its somewhat more common sense of "unwilling to believe" or were perhaps making a deliberate attempt to preserve the ambiguity of the Greek.

2. Literal, but equivalent to an interpretation: Wycliffe, Rheims, and Confraternity, following the Vulgate interpretation, "non crediderunt."

3. Interpretative, with at least one alternative: Weymouth.

4. Interpretative, with no alternative: Tyndale, Coverdale, Rogers, Taverner, Great, Geneva, Bishops', King James, English Revised, Twentieth Century, American Standard, Moffatt, Westminster, Goodspeed, Williams, Spencer, Basic English, Knox, Verkuyl, Revised Standard, Schonfield, and Lilly.

Of the versions offering deliberately interpretative translations, ἡπίστανται is interpreted to mean "they did not believe" by Tyndale, Coverdale, Rogers, Taverner, Great, Geneva, Bishops', King James, English Revised, Twentieth Century, American Standard, Weymouth (margin), Westminster, Goodspeed, Basic English, and Verkuyl. The interpretation "they were unfaithful" is preferred by Weymouth, Moffatt, Williams, Knox (in spite of the Latin "non crediderunt"), Revised Standard, Schonfield, and Lilly.

Romans 3:4--νικήσεις ἐν τῷ κρίνεσθαι σε

The infinitive *κρίνεσθαι* may be interpreted as middle voice, meaning "to go to law," "to enter a suit," or passive, meaning "to be judged." In Psalm 51:4, from which this passage is quoted, the Hebrew  $\text{פָּרַשׁוּן־לִּי}$  is active, but Paul adopts the Septuagint *κρίνεσθαι*, thus giving rise to this problem of ambiguity. Is the passage to be understood as a wish that God may be victorious when he "takes his case to court" or when "he himself is put on trial to be judged?"

Robertson cites both alternatives but ventures no conclusion. Barmby is equally non-committal. Sanday and Headlam suggest that *κρίνεσθαι* is "probably" not middle but passive. Denney states similarly that "probably the infinitive is passive." J. Knox also interprets as passive and explains that "God is being judged as to his fidelity to his promises." Thayer gives the meaning of *κρίνεσθαι* in this verse as "summoned to trial that one's case may be examined and judgment passed upon it." The passive is also preferred by Hodge, Lange, Weiss, Parry, Boylan, and Bauer.

Lightfoot, on the other hand, claims definitely that "*κρίνεσθαι* is middle" and means "when thou pleadest"--"certainly not, 'when Thou are judged,' as in A. V." Schaff, disagreeing with Lange, states more cautiously that the infinitive is "more probably" in the middle voice. Meyer also prefers to interpret as middle voice. This is the interpretation adopted by Weymouth, Moffatt, Goodspeed, and Williams.

The versions have translated as follows:

Wycliffe (1382), "overcome whanne thou art demed" (Vulgate: "uincas cum iudicaris");

Tyndale (1525), "overcome when thou arte judged" (Luther, 1524: "überwindest, wenn du gerichtet wirst");

Coverdale (1535), same as Tyndale;

Rogers (1537), same as Tyndale;

Taverner (1539), same as Tyndale;

Great (1539), same as Tyndale;

Geneva (1560), same as Tyndale (margin: "That thou maist be declared iuste, and thy goodnes and trueth in performing thy promises may appeare, when man ether of curiositie or arrogancie wolde iudge thy workes");

Bishops' (1568), same as Tyndale;

Rheims (1582), same as Tyndale;

King James (1611), same as Tyndale;

English Revised (1881), "prevail when thou comest into judgment";

Twentieth Century (1900), "gain the day when men would judge thee" (changed to "gain thy cause when men would judge thee" in the 1904 final edition);

American Standard (1901), same as English Revised;

Weymouth (1903), "gain thy cause when Thou contendest" (changed to "succeed in Thy cause" in the 1929 fifth edition);

Moffatt (1913), "triumph in thy trial";

Westminster (1920), "prevail when thou art judged";

Goodspeed (1923), "win your case when you go into court";

Ballantine (1923), "triumph when thou art judged";

Montgomery (1924), "gain thy cause when thou contendest";

Williams (1937), same as Goodspeed;

Spencer (1937), "triumphant when Thou art judged";

Confraternity (1941), "be victorious when thou art judged";

Basic English (1941), "be seen to be right when you are judged";

Knox (1944), "if thou art called in question, thou hast right on thy side";

Verkuy1 (1945), "mightest triumph when Thou art tried";

Revised Standard (1946), same as Westminster;

Phillips (1947), same as English Revised;

Schonfield (1955), "prevail when you are arraigned";

Lilly (1956), "win your case when you are judged."

The translations seem to come under the four classifications as follows:

1. Literal, obscure, and ambiguous: None.
2. Literal, but equivalent to an interpretation: Wycliffe, Rheims, Confraternity, and Knox, following the passive interpretation of the Latin.
3. Interpretative, with at least one alternative: None.
4. Interpretative, with no alternative: All versions other than Wycliffe, Rheims, Confraternity, and Knox.

Of the versions offering deliberately interpretative translations, Weymouth, Goodspeed, Montgomery, and Williams interpret κρίνεσθαι as middle voice. All others interpret the infinitive as passive.

Romans 3:8---ὧν τὸ κρίμα ἔνδικόν ἐστιν

There are at least four possible interpretations of this ambiguous passage, each of which depends on the interpretation placed on the relative pronoun ὧν. In this context, the gender of ὧν may be masculine or neuter, and the genitive case of ὧν may be subjective or objective. If the pronoun is taken as masculine and the genitive as subjective, ὧν would refer to the slanderous critics, and the passage would mean that

their active condemnation of such specious arguments as have just been mentioned is just. If the pronoun is taken as masculine and the genitive as objective,  $\hat{\omega}\nu$  could refer either to the slanderous critics or to those who are being slanderously criticized. The passage would then mean either that the passive condemnation of the slanderous critics is just or that the passive condemnation of the slanderously criticized is just. If the pronoun is taken as neuter and the genitive as objective,  $\hat{\omega}\nu$  would then refer to the specious arguments, and the passage would mean that the passive condemnation of such arguments is just. This last interpretation comes close in meaning to the first one listed above, and with such interpretative translations as "such arguments are rightly condemned" it is difficult to tell whether the translators regarded  $\hat{\omega}\nu$  as neuter and objective or masculine and subjective.

Gifford takes  $\hat{\omega}\nu$  as masculine and objective and explains that the passage "is not directed against the slanderers just mentioned, but against those who object to being judged as sinners." Schaff also refers  $\hat{\omega}\nu$  "to the subjects of  $\piαρῆσμεν$ , to those who speak and act according to this pernicious and blasphemous maxim." Barth makes the same connection and translates, "those who speak thus do but confirm their own condemnation." Denney interprets likewise, "the judgment that comes on those who by such perversions of reason and conscience seek to evade all judgment is just." Stephens interprets clearly, "those who do maintain such principles are under a just condemnation." The same view is held by Sanday and Headlam and Lightfoot. Thayer and Bauer agree that  $\hat{\omega}\nu$  is objective genitive, but they do not specify upon whom or what the condemnation is falling. Barrett interprets  $\hat{\omega}\nu$  as masculine and refers it to the slanderers,



translating, "they will get what they deserve."

Lange prefers to regard the gender of  $\hat{\omega}\nu$  as neuter and explains that it does not refer to the slanderers but to the principle, "let us do evil that good may come." Parry interprets similarly that "the clear statement of the position furnishes its own condemnation." Dodd also seems to take  $\hat{\omega}\nu$  as neuter in his use of Moffatt's translation, "such arguments are rightly condemned." Dummelow explains in his comments that  $\hat{\omega}\nu$  is masculine, but in his paraphrase he translates, "such a principle is to be condemned."

W. O. Fitch prefers to take  $\hat{\omega}\nu$  as masculine and subjective and claims that "no commentators, ancient or modern, seems to have considered the possibility that the genitive  $\hat{\omega}\nu$  may be subjective, 'whose verdict is just'; yet, if these words were found in a secular writer, I venture to think that they would naturally convey that meaning and no other. Moreover, this interpretation seems to me to suit the context, and to be in line with the general use of the words  $\kappa\rho\acute{\iota}\mu\alpha$  and  $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\delta\iota\kappa\omicron\varsigma$ ."<sup>1</sup>

It is interesting to note that R. A. Knox (1944) had already offered this subjective interpretation in his New Testament three years before Fitch made this claim to originality. W. K. Grobel also recognized the same possibility in an article published in America three months later.<sup>2</sup>

In view of the problems involved in the interpretation of this passage, Grobel commends the ambiguous Revised Standard translation,

---

<sup>1</sup>W. O. Fitch, "Notes on Romans 3:8b," The Expository Times, Vol. LIX (Oct., 1947), p. 26.

<sup>2</sup>W. K. Grobel, "The Revision of the English New Testament," Journal of Biblical Literature, Vol. LXVI (Dec., 1947), p. 363.

"their condemnation is just" as "ingenious and beyond reproach," adding that "it is not often possible to retain a Greek ambiguity in English." He suggests that since Moffatt and Goodspeed, who had reached opposite decisions as to whether  $\hat{\omega}\nu$  is subjective or objective genitive, were both among the RSV translators, "perhaps this balance of opinion within the committee led to the retention of the ambiguous translation, from RV."

The versions have translated as follows:

Wycliffe (1382), "Whos dampnacioun is iust" (Vulgate: "quorum damnatio iusta est");

Tyndale (1525), same as Wycliffe;

Coverdale (1535), same as Wycliffe;

Rogers (1537), same as Wycliffe;

Taverner (1539), same as Wycliffe;

Great (1539), same as Wycliffe;

Geneva (1560), same as Wycliffe;

Bishops' (1568), same as Wycliffe;

Rheims (1582), same as Wycliffe;

King James (1611), same as Wycliffe;

English Revised (1881), "Whose condemnation is just";

Twentieth Century (1900), "The condemnation of such people is indeed just!" (The context indicates that "such people" are the slanderous critics, but it is not clear whether the condemnation is active or passive.);

American Standard (1901), same as English Revised;

Weymouth (1903), "The condemnation of those who would so argue is just" (The context shows that this refers to the passive condemnation of those who say, "Let us do evil that good may come." This is changed in the 1929 fifth edition to "The condemnation of such people is just," the context indicating that this refers to the passive condemnation of the slanderers.);

Moffatt (1913), "Such arguments are rightly condemned";

- Westminster (1920), "The condemnation of such disputants is just!" (referring to those who argue, "Let us do evil that good may come");
- Goodspeed (1923), "Such people will be condemned as they deserve" (the context indicating that "such people" are the slanderers);
- Ballantine (1923), same as Weymouth (1929) (the context indicating that this refers to the passive condemnation of the slanderers);
- Montgomery (1924), same as Moffatt;
- Williams (1937), "Their condemnation is just" ("Their" refers to the critics, but there is no indication as to whether the condemnation is active or passive.);
- Spencer (1937), "--whose condemnation is just!";
- Confraternity (1941), "The condemnation of such is just";
- Basic English (1941), "such behaviour will have its right punishment" (the context showing that this refers to the argument, "Let us do evil that good may come");
- Knox (1944), "and their condemnation of it is just";
- Verkuyll (1945), "Deservedly are such talkers condemned" (referring to those who argue, "Let us do evil that good may come");
- Revised Standard (1946), same as Williams ("Their" refers to the critics, but there is no indication as to whether the condemnation is active or passive.);
- Phillips (1947), "But, of course, such an argument is quite properly condemned";
- Schonfield (1955), "whose condemnation is richly merited" (referring clearly to the passive condemnation of the slanderers);
- Lilly (1956), "The condemnation of such is well deserved."

The translations seem to come under the four classifications as follows:

1. Literal, obscure, and ambiguous: Wycliffe, Tyndale, Coverdale, Rogers, Taverner, Great, Geneva, Bishops', Rheims, King James, English Revised, Twentieth Century, American Standard, Williams, Spencer, Confraternity, Revised Standard, and Lilly. Of these, Wv has clearly

been interpreted as masculine by the Twentieth Century, Williams, Revised Standard, and Lilly. But there is no indication as to whether the ambiguous "condemnation" is active or passive.

2. Literal, but equivalent to an interpretation: None.
3. Interpretative, with at least one alternative: None.
4. Interpretative, with no alternative: Weymouth, Moffatt, Westminster, Goodspeed, Ballantine, Montgomery, Basic English, Knox, Verkuyl, Phillips, and Schonfield.

The passage has been interpreted as referring to the passive condemnation of the slanderous critics by Weymouth (1929), Goodspeed, Ballantine, and Schonfield; as the passive condemnation of those who argue, "Let us do evil that good may come," by Weymouth (1903), Westminster, and Verkuyl; as the active condemnation of the slanderous critics by Knox; and as the passive condemnation of such specious arguments as "Let us do evil that good may come" by Moffatt, Montgomery, Basic English, and Phillips.

Romans 3:9.--προεχόμεθα;

The voice of this ambiguous verb may be interpreted as middle or passive. Taken as middle, in the intransitive sense, the question would be, "Are we better off?" Taken again as middle, but in the ordinary middle sense, the question would be, "Do we put something forward as an excuse?" "Do we excuse ourselves?" Taken as passive, the question would be, "Are we excelled?" Again taken as passive, some have suggested the possible translation, "Are we preferred?" meaning, "Are we Jews preferred to the Gentiles in the sight of God?" The problem has been discussed at considerable length in the commentaries.

Dodd admits that "neither the reading nor the meaning of the Greek is certain here. The text and the interpretation of the question are doubtful." He regards Moffatt's translation, "Are we Jews in a better position?" as the one "probably to be accepted." J. Knox advises that "everything depends on the context in such cases; and this time the context is not clear." He considers the translation "Are we Jews any better off?" as "more natural" but concedes that "Are we Jews at a disadvantage?" is also suitable in this context.

Thayer also prefers the middle voice, in the sense of "to excel, to surpass," and argues that "it does not make against this force of the middle in the present passage that the use is nowhere else met with, nor is there any objection to an interpretation which has commended itself to a great many and which the context plainly demands." Barrett analyses the problem in some detail and concludes that "Do we excell?" is the interpretation which "harmonizes best with Paul's thought." Gifford regards the translation "Are we better than they?" as "the simplest and best." Essentially the same view is taken by Lange, Schaff, Dummelow, Lietzmann, Lagrange, and Boylan.

Garvie acknowledges that the meaning is "very difficult to fix" but decides that the interpretation "adopted by many of the best scholars," the passive "Are we in worse case than they?" is to be preferred. Denney also recognizes the difficulties but concludes that the passive "Are we excelled?" is "the only alternative." Field presents a careful analysis of all three main possibilities and likewise concludes that the passive interpretation, "Are we in worse case than they?" is "the best, if not the only solution of the difficulty."

Sanday and Headlam also list the various alternatives. They dismiss the middle "Are we better off?" on the basis that "no examples of this use are to be found." They reject the middle "Do we put forward as an excuse?" as "impossible" on the ground that no object is expressed. They admit that the passive "Are we excelled?" is "a rare use" of the verb but prefer it as "still one which is sufficiently substantiated." They also mention the fourth possibility, the passive "Are we preferred?"

Lightfoot concedes that this passive "Are we preferred?" gives "excellent sense," but, though he admits that "the exact meaning of the word here is uncertain," he states his conviction that, pending further information, he "must adhere" to the rendering "Are we excelled?" With similar conviction, Parry claims that the passive "Are we surpassed?" is the "settled" meaning. Kirk states more cautiously that the passive "Are we in worse case than they?" is "probably the best translation."

Barth prefers to interpret *προεχόμεθα* in the ordinary middle sense of "Do we excuse ourselves?"

Bauer offers non-committally the two possible meanings of the middle voice. Arndt and Gingrich add the passive "Are we excelled?" as a third possibility but venture to express no preference. Bosworth notes that the problem of *προεχόμεθα* has been the subject of much discussion but likewise takes no position. Robertson observes that "there is still no fresh light on this difficult and common word." He cites the passive "Are we preferred?" as a translation that "suits the context, but no other example has been found." His conclusion is, "So the point remains unsettled."

The versions have translated as follows:

- Wycliffe (1382), "Passen we hem?" (Vulgate: "praecellimus eos?");
- Tyndale (1525), "Are we better then they?" (Luther, 1524: "haben wir ein vorteyl");
- Coverdale (1535), same as Tyndale;
- Rogers (1537), same as Tyndale;
- Taverner (1539), same as Tyndale;
- Great (1539), same as Tyndale;
- Geneva (1560), "are we more excellent?" (changed from "Are we better then they?" the same as Tyndale, in the 1557 Whittingham edition);
- Bishops' (1568), "Are we better [then they?]" (The brackets are in the text.);
- Rheims (1582), "do we excel them?";
- King James (1611), "are we better than they?" (cf. Bishops');
- English Revised (1881), "are we in worse case than they?" (margin: "Or, do we excuse ourselves?");
- Twentieth Century (1900), "Are we Jews in any way superior to them?";
- American Standard (1901), "are we better than they?";
- Weymouth (1903), "are we Jews more highly estimated than they?" (changed to "Have we Jews any advantage?" in the 1929 fifth edition);
- Moffatt (1913), "are we Jews in a better position?";
- Westminster (1920), "are we in worse case?" (cf. English Revised. Margin: "Lit. 'are we excelled?' This seems the best rendering: the Vulgate praecellimus eos ['do we excel them'] gives a sense . . . not found elsewhere, and is difficult to fit into the context." This note is changed in the 1948 edition to, "translation and explanation are rather uncertain");
- Goodspeed (1923), "Are we Jews at a disadvantage?";
- Ballantine (1923), "Have we an advantage?";
- Montgomery (1924), same as Moffatt;
- Williams (1937), "Is it that we Jews are better than they?";
- Spencer (1937), "Do we hold the pre-eminence?";

- Confraternity (1941), "Are we better off than they?";
- Basic English (1941), "are we worse off than they?";
- Knox (1944), "has either side the advantage?" (margin: "the Greek word here may mean 'Do we excel them?' Or 'Are we excelled by them?'");
- Verkuyl (1945), "Do we come out ahead?";
- Revised Standard (1946), "Are we Jews any better off?" (margin: "Or at any disadvantage?");
- Phillips (1947), "Are we Jews then a march ahead of other men?";
- Schonfield (1955), "Do we Jews come off any better?";
- Lilly (1956), "Are we better off than the Gentiles?"

The translations seem to come under the four classifications as follows:

1. Literal, obscure, and ambiguous: None.
2. Literal, but equivalent to an interpretation: Wycliffe, Rheims, and Confraternity, all following the Latin interpretation, "prae-cellimus eos?"
3. Interpretative, with at least one alternative: English Revised, Westminster, Knox, and Revised Standard. The Knox translation, "Has either side the advantage?" is a striking example of a deliberate attempt to preserve in the translation English the ambiguity of the original Greek.
4. Interpretative, with no alternative: Tyndale, Coverdale, Rogers, Taverner, Great, Geneva, Bishops', King James, Twentieth Century, American Standard, Weymouth, Moffatt, Goodspeed, Ballantine, Montgomery, Williams, Spencer, Basic English, Verkuyl, Phillips, Schonfield, and Lilly.

Of the versions offering deliberately interpretative translations,



*προεχόμεθα* has been interpreted as middle voice in the intransitive sense of "Are we better than they?" by Tyndale, Coverdale, Rogers, Taverner, Great, Geneva, Bishops', King James, Twentieth Century, American Standard, Weymouth (1929), Moffatt, Westminster (margin), Ballantine, Montgomery, Williams, Spencer, Verkuyl, Revised Standard, Phillips, Schonfield, and Lilly. It is interpreted in the more ordinary middle sense, "Do we excuse ourselves?" by the English Revised (margin). It is interpreted as passive to mean "Are we excelled?" or "Are we worse off?" by the English Revised, Westminster, Goodspeed, Basic English, and Revised Standard (margin). It is interpreted as passive to mean "Are we preferred?" by Weymouth (1903).

Romans 3:22.--δικαιοσύνη δὲ Θεοῦ

The problems involved in the interpretation of this phrase are the same as in the translation of *δικαιοσύνη γὰρ Θεοῦ* in Rom. 1:17. The commentaries and versions show similar disagreement as to the precise meaning intended.

The versions have translated as follows:

Wycliffe (1382), "the riztwysnesse of God" (Vulgate: "Iustitia autem Dei");

Tyndale (1525), "The rightewesnes no dout which ys goode before God";

Coverdale (1535), "ye righteousnes before God" (Luther, 1524: "gerechtigkeyt vor Gott");

Rogers (1537), same as Tyndale;

Taverner (1539), same as Tyndale;

Great (1539), same as Wycliffe;

Geneva (1560), same as Wycliffe;

Bishops' (1568), same as Wycliffe;

Rheims (1582), "the justice of God";

King James (1611), same as Wycliffe;

English Revised (1881), same as Wycliffe;

Twentieth Century (1900), "a righteousness which comes from God" (changed to "the Divine Righteousness which is bestowed" in the 1904 final edition);

American Standard (1901), same as Wycliffe;

Weymouth (1903), "a righteousness coming from God" (changed in the 1929 fifth edition to "a righteousness of God," the same as Moffatt);

Moffatt (1913), "a righteousness of God";

Westminster (1920), "the justness of God";

Goodspeed (1923), "God's way of uprightness";

Ballantine (1923), "a righteousness from God";

Montgomery (1924), same as Weymouth (1903);

Williams (1937), "God's own way of giving men right standing with Himself (margin: "Lit. God's righteousness");

Spencer (1937), "a justification from God";

Confraternity (1941), same as Rheims;

Basic English (1941), same as Wycliffe;

Knox (1944), "God's way of justification";

Verkuyyl (1945), "God's righteousness";

Revised Standard (1946), same as Wycliffe;

Phillips (1947), "a righteousness" (identified earlier in the verse as "the righteousness of God");

Schonfield (1955), same as Wycliffe;

Lilly (1956), "the sanctification brought about by God."

The translations seem to come under the four classifications as follows:

1. Literal, obscure, and ambiguous: Wycliffe, Great, Geneva,

Bishops', Rheims, King James, English Revised, American Standard, Weymouth (1929), Moffatt, Westminster, Confraternity, Basic English, Revised Standard, Phillips, and Schonfield. As in Rom. 1:17, the translation "the righteousness of God" would seem to be most readily understood as referring to God's own righteousness. However, the marginal notes on Rom. 1:17 in the Geneva, Rheims, and Confraternity illustrate the ambiguity of the literal rendering.

2. Literal, but equivalent to an interpretation: None.
3. Interpretative, with at least one alternative: Williams.
4. Interpretative, with no alternative: Tyndale, Coverdale, Rogers, Taverner, Twentieth Century, Weymouth (1903), Goodspeed, Ballantine, Montgomery, Spencer, Knox, Verkuyl, and Lilly.

Of the versions which offer interpretative translations, Goodspeed, Williams, Knox, and Verkuyl have taken the case of  $\theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$  as genitive of possession. Tyndale, Coverdale, Rogers, Taverner, and Twentieth Century (1904) interpret as genitive of description; Twentieth Century (1900), Weymouth (1903), Ballantine, Montgomery, and Spencer as the genitive of source. Lilly seems to take it as a subjective genitive.

Of this same group of versions, Goodspeed, Williams, Spencer, Knox, and Lilly interpret  $\delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\omicron\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu\eta$  as an outgoing act of God in man's behalf. The rest translate simply as "righteousness." The Twentieth Century (1900), Weymouth, Moffatt, Ballantine, Spencer, and Phillips translate "a righteousness" with the indefinite article.

A number of the versions have offered significantly different translations in Rom. 1:17 and Rom. 3:22. Of these, Tyndale and Rogers have changed their interpretation of the case of  $\theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$  from the genitive

of source to the genitive of description. Taverner has changed from a literal "the righteousness of God" to the genitive of description, this time following Tyndale and Rogers. Ballantine has changed from a literal "a righteousness of God" to the genitive of source.

Weymouth (1929), Moffatt, and Phillips have changed from interpretative translations in Rom. 1:17 to literal, obscure, and ambiguous renderings in Rom. 3:22.

Romans 3:22.--πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ

The genitive case of Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ may be either subjective or objective. If taken as subjective, the passage could mean that δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ has been revealed or made available through Christ's own faith or faithfulness. If taken as objective, the passage could mean that δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ is revealed by, or is conditional upon, the believer's exercising faith in Jesus Christ.

Lange definitely prefers to interpret the genitive as subjective and understands the passage to mean "Christ's faithfulness to us." "The revelation of God's righteousness in the faithfulness of Christ is the ground of justifying faith, but faith is not the ground of this revelation." Barth explains that the phrase refers to "God's own faithfulness manifested in Christ" and translates, "his faithfulness in Jesus Christ." In Rom. 3:26 he translates τὸν ἐκ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ as "him that is grounded upon the faithfulness which abides in Jesus."

In 1891, J. Haussleiter presented an extended argument in support of his contention that the genitive here is subjective. He claims that this passage refers to the faith in God which Christ Himself maintained

even through the ordeal of the crucifixion."<sup>1</sup>

Most commentators, however, interpret the genitive case of Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ as objective. Sanday and Headlam refer to the "very carefully worked out argument" of Haussleiter but reject it in favor of the objective "faith in Jesus." They observe that before Haussleiter's work, the latter interpretation was the "hitherto almost universally accepted view." J. Knox acknowledges that some scholars see the genitive here as subjective but concludes that "almost certainly, however, the RSV translators are correct in understanding the genitive to be objective."

Lietzmann refers to both Haussleiter and Gottfried Kittel<sup>2</sup> as taking the genitive here as subjective, but he denies the plausibility of their view. Robertson also refers to Haussleiter's argument but still prefers to interpret objectively, "in Jesus Christ." Garvie cites both alternatives but regards the subjective genitive as "improbable" here. Denney claims that "there is no difficulty whatever in regarding θεοῦ as objective genitive, as the use of πιστεύειν throughout the N. T. . . . requires us to do." Schaff considers the argument in favor of the objective genitive as "conclusive." The genitive is interpreted as objective also by Gifford, Thayer, Stephens, Vincent, Parry, Dummelow, Bosworth, Abel, Lagrange, Nygren, Bauer, and Theissen.

Deissmann describes the case of Ἰησοῦ here as the "mystic genitive,"

---

<sup>1</sup>J. Haussleiter, Der Glaube Jesu Christi und der christliche Glaube (Erlangen: Diechert Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1891).

<sup>2</sup>Gottfried Kittel, "Πίστις Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ bei Paulus," Theologische Studien und Kritiken, Vol. LXXIX, Pt. III (1906), pp. 419ff.

interpreting the phrase to mean "faith in-Christ."<sup>1</sup>

The versions have translated as follows:

- Wycliffe (1382), "the faith of Jhesu Crist" (Vulgate: "fidem Iesu Christi");
- Tyndale (1525), same as Wycliffe;
- Coverdale (1535), "the faith on Jesus Christ" (Luther, 1524: "den glauben an Iesum Christ");
- Rogers (1537), same as Wycliffe;
- Taverner (1539), same as Wycliffe;
- Great (1539), same as Wycliffe;
- Geneva (1560), same as Wycliffe;
- Bishops' (1568), same as Wycliffe;
- Rheims (1582), "faith of Jesus Christ";
- King James (1611), same as Wycliffe;
- English Revised (1881), "faith in Jesus Christ" (margin: "Or, of");
- Twentieth Century (1900), same as English Revised;
- American Standard (1901), same as English Revised (margin: "Or, of");
- Weymouth (1903), same as English Revised;
- Moffatt (1913), "believing in Jesus Christ";
- Westminster (1920), same as English Revised;
- Goodspeed (1923), same as English Revised;
- Ballantine (1923), same as English Revised;
- Montgomery (1924), same as English Revised;
- Williams (1937), same as English Revised;

---

<sup>1</sup>G. A. Deissmann, Paul, trans. W. E. Wilson (2d ed.; New York: Doran and Co., 1926), p. 141.

Spencer (1937), same as Wycliffe;  
 Confraternity (1941), same as English Revised;  
 Basic English (1941), same as English Revised;  
 Knox (1944), same as English Revised;  
 Verkuyll (1945), same as English Revised;  
 Revised Standard (1946), same as English Revised;  
 Phillips (1947), same as English Revised;  
 Schonfield (1955), same as English Revised;  
 Lilly (1956), same as English Revised.

The translations seem to come under the four classifications as follows:

1. Literal, obscure, and ambiguous: Wycliffe, Tyndale, Rogers, Taverner, Great, Geneva, Bishops', Rheims, King James, and Spencer. It would seem that the literal "the faith of Jesus Christ" would be most readily understood to mean "Jesus' own faith" and that consequently these versions should be listed as literal, but equivalent to an interpretation. Evidence for this is the marginal "faith of Jesus Christ" given as the alternative for "faith in Jesus Christ" in the English Revised and American Standard. John Knox, however, maintains that the translators of the King James version "undoubtedly" understood the genitive in this passage to be objective, "even though they adhere more rigidly to the Greek idiom." If this is so, it is hard to understand why the King James, and other of the older versions, should choose to translate literally here when they clearly interpret τὸν ἐκ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ in Rom. 3:26 as "him which believeth in Jesus" and ἔχετε πίστιν Θεοῦ in Mark 11:22 as "have faith in God." But it is evident that the translation "the faith of Jesus

Christ" is correctly classified as literal, obscure, and ambiguous.

2. Literal, but equivalent to an interpretation: None.
3. Interpretative, with at least one alternative: English Revised and American Standard.
4. Interpretative, with no alternative: Coverdale, Twentieth Century, Weymouth, Moffatt, Westminster, Goodspeed, Ballantine, Montgomery, Williams, Confraternity, Basic English, Knox, Verkuyl, Revised Standard, Phillips, Schonfield, and Lilly.

All the versions offering clearly interpretative translations have taken the genitive case of Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ as objective. It seems probable that the English Revised and American Standard intended their marginal alternative "of Jesus" to be understood as the subjective interpretation "Jesus' own faith," since they list it as an alternative rather than as merely the literal rendering.

Romans 3:23.--ὅστεροῦνται τῆς δόξης τοῦ Θεοῦ

The ambiguous phrase τῆς δόξης τοῦ Θεοῦ has been variously understood. As used in the New Testament, δόξα seems to have two somewhat distinct meanings--"reputation," "honor," "praise," or "brightness," "splendor," "radiance." In the latter sense, it is used to describe God's power and perfection, or the reflection of the divine perfection, as may be produced in man, or the future state of glory into which man may enter.

Vincent observes that interpretations of this passage "vary greatly." He lists six different possibilities, concluding with his own preference, "they are coming short of the honor or approbation which God bestows." He lists Meyer, Shedd, Beet, De Wette, and Alford as taking the same view. Denney claims that the meaning of τῆς δόξης τοῦ Θεοῦ



"must be the approbation or praise of God." Cremer interprets similarly, "they lack recognition on the part of God," and warns that to translate as "the glory of God" or "His image" is to "lose the true relation" between verses 23 and 24. Bauer translates "honor or glory with God"; Thayer, "God's praise, honor."

Lightfoot, however, argues that "Meyer is wholly wrong in taking the expression to mean 'the honor which God gives . . . . Still less can it be explained to mean 'glory in the sight of God,' as others render it." He understands it to mean "the manifestation of God's Person and attributes, . . . the transformation of the faithful into the same image." Parry likewise interprets, "that exhibition of God in their own character, which is man's proper work."

Sanday and Headlam understand  $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$  here as denoting "the bright effulgence of God's presence." They explain that this represents the "Divine perfections" which in turn may be communicated to man as he is morally and physically "transfigured"--"partially here, completely hereafter." Gifford notes that the meaning of this passage is "much disputed" and speaks of the "many meanings which have been invented for it." He also seems to regard  $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$  here as including all "Divine perfection," which is received by man as he is transformed. Dummelow likewise interprets, "the divine perfection."

J. Knox explains the passage as a reference to the glory of man's original state as created in the likeness of God, his "true character and "the destiny that belongs with it." Lange and Barrett seem to take a similar view.

Garvie cites the two basic interpretations of  $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$ , "honor,"

or "brightness," and concludes noncommittally that the context here would make the former sense "more appropriate," while the common usage of the term in the New Testament "rather supports the latter."

The versions have translated as follows:

- Wycliffe (1382), "han nede to the glorie of god" (Vulgate: "egent gloriam Dei." Purvey adds a note explaining that this means, "the grace of God, bi which he apperith gloriouse");
- Tyndale (1525), "lacke the prayse that is off valoure before God";
- Coverdale (1535), "wante the prayse that God shulde have of them" (Luther, 1524: "mangeln dess preyses den gott an in haben solt"; changed in the 1534 edition to "mangeln des rhumes, den sie an Gott haben solten");
- Rogers (1537), same as Tyndale;
- Taverner (1539), "lacke the glorye of God";
- Great (1539), "are destitute of the glorye of God";
- Geneva (1560), "are deprived of the glorie of God (changed from "are destitute of the glorye of God," in Whittingham, 1557. The 1560 edition has a marginal note explaining that "the glorie of God" means "everlasting life.");
- Bishops' (1568), same as Great (changed to "have need of the glory of God" in the 1572 edition);
- Rheims (1582), "doe neede the glorie of God";
- King James (1611), "come short of the glorie of God";
- English Revised (1881), "fall short of the glory of God";
- Twentieth Century (1900), "all fall short of God's glorious ideal";
- American Standard (1901), same as English Revised;
- Weymouth (1903), "all consciously come short of the glory of God";
- Moffatt (1913), same as King James;
- Westminster (1920), "need the glory of God" (the marginal note explaining that the glory of God means "His grace");
- Goodspeed (1923), same as King James;

- Ballantine (1923), "have come short of the glory of God";
- Montgomery (1924), "lack the glory which comes from God";
- Williams (1937), "continues to come short of God's glory";
- Spencer (1937), same as English Revised;
- Confraternity (1941), same as Bishops' (1572);
- Basic English (1941), "are far from the glory of God";
- Knox (1944), "all alike are unworthy of God's praise" (margin: "'God's praise'; some translate 'the glory of God,' but it seems simplest to understand the words . . . as referring to the praise which God bestows.");
- Verkuyyl (1945), "fall behind in being any glory to God" (cf. Coverdale and Luther);
- Revised Standard (1946), same as English Revised;
- Phillips (1947), "has fallen short of the beauty of God's plan";
- Schonfield (1955), "failed to reach God's standard";
- Lilly (1956), "lack the approval of God" (margin: "Others understand of the goodness of God manifested in man when he is in the state of grace. Perhaps there is reference to the glorious adornment of grace which Adam and his posterity lost by original sin.").

The translations seem to come under the four classifications as follows:

1. Literal, ambiguous, and obscure: Wycliffe, Taverner, Great, Geneva, Bishops', Rheims, King James, English Revised, American Standard, Weymouth, Moffatt, Westminster, Goodspeed, Ballantine, Montgomery, Williams, Spencer, Confraternity, Basic English, and Revised Standard. It seems probable that many of these versions intended the literal "glory of God" to be understood in the basic sense of "brightness," "splendor," hence "perfection." It is significant, however, to compare the treatment given to the same phrase, τῆς δόξης τοῦ Θεοῦ, in Rom. 5:2. Since there seems to be almost unanimous agreement as to the meaning of the passage

in this later context, Weymouth and Williams venture to offer interpretative renderings. Weymouth translates, "of some day sharing in God's glory" (changed to "of seeing God's glory" in the 1929 fifth edition). Williams interprets clearly, "of enjoying the glorious presence of God." Taverner also interprets this time, but goes against the interpretation of Luther, adopted by Coverdale, and follows Tyndale and Rogers with "of the prayse that shelbe geven of God." Schonfield changes from "God's standard" in Rom. 3:23 to "God's esteem" in Rom. 5:2.

2. Literal, but equivalent to an interpretation: None.

3. Interpretative, with at least one alternative: Knox and Lilly. The alternative which appears in the margin of Knox is literal, obscure, and ambiguous, but it at least suggests the possibility of other interpretations.

4. Interpretative, with no alternative: Tyndale, Coverdale, Rogers, Twentieth Century, Verkuyl, Phillips, and Schonfield. It is being assumed that in Verkuyl's translation, "fall behind in being any glory to God," "glory" means "honor" or "praise," following the interpretation of Luther, adopted by Coverdale.

Of the versions offering interpretative translations,  $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$  is interpreted in the basic sense of "honor," "praise" by Tyndale, Coverdale, Rogers, Knox, Verkuyl, and Lilly. It is interpreted as "brightness," "splendor," representing God's perfection, which may be communicated to man, by the Twentieth Century, Phillips, Lilly (margin), and, presumably, Schonfield.

Romans 3:25.-- $\pi\rho\acute{o}\epsilon\theta\epsilon\tau\omicron$

This verb is capable of two or more meanings in the New Testament,

and there has been considerable uncertainty as to its precise usage in this verse. It may mean, "set before himself," hence "purposed," "ordained." Or it may mean, "set forth publicly." Is Paul saying that God "ordained" or "purposed" that Jesus Christ should be the *ἱλαστήριον*, or that God "publicly set him forth" as the *ἱλαστήριον*? A third possibility is proposed by J. H. Moulton, who suggests on the strength of an inscription that the meaning may rather be "offered," or "provided."

Lightfoot states that *προέθετο* here means "set before himself," and so "purposed." Barmby admits that either interpretation might be correct. Gifford agrees that both interpretations are "admissible." He recognizes "designed," "proposed," "ordained," as the "more ancient interpretation" but prefers "set forth," the view supported by "the majority of modern interpreters." He claims that the latter interpretation is "best suited" to the context but hesitates to reject the possibility of the other meaning being correct.

Sanday and Headlam concede that both possible interpretations "would be in full accordance with the teaching of St. Paul" but argue that the immediate context favors the translation "set forth publicly." In their paraphrase they translate, "set Him there as a public spectacle." Many other commentators recognize the two possibilities but conclude that the meaning "set forth" is the one to be preferred in this context. Deissmann translates, "has publicly set forth";<sup>1</sup> Bauer, "display publicly"; Boylan, "set forth before the eyes of all"; Parry, "published." Vincent Taylor, in his special study on Rom. 3:25 likewise prefers "set

---

<sup>1</sup>G. A. Deissmann, *Bible Studies*, trans. A. Grieve (2d ed.; Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1909), p. 133.

forth publicly."<sup>1</sup> The same interpretation is preferred by Lange, Schaff, Thayer, Vincent, Garvie, Abbott-Smith, J. Knox, and Barrett.

Robertson seems to include both possible meanings in his explanation that "God set before himself (purposed) and did it publicly before . . . the whole world."

The versions have translated as follows:

Wycliffe (1382), "purposide" (variant reading: "ordeyned." Purvey, 1388, has the latter. Vulgate: "proposuit," as ambiguous as the Greek);

Tyndale (1525), "hath made";

Coverdale (1535), "hath set forth" (Luther, 1524: "hatt fürgestellet");

Rogers (1537), same as Tyndale;

Taverner (1539), same as Tyndale;

Great (1539), same as Coverdale;

Geneva (1560), same as Coverdale;

Bishops' (1568), same as Coverdale;

Rheims (1582), "hath proposed" (Vulgate: "proposuit");

King James (1611), same as Coverdale (margin: "Or, foreordained");

English Revised (1881), "set forth" (margin: "Or, purposed");

Twentieth Century (1900), "placed him before the world";

American Standard (1901), same as English Revised;

Weymouth (1903), "put forward";

Moffatt (1913), same as Weymouth;

Westminster (1920), same as Coverdale;

Goodspeed (1923), "showed him publicly";

---

<sup>1</sup>V. Taylor, "Great Texts Reconsidered: Romans 3:25-26," The Expository Times, Vol. L (Oct. 1933-Sept. 1939), pp. 295-300.

Ballantine (1923), "has set forth";  
 Montgomery (1924), "openly set him forth";  
 Williams (1937), "once publicly offered";  
 Spencer (1937), "has put forward";  
 Confraternity (1941), same as Coverdale;  
 Basic English (1941), same as Spencer;  
 Knox (1944), "has offered him to us";  
 Verkuyl (1945), same as Weymouth;  
 Revised Standard (1946), same as Weymouth;  
 Phillips (1947), "has appointed";  
 Schonfield (1955), same as Phillips;  
 Lilly (1956), "has publicly exhibited."

The translations seem to come under the four classifications as follows:

1. Literal, obscure, and ambiguous: Rheims. The literal translation "proposed," from the Latin "proposuit," may mean either "set forth" (now obsolete) or "purposed."
2. Literal, but equivalent to an interpretation: None.
3. Interpretative, with at least one alternative: King James and English Revised.
4. Interpretative, with no alternative: All versions except Rheims, King James, and English Revised.

Of the versions offering interpretative translations, *προέθετο* has been interpreted to mean "set forth publicly" by Coverdale, Great, Geneva, Bishops', King James, English Revised, Twentieth Century, American Standard, Weymouth, Moffatt, Westminster, Goodspeed, Ballantine,

Montgomery, Spencer, Confraternity, Basic English, Verkuyl, Revised Standard, and Lilly. The verb has been interpreted to mean "appointed," "purposed," "ordained," by Wycliffe, Purvey, Tyndale, Rogers, Taverner, King James (margin), English Revised (margin), Phillips, and Schonfield. It is being assumed that Tyndale's "made" is to be understood in this sense. Williams and Knox seem to have adopted Moulton's suggestion by translating "offered."

Romans 3:25.--*ἱλαστήριον*

The precise meaning of *ἱλαστήριον* in this context has been the subject of a great deal of discussion. There is disagreement, first, as to whether *ἱλαστήριον* is a noun or an adjective. Bauer, for example, lists it as a noun. Moulton and Milligan claim that the adjectival use of *ἱλαστήριος* is now "definitely established." If the word is taken as an adjective, there is further disagreement as to whether it is masculine or neuter in gender.

The grammatical possibilities have given rise to a variety of interpretations. *ἱλαστήριον* has been understood to mean "propitiatory covering," "mercy seat," "propitiatory," "propitiator," "propitiatory sacrifice," "means of propitiation," "propitiation," "place of propitiation," "expiation," "an offering of atonement," "a means of reconciliation," "a sacrifice of reconciliation," etc.

Sanday and Headlam observe that the Greek commentators are "unanimous" in taking *ἱλαστήριον* to be the "mercy seat." They themselves, however, prefer "propitiation," or "the propitiatory." Nygren rejects "means of atonement" as too general and claims that "convincing reasons



support 'mercy seat.'" Vincent, Cremer, and T. W. Manson<sup>1</sup> also prefer "mercy seat," Cremer explaining further that this implies a "place of expiation or conciliation." Barth interprets, "a covering of propitiation," meaning "the place of propitiation."

Bosworth is opposed to the interpretation "mercy seat" and prefers to regard ἱλαστήριον as a neuter adjective, translating it "propitiatory thing." Abbott-Smith makes the same grammatical decision and translates "propitiatory." Dummelow interprets as "that which makes it possible for God to be propitious or favourable to man." Deissmann also rejects "mercy seat" or "propitiatory covering" as "impossible,"<sup>2</sup> claiming that "the metaphor were as unlike Paul as possible."<sup>3</sup> He explains further that "propitiatory sacrifice" is "opposed by the context." His own preference is for "means of propitiation," or "of use for propitiation."<sup>4</sup> Weiss and J. Knox take the same view. Kirk translates "means of cleansing," or "means of forgiveness," regarding ἱλαστήριον as "probably adjectival."

Lightfoot is opposed to "mercy seat" and prefers "propitiatory offering." Sanday and Headlam translate in their paraphrase, "a sacrifice which had the effect of making propitiation or atonement for sin." Theissen argues that the context supports the interpretation "a propitiatory sacrifice," but he translates simply "propitiation." Robertson

---

<sup>1</sup>T. W. Manson, "ἹΛΑΣΤΗΡΙΟΝ," The Journal of Theological Studies, Vol. XLVI (1945), pp. 1-10.

<sup>2</sup>G. A. Deissmann, "Mercy Seat," Encyclopaedia Biblica, eds. T. K. Cheyne and J. S. Black, Vol. III (1903), col. 3033.

<sup>3</sup>Deissmann, Bible Studies, p. 129.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., p. 130.

offers the same translation and claims that there is "no longer room for doubting" the meaning of *ἱλαστήριον* in this verse.

Denney regards *ἱλαστήριον* as a masculine adjective and translates the phrase, "whom God set forth in propitiatory power." Parry makes the same grammatical choice and translates, "agent of propitiation."

Dodd states that "most translators and commentators are wrong" in translating *ἱλαστήριον* as conveying the idea of "propitiation." He points out that this suggests the placating of an angry God, whereas the meaning of *ἱλαστήριον* is rather that of "expiation."<sup>1</sup> Barrett claims that "we can hardly doubt" that "expiation rather than propitiation" was in Paul's mind. Thayer translates, "an expiatory sacrifice," "a piacular victim." Lagrange explains that *ἱλαστήριον* cannot mean "an expiatory sacrifice" and translates rather "un instrument de propitiation expiatoire."

Lietzmann recommends that it is best to use a general word such as "Sühnemittel" or "Versöhner" and let the context supply the precise meaning. Bauer translates "Versöhnende," "Sühnende," hence concretely, "Sühnemittel," "Sühnegabe," "Sühnegeschenk." Boylan commends the indefinite Vulgate "propitiatio" as "prudent, for it is quite possible that Paul has several nuances of the word *ἱλαστήριον* before his mind in this passage."

The versions have translated as follows:

Wycliffe (1382), "an helpere" (changed to "forzyuer" in the 1388 Purvey revision." Vulgate: "propitiationem");

---

<sup>1</sup>See also C. H. Dodd, "*ἸΛΑΣΚΕΣΘΑΙ*, its Cognates, Derivatives, and Synonyms, in the Septuagint," The Journal of Theological Studies, Vol. XXXII (1931), pp. 352-360.

- Tyndale (1525), "a seate of mercy" (Luther, 1524: "gnad stul");
- Coverdale (1535), "a Mercy seate";
- Rogers (1537), same as Tyndale;
- Taverner (1539), same as Tyndale;
- Great (1539), "the obtayner of mercy";
- Geneva (1560), "a reconciliation" (changed from "a pacification" in Whittingham, 1557);
- Bishops' (1568), "a propitiation" (margin: "which is a pacifying of God's displeasure. That whereas we were sometime bondslaves to synne, God made his only sonne Christe Jesus a sacrifice for our sin, to reconcile us agayne by fayth into gods favour.");
- Rheims (1582), same as Bishops' (Vulgate: "propitiationem");
- King James (1611), same as Bishops';
- English Revised (1881), same as Bishops' (margin: "Or, propitiatory");
- Twentieth Century (1900), "a means of reconciliation";
- American Standard (1901), same as Bishops' (margin: "Or, propitiator");
- Weymouth (1903), "a Mercy-Seat" (margin: "Or, 'a propitiation.' But 'mercy-seat' is the meaning of the word in the only other passage, Heb. 9:5, where it is found in the N. T., and almost everywhere in LXX., and is favoured by the Greek Commentators." Changed in the 1929 fifth edition to "a propitiation," same as Bishops', with margin: "Or perhaps 'propitiatory.' The Greek word has the meaning 'mercy-seat' in the LXX translation of the Pentateuch, and also in Heb. 1:5; but this meaning is improbable here.");
- Moffatt (1913), "the means of propitiation";
- Westminster (1920), same as Bishops' (margin: "Lit. a means or instrument of propitiation");
- Goodspeed (1923), "a sacrifice of reconciliation";
- Ballantine (1923), same as Bishops';
- Montgomery (1924), "an offering of atonement" (margin: "God thus makes Christ his votive gift for the world.");
- Williams (1937), same as Goodspeed;
- Spencer (1937), same as Bishops';

Confraternity (1941), same as Bishops' (cf. Latin);  
 Basic English (1941), "the sign of his mercy";  
 Knox (1944), same as Twentieth Century;  
 Verkuyl (1945), "a reconciling sacrifice";  
 Revised Standard (1946), "an expiation";  
 Phillips (1947), same as Bishops';  
 Schonfield (1955), "an expiatory sacrifice";  
 Lilly (1956), "a means of expiation."

The translations seem to come under the four classifications as follows:

1. Literal, obscure, and ambiguous: None.
2. Literal, but equivalent to an interpretation: Rheims and Confraternity, following the Vulgate "propitiationem."
3. Interpretative, with at least one alternative: English Revised, American Standard, Weymouth, and Westminster. Only the 1929 fifth edition of Weymouth seems to approach a fair representation of the possible alternatives.
4. Interpretative, with no alternatives: All versions except the Rheims, English Revised, American Standard, Weymouth, Westminster, and Confraternity.

The most common interpretation of *ἱλαστήριον* offered in the versions is the somewhat general "a propitiation," appearing first in the Bishops' and adopted by the King James, English Revised, American Standard, Weymouth (1929), Westminster, Ballantine, Spencer, and Phillips. This is also the translation in the Rheims and Confraternity, following the Latin "propitiationem." "Mercy seat," following Luther's "gnad

stul," is adopted by Tyndale, Coverdale, Rogers, Taverner, and Weymouth (1903). The idea of "sacrifice" is presented by Goodspeed, Montgomery, Williams, Verkuyl, and Schonfield. The interpretation "means or instrument of propitiation," "means of reconciliation," is offered by Moffatt, Twentieth Century, and Westminster (margin). The concept of "expiation" is found in the Revised Standard, Schonfield, and Lilly. Virtually all of the possible interpretations discussed by the commentators are represented by the versions included in this study.

Romans 3:25.--*διὰ τῆς πίστεως ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι*

Grammatically, the phrase *διὰ τῆς πίστεως* may be connected directly with *ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι*, meaning that the *ἱλαστήριον* is made effective "through faith in his blood." Or, the two prepositional phrases may be regarded as parallel, both modifying the preceding *προέθετο ἱλαστήριον* and meaning that the *ἱλαστήριον* is made possible "by his blood" and is to be taken advantage of "by faith." Some have recommended that *ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι* be connected with *προέθετο*, and *διὰ τῆς πίστεως* with *ἱλαστήριον*, meaning that Christ was "set forth in his blood as a *ἱλαστήριον* to have effect through faith."

Thayer prefers "faith in his blood," the translation found in almost all the sixteenth century versions. Lange and Schaff list Luther, Calvin, Beza, Olshausen, Tholuck, Hodge, and others, as favoring this interpretation.

Denney admits that "the precise connection and purpose" of *διὰ τῆς πίστεως* is "not at once clear." He concedes that grammatically the phrase might be construed with *ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι* but concludes that the two phrases should be taken as parallel. Sanday and Headlam also grant

that connecting ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι with πίστεως would be a "quite legitimate combination" but state definitely that it should be taken rather with προέθετο ἰλαστήριον. Kirk claims that the latter connection is "certainly right." J. Knox urges that the phrase "must be taken" with ἰλαστήριον. Essentially the same interpretation is favored by Gifford, Dummelow, Parry, Bosworth, Parry, Lagrange, Lietzmann, Taylor,<sup>1</sup> Manson,<sup>2</sup> C. F. D. Moule, Blass-Debrunner, Kittel, Bauer, and Barrett.

Vincent and Robertson prefer to connect ἐν τῷ αἵματι with προέθετο. Barth translates "through his faithfulness, by his blood," "his faithfulness" meaning "God's."

The versions have translated as follows:

Wycliffe (1382), "bi feith in his blood" (Vulgate: "per fidem in sanguine ipsius," the word order being as ambiguous as the Greek);

Tyndale (1525), "thorow faith in his bloud" (Luther, 1524: "durch den glauben in seinem blut");

Coverdale (1535), same as Tyndale;

Rogers (1537), same as Tyndale;

Taverner (1539), same as Tyndale;

Great (1539), "thorow fayth, by the meanes of hys bloude";

Geneva (1560), same as Tyndale;

Bishops' (1568), same as Tyndale;

Rheims (1582), same as Wycliffe;

King James (1611), same as Tyndale;

English Revised (1881), "through faith, by his blood" (margin: "Or, faith in his blood");

---

<sup>1</sup>Taylor, loc. cit.

<sup>2</sup>Manson, loc. cit.

Twentieth Century (1900), "by his sacrifice of himself . . . through faith in him" (changed to "by the shedding of his blood, . . . through faith" in the 1904 final edition);

American Standard (1901), "through faith, in his blood";

Weymouth (1903), "rendered efficacious through faith in His blood" (changed to "available to faith in virtue of His blood" in the 1929 fifth edition);

Moffatt (1913), "by his blood, to be received by faith";

Westminster (1920), "by his blood, to have effect through faith";

Goodspeed (1923), "dying . . . to be taken advantage of through faith";

Ballantine (1923), "by his blood through faith";

Montgomery (1924), "through faith, by means of his blood";

Williams (1937), "in his death . . . through faith";

Spencer (1937), "in his Blood through faith";

Confraternity (1941), same as Ballantine;

Basic English (1941), same as English Revised;

Knox (1944), "in virtue of faith, ransoming us with his blood";

Verkuyl (1945), "in His blood through faith";

Revised Standard (1946), same as Moffatt;

Phillips (1947), "accomplished by the shedding of His blood, to be received and made effective in ourselves by faith";

Schonfield (1955), "by their reliance on his blood";

Lilly (1956), "available to all through the shedding of his blood."

The translations seem to come under the four classifications as follows:

1. Literal, obscure, and ambiguous: None.
2. Literal, but equivalent to an interpretation: Wycliffe, Tyndale, Coverdale, Rogers, Taverner, Geneva, Bishops', Rheims, King James, and Weymouth (1903). It is possible that some, if not all, of these ver-

sions--and especially Weymouth (1903)--intended that the literal "through faith in his blood" should be understood to mean that believers must exercise "faith in his blood." In view of the appearance of the alternative interpretation in the Great Bible of 1539, all subsequent translators must have been aware that the literal "through faith in his blood" was equivalent to an interpretation.

3. Interpretative, with at least one alternative: English Revised.

4. Interpretative, with no alternative: Great, Twentieth Century, American Standard, Weymouth (1929), Moffatt, Westminster, Goodspeed, Ballantine, Montgomery, Williams, Spencer, Confraternity, Basic English, Knox, Verkuyl, Revised Standard, Phillips, Schonfield, and Lilly.

All but one of the versions offering deliberately interpretative translations have preferred to regard *διὰ τῆς πίστεως* and *ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι* as parallel phrases modifying *προέθετο ἰλαστήριον*. Goodspeed and Williams have clearly connected *ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι* with *προέθετο*. Schonfield alone has connected *διὰ τῆς πίστεως* with *ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι*.

Romans 3:25.--*διὰ τὴν πᾶρεσιν τῶν προγεγονότων ἁμαρτημάτων ἐν τῇ ἀνοχῇ τοῦ Θεοῦ*

The main problem in this passage is the interpretation of the noun *πᾶρεσιν*. Some understand it to mean "forgiveness," as if more or less synonymous with *ἄφεσις*. In this case, Paul may be saying that Christ died to show God's righteousness "in view of His forgiveness of former sins in His divine forbearance." Or, if *διὰ* should be given the somewhat unusual sense "with a view to," Paul could be saying that Christ



died to reveal God's righteousness "for the forgiveness of former sins through the forbearance of God." Others, however, prefer to make a distinction between *πάρεσις* and *ἄφεσις*, interpreting the former to mean "overlooking," "passing by," and the latter "forgiveness," "remission." In this case, the passage would mean that Christ died to reveal God's righteousness, "because of the fact that in His divine forbearance He had overlooked men's former sins."

For conservative commentators and translators, the solution to this problem has an important bearing on the question as to whether God actually forgave, or merely overlooked, the sins committed during the pre-Christian era. Consequently, the problem has been the subject of considerable theological debate, especially during the late sixteenth and early seventeenth century Cocceian controversy in Holland.<sup>1</sup>

Gifford reminds that in distinguishing between "praetermission" and "remission" "we are treading on the ashes of a fierce but extinct controversy concerning the remission of sins under the Mosaic dispensation." Lightfoot prefers "praetermission" and claims that "to substitute *ἄφεσιν* for *παρεσιν* here would utterly destroy the sense." He considers the marginal alternative "passing over" in the King James version as "doubtless due to the Cocceian controversy" and criticizes this alternative as inadequate, "for the preposition itself must be altered from 'for' into 'owing to, by reason of.'" Barmby observes that the King James translators, "in a way very unusual with them, seem to have missed the drift of the passage, and so been led to give the . . . untenable render-

---

<sup>1</sup>See R. C. Trench, Synonyms of the New Testament (7th ed.; London: Macmillan Co., 1871), pp. 108-109.

ing ["for the remission of sins"] in order to suit their view of it."

Bosworth prefers to interpret *πάρεσις* here as "passing over" but admits that it could also mean "forgiveness." Barrett favors "because of the passing over" but recognizes the possibility of the translation "with a view to the forgiveness." He insists that there is a real difference between *πάρεσις* and *ἀφεσις*. Trench translates, "because of the praetermission" and agrees that *πάρεσις* is not synonymous with *ἀφεσις*. J. Knox explains that the idea here is that of God's "apparently ignoring" men's previous sins. Garvie explains that "the sins of the race before Christ had not been forgiven in the full sense . . . they had been passed over." Essentially the same view is taken by Lange, Schaff, Sunday and Headlam, Denney, Parry, Kittel, Bauer, and Theissen. Thayer explains that God had "tolerated" sins committed previously and "had not punished." Lagrange interprets likewise, "having borne without punishing."

On the other hand, however, Cremer explains that *πάρεσις* denotes "not a temporary and conditional, but actual and full, remission of punishment." Field agrees that *πάρεσις* and *ἀφεσις* both imply remission, but the former is "more commonly used of the remission or forgiveness of a sin, the latter of a debt." Moulton and Milligan seem to incline toward the same view. Hodge admits that *πάρεσις* means strictly "passing by," "overlooking." However, he argues that Paul uses the word here to express essentially the same meaning as *ἀφεσις* and claims that the "majority of commentators" agree with this position. He refers to the "modern transcendental theologians in Germany" who deny actual forgiveness before the coming of Christ as agreeing with "the Papists" here--as they do "in

so many other points." Deissmann states that he does not believe that there is "any great difference" between *ἡμεῖς* and *ἡμεῖς*.<sup>1</sup> Lietzmann translates "forgiveness" and seems to emphasize no distinction between the two words. Barth interprets the passage on the basis of the idea of forgiveness.

The versions have translated as follows:

- Wycliffe (1382), "for remiscioun of bifore goynge synnes, in the sustentacioun, or beringe up, of God" (Vulgate: "propter remissionem praecedentium delictorum, in sustentatione Dei");
- Tyndale (1525), "in that he forgeveth the synnes thatt are passhed which God did suffre" (Luther, 1524: "in dem, dasz er vergibt die sünd, die zuor sind geschehen under götlicher gedult");
- Coverdale (1535), "in that he forgeveth the synnes, which were done before under the sufferance of God, which he suffred";
- Rogers (1537), same as Tyndale;
- Taverner (1539), same as Tyndale;
- Great (1539), same as Tyndale;
- Geneva (1560), "by the forgiveness of the sinnes that are passed through the pacience of God" (changed from the same as Tyndale in the 1557 Whittingham edition);
- Bishops' (1568), same as Tyndale;
- Rheims (1582), "for the remission of former sinnes, in the toleration of God" (changed to "for the remission of former sins, through the forbearance of God" in the 1749 Challoner edition);
- King James (1611), "for the remission of sinnes, that are past, through the forbearance of God" (margin: "Or, passing over");
- English Revised (1881), "because of the passing over of the sins done aforetime, in the forbearance of God";
- Twentieth Century (1900), "because in his forbearance he had passed over the sins men had previously committed";

---

<sup>1</sup>Deissmann, Paul, p. 149.

- American Standard (1901), same as English Revised;
- Weymouth (1903), "because of the passing over, in God's forbearance, of the sins previously committed" (changed in the 1929 fifth edition to "in view of the condoning by His forbearance of sins previously committed"; margin: "i.e. in O. T. times");
- Moffatt (1913), "in view of the fact that sins previously committed during the time of God's forbearance had been passed over";
- Westminster (1920), "For through the patience of God the sins of times gone by are to be passed over" (margin: "probably not implying that they are forgiven, [πάρεσις, not ἀφεσις, being used], but that the sins of the fathers are not to be visited on the sons");
- Goodspeed (1923), "(for in his forbearance, God passed over man's former sins");
- Ballantine (1923), "because of the passing over of previous sins in the forbearance of God";
- Montgomery (1924), "he had passed over the sins previously committed";
- Williams (1937), "(for in His forbearance God had passed over men's former sins)" (cf. Goodspeed);
- Spencer (1937), "owing to the passing over of former sins by the divine forbearance";
- Confraternity (1941), "God in his patience remitting former sins";
- Basic English (1941), "when, in his pity, God let the sins of earlier times go without punishment";
- Knox (1944), "shewing us why he overlooked our former sins in the days of his forbearance";
- Verkuyl (1945), "in forgiving the sins that previously were committed under God's forbearance";
- Revised Standard (1946), "because in his divine forbearance he had passed over former sins";
- Phillips (1947), "by the wiping out of the sins of the past (the time when He withheld His Hand)";
- Schonfield (1955), "In God's forbearance he overlooked the sins of past generations";
- Lilly (1956), "since, during the period of tolerance, he had passed over former sins without punishing them."

The translations seem to come under the four classifications as follows:

1. Literal, obscure, and ambiguous: None.
2. Literal, but equivalent to an interpretation: Wycliffe, Rheims, and Confraternity, all following the Vulgate interpretation, "remissionem."
3. Interpretative, with at least one alternative: King James. As Lightfoot observes, the marginal alternative "passing over" in the King James is somewhat inadequate, inasmuch as the preposition should also be changed from "for" to "because of." However, the version does represent the two alternative interpretations of *πάρεσιν*, "forgiveness" and "passing over."
4. Interpretative, with no alternative: All versions other than Wycliffe, Rheims, Confraternity, and King James.

Of the versions offering deliberately interpretative translations, *πάρεσιν* is interpreted here as "forgiveness," "remission," by Tyndale, Coverdale, Rogers, Taverner, Great, Geneva, Bishops', King James, Verkuyl, and Phillips, the latter translating, "wiping out." *πάρεσιν* is interpreted as "passing over," "overlooking," "condoning," "letting go without punishment," by King James (margin), English Revised, Twentieth Century, American Standard, Weymouth, Moffatt, Westminster, Goodspeed, Ballantine, Montgomery, Williams, Spencer, Basic English, Knox, Revised Standard, Schonfield, and Lilly.

Romans 3:26.--τὸν ἐκ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ

As in Rom. 3:22, the genitive case of Ἰησοῦ may be taken as sub-

jective or objective. Interpreted as subjective genitive, the passage would mean that God justifies those who have a faith such as Jesus had. Interpreted as objective genitive, the passage would mean that God justifies those who place their faith in Jesus. Commentators have expressed the same differences of opinion as in the discussion of the similar problem in Rom. 3:22. However, a number of the versions have offered different translations.

The versions have translated as follows:

Wycliffe (1382), "him that is of the faith of Iesu Crist" (Vulgate: "eum, qui est ex fide Jesu Christ," which presents the same problem of ambiguity as the Greek);

Tyndale (1525), "hym which belevith on Jesus";

Coverdale (1535), "him which is of the faith on Jesus" (Luther, 1524: "der da ist des glaubens an Iesu");

Rogers (1537), same as Tyndale;

Taverner (1539), same as Tyndale;

Great (1539), same as Tyndale;

Geneva (1560), "him which is of the faith of Jesus" (changed from "him which beleveth on Iesus," the same as Tyndale, in the Whittingham 1557 edition);

Bishops' (1568), same as Tyndale;

Rheims (1582), same as Wycliffe;

King James (1611), "him which beleeveth in Iesus";

English Revised (1881), "him that hath faith in Jesus" (margin no. 1: "Gr. is of faith"; margin no. 2: "Or, of");

Twentieth Century (1900), "those who have faith in Jesus" (changed to "the man who takes his stand on faith in Jesus" in the 1904 final edition);

American Standard (1901), same as English Revised (margin no. 1: "Gr. is of faith"; margin no. 2: "Or, of");

Weymouth (1903), "those who believe in Jesus" (changed to "the man who

believes in Jesus" in the 1929 fifth edition);  
 Moffatt (1913), "man on the score of faith in Jesus";  
 Westminster (1920), "him that is of faith in Jesus";  
 Goodspeed (1923), same as Twentieth Century (1900);  
 Ballantine (1923), "him who has faith in Jesus";  
 Montgomery (1924), same as Ballantine;  
 Williams (1937), "the man who has faith in Jesus";  
 Spencer (1937), "him who is of the faith of Jesus";  
 Confraternity (1941), same as Ballantine;  
 Basic English (1941), same as Ballantine;  
 Knox (1944), "those who take their stand upon faith in him" (cf. Twentieth Century 1904 final edition);  
 Verkuyl (1945), "one who has faith in Jesus";  
 Revised Standard (1946), same as Ballantine;  
 Phillips (1947), "every man who has faith in Jesus Christ";  
 Schonfield (1955), "whoever places his faith in Jesus";  
 Lilly (1956), same as Ballantine.

The translations seem to come under the four classifications as follows:

1. Literal, obscure, and ambiguous: Wycliffe, Geneva (1560), Rheims, and Spencer. As in Rom. 3:22, it would seem that the literal "the faith of Jesus," especially in Spencer, would be most readily understood to mean "Jesus' own faith" and that consequently these versions should be listed as literal, but equivalent to an interpretation. However, see the discussion of the literal, obscure, and ambiguous translations of this phrase in Rom. 3:22.

2. Literal, but equivalent to an interpretation: None.

3. Interpretative, with at least one alternative: English Revised and American Standard.

4. Interpretative, with no alternative: All versions except Wycliffe, Geneva (1560), Rheims, English Revised, American Standard, and Spencer.

All versions offering interpretative translations have interpreted Ἰησοῦ as objective genitive. Of these, Tyndale, Rogers, Taverner, Great, Whittingham, Bishops', and King James have changed from a literal, obscure, and ambiguous "faith of Jesus" to a clearly interpretative "believeth on (or in) Jesus."

Romans 3:28.--δικαιοῦσθαι

The problem here is substantially the same as in Rom. 2:13. Is forensic, or does it mean actually to "make righteous"? A number of the versions offer different translations here than in Rom. 2:13, few of which seem to be due to the change in context.

The versions have translated as follows:

Wycliffe (1382), "iustified" (Vulgate: "iustificari." Rom. 2:13, "maad iust");

Tyndale (1525), same as Wycliffe (Luther, 1524: "gerechtfertiget werde"; changed in the 1534 edition to "gerecht werde");

Coverdale (1535), same as Wycliffe (although he translates δικαιοῦντα as "righteous maker" in Rom. 3:26, following Luther's "gerecht mache");

Rogers (1537), same as Wycliffe;

Taverner (1539), same as Wycliffe;

Great (1539), same as Wycliffe;

Geneva (1560), same as Wycliffe;

Bishops' (1568), same as Wycliffe;



- Rheims (1582), same as Wycliffe;
- King James (1611), same as Wycliffe;
- English Revised (1881), same as Wycliffe (margin: "Or, accounted righteous");
- Twentieth Century (1900), "stands right with God" (changed to "pronounced righteous" in the 1904 final edition);
- American Standard (1901), same as Wycliffe (margin: "Or, accounted righteous");
- Weymouth (1903), "held to be righteous (changed to "accounted righteous" in the 1929 fifth edition. Rom. 2:13, "pronounced righteous");
- Moffatt (1913), same as Wycliffe (Rom. 2:13, "acquitted");
- Westminster (1920), same as Wycliffe;
- Goodspeed (1923), "made upright";
- Ballantine (1923), "pronounced righteous";
- Montgomery (1924), same as Tyndale (Rom. 2:13, "accounted righteous");
- Williams (1937), "brought into right standing with God" (Rom. 2:13, "recognized as upright");
- Spencer (1937), same as Wycliffe;
- Confraternity (1941), same as Wycliffe;
- Basic English (1941), "get righteousness" (Rom. 2:13, "judged as having righteousness");
- Knox (1944), same as Wycliffe;
- Verkuyl (1945), same as Wycliffe (Rom. 2:13, "pronounced righteous");
- Revised Standard (1946), same as Wycliffe;
- Phillips (1947), same as Wycliffe;
- Schonfield (1955), "exonerated";
- Lilly (1956), "sanctified."

The translations seem to come under the four classifications as follows:

1. Literal, obscure, and ambiguous: Wycliffe, Tyndale, Coverdale, Rogers, Taverner, Great, Geneva, Bishops', Rheims, King James, Moffatt, Westminster, Montgomery, Spencer, Confraternity, Basic English, Knox, Verkuyl, Revised Standard, and Phillips. The Basic English "get righteousness" may be a deliberate attempt to preserve the ambiguity of the Greek.

2. Literal, but equivalent to an interpretation: None.

3. Interpretative, with at least one alternative: None. As in Rom. 2:13, the English Revised and American Standard offer "justified" in the text and "accounted righteous" in the margin, but the margin would probably be taken as an explanation of the obscure term "justified," thus in effect only one interpretation being represented.

4. Interpretative, with no alternative: English Revised, Twentieth Century, American Standard, Weymouth, Goodspeed, Ballantine, Williams, Schonfield, and Lilly.

Goodspeed and Lilly have interpreted *δικαιῶ* to mean "make righteous." English Revised, Twentieth Century, American Standard, Weymouth, Ballantine, Williams, and Schonfield interpret in the forensic sense.

A number of the versions have changed from an interpretative rendering in Rom. 2:13 to the obscure "justified" here in Rom. 3:28--Wycliffe, Moffatt, Montgomery, and Verkuyl. The Basic English has changed from an interpretative "judged as having righteousness" to an ambiguous "get righteousness." Weymouth and Williams also offer different translations, but they both still represent the forensic interpretation.

Romans 4:17.--καλοῦντας τὰ μὴ ὄντα ὡς ὄντα

This ambiguous phrase is capable of at least three somewhat differ-

ent interpretations. It may be understood to mean "calling into existence things which do not exist," or "naming, speaking of things which do not exist as though they did," or "calling, summoning the non-existent as if they existed." The first of these would refer to God's creative power, the second and third to his foreknowledge.

Sanday and Headlam note that "most commentators" interpret *καλοῦντος* as "calling into being." They reject this, however, as being "too remote from the context" and state that the choice must be made between "naming," "speaking of," "describing," and "calling," "summoning," "issuing His commands to." They conclude that "if the former seems the simplest, the latter is the more forcible rendering, and as such more in keeping with the imaginative grasp of the situation displayed by St. Paul." In their paraphrase they translate, "issues His summons to generations yet unborn." Parry also opposes "calling into being things that are not," and of the other two choices he prefers "summoning to His service things that are not as though they were." He claims that "the context points" to this "fuller meaning." Gifford, Garvie, and Robertson take the same view.

Bauer, however, gives the meaning of this passage as "calls into being what does not exist." Lightfoot explains that *καλοῦντος* here means "evoking something out of nothing." Kirk states more cautiously that the participle "probably" means "calls into existence." Barrett claims that "calls into being things which do not exist" is the "only translation of Paul's words that makes sense."

Vincent recognizes the various interpretations possible and suggests that "the simplest explanation appears to be to give *καλεῖν* the

sense of nameth, speaketh of." He dismisses the interpretation "calls into being," on the basis that "it can scarcely be said that God creates things that are not as actually existing." Denney interprets similarly, "God speaks of them (hardly, issues his summons to them) as if they had a being."

The versions have translated as follows:

- Wycliffe (1382), "clepith tho thingis that ben not, as tho that ben"  
(Vulgate: "uocat ea quae non sunt, tamquam es quae sunt");
- Tyndale (1525), "calleth those thynges which be not as though they were");
- Coverdale (1535), "calleth it which is not, that it maye be" (Luther, 1524: "ruffet dem, das nicht ist, das es sey");
- Rogers (1537), same as Tyndale;
- Taverner (1539), same as Tyndale;
- Great (1539), same as Tyndale;
- Geneva (1560), same as Tyndale;
- Bishops' (1568), same as Tyndale (margin: "In the creation of the world this appeared. For when he commanded any thyng to be, foorthwith it was.");
- Rheims (1582), "calleth those things that are not, as those things that are";
- King James (1611), same as Tyndale;
- English Revised (1881), "calleth the things that are not, as though they were";
- Twentieth Century (1900), "speaks of what does not yet exist as if it did";
- American Standard (1901), same as English Revised;
- Weymouth (1903), "makes reference to things that do not exist, as though they did";
- Moffatt (1913), "calls into being what does not exist";
- Westminster (1920), "nameth things that are not as though they were"  
(margin: "'nameth,' with sure foreknowledge");

- Goodspeed (1923), same as Moffatt;
- Ballantine (1923), "calls things that are not as if they were";
- Montgomery (1924), "calls into being that which is not";
- Williams (1937), "can call to Himself the things that do not exist as though they did";
- Spencer (1937), "calls the nonexistent as though existent" (margin: "God in His eternity calls men to faith before they exist");
- Confraternity (1941), "calls things that are not as though they were";
- Basic English (1941), "to whom the things which are not are as if they were";
- Knox (1944), "send his call to that which has no being, as if it already were";
- Verkuyl (1945), "calls into existence what has no being";
- Revised Standard (1946), "calls into existence the things that do not exist";
- Phillips (1947), "can speak His Word to those who are yet unborn";
- Schonfield (1955), "the Namer of things as existing which as yet are nonexistent";
- Lilly (1956), "calls into existence what was not before."

The translations seem to come under the four classifications as follows:

1. Literal, obscure, and ambiguous: Wycliffe, Tyndale, Rogers, Taverner, Great, Geneva, Bishops', Rheims, King James, English Revised, American Standard, Ballantine, Spencer, and Confraternity. The translation "calls those things which are not as if they were," which is adopted substantially by each of these versions, would seem to incline toward the interpretation of *καλοῦντας* as "calling to himself," "summoning to service," or perhaps "naming," "speaking of," "describing." But the ambiguity of the translation adopted in these versions is illustrated by the

Bishops' marginal note, which explains that the passage refers rather to God's creative power.

2. Literal, but equivalent to an interpretation: None.
3. Interpretative, with at least one alternative: None.
4. Interpretative, with no alternative: Coverdale, Twentieth Century, Weymouth, Moffatt, Westminster, Goodspeed, Montgomery, Williams, Basic English, Knox, Verkuyl, Revised Standard, Phillips, Schonfield, and Lilly.

The participle *καλοῦντος* is interpreted as "calling into existence" by Coverdale (following Luther), Moffatt, Goodspeed, Montgomery, Verkuyl, Revised Standard, and Lilly. It is interpreted as "naming," "speaking of," "describing," by the Twentieth Century, Weymouth, Westminster, and Schonfield. The interpretation "summoning," "calling to Himself," is offered by Williams, Knox, and Phillips. The Basic English translation "to whom the things which are not are as if they were" clearly implies God's foreknowledge rather than his creative power.

Romans 4:20. -- ἐνεδυναμώθη τῇ πίστει

The dative case of *τῇ πίστει* may be interpreted as instrumental, the passage thus meaning that Abraham "was strengthened by his faith." Or it may be interpreted as dative of respect, making the passage mean that Abraham "grew strong in faith," "his faith was confirmed."

Sanday and Headlam cite both possibilities somewhat non-committally, but in their paraphrase they show a preference for the instrumental dative by translating, "his faith endowed him with the power which he seemed to lack." Parry explains that Abraham "was empowered, by his faith, to beget a son." Garvie claims that the instrumental "by faith"

is "undoubtedly to be preferred." Lightfoot states more cautiously that it is "perhaps best" to consider the dative case of  $\tau\omega\omega$   $\pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\epsilon\iota$  as instrumental. Barmby interprets, "faith made him strong." Robertson endorses the English Revised and American Standard "waxed strong through faith." Dummelow and Dodd also prefer to interpret as instrumental.

On the other hand, J. Knox, while recognizing the possibility of more than one interpretation, regards the translation "grew strong in his faith" as the "more obvious meaning." Denney also acknowledges the possibility that the phrase may mean "became strong by faith" but expresses his preference for the dative of respect. The same view is taken by Thayer, Lange, Lietzmann, Lagrange, Bauer, and Barrett.

The versions have translated as follows:

- Wycliffe (1382), "is comfortid in bileue" (Vulgate: "confortatus est fide," which presents the same ambiguity as the Greek);
- Tyndale (1525), "was made strong in the fayth";
- Coverdale (1535), "was stronge in faith" (Luther, 1524: "ward starck in glauben");
- Rogers (1537), same as Tyndale;
- Taverner (1539), same as Tyndale;
- Great (1539), "became strong in fayth";
- Geneva (1560), "was strengthened in ye faith" (changed from "was made stronge in the fayth," the same as Tyndale, in the 1557 Whittingham edition);
- Bishops' (1568), same as Coverdale;
- Rheims (1582), "was strengthened in faith";
- King James (1611), same as Coverdale;
- English Revised (1881), "waxed strong through faith";
- Twentieth Century (1900), "his faith gave him strength";

American Standard (1901), same as English Revised;  
 Weymouth (1903), "became mighty in faith" (changed to "had intense faith"  
 in the 1929 fifth edition);  
 Moffatt (1913), "his faith won strength";  
 Westminster (1920), same as Coverdale;  
 Goodspeed (1923), "his faith gave him power";  
 Ballantine (1923), same as Coverdale;  
 Montgomery (1924), "he waxed strong in faith";  
 Williams (1937), "grew powerful in faith";  
 Spencer (1937), "grew strong in his faith";  
 Confraternity (1941), same as Rheims;  
 Basic English (1941), "was made strong by faith";  
 Knox (1944), "drew strength from his faith";  
 Verkuyl (1945), "empowered by faith";  
 Revised Standard (1946), same as Spencer;  
 Phillips (1947), same as Knox;  
 Schonfield (1955), "fortified by faith";  
 Lilly (1956), same as Rheims.

The translations seem to come under the four classifications as follows:

1. Literal, obscure, and ambiguous: None.
2. Literal, but equivalent to an interpretation: None.
3. Interpretative, with at least one alternative: None.
4. Interpretative, with no alternative: All the versions included in this study.

The case of τῇ πίστει has been interpreted as instrumental dative by the English Revised, Twentieth Century, American Standard, Moffatt,



Goodspeed, Montgomery, Basic English, Knox, Verkuyl, Phillips, and Schofield. It has been interpreted as dative of respect by Wycliffe, Tyndale, Coverdale, Rogers, Taverner, Great, Geneva, Bishops', Rheims, King James, Weymouth, Westminster, Ballantine, Williams, Spencer, Confraternity, Revised Standard, and Lilly.

Romans 5:1.--εἰρήνην ἔχομεν, ἢ εἰρήνην ἔχωμεν

Although this is a problem of textual criticism, the choice is largely one of interpretation.

There has been much difference of opinion as to whether the context requires the indicative ἔχομεν, as a statement that peace is possessed as a result of justification, or the subjunctive ἔχωμεν, as an exhortation to have peace now that justification has been experienced. Among versions which have chosen the subjunctive reading, some have translated ἔχωμεν somewhat ambiguously as "let us have," which may be taken to mean either "let us begin to have," or "let us go on having." Others have sought to avoid this ambiguity in the English by such interpretative translations as "let us enjoy peace," or more clearly, "let us enjoy the peace we have." J. H. Moulton, in his *Prolegomena*, translates, "let us enjoy the possession of peace," a rendering subsequently adopted by C. F. D. Moule. Such emphasis on the continuous action implied by the present tense of ἔχωμεν actually results in a combination of the hortatory subjunctive with the meaning of the indicative.

Evidence supporting the indicative includes the correctors of uncials  $\aleph$  and B, 0220, G, P, most cursives, the Didache, Epiphanius, and Cyril of Alexandria (usually). Evidence supporting the subjunctive includes uncials  $\aleph$ , A, B, C, D, E, K, L, some cursives, the Vulgate,

Syriac, Bohairic, Armenian, and Ethiopic versions, Origen (Latin), Chrysostom (usually), Ambrosiaster, and others.

Nestle, in his twenty-first edition, decides against Westcott and Hort and Tischendorf in favor of the indicative. Garvie observes that while the external evidence is "overwhelmingly" for the subjunctive, the internal evidence seems to be "as strongly" for the indicative. Denney decidedly favors the indicative and urges that "in a variation of this kind no degree of MS. authority could support a reading against a solid exegetical reason for changing  $\omega$  to  $\sigma$ . That such solid reason can be given here I agree with the expositors named below." He lists Meyer, Weiss, Lipsius, Godet, and others. Barrett also prefers the indicative, on the basis that "the context is not hortatory, but indicative." Nevertheless, he admits that the textual support for the subjunctive is "so strong that a measure of doubt will always remain."

Field points rather to the continual confusion of  $\sigma$  and  $\omega$ , "even in the best manuscripts," to support his contention that it is "hardly within the competence of manuscripts to decide (especially against the strongest internal evidence) between such variants." Thayer, Vincent, Stephens, Bosworth, and Boylan also prefer the indicative. Nygren cites with approval Lietzmann's judgment that "only  $\acute{\epsilon}\chi\theta\mu\epsilon\nu$  gives Paul's real meaning." J. Knox admits that the textual evidence is "strongly" on the side of the subjunctive yet favors "we have peace" on exegetical grounds. Theissen goes so far as to claim that the "indicative can be defended on external and internal evidence." McClellan, in a criticism of the English Revised Version, condemns the 1881 decision in favor of the subjunctive as "one of the very worst of the Revisers' alterations." He claims that "the

context is decisive against this change, which vitiates S. Paul's argument, and introduces a serious error of doctrine."<sup>1</sup>

On the contrary, Robertson asserts that ἔχωμεν "is the correct text beyond a doubt . . . . It is curious how perverse many real scholars have been on this word and phrase here." Lightfoot states summarily that "if external authority is to be regarded," the subjunctive is "unquestionably the right reading." Sanday and Headlam, Lagrange, and Hastings also prefer ἔχωμεν on purely textual grounds.

J. H. Moulton, in his Prolegomena, refers to the "overwhelming manuscript authority" but adds that, inasmuch as ο and ω were no longer distinct in pronunciation by the time the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus manuscripts were copied, the modern expositor of this verse "feels himself entirely at liberty to decide according to his view of the context." Moulton's own view of the context led him to choose the subjunctive. Subsequent study, however, of evidence presented by Thackeray,<sup>1</sup> demonstrating the rarity of confusion of ο and ω in the principal Septuagint uncials convinced him that the interpretation of Rom. 5:1 cannot rest upon the assumption of itacism. Consequently, in the second volume of his Grammar he modifies the freedom he earlier claimed for the modern editor, and, even against the respectfully acknowledged opposition of Kennedy, Harris, and Deissmann, reaffirms his preference for the subjunctive--now on textual as well as contextual grounds.

Kennedy speaks of the fact that "some modern commentators have

<sup>1</sup>J. B. McClellan, "The Revised Version of the New Testament, a Plea for Hesitation as to its Adoption," The Expositor, Vol. X (1904), p. 190.

<sup>2</sup>H. St. John Thackeray, A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1909), pp. 89-91.

strained the sense of the passage to suit  $\epsilon\chi\omega\mu\epsilon\nu$  and adds, "We regret to find that Dr. Moulton joins them."<sup>1</sup> Harris claims that the problem here is "a mere itacism ( $\omega$  for  $o$ )" and that the hortatory sense is "impossible."<sup>2</sup>

Gifford lists many scholars on either side of the question and concludes: "Without presuming to decide between such accomplished critics, we are bound to express our opinion that the internal grounds of objection to  $\epsilon\chi\omega\mu\epsilon\nu$  are not sufficient to outweigh the great preponderance of external testimony in its favour." But he recommends that "in a case where scholars of the greatest authority differ so widely, we think it better to retain in our footnotes and revised version the reading of the received text."

The versions have translated as follows:

Wycliffe (1382), "we . . . haue pees" (Vulgate: "pacem habeamus");  
 Tyndale (1525), "we are at peace";  
 Coverdale (1535), same as Wycliffe (Luther, 1524: "haben wir frid");  
 Rogers (1537), same as Tyndale;  
 Taverner (1539), same as Tyndale;  
 Great (1539), same as Tyndale;  
 Geneva (1560), same as Wycliffe;  
 Bishops' (1568), same as Tyndale;  
 Rheims (1582), "let us have peace" (There is a long marginal note explaining, among other considerations of doctrinal interest, that "diverse

---

<sup>1</sup>H. A. A. Kennedy, a note on Romans 5:1 in The Expository Times, Vol. XVII (July, 1906), p. 451.

<sup>2</sup>Rendel Harris, a note on Romans 5:1 in The Expositor, Vol. VIII, No. 8 (1914), p. 527.

- also of the Greeke Doctors" read "Let us have peace." Recognition is also given to the alternative, "We have peace.");
- King James (1611), same as Wycliffe;
- English Revised (1881), same as Rheims (margin: "Some authorities read we have.");
- Twentieth Century (1900), "let us enjoy peace";
- American Standard (1901), same as Wycliffe (margin: "Many ancient authorities read let us have.");
- Weymouth (1903), same as Twentieth Century (margin: "v.l. 'we have peace.'");
- Moffatt (1913), "let us enjoy the peace we have";
- Westminster (1920), same as Rheims;
- Goodspeed (1923), "let us live in peace";
- Ballantine (1923), same as Rheims;
- Montgomery (1924), "let us continue to enjoy the peace we have";
- Williams (1937), "let us continue enjoying peace" (margin: "Lit., holding or having, so enjoying.");
- Spencer (1937), same as Wycliffe;
- Confraternity (1941), same as Rheims;
- Basic English (1941), "let us be at peace with God";
- Knox (1944), same as Twentieth Century (margin: "Some Greek manuscripts have 'we enjoy' for 'let us enjoy.'");
- Verkuyl (1945), same as Twentieth Century;
- Revised Standard (1946), same as Wycliffe (margin: "Or let us");
- Phillips (1947), "let us grasp the fact that we have peace";
- Schonfield (1955), "we enjoy peace";
- Lilly (1956), same as Rheims.

The translations seem to come under the four classifications as follows:

1. Literal, obscure, and ambiguous: None.

2. Literal, but equivalent to an interpretation: None. In view of the Rheims note, it may be assumed that the translators of the Protestant versions were not unaware that "diverse also of the Greeke Doctors" read "Let us have peace" and that consequently they must have made a decision against the subjunctive.

3. Interpretative, with at least one alternative: Rheims, English Revised, American Standard, Weymouth, Knox, and Revised Standard.

4. Interpretative, with no alternative: Wycliffe, Tyndale, Coverdale, Rogers, Taverner, Great, Geneva, Bishops', King James, Twentieth Century, Moffatt, Westminster, Goodspeed, Ballantine, Montgomery, Williams, Spencer, Confraternity, Basic English, Verkuyl, Phillips, Schonfield, and Lilly.

The indicative mode has been preferred by Wycliffe (apparently departing from the subjunctive mode of the Latin "habeamus"), Tyndale, Coverdale, Rogers, Taverner, Great, Geneva, Bishops', King James, American Revised, Spencer, Revised Standard, and Schonfield. The subjunctive has been preferred by the Rheims, English Revised, Twentieth Century, Weymouth, Moffatt, Westminster, Goodspeed, Ballantine, Montgomery, Williams, Confraternity, Basic English, Knox, Verkuyl, Phillips, and Lilly. Of the latter, Moffatt, Montgomery, Williams, and Phillips have clearly emphasized the continuous action implied by the present tense of ἔχωμεν.

Romans 5:18.--ἐνὸς παραπτώματος

The gender of ἐνός may be either masculine, referring to Adam, or neuter, modifying παραπτώματος. Taken as masculine, both here with παρα-

ππτώματος and in the following clause with δικαϊώματος, the contrast in this verse would be between Adam and Christ as two agents, Adam of condemnation, Christ of justification. Taken as neuter in each case, the contrast would be between two acts, from which condemnation and justification have resulted.

J. Knox recognizes the problem but ventures no opinion. Kirk maintains that "the problem of interpretation is not unimportant" and claims that the argument in favor of the rendering "the trespass of one . . . the act of one" is "overwhelming." Hodge, Parry, Bosworth, Boylan, Zahn, and Kittel also prefer to interpret ἐνός as masculine.

On the other hand, Schaff prefers to interpret ἐνός as neuter, arguing that the absence of the article before ἐνός is "almost conclusive" against regarding it as masculine. He adds that "the objection that the comparison is between Adam and Christ, rather than between the fall of one and the righteousness of another, does not hold, for it is clearly a comparison of both persons and effects."

Sanday and Headlam recommend that "it is best to follow the natural construction of the Greek and make ἐνός neuter in agreement with παραπτώματος rather than masculine." They translate, "a single Fall." Denney regards this interpretation as "the simplest." Gifford, Vincent, Lightfoot, Robertson, and Barrett also prefer the neuter.

The versions have translated as follows:

Wycliffe (1382), "the gilt of oon" (Vulgate: "unius delictum");  
 Tyndale (1525), "the synne of one" (Luther, 1524: "eins sünd");  
 Coverdale (1535), same as Tyndale;  
 Rogers (1537), same as Tyndale;

Taverner (1539), same as Tyndale;  
 Great (1539), same as Tyndale;  
 Geneva (1560), "the offence of one";  
 Bishops' (1568), same as Tyndale;  
 Rheims (1582), same as Geneva;  
 King James (1611), same as Geneva (margin: "Or, one offence");  
 English Revised (1881), "one trespass";  
 Twentieth Century (1900), "a single offence";  
 American Standard (1901), same as English Revised;  
 Weymouth (1903), "a single transgression";  
 Moffatt (1913), "one man's trespass";  
 Westminster (1920), same as King James (margin);  
 Goodspeed (1923), same as King James (margin);  
 Ballantine (1923), "one fall";  
 Montgomery (1924), "the transgression of one man";  
 Williams (1937), same as King James (margin);  
 Spencer (1937), "the transgression of one";  
 Confraternity (1941), "the offense of the one man";  
 Basic English (1941), "one act of wrongdoing";  
 Knox (1944), "one man's fault";  
 Verkuy1 (1945), "the one fall";  
 Revised Standard (1946), same as Moffatt;  
 Phillips (1947), "one act of sin";  
 Schonfield (1955), same as Weymouth;  
 Lilly (1956), same as Confraternity.

The translations seem to come under the four classifications as follows:



1. Literal, obscure, and ambiguous: None.
2. Literal, but equivalent to an interpretation: Wycliffe, Rheims, Confraternity, and Knox, following the Vulgate interpretation, "unius delictum."
3. Interpretative, with at least one alternative: King James.
4. Interpretative, with no alternative: All versions other than Wycliffe, Rheims, King James, Confraternity, and Knox.

The gender of *ἑνός* is interpreted as masculine by Tyndale, Coverdale, Rogers, Taverner, Great, Geneva, Bishops', King James, Moffatt, Montgomery, Spencer, Revised Standard, and Lilly. The masculine also appears in Wycliffe, Rheims, Confraternity, and Knox, following the Latin. The gender of *ἑνός* is taken as neuter by the King James (margin), English Revised, Twentieth Century, American Standard, Weymouth, Westminster, Goodspeed, Ballantine, Williams, Basic English, Verkuyl, Phillips, and Schonfield.

Romans 5:18.--*ἑνὸς δικαίωματος*

In this context, the noun *δικαίωμα* may be interpreted to mean "act of righteousness" or "sentence of acquittal." It is generally agreed that the same word, as used in Rom. 5:16, means "justification," "justifying decree." But there has been considerable difference of opinion as to whether or not *δικαίωμα* should be given the same meaning here in Rom. 5:18. Is Paul saying that "justification and life" are the result of "one man's act of righteousness" or of "one sentence of acquittal"? Some who prefer to interpret *δικαίωμα* as "righteous act" see in this a special sense of "the making right of what is wrong," "an act of redress." This raises the further question as to whether Paul is re-

ferring to Christ's "act of redress" or God's "justifying decree."

Kirk states that "act of righteousness . . . seems to be the true meaning." He concedes that *δικαίωμα* here could mean "act of acquittal," "justifying act," but he describes the interpretation "an act of redress" as the "intrusion of an exact Greek ethico-legal idea" and therefore "unlikely." Parry admits that the phrase may "possibly" mean "one man's acquittal" but argues that "the antithesis to *παράπτωμα*, and the parallel with *τῆς ὑπακοῆς* suggest the rendering 'righteous act' or 'enacted righteousness.'"

J. Knox discusses the problem in some detail and favors "act of righteousness," meaning "Christ's act of perfect obedience." Denney claims that the translation "a righteous act" "seems to be required by the contrast with *παράπτωμα*." Barrett also argues for "one act of righteousness" and explains that as used here in contrast to *παράπτωμα* it cannot mean "justification." Kittel likewise favors "righteous act," the "perfect realization of the will of God." He states that it cannot mean "sentence of justification." The same view is held by Lange, Schaff, Thayer, Vincent, Lightfoot, Bosworth, Lietzmann, Lagrange, Robertson, Abbott-Smith, and Bauer.

On the other hand, Sanday and Headlam argue that "it seems better" to give the same sense to *δικαίωμα* here in Rom. 5:18 as in Rom. 5:16. They interpret, "a single absolving act," "the decision or sentence by which persons are declared *δίκαιοι*," adding that this may be used in the antithesis with *παράπτωμα* "as naturally" as the alternative "one righteous act." Dummelow interprets "sentence of acquittal"; Gifford, "justificatory sentence"; Garvie, "the Divine sentence of justification pro-

nounced on the race." Meyer takes a similar view.

Dodd prefers "one man's act of redress," supporting Moffatt's translation.

The versions have translated as follows:

- Wycliffe (1382), "the riztwysnesse of oon" (Vulgate: "unius iustitiam");
- Tyndale (1525), "the iustifyinge of one";
- Coverdale (1535), same as Wycliffe (Luther, 1524: "eines rechtfertigkeit"; changed in the 1534 edition to "eines gerechtigkeit");
- Rogers (1537), same as Tyndale;
- Taverner (1539), same as Tyndale;
- Great (1539), same as Wycliffe;
- Geneva (1560), same as Tyndale;
- Bishops' (1568), same as Wycliffe;
- Rheims (1582), "the iustice of one";
- King James (1611), same as Wycliffe (margin: "Or, by one righteousnesse");
- English Revised (1881), "one act of righteousness";
- Twentieth Century (1900), "a single decree setting men right with God" (changed to "a single decree of righteousness," the same as Weymouth, 1903, in the 1904 final edition);
- American Standard (1901), same as English Revised;
- Weymouth (1903), "a single decree of righteousness" (changed to "a single deed of righteousness" in the 1929 fifth edition);
- Moffatt (1913), "one man's act of redress";
- Westminster (1920), "a single justifying act";
- Goodspeed (1923), "one righteous act";
- Ballantine (1923), same as Goodspeed;
- Montgomery (1924), "the act of righteousness of One";
- Williams (1937), "one act of uprightness";

Spencer (1937), "the righteousness of One";  
 Confraternity (1941), "the justice of the one";  
 Basic English (1941), same as English Revised;  
 Knox (1944), "one man makes amends";  
 Verkuyl (1945), same as Goodspeed (a marginal note explaining that this means "Christ's self-sacrifice");  
 Revised Standard (1946), "one man's act of righteousness";  
 Phillips (1947), "one Man's obedience";  
 Schonfield (1955), "a single worthy action";  
 Lilly (1956), "the one's fulfilment of a mandate."

The translations seem to come under the four classifications as follows:

1. Literal, obscure, and ambiguous: None.
2. Literal, but equivalent to an interpretation: Wycliffe, Rheims, and Confraternity, all following the Vulgate interpretation "unius iustitiam."
3. Interpretative, with at least one alternative: None.
4. Interpretative, with no alternative: All versions except Wycliffe, Rheims, and Confraternity.

Of the versions offering deliberately interpretative translations, *δικαιοσύνη* is interpreted to mean "act of righteousness," "righteousness," by Coverdale, Great, Bishops', King James, English Revised, American Standard, Weymouth (1929), Goodspeed, Ballantine, Montgomery, Williams, Spencer, Basic English, Verkuyl, Revised Standard, Phillips, Schonfield, and Lilly. It is interpreted to mean "justifying act," "decree of righteousness," by Tyndale, Rogers, Taverner, Geneva, Twentieth Century, Weymouth (1903), and Westminster. It is interpreted as Christ's

"act of redress" by Moffatt, and evidently this is also the meaning of Knox in his translation "one man makes amends."

Romans 7:21.--εὐρίσκω ἔργα τὸν νόμον

The precise meaning of τὸν νόμον in this context is not readily apparent. It has been interpreted as the Mosaic law, as a rule or general principle, or as "a constant pattern of experience."

Gifford describes this as an "obscure and much disputed passage . . . regarded by Chrysostom and the Greek Fathers as 'a dark saying.'" He notes that the verse is "given up" by some modern commentators as "hopelessly unintelligible." Meyer, however, argues that the article requires that τὸν νόμον be interpreted as the law of Moses. Lange and Riddle prefer "a general rule," "a law of moral contradiction," and regard Meyer's exposition as "forced" and "thoroughly untenable." Garvie sees two possibilities for the passage: "I find in regard to the Mosaic law," or "I find a constraining principle." He states his preference for the latter as doing "less violence to the grammatical structure of the sentence."

Denney considers the modern sense of "a law of experience" as "most unlikely for Paul" and expresses his agreement with those who take τὸν νόμον as the Mosaic law. Parry favors "this law of my condition" but admits that this "new sense of the word" involves "some confusion of language." Consequently, he concedes the possibility that Paul may be speaking here of the law of God. "This is strained, but diminishes the confusion." Thayer lists νόμος in this verse as meaning the law of Moses.

On the contrary, Lightfoot states definitely that τὸν νόμον "has nothing to do with the Mosaic Law . . . It is 'the law of my being.'"

J. Knox interprets, "a rule, a constant pattern"; Vincent, "the constant rule of experience imposing itself on the will"; Kirk, "the general principle"; Bauer, "a norm," "a rule," "a principle"; Boylan, "a norm," "a sort of fixed law"; Bosworth, "an established order"; Robertson, "a principle at work"; Barrett, "a law-like rule"; Lietzmann, "eine 'gesetz-mässig Regel.'"

Sanday and Headlam prefer "this rule," "this constraining principle" but reject "this constantly recurring experience" as "too modern." In their paraphrase they interpret, "I find therefore this law--if so it may be called." They claim that the "many commentators, from Chrysostom onwards" who have tried to make τὸν νόμον mean the Mosaic law have either "read into the passage more than the context will allow" or have given to the sentence "a construction which is linguistically intolerable." They regard the "best attempt in this direction" as "probably" that of Vaughan, who translates, "I find then with regard to the Law."

The versions have translated as follows:

Wycliffe (1382), "Therefore I fynde a lawe to me" (One manuscript of Wycliffe has "the lawe," and this is the reading adopted in the 1388 Purvey revision. The translation of the rest of the verse in both these versions is so obscure that it seems impossible to tell what is meant by "a lawe" or "the lawe." Vulgate: "Inuenio igitur legem," which is as ambiguous as the Greek);

Tyndale (1525), "I fynde then by the lawe" (Luther, 1524: "So finde ich nun ein gesetze mir"; cf. Vulgate);

Coverdale (1535), "Thus fynde I now by the lawe";

Rogers (1537), same as Tyndale;

Taverner (1539), same as Tyndale;

Great (1539), same as Tyndale;

Geneva (1560), "I finde then by the Law" ("The lawe of my mynde" is not capitalized in verse 23.);

Bishops' (1568), same as Tyndale (The law of God is not capitalized anywhere in this chapter.);

Rheims (1582), "I find therefore, the Law" (changed in the 1749 Challoner edition to the same as King James, but with "law" not capitalized. The translation of the whole verse in the 1582 Rheims is quite obscure, but inasmuch as "law" is not capitalized in verse 23, it may be assumed that the capitalized "the Law" here in verse 21 means that "legem" is being interpreted as the Mosaic law.);

King James (1611), "I find then a Law" (The capitalized "law" evidently does not mean the Mosaic law, for "law" is also capitalized throughout verse 23. "Law" is not capitalized in verse 21 in the 1769 Blayney edition, the same as Challoner.);

English Revised (1881), "I find then the law" (margin: "Or, in regard of the law");

Twentieth Century (1900), "This, then, is the law I find";

American Standard (1901), same as English Revised (margin: "Or, in regard of the law. Cf. ver. 12, 14");

Weymouth (1903), "I find therefore the law of my nature to be" (margin: "Or 'rule.'" Changed to "I find therefore this rule" in the 1929 fifth edition);

Moffatt (1913), "So this is my experience of the Law";

Westminster (1920), "I find, then, this law";

Goodspeed (1923), "I find the law to be" (clearly not meaning the Mosaic law, as shown by the translation of the rest of the sentence);

Ballantine (1923), "I find then this rule";

Montgomery (1924), same as Westminster;

Williams (1937), "So I find this law";

Spencer (1937), "I discover then this law";

Confraternity (1941), "I discover this law";

Basic English (1941), "So I see a law";

Knox (1944), "This, then, is what I find about the law";

Verkuyl (1945), "Consequently I discover the Law" (evidently meaning the Mosaic law, as shown by the translation of the rest of the verse);

Revised Standard (1946), "So I find it to be a law";

Phillips (1947), "When I come up against the Law";

Schonfield (1955), "I discover therefore the law" (the translation of the rest of the verse making it clear that this does not refer to the Mosaic law);

Lilly (1956), "I discover this to be the rule."

The translations seem to come under the four classifications as follows:

1. Literal, obscure, and ambiguous: Wycliffe and Purvey. It may be that there was some attempt at interpretation in these versions, as suggested by the change from "a law" in Wycliffe to "the law" in Purvey. But both readings seem to be none the less obscure.

2. Literal, but equivalent to an interpretation: None.

3. Interpretative, with at least one alternative: English Revised and American Standard.

4. Interpretative, with no alternative: Tyndale, Coverdale, Rogers, Taverner, Great, Geneva, Bishops', Rheims, King James, Twentieth Century, Moffatt, Westminster, Goodspeed, Ballantine, Montgomery, Williams, Spencer, Confraternity, Basic English, Knox, Verkuyl, Revised Standard, Phillips, Schonfield, and Lilly.

Of the versions offering interpretative translations, τὸν νόμον is understood as the Mosaic law by Tyndale, Coverdale, Rogers, Taverner, Great, Geneva, Bishops', Rheims, English Revised (margin), American Standard (margin), Moffatt, Knox, Verkuyl, and Phillips. The interpretation "law" or "rule" in the sense of "principle" is offered in the King James, Challoner, English Revised, Twentieth Century, American Standard, Westminster, Goodspeed, Ballantine, Montgomery, Williams, Spencer, Confraternity, Basic English, Revised Standard, Schonfield, and Lilly.



Romans 7:25.--'Ἄρα οὖν αὐτὸς ἐγὼ τῷ μὲν νοῦ δουλεύω νόμῳ θεοῦ

The meaning of this passage, and particularly its connection with the rest of the chapter, has been one of the most discussed problems in the whole epistle and the subject of prolonged theological controversy. The solution depends largely upon the decision as to whether Paul's description of inner conflict refers to the experience of an unregenerate but enlightened sinner, an enlightened sinner in process of being regenerated, or a regenerate believer in process of being sanctified.

Some commentators and translators understand the second half of Rom. 7:25 as referring back to the previously described conflict of an unregenerate person. This has led some to regard this part of verse 25 as having been misplaced by some early corruption of the text, and they recommend that it be restored to its original position after verse 23 and before Paul's exclamation of thankfulness for deliverance. Others indicate the same connection between the last part of verse 25 and verse 23 by placing verse 24 and the first part of verse 25 in parentheses.

Others, who similarly interpret the conflict as that of an unregenerate person, prefer to leave these words in their traditional position and lay stress rather on the emphatic αὐτὸς ἐγώ, translating "I of myself," meaning "left to my own resources, without Christ in the picture." Still others, who place the same interpretation on the description of conflict in Rom. 7:14-24, regard the last part of verse 25 as definitely in its original and logical position and understand it as an honest recognition of the continuing struggle common to every believer after conversion.

Yet others, however, regard the conflict of Rom. 7 as being that

of a regenerate Christian. This has led to two other recommended interpretations. One is to translate  $\alphaὐτὸς \acute{\epsilon}\gamma\acute{\omega}$  as "I of myself," "I left to myself," and interpret the passage as describing the experience of a believer who, although enjoying the deliverance expressed in verse 24, at times attempts to live apart from Christ. The other is to take the last part of verse 25 as a concluding summary of the believer's conflict and to translate  $\alphaὐτὸς \acute{\epsilon}\gamma\acute{\omega}$  as "I myself," thus identifying emphatically the regenerate struggler described in verses 14-24 with the still struggling saint of verse 25.

Dodd believes that these verses describe Paul's experience "before Damascus" and agrees with Moffatt that the second half of verse 25 should be put back in "its proper place" after verse 23 and before the expression of thanksgiving. Parry commends the suggestion of Weiss that "there has been a primitive transposition of text." He argues that verse 24 would come "most properly" after the summary of the "all but desperate situation" expressed in verse 25. Lightfoot agrees that the thanksgiving seems to be "out of place." Bosworth regards the first part of verse 25 as parenthetical.

Sanday and Headlam leave the last part of verse 25 in its traditional position and interpret it as "a terse compressed summary of the previous paragraph . . . describing in two strokes the state of things prior to the intervention of Christ." The same view is taken by Barmby, Denney, Dummelow, Robertson, and Boylan, Denney explaining that "I myself" means "I, leaving Jesus Christ our Lord out of the question." Clarke also regards these words as describing Paul's unregenerate state and warns that to say that the apostle is speaking of his experience

after conversion "would be monstrous and absurd, if not blasphemous."

Gifford urges that "it is better to keep the order of the original, which puts the emphasis on  $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma \acute{\epsilon}\gamma\acute{\omega}$ ." He regards the passage as a description of the conflict of a person "in the process of regeneration." Garvie interprets it as "an admission by Paul that the deliverance in Christ has not yet been completed, and that the inward conflict, though in modified form, still continues." Lange takes a similar view. J. Knox understands the second half of verse 25 as representing a hope "already beginning to be fulfilled" but with the ultimate fulfilment "still largely in the future." He regards the interpretation "I of myself," or "I left to myself," as "probably correct" but concedes that Paul "may again be identifying his essential self (I myself) with the mind, or 'inner man.'" "

Nygren and Barrett both regard verses 14-25 as describing the experience of a Christian, a view held by a number of the older conservative commentators. (Note, however, Clarke's view to the contrary, cited above.) Sadler claims that in the light of the context "this place has a very simple meaning." "It means that the mind or spirit is renewed, and that the body, even of the apostle, continues unrenewed." Jacobs interprets similarly, "so far as the 'flesh' still remains, viz. so far as his nature has not been entirely pervaded by the sanctifying influence of the Holy Spirit--but only so far--the regenerate man serves sin." Barnes explains that this condition described in the last half of verse 25 is "a characteristic of the renewed nature. Of no impenitent sinner could it be ever affirmed that with his mind he served the law of God." He translates  $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma \acute{\epsilon}\gamma\acute{\omega}$  literally as "I myself," meaning "still the same person, though

acting in this apparently contradictory manner." Jamieson, Fausset and Brown interpret, "God's holy law is dear to my renewed mind."

The versions have translated as follows:

Wycliffe (1382), "therfore I my silf by resoun of the soule serue to the lawe of God" (changed to "therfor I my silf by the soule serue to the lawe of God" in the 1388 Purvey revision. Vulgate: "Igitur ego ipse mente seruiio legi Dei");

Tyndale (1525), "So then I my silfe in my mynde serve the lawe off God";

Coverdale (1535), "So then with the mynde I serve ye lawe of God"  
(Luther, 1524: "So diene ich nun mit dem gemüt dem gesetz gottes");

Rogers (1537), same as Tyndale;

Taverner (1539), "So then the selfe same I in my mynde serve the lawe of God";

Great (1539), "So then, with the mynde I serve the lawe of God";

Geneva (1560), "Then I my self in my minde serve the Law of God" (A note explains that the mind is "that part which is regenerate," while the flesh is "the part corrupted." A 1562 printing has "degenerate" instead of "regenerate"!);

Bishops' (1568), "So then, with the mynde I my selfe serve the lawe of God";

Rheims (1582), "Therefore I my self with the minde serve the law of God";

King James (1611), same as Bishops';

English Revised (1881), "So then, I myself with the mind serve the law of God";

Twentieth Century (1900), "So then, with my reason I myself submit to the Law of God" (changed to "Well then, for myself, with my reason I serve the law of God" in the 1904 final edition);

American Standard (1901), "So then I of myself with the mind, indeed, serve the law of God";

Weymouth (1903), "To sum up then, with my understanding, I--my true self --am in servitude to the law of God" (changed to "So then I myself serve with my understanding the law of God" in the 1929 fifth edition);

Moffatt (1913), "(Thus, left to myself, I serve the law of God with my

mind)" (margin: "Restoring the second part of ver. 25 to what seems its original and logical position before the climax of ver. 24." Evidently Dr. Moffatt subsequently became more strongly convinced of the correctness of this interpretation, for the qualifying "what seems" is dropped in the 1935 final edition.);

Westminster (1920), "So then, one and the same self, with my mind I serve the law of God";

Goodspeed (1923), "So mentally I am a slave to God's law";

Ballantine (1923), "So then I myself with my mind serve the Law of God";

Montgomery (1924), "So then I myself in my will am in thralldom to the law of God";

Williams (1937), "So in my higher nature I am a slave to the law of God";

Spencer (1937), "So then I myself, while I serve with my mind the law of God";

Confraternity (1941), "Therefore I myself with my mind serve the law of God";

Basic English (1941), "So with my mind I am a servant to the law of God";

Knox (1944), "If I am left to myself, my conscience is at God's disposition";

Verkuyl (1945), "So then, with my heart I serve God's law" (margin: "In the normal person one ego is usually dominant, the innermost self. In the Christian this is the Christ-controlled self.");

Revised Standard (1946), "So then, I of myself serve the law of God with my mind";

Phillips (1947), "In my mind I am God's willing servant" (with the second half of verse 25 placed between verses 23 and 24);

Schonfield (1955), "So there it is, I myself intellectually am bound to God's law" (with the second half of verse 25 placed between verses 23 and 24);

Lilly (1956), "So then, I by myself with my mind serve the Law of God" (The marginal note explains that Paul is here describing the "inner struggle which goes on in all human beings between the lower, sensual nature and the higher aspirations of the soul.").

The translations seem to come under the four classifications as follows:

1. Literal, obscure, and ambiguous: Wycliffe, Tyndale, Coverdale, Rogers, Taverner, Great, Geneva, Bishops', Rheims, King James, English Revised, Twentieth Century, Weymouth (1929), Westminster, Goodspeed, Ballantine, Montgomery, Williams, Spencer, Confraternity, Basic English, and Verkuyl. Taverner and Westminster have interpreted to the extent of translating "the selfe same I" and "one and the same self" respectively, but the resulting translations still seem to be too ambiguous to be classified as interpretative renderings.

2. Literal, but equivalent to an interpretation: None.

3. Interpretative, with at least one alternative: None.

4. Interpretative, with no alternative: American Standard, Weymouth (1903), Moffatt, Knox, Revised Standard, Phillips, Schonfield, and Lilly.

Of the versions offering interpretative translations, Moffatt, Phillips, and Schonfield place the second half of verse 25 between verses 23 and 24. In addition Moffatt encloses the transferred phrase in parentheses and translates  $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma \epsilon\gamma\acute{\omega}$ , "left to myself." Thus these three versions seem to represent the struggle of Rom. 7 as a pre-conversion experience.

The American Standard, Revised Standard, Knox, and Lilly (besides Moffatt) translate  $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma \epsilon\gamma\acute{\omega}$  "I of myself," "I by myself," "I left to myself," indicating that this is the struggle of a person who attempts to achieve righteousness apart from Christ. Weymouth (1903) translates  $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma \epsilon\gamma\acute{\omega}$  "I--my true self," and his use of the introductory words "To sum up then" shows that he regards the last half of verse 25 as a summary of the struggle described in verses 14-24. None of these versions, however,

clearly indicates whether the struggle is that of a regenerate or unregenerate person.

Romans 8:3.--καὶ περὶ ἁμαρτίας

This phrase is capable of two main interpretations. *περὶ ἁμαρτίας* may be understood in a very general sense as "for sin," "concerning sin," "on account of sin." This in turn has been interpreted broadly to include every sense in which the life and death of Christ were related to sin, or more specifically to mean "to deal with sin," or even more specifically "to atone for sin." Or Paul may have intended the words to be understood in their technical Septuagint sense of "sin offering."

A third interpretation was found by some of the older commentators and translators by coupling *καὶ περὶ ἁμαρτίας* with the remaining words of the sentence and translating the passage "and by sin he condemned sin in the flesh." The meaning of this rendering seems quite obscure, and modern scholarship has eliminated the construction as linguistically impossible. It appears, however, in the Latin Vulgate, and is adopted by Luther and Tyndale, thus influencing a number of subsequent versions.

C. F. D. Moule admits that "it is not certain" whether *περὶ ἁμαρτίας* should be translated "sin offering" or "to deal with sin, in connection with sin." J. Knox expresses the same uncertainty. Parry, however, thinks it "probable" that there is a "direct allusion" here to the sin offering. Kirk agrees that this is a "very probable meaning." Dummelow likewise prefers "as an offering for sin." Denney regards this translation as "legitimate, but not formally necessary."

On the contrary, Bosworth considers "as a sacrifice for sin" "un-

justified in this context" and recommends "to do something about sin." Gifford also claims that "an exclusive reference to sacrifice is not permitted by the context." He prefers "the more comprehensive meaning 'for sin.'" Weiss urges that "it is impossible to think here of expiating sin [die Sünde zu sühnen], because only the removal of the power of sin [Sündenmacht] belongs to the context."

Garvie admits the possibility of the interpretation "as a sin offering" but explains that "the context seems to require a wider reference." Barrett likewise recognizes the possible allusion to the sin offering but thinks it on the whole more probable that Paul means nothing more precise than "concerning sin." Robertson understands these words to be a "condensed phrase" implying that "God sent his Son also concerning sin (our sin)." Boylan translates, "to deal with Sin, to overcome Sin." Vincent explains that "the preposition expresses the whole relation of the mission of Christ to sin." Sanday and Headlam state that the phrase should not be "specially limited" to the sense of "sin offering." "It includes every sense in which the Incarnation and Death of Christ had relation to, and had it for their object to remove, human sin." Bauer explains that when used with *ἀμαρτία, περί* has the sense of "zur Fortschaffung, zur Sühnung." Abel translates, "au sujet du péché," "à cause du péché"; Lietzmann, "um der Sünde Willen."

The versions have translated as follows:

Wycliffe (1382), "of the synne" (changed to "and of synne" in the 1388 Purvey revision. Vulgate: "de peccato");

Tyndale (1525), "and by synne" (Luther, 1524: "durch sünd");

Coverdale (1535), same as Tyndale;

Rogers (1537), same as Tyndale;



Taverner (1539), same as Tyndale;

Great (1539), same as Tyndale (In all the versions cited so far, including Luther, these words are connected with the succeeding phrase, "he condemned sin.");

Geneva (1560), "and for sinne," (The punctuation indicates connection with the preceding phrase. Margin: "Or, by sinne.");

Bishops' (1568), "even by sinne," (margin: "God, thorow the sacrifice of synne, which Christ . . . offered upon ye crosse . . . hath condempned and abolished sin." Although the words "even by sinne" are enclosed within commas, the sense still seems to be that "by sin he condemned sin.");

Rheims (1582), "even of sinne" (The connection is with "he condemned." This is changed to "and of sin," in the 1749 Challoner edition, the punctuation indicating connection with the preceding phrase.);

King James (1611), "and for sinne" (margin: "Or, by a sacrifice for sin," as explained in the Bishops' margin. There is a comma before "and for sinne." In the 1769 Blayney edition the comma has been moved to the end of the phrase, thus changing the connection to the preceding part of the sentence.);

English Revised (1881), "and as an offering for sin" (margin: "Or, and for sin");

Twentieth Century (1900), "to stone for sin";

American Standard (1901), "and for sin" (margin: "Or, and as an offering for sin");

Weymouth (1903), "as a sacrifice for sin" (changed to "to deal with sin" in the 1929 fifth edition);

Moffatt (1913), "to deal with sin";

Westminster (1920), "as a sin-offering" (margin: "so the words are used constantly in the Greek Old Testament");

Goodspeed (1923), same as Westminster;

Ballantine (1923), "for sin";

Montgomery (1924), "on account of sin";

Williams (1937), same as Weymouth (1903);

Spencer (1937), "in reparation for sin";

Confraternity (1941), same as Westminster;

Basic English (1941), "as an offering for sin";

Knox (1944), "to make amends for our guilt";

Verkuyyl (1945), same as Montgomery;

Revised Standard (1946), same as American Standard (margin: "Or and as a sin-offering");

Phillips (1947), "taking upon Himself the sins of men" (This translation includes part of the preceding Greek phrase.);

Schonfield (1955), "as regards sin" (the punctuation connecting these words with the remaining part of the sentence);

Lilly (1956), "in order to remove sin."

The translations seem to come under the four classifications as follows:

1. Literal, obscure, and ambiguous: Challoner. By connecting "and of sin" with the preceding phrase, Challoner departs from the traditional punctuation of the Latin. But the resulting translation seems too obscure in meaning to be classified as interpretative.

2. Literal, but equivalent to an interpretation: Wycliffe, Purvery, and Rheims. The translations "of the synne," "and of synne," and "even of sinne" are literal, but since the punctuation in each case connects these words with "he condemned," following the Latin, these renderings are equivalent to an interpretation, somewhat obscure as they are. It is being assumed that at the time of the publication of these versions "of sin" in this context was readily understood as meaning "by sin."

3. Interpretative, with at least one alternative: King James, English Revised, American Standard, and Revised Standard. The translation offered in the King James text, with "and for sinne" connected with "he condemned," is somewhat obscure. But a clear interpretation is offered in the margin. The obscurity in the text is later eliminated by

Blayney's change of punctuation.

4. Interpretative, with no alternative: Tyndale, Coverdale, Rogers, Taverner, Great, Geneva, Bishops', Twentieth Century, Weymouth, Moffatt, Westminster, Goodspeed, Ballantine, Montgomery, Williams, Spencer, Confraternity, Basic English, Knox, Verkuyl, Phillips, Schonfield, and Lilly.

Of the versions offering deliberately interpretative translations, *περὶ ἁμαρτίας* has been understood as referring to the sin offering by the King James (margin), English Revised, American Standard (margin), Weymouth (1903), Westminster, Goodspeed, Williams, Confraternity, Basic English, and Revised Standard (margin).

The phrase has been interpreted somewhat more generally as "to atone for sin," "in reparation for sin," "to make amends for our guilt," "taking upon Himself the sins of men," and "in order to remove sin" by the Twentieth Century, Spencer, Knox, Phillips, and Lilly respectively. It is interpreted still more generally as "to deal with sin" by Weymouth (1929) and Moffatt, and even more generally as simply "for sin," "on account of sin," "as regards sin" by the Geneva, King James, English Revised (margin), American Standard, Ballantine, Montgomery, Verkuyl, Revised Standard, and Schonfield.

Tyndale, Coverdale, Rogers, Taverner, Great, and Bishops' connect *καὶ περὶ ἁμαρτίας* with the following phrase, thus departing from the traditional punctuation of the Greek, and translate, "by sin he condemned sin." Schonfield makes the same connection but translates "as regards sin."

Romans 8:10.--τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα ζῶν

This phrase is ambiguous in that it is uncertain whether *πνεῦμα*

here refers to the human or divine spirit. Does Paul mean that the human spirit has life because of righteousness, or that the Spirit of God gives life because of righteousness?

Sanday and Headlam claim that "clearly the *πνεῦμα* here meant is the human *πνεῦμα*." Gifford argues that this reference to the human spirit is "proved" by the direct contrast between the body and the spirit. Denney agrees that this meaning "is shown by the contrast with *σῶμα*." Riddle asserts that "the subjective meaning is undoubtedly the correct one." Robertson interprets *πνεῦμα* as "the redeemed human spirit." The same view is taken by Meyer, Lange, Thayer, Garvie, Dummelow, Parry, Bosworth, Dodd, and Kirk.

On the contrary, however, J. Knox translates, "that Spirit means life to us because of righteousness." While admitting that the phrase is ambiguous, he argues that the human spirit is not referred to in this context until the end of Rom. 8:16. Thus he concludes that "it seems best (with Lietzmann) to take Spirit here (as in the KJV) to mean the divine Spirit." Barrett likewise interprets, "the Spirit is at work giving life." He denies that Paul may have intended this to mean "the (human) spirit is alive . . . If he had meant this he would have said, 'The spirit is alive,' not 'the spirit is life.'" Bauer also interprets *πνεῦμα* here as the divine Spirit.

The versions have translated as follows:

Wycliffe (1382), "the spirit lyueth" (Vulgate: "spiritus uero uiuit."  
Wordsworth and White have the literal "spiritus uero uita" in the text, but evidently Wycliffe was using a text containing the interpretative "uiuit," which is adopted in the Sistine and Clementine editions of the Vulgate.);

Tyndale (1525), "the sprete is lyfe" (Luther, 1524: "der geist aber ist das leben");

Coverdale (1535), same as Tyndale;

Rogers (1537), same as Tyndale;

Taverner (1539), same as Tyndale;

Great (1539), same as Tyndale (None of the versions cited so far capitalizes the divine Spirit in this chapter.);

Geneva (1560), "the Spirit (is) life" (a marginal note explaining that the Spirit here is "the Spirit of regeneration which abolisheth sinne." "Spirit" is capitalized in every occurrence in this chapter. However, where the human spirit is unquestionably referred to in Rom. 1:9 and 2 Cor. 2:13 and 7:13, "spirit" is not capitalized. Whittingham, 1557, has "the Spirite is life.");

Bishops' (1568), same as Tyndale;

Rheims (1582), same as Wycliffe (the Holy Spirit being usually capitalized in this chapter);

King James (1611), same as Tyndale (changed to "the Spirit is life" in the 1769 Blayney edition. The divine Spirit is not capitalized in this chapter in the 1611 edition.);

English Revised (1881), same as Tyndale (the Holy Spirit being regularly capitalized in this chapter, as also in all the remaining versions cited below);

Twentieth Century (1900), "the spirit is full of Life";

American Standard (1901), same as Tyndale;

Weymouth (1903), "your spirit has Life";

Moffatt (1913), "the spirit is living";

Westminster (1920), "your spirit is life";

Goodspeed (1923), "your spirits have life";

Ballantine (1923), same as Tyndale;

Montgomery (1924), "your spirit is full of life";

Williams (1937), "your spirits are now enjoying life";

Spencer (1937), "the spirit lives";

Confraternity (1941), same as Tyndale;

Basic English (1941), same as Tyndale;

Knox (1944), "the spirit is a living thing";  
 Verkuyl (1945), "the spirit is alive";  
 Revised Standard (1946), "your spirits are alive";  
 Phillips (1947), "your spirit becomes alive";  
 Schonfield (1955), same as Verkuyl;  
 Lilly (1956), "the spirit has life."

The translations seem to come under the four classifications as follows:

1. Literal, obscure, and ambiguous: Tyndale, Coverdale, Rogers, Taverner, Great, Bishops', and King James (1611). Inasmuch as these versions do not capitalize the Holy Spirit, it is impossible to tell from the uncapitalized "spirit" in the literal translation "the spirit is life" whether the divine or human spirit is intended. It seems likely, however, that the translators understood "spirit" here as the divine, as indicated by the later capitalization of "Spirit" in the same literal translation by Geneva and King James (Blayney, 1769).

2. Literal, but equivalent to an interpretation: Wycliffe, Rheims, Confraternity, and Knox, all following the Latin interpretation that the spirit here is human.

3. Interpretative, with at least one alternative: None.

4. Interpretative, with no alternative: Geneva, King James (Blayney, 1769), English Revised, Twentieth Century, American Standard, Weymouth, Moffatt, Westminster, Goodspeed, Ballantine, Montgomery, Williams, Spencer, Basic English, Verkuyl, Revised Standard, Phillips, Schonfield, and Lilly.

Of the versions offering deliberately interpretative translations,

*πνεῦμα* has been interpreted as the divine Spirit by the Geneva and King James (Blayney, 1769). All others have interpreted as the human spirit. Among the latter, the literal translation "the spirit is life" is somewhat obscure. Nevertheless, the uncapitalized "spirit" clearly refers to the human spirit rather than the divine.

Romans 8:11.--*διὰ τοῦ ἐνοικουῦντος αὐτοῦ πνεύματος ἐν ὑμῖν,*  
or *διὰ τὸ ἐνοικουν αὐτοῦ πνεῦμα ἐν ὑμῖν*

Although this is a problem of textual criticism, the choice, as in Rom. 5:1, is largely one of interpretation. Adoption of the genitive *τοῦ ἐνοικουῦντος πνεύματος* would mean that believers are resurrected by the power of the indwelling Spirit. The accusative *τὸ ἐνοικουν πνεῦμα* would mean that believers are resurrected because of the presence of the indwelling Spirit.

Evidence supporting the genitive includes  $\aleph$ , A, C,  $p^2$ , Clement of Alexandria, Irenaeus (Armenian), and the Bohairic, Sahidic, Harklean Syriac, Armenian, and Ethiopic versions. Evidence supporting the accusative includes B, D, E, F, G, K, L, P, the Byzantine text, the Old Latin, Vulgate, and Peshito Syriac versions, Irenaeus (Latin), and Origen.

Denney observes that the reading "is very doubtful" and takes no definite position. He does point out, however, that the idea implied by the genitive that the Spirit is the agent in the resurrection is a conception "not found elsewhere in Scripture." Sanday and Headlam concede that the authorities for the two readings "seem at first sight very evenly divided" but conclude that, while "neither reading can be ignored," yet "on the whole the preponderance seems to be slightly on the side of the genitive." Robertson ventures with much caution that "the genitive

is slightly more probably correct," though "both ideas are true." But J. Knox states definitely that "there can be little doubt" that the genitive here is correct. "It will be by the agency of the Spirit, not because of the Spirit, that God will give life to our mortal bodies." The genitive is preferred also by Westcott and Hort, Stephens, Lietzmann, Lagrange, Dodd, and Barrett.

On the contrary, Gifford argues that the accusative "because of his Spirit that dwells in you" is "most in accordance with the language of the New Testament, which nowhere represents the Holy Ghost as the special agent or instrument by whom the dead are raised." Nygren also prefers the accusative and explains that "the resurrection is the result of the indwelling of the Spirit." Lange claims that in this verse "the raising act of God is distinguished . . . from the working of the Spirit." In supporting Lange's choice of the accusative reading, Riddle admits that the textual authorities are "of equal weight" but suggests the possibility that the accusative may have been altered to the genitive for polemical purposes during the fourth century Macedonian controversy regarding the divinity of the Holy Spirit. He lists Griesbach, Scholz, Mill, Bengel, Tischendorf (in later editions), Meyer, Tholuck, Alford, Tregelles, and others as preferring the accusative reading and concludes that "it is better to follow the current of criticism, and adopt the accusative." Dummelow likewise interprets, "the Spirit within you is a pledge that God will cause your bodies also to participate in Christ's Resurrection."

The versions have translated as follows:

Wycliffe (1382), "for the spirit of him dwellinge in zou" (Vulgate:



- "propter inhabitantem Spiritum eius in uobis");
- Tyndale (1525), "because that his sprete dwelleth in you" (Luther, 1524: "umb des willen das sein geist in euch wonet");
- Coverdale (1535), same as Tyndale;
- Rogers (1537), same as Tyndale;
- Taverner (1539), same as Tyndale;
- Great (1539), "because of hys sprete that dwelleth in you";
- Geneva (1560), same as Tyndale;
- Bishops' (1568), same as Tyndale;
- Rheims (1582), "because of his Spirit dwelling in you";
- King James (1611), "by his spirit that dwelleth in you" (margin: "Or, because of his spirit");
- English Revised (1881), "through his Spirit that dwelleth in you (margin: "Many ancient authorities read because of")";
- Twentieth Century (1900), "through his Spirit living within you";
- American Standard (1901), same as English Revised (margin: "Many ancient authorities read because of")";
- Weymouth (1903), "because of His Spirit who dwells in you (margin: "v.l. 'by means of.'" This is changed to "through His Spirit dwelling in you" in the 1929 fifth edition.);
- Moffatt (1913), "by his indwelling Spirit in your lives";
- Westminster (1920), "through his Spirit who dwelleth within you" (margin: "The present indwelling of the Holy Ghost is an earnest of a fuller indwelling to come . . . An alternative reading, 'because of his Spirit' . . . is strongly attested.");
- Goodspeed (1923), "through his Spirit that has taken possession of you";
- Ballantine (1923), "through his indwelling Spirit in you";
- Montgomery (1924), same as Moffatt;
- Williams (1937), "through His Spirit that has His home within you";
- Spencer (1937), "by means of His Spirit dwelling in you";
- Confraternity (1941), same as Weymouth (1903);

Basic English (1941), "through his spirit which is in you";  
 Knox (1944), "for the sake of his Spirit who dwells in you";  
 Verkuyl (1945), "through the Spirit that dwells in you";  
 Revised Standard (1946), "through his Spirit which dwells in you";  
 Phillips (1947), "by that same Spirit";  
 Schonfield (1955), "by very reason of his Spirit indwelling in you";  
 Lilly (1956), same as Weymouth (1903).

The translations seem to come under the four classifications as follows:

1. Literal, obscure, and ambiguous: None.
2. Literal, but equivalent to an interpretation: Wycliffe, Rheims, Confraternity, and Knox, all following the Vulgate "propter."
3. Interpretative, with at least one alternative: King James, English Revised, American Standard, Weymouth (1903), and Westminster.
4. Interpretative, with no alternative: Tyndale, Coverdale, Rogers, Taverner, Great, Geneva, Bishops' (all of whom follow the Latin "propter" and Luther's "umb des willen das" rather than the genitive case in the standard sixteenth century Greek text), Twentieth Century, Weymouth (1929), Moffatt, Goodspeed, Ballantine, Montgomery, Williams, Spencer, Basic English, Verkuyl, Revised Standard, Phillips, Schonfield, and Lilly.

Of the versions offering deliberately interpretative translations, the passage is interpreted to mean "because of his Spirit dwelling in you" by Tyndale, Coverdale, Rogers, Taverner, Great, Geneva, Bishops', King James (margin), English Revised (margin), American Standard (margin), Weymouth (1903), Westminster (margin), Schonfield, and Lilly. It is in-

terpreted to mean "by (or through) his Spirit dwelling in you" by the King James, English Revised, Twentieth Century, American Standard, Weymouth (1903, margin), Weymouth (1929), Moffatt, Westminster, Goodspeed, Ballantine, Montgomery, Williams, Spencer, Basic English, Verkuyl, Revised Standard, and Phillips.

Romans 8:13.--πνεύματι

As in Rom. 8:10, it is uncertain whether Paul is speaking here of the Holy Spirit or the human spirit. Is Paul emphasizing that Christians are to put to death the deeds of the body by the power of the Spirit of God or by the exercise of their own spiritual natures--as led by the Holy Spirit, of course, as is implied elsewhere in this chapter?

Riddle affirms that πνεύμα here is "undoubtedly not subjective, but the Holy Spirit." The same view is held by Meyer, Gifford, Thayer, Denney, Robertson, Bauer, J. Knox, and Barrett.

On the contrary, Sanday and Headlam argue that "the antithesis to σάρξ seems to show that this is still . . . the human πνεύμα, but it is the human πνεύμα in direct contact with the Divine." Presumably this last observation is responsible for the capitalization of "Spirit" in their paraphrase, even though they intend this to be understood of the human spirit. In Rom. 8:10, where they clearly interpret πνεύμα as the human spirit, "spirit" is not capitalized. Parry also regards πνεύμα here as the human spirit. Boylan agrees that this is not the Holy Spirit but explains that Paul is speaking of the "help of grace, the Spirit which we have received as a principle of eternal life. It is the effect produced in us by the Holy Spirit--not the Holy Spirit himself." Like Sanday and Headlam he also capitalizes this human "Spirit."

The versions have translated as follows:

- Wycliffe (1382), "by spirit" (changed to "bi the spirit" in the 1388 Purvey revision. Vulgate: "spiritu");
- Tyndale (1525), "by the help of the sprite";
- Coverdale (1535), "thorow the sprete" (Luther, 1524: "durch den geist");
- Rogers (1537), same as Tyndale;
- Taverner (1539), same as Tyndale;
- Great (1539), same as Coverdale (None of the versions cited so far capitalizes "spirit" elsewhere in this chapter.);
- Geneva (1560), "by the Sprite" ("Spirit" is capitalized in every occurrence in this chapter. However, where the human spirit is unquestionably referred to in Rom. 1:9 and 2 Cor. 2:13 and 7:13, "spirit" is not capitalized.);
- Bishops' (1568), same as Coverdale ("Spirit" is nowhere capitalized in this chapter.);
- Rheims (1582), "by the spirit" (changed to "by the Spirit" in the 1749 Challoner edition. "Spirit" is frequently capitalized in this chapter in the 1582 edition. Where *πνεῦμα* may refer to the human spirit, the word is not capitalized. However, in Rom. 8:14, the "spirit of God" seems to have been inconsistently spelled without capitalization.);
- King James (1611), same as Coverdale (changed to "through the Spirit" in the 1769 Blayney edition. "Spirit" is nowhere capitalized in this chapter in the 1611 edition.);
- English Revised (1881), same as Rheims (The Holy Spirit is consistently capitalized.);
- Twentieth Century (1900), "by the power of the Spirit";
- American Standard (1901), same as Geneva;
- Weymouth (1903), "through being under the sway of the spirit" (The marginal note explains that this is man's higher spiritual nature, in distinction from the Spirit of God.);
- Moffatt (1913), same as Geneva;
- Westminster (1920), same as Rheims (The Holy Spirit is consistently capitalized.);
- Goodspeed (1923), "by means of the Spirit";

Ballantine (1923), same as Geneva;  
 Montgomery (1924), same as Geneva;  
 Williams (1937), same as Geneva;  
 Spencer (1937), same as Geneva;  
 Confraternity (1941), same as Rheims (The Holy Spirit is consistently capitalized.);  
 Basic English (1941), same as Rheims (The Holy Spirit is consistently capitalized.);  
 Knox (1944), "through the power of the Spirit";  
 Verkuyl (1945), "through the Spirit";  
 Revised Standard (1946), same as Geneva;  
 Phillips (1947), "by obeying the Spirit";  
 Schonfield (1955), "by the spiritual";  
 Lilly (1956), same as Rheims (The Holy Spirit is consistently capitalized.).

The translations seem to come under the four classifications as follows:

1. Literal, obscure, and ambiguous: Wycliffe, Coverdale, Great, Bishops', and King James (1611). Inasmuch as these versions do not capitalize the Holy Spirit, it is impossible to tell from the uncapitalized "spirit" whether the divine or human spirit is intended. However, it seems probable that the translators understood "spirit" here as the divine.

2. Literal, but equivalent to an interpretation: None.

3. Interpretative, with at least one alternative: None.

4. Interpretative, with no alternative: Tyndale, Rogers, Taverner, Geneva, Rheims, Challoner, Blayney, English Revised, Twentieth Century, American Standard, Weymouth, Moffatt, Westminster, Goodspeed,

Ballantine, Montgomery, Williams, Spencer, Confraternity, Basic English, Knox, Verkuyl, Revised Standard, Phillips, Schonfield, and Lilly. Even though Tyndale, Rogers, and Taverner consistently do not capitalize "spirit," whether human or divine, nevertheless their interpretative translation "by the help of the sprite" is most readily understood as referring to the Spirit of God.

Of the versions offering interpretative translations, πνεῦμα is interpreted as the divine Spirit by Tyndale, Rogers, Taverner, Geneva, Challoner, Blayney, Twentieth Century, American Standard, Moffatt, Goodspeed, Ballantine, Montgomery, Williams, Spencer, Knox, Verkuyl, Revised Standard, and Phillips. It is conceivable that some of the translators capitalizing "Spirit" may have understood the term in the sense proposed by Sanday and Headlam and Boylan. But this interpretation has not been made apparent in any of the versions cited. πνεῦμα is interpreted as the human spirit by the Rheims, English Revised, Weymouth, Westminster, Confraternity, Basic English, Schonfield, and Lilly.

Romans 8:16.--αὐτὸ τὸ πνεῦμα

Since αὐτό is neuter, to agree with τὸ πνεῦμα, the literal translation of this phrase would be "the spirit itself." However, many have urged that in view of the fact that other passages of Scripture teach the personality of the Holy Spirit, the phrase should be translated "the Spirit Himself."

Robertson, for example, regards it as "a grave mistake to use the neuter 'it' or 'itself' when referring to the Holy Spirit." Dummelow also prefers the masculine "himself," in order to designate the Spirit "as a Person and distinct from the Father."

On the contrary, however, when the English Revised Version in 1881 changed the King James "itself" to "himself," vigorous opposition was aroused. J. A. Beet criticized the change as one of the few examples of theological bias in the new revision.<sup>1</sup> J. Knox seems to see room for either translation, since "there is not a clear, consistent doctrine of the 'personality' of the Spirit in Paul's letters." Barrett uses "himself" in his translation.

Most writers seem to have ignored this question in their specific comments on Rom. 8:16. However, in their general discussion of Paul's doctrine of the Spirit in this chapter, there is evident disagreement as to whether the Holy Spirit should be referred to by the masculine or neuter pronoun.

The versions have translated as follows:

Wycliffe (1382), "the ilke spirit" (Vulgate: "Ipse Spiritus");  
 Tyndale (1525), "the same sprete" (Luther, 1524: "der selbig geyst");  
 Coverdale (1535), same as Tyndale;  
 Rogers (1537), same as Tyndale;  
 Taverner (1539), same as Tyndale;  
 Great (1539), same as Tyndale;  
 Geneva (1560), same as Tyndale;  
 Bishops' (1568), same as Tyndale (changed in the 1572 edition to "the spirit it selfe");  
 Rheims (1582), "the Spirit him self";  
 King James (1611), same as Bishops' (1572);

---

<sup>1</sup>J. A. Beet, "The Revised Version of the New Testament," The Expositor, Vol. III (1882), p. 131.

English Revised (1881), same as Rheims;  
 Twentieth Century (1900), same as Rheims;  
 American Standard (1901), same as Rheims;  
 Weymouth (1903), same as Rheims;  
 Moffatt (1913), "this Spirit";  
 Westminster (1920), same as Rheims;  
 Goodspeed (1923), same as Bishops' (1572);  
 Ballantine (1923), same as Bishops' (1572);  
 Montgomery (1924), "his Spirit himself";  
 Williams (1937), same as Rheims;  
 Spencer (1937), same as Rheims;  
 Confraternity (1941), same as Rheims;  
 Basic English (1941), "The Spirit";  
 Knox (1944), same as Rheims;  
 Verkuyll (1945), same as Moffatt;  
 Revised Standard (1946), same as Rheims;  
 Phillips (1947), same as Rheims;  
 Schonfield (1955), "the Spirit [joins] its [witness]";  
 Lilly (1956), same as Rheims.

The translations seem to come under the four classifications as follows:

1. Literal, obscure, and ambiguous: None.
2. Literal, but equivalent to an interpretation: Bishops' (1572), Rheims, King James, Goodspeed, Ballantine, Confraternity, Knox, and Schonfield, the three Catholic versions following the masculine "Spiritus" of the Vulgate.



3. Interpretative, with at least one alternative: None.

4. Interpretative, with no alternative: English Revised, Twentieth Century, American Standard, Weymouth, Westminster, Montgomery, Williams, Spencer, Revised Standard, Phillips, and Lilly.

5. Avoiding the problem of interpretation: Wycliffe, Tyndale, Coverdale, Rogers, Taverner, Great, Geneva, Bishops' (1568), Moffatt, Basic English, and Verkuyl.

The Bishops' (1572), King James, Goodspeed, Ballantine, and Schonfield have translated the neuter αὐτό "itself." The Rheims, English Revised, Twentieth Century, American Standard, Weymouth, Westminster, Montgomery, Williams, Spencer, Confraternity, Knox, Revised Standard, Phillips, and Lilly have translated "himself."

The remaining versions have avoided the problem of gender by translating in some other way. Wycliffe, Tyndale, Coverdale, Rogers, Taverner, Great, Geneva, and Bishops' (1568) have translated the phrase, "the same spirit," as if αὐτό were in the attributive position. Moffatt and Verkuyl have translated, "this Spirit," preferring to regard αὐτό as somewhat demonstrative in this context. The Basic English has translated simply "the Spirit."

Romans 8:23.--τὴν ἀπαρχὴν τοῦ πνεύματος

The genitive case of τοῦ πνεύματος may be interpreted as partitive or as genitive of apposition. Thus the phrase may mean that Christians had received the early outpouring of the Spirit as a foretaste, or first instalment, as it were, of the full gift of the Spirit yet to come. Or it may mean that the Spirit itself was the first fruits of future glory and blessedness.

Riddle argues against Lange's preference for the genitive of apposition and concludes that "it is difficult to sustain any other view here" than that this is the partitive genitive. He cites many scholars in his support. J. Knox and Sanday and Headlam take the same view, translating the phrase, "the first installment of the Spirit." Bauer explains the phrase to mean, "as much of the Spirit as has been poured out so far." Gifford translates, "the first outpouring of the Spirit."

On the contrary, Kirk interprets, "we have the Spirit, which is the first fruit, or foretaste, of our future glory." Denney explains that "the spirit which Christians have received is itself the first fruits." Dummelow translates, "we have the Spirit as a foretaste of blessedness." Barrett interprets, "the Holy Spirit is thus regarded as an anticipation of final salvation." Winer, Thayer, and Boylan also regard the case of τοῦ πνεύματος as genitive of apposition.

The versions have translated as follows:

- Wycliffe (1382), "the firste fruytis of the spirit" (Vulgate: "primitias Spiritus habentes," which is equally ambiguous with the Greek);
- Tyndale (1525), same as Wycliffe (Luther, 1524: "des geysts erstling");
- Coverdale (1535), same as Wycliffe;
- Rogers (1537), same as Wycliffe (margin: "Fyrst frutes, a tast, and a certain porcion and not the ful gyfte of the spirite");
- Taverner (1539), same as Wycliffe;
- Great (1539), same as Wycliffe;
- Geneva (1560), same as Wycliffe (margin: "And yet are farre from the perfection");
- Bishops' (1568), same as Wycliffe;
- Rheims (1582), same as Wycliffe;
- King James (1611), same as Wycliffe;

English Revised (1881), same as Wycliffe;

Twentieth Century (1900), "in the Spirit an earnest of the future"  
(changed to "a first gift of the Spirit" in the 1904 final edition);

American Standard (1901), same as Wycliffe;

Weymouth (1903), "the Spirit as a foretaste and pledge of the glorious  
future (margin: "Lit. 'the first-fruits of the Spirit.'");

Moffatt (1913), "the Spirit as a foretaste of the future";

Westminster (1920), same as Wycliffe (margin: "that is, a first instal-  
ment of the Spirit");

Goodspeed (1923), "in the Spirit a foretaste of the future";

Ballantine (1923), same as Wycliffe;

Montgomery (1924), same as Wycliffe;

Williams (1937), same as Moffatt;

Spencer (1937), same as Wycliffe;

Confraternity (1941), same as Wycliffe;

Basic English (1941), same as Wycliffe;

Knox (1944), "already begun to reap our spiritual harvest";

Verkuyyl (1945), "the Spirit's fruitions that promise yet greater bless-  
ings";

Revised Standard (1946), same as Wycliffe;

Phillips (1947), "a foretaste of the Spirit";

Schonfield (1955), "the spiritual firstfruits";

Lilly (1956), "the Holy Spirit as first fruits."

The translations seem to come under the four classifications as  
follows:

1. Literal, obscure, and ambiguous: None.
2. Literal, but equivalent to an interpretation: Wycliffe, Tyn-  
dale, Coverdale, Rogers, Taverner, Great, Geneva, Bishops', Rheims, King

James, English Revised, Twentieth Century (1904), American Standard, Westminster, Ballantine, Montgomery, Spencer, Confraternity, Basic English, and Revised Standard. The translation, "the first fruits of the Spirit," though literal, is most naturally understood to mean "the first instalment of the full gift of the Spirit" and is thus equivalent to an interpretation. Evidence for this are the explanatory notes in Rogers and Westminster.

3. Interpretative, with at least one alternative: Weymouth.

4. Interpretative, with no alternative: Twentieth Century (1900), Moffatt, Goodspeed, Williams, Knox, Verkuyl, Phillips, Schonfield, and Lilly.

Of the versions offering deliberately interpretative translations, Knox, Phillips, and Schonfield have chosen to regard the case of τοῦ πνεύματος as partitive genitive. It has been interpreted as genitive of apposition by the Twentieth Century (1900), Weymouth, Moffatt, Goodspeed, Williams, Verkuyl, and Lilly.

Romans 8:24.--τῇ γὰρ ἐλπίδι ἐσώθημεν

The case of ἐλπίδι may be taken as either dative of means or dative of manner or "accompaniment" (C. F. D. Moule). The passage may mean that we were saved by hope or that we were saved in hope, meaning "in a state of hope," or proleptically, "in hope though not in actuality." As a third possibility, it has been suggested that the dative may be translated "for hope," as if we were saved in order to enjoy the hope of future blessedness.

Robertson concedes that the case of ἐλπίδι is not certain but adds that "curiously enough either makes good sense in this context."

In his Grammar he expresses a preference for "by hope." Kirk also argues for the instrumental dative, on the ground that Paul's point is that we are saved "by the faith-hope state of mind," and not by works. Chamberlain agrees that the instrumental "by hope" is "undoubtedly more consistent" with the Pauline viewpoint. Richardson also prefers "by hope" but explains that this must not be taken to mean that we are saved simply "by hoping."

On the contrary, Gifford maintains that the traditional interpretation, "by hope," "disregards St. Paul's distinction between faith and hope." He and many others, including Sanday and Headlam, Vincent, Garvie, Denney, Dummelow, Hastings, Parry, Nygren, and Barrett prefer "in hope." Bauer translates, "we are saved only in expectation." Theissen translates, "with hope," because it is by faith that we are saved and not by hope."

Weiss has recommended "for hope."

The versions have translated as follows:

Wycliffe (1382), "Sothli by hope we ben mad saaf" (Vulgate: "Spe enim salui facti sumus," as ambiguous as the Greek);

Tyndale (1525), "For we are saved by hope";

Coverdale (1535), "For we are saved in dede, howbeit in hope" (Luther, 1524: "denn wir sind wol selig wordenn, doch in der hoffnung." Evidently Luther was anxious that this verse should not seem to contradict Rom. 3:28, *λογιζόμεθα γὰρ δικαιοῦσθαι πίστει ἀνθρώπων*, where he boldly adds "allein.");

Rogers (1537), same as Tyndale;

Taverner (1539), same as Tyndale;

Great (1539), same as Tyndale;

Geneva (1560), same as Tyndale;

Bishops' (1568), same as Tyndale;

Rheims (1582), "For by hope we are saved" (the marginal note making much of this additional cause of salvation and blaming "adversaries" for "captiously and ignorantly" maintaining that faith is the exclusive means);

King James (1611), same as Tyndale;

English Revised (1881), "For by hope were we saved";

Twentieth Century (1900), "In this hope we were saved" (changed in the 1904 final edition to "By our hope we were saved");

American Standard (1901), "For in hope were we saved" (margin: "Or, by");

Weymouth (1903), "It is in hope that we have been saved" (changed in the 1929 fifth edition to "It is by hope that we have been saved");

Moffatt (1913), "we were saved with this hope in view";

Westminster (1920), same as American Standard;

Goodspeed (1923), "It was in this hope that we were saved";

Ballantine (1923), "For we are saved by hope";

Montgomery (1924), "For by hope we are saved";

Williams (1937), "For we were saved in such a hope (margin: "Implied from context.");

Spencer (1937), "For our salvation is in hope";

Confraternity (1941), same as American Standard;

Basic English (1941), "For our salvation is by hope";

Knox (1944), "It must be so, since your salvation is founded upon the hope of something";

Verkuyl (1945), "In this hope are we saved";

Revised Standard (1946), "For in this hope we were saved";

Phillips (1947), "We were saved by this hope";

Schonfield (1955), "For we are kept alive on hope";

Lilly (1956), "our salvation is only a matter of hope."

The translations seem to come under the four classifications as

follows:

1. Literal, obscure, and ambiguous: None.
2. Literal, but equivalent to an interpretation: None.
3. Interpretative, with at least one alternative: American Standard.
4. Interpretative, with no alternative: All versions other than the American Standard.

The case of ἐλπίδι has been taken as dative of means by Wycliffe, Tyndale, Rogers, Taverner, Great, Geneva, Bishops', Rheims, King James, English Revised, Twentieth Century (1904) Weymouth (1929), Ballantine, Montgomery, Basic English, Knox, Phillips, and Schonfield. The remaining versions, Coverdale, Twentieth Century (1900), American Standard, Weymouth (1903), Moffatt, Westminster, Goodspeed, Williams, Spencer, Confraternity, Verkuyl, Revised Standard, and Lilly have preferred the dative of manner.

Romans 8:26.--αὐτὸ τὸ πνεῦμα

The problem of gender is the same as in Rom. 8:16. However, some of the versions have presented different translations.

The versions have translated as follows:

Wycliffe (1382), "the ilke spirit" (Vulgate: "ipse Spiritus");

Tyndale (1525), "the sprete";

Coverdale (1535), "the sprete itself" (Luther, 1524: "der geist . . . selbs");

Rogers (1537), same as Tyndale;

Taverner (1539), same as Tyndale;

Great (1539), same as Tyndale;

Geneva (1560), same as Coverdale (changed from "the Spirite," the same as Tyndale, in Whittingham, 1557);

Bishops' (1568), same as Tyndale (changed in the 1572 edition to the same as Coverdale);

Rheims (1582), "the Spirit him self";

King James (1611), same as Coverdale;

English Revised (1881), same as Rheims;

Twentieth Century (1900), same as Rheims;

American Standard (1901), same as Rheims;

Weymouth (1903), same as Rheims;

Moffatt (1913), same as Tyndale;

Westminster (1920), same as Rheims;

Goodspeed (1923), same as Coverdale;

Ballantine (1923), same as Coverdale;

Montgomery (1924), same as Rheims;

Williams (1937), same as Rheims;

Spencer (1937), same as Rheims;

Confraternity (1941), same as Rheims;

Basic English (1941), same as Tyndale;

Knox (1944), same as Rheims;

Verkuyll (1945), same as Rheims;

Revised Standard (1946), same as Rheims;

Phillips (1947), "His Spirit";

Schonfield (1955), same as Coverdale;

Lilly (1956), same as Rheims.

The translations seem to come under the four classifications as follows:



1. Literal, obscure, and ambiguous: None.
2. Literal, but equivalent to an interpretation: Coverdale, Geneva, Bishops' (1572), Rheims, King James, Goodspeed, Ballantine, Confraternity, Knox, and Schonfield.
3. Interpretative, with at least one alternative: None.
4. Interpretative, with no alternative: English Revised, Twentieth Century, American Standard, Weymouth, Westminster, Montgomery, Williams, Spencer, Verkuyl, Revised Standard, and Lilly.
5. Avoiding the problem of interpretation: Wycliffe, Tyndale, Rogers, Taverner, Great, Whittingham, Bishops' (1568), Moffatt, Basic English, and Phillips.

Coverdale, Geneva, Bishops' (1572), King James, Goodspeed, Ballantine, and Schonfield have translated the neuter  $\alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{o}$  "itself." The English Revised, Twentieth Century, American Standard, Weymouth, Westminster, Montgomery, Williams, Spencer, Verkuyl, Revised Standard, and Lilly have translated "himself."

The remaining versions have avoided the problem of gender by translating in some other way, Wycliffe as "the ilke spirit," Phillips as "His Spirit," and Tyndale, Rogers, Taverner, Great, Bishops' (1568), Moffatt, and Basic English as simply "the spirit."

Although the Greek phrase is identically the same here in Rom. 8:26 as in Rom. 8:16, eleven of the versions have offered different translations. Tyndale, Rogers, Taverner, Great, and Bishops' have changed from "the same spirit" to "the spirit"; Coverdale and Geneva have changed from "the same spirit" to "the spirit itself"; Moffatt from "this spirit" to "the spirit"; Montgomery from "his Spirit himself" to "the Spirit him-

self"; Verkuyl from "this Spirit" to "the Spirit Himself"; and Phillips from "the Spirit Himself" to "His Spirit."

In connection with Coverdale's change from "the same Spirit" to "the spirit itself," it is interesting to note that Luther had made a similar shift, from "der selbig geyst" to "der geist selbs."

Romans 8:27.--ὅτι κατὰ θεὸν ἐντύχῳσιν

The conjunction ὅτι may be translated "because" or "that." Some have taken the passage to mean that God knows what is the mind of the Spirit, "because he intercedes according to the will of God." Others interpret it to mean that God knows the mind of the Spirit, "that he intercedes according to the will of God."

Lange claims that the interpretation "because" is supported by "most expositors" and expresses his opinion that the interpretation "God knows the mind of the Holy Spirit, that He intercedes . . . in a way well-pleasing to God" is "a very idle thought." Riddle approves of this judgment as "very just" and commends the English Revised translation "because he maketh intercession according to the will of God" as an "exceedingly happy" rendering. Barrett offers both possibilities in his translation, using "for" in his text and giving "namely that" as an alternative. The causal interpretation of ὅτι is also preferred by Gifford, Weiss, and Dodd.

J. Knox cites the two possible interpretations, "because" or "that," and explains that if the former is chosen, then the clause following gives "the ground of God's knowing." If the latter is preferred, then the clause indicates "the content of the mind of the Spirit." Knox considers the latter "on the whole the more likely." Sanday and Headlam

list scholars on either side of the question and state their preference for "that" as "probably" correct. They argue that if  $\acute{\omicron}\nu\iota$  is taken as assigning a reason why God knoweth the mind of the Spirit, "the reason would not be adequate." For God would know the mind of the Spirit, even if it were not according to his will. Therefore, they conclude that "it seems best to make  $\acute{\omicron}\nu\iota$  describe the nature of the Spirit's intercession." Garvie agrees that "we need no reason given for God's knowledge of the mind of the Spirit, but a definition of that mind may be fitly added." The same view is held by Denney, Lietzmann, and Lagrange.

The versions have translated as follows:

Wycliffe (1382), "for aftir God, that is, at Goddis wille, he axith"  
(Vulgate: "quia secundum Deum postulat");

Tyndale (1525), "for he maketh intercession . . . according to the pleasure of God" (Luther, 1524: "denn er vertritt . . . nach dem das gott gefelt");

Coverdale (1535), same as Tyndale;

Rogers (1537), same as Tyndale;

Taverner (1539), same as Tyndale;

Great (1539), same as Tyndale;

Geneva (1560), "for he maketh request . . . according to (the wil of) God" (changed from the same as Tyndale in the 1557 Whittingham edition);

Bishops' (1568), same as Tyndale;

Rheims (1582), "because according to God he requesteth";

King James (1611), "because he maketh intercession . . . according to the will of God" (margin: "Or, that");

English Revised (1881), same as King James (margin: "Or, that");

Twentieth Century (1900), "because the pleadings of the Spirit . . . are in accordance with God's will";

American Standard (1901), same as King James (margin: "Or, that");

- Weymouth (1903), "because His intercessions . . . are in harmony with God's will" (margin: "Or 'that.'" The 1929 fifth edition omits the marginal alternative.);
- Moffatt (1913), "since the Spirit pleads before God";
- Westminster (1920), "how he pleadeth before God";
- Goodspeed (1923), "for it pleads . . . in accordance with his will";
- Ballantine (1923), "because he intercedes . . . according to the will of God";
- Montgomery (1924), "because his intercessions . . . are according to the will of God";
- Williams (1937), "for He pleads . . . in accordance with God's will";
- Spencer (1937), "for he intercedes . . . according to God";
- Confraternity (1941), "that he pleads . . . according to God" (in spite of the Latin "quia");
- Basic English (1941), "because he is making prayers . . . in agreement with the mind of God";
- Knox (1944), "for indeed it is according to the mind of God that he makes intercession";
- Verkuyl (1945), "for He pleads with God";
- Revised Standard (1946), "because the Spirit intercedes . . . according to the will of God" (margin: "Or that");
- Phillips (1947), "as He prays";
- Schonfield (1955), "that in God's way it is interceding";
- Lilly (1956), "that he in accord with God's designs pleads."

The translations seem to come under the four classifications as follows:

1. Literal, obscure, and ambiguous: None.
2. Literal, but equivalent to an interpretation: Wycliffe, Rheims, and Knox, all following the Vulgate interpretation "quia."
3. Interpretative, with at least one alternative: King James,

English Revised, American Standard, Weymouth (1903), and Revised Standard.

4. Interpretative, with no alternative: Tyndale, Coverdale, Rogers, Taverner, Great, Geneva, Bishops', Twentieth Century, Weymouth (1929), Moffatt, Westminster, Goodspeed, Ballantine, Montgomery, Williams, Spencer, Confraternity, Basic English, Verkuyl, Schonfield, and Lilly.

5. Avoiding the problem of interpretation: Phillips.

Of the versions offering deliberately interpretative renderings, ὅτι is interpreted as "because," "for," by Tyndale, Coverdale, Rogers, Taverner, Great, Geneva, Bishops', King James, English Revised, Twentieth Century, American Standard, Weymouth, Moffatt, Goodspeed, Ballantine, Montgomery, Williams, Spencer, Basic English, Verkuyl, and Revised Standard. It is interpreted as "that" by King James (margin), English Revised (margin), American Standard (margin), Weymouth (1903, margin), Westminster ("how"), Confraternity, Schonfield, and Lilly. Phillips disposes of the problem by translating freely, "as He prays."

Romans 9:5.--ἐξ ὧν ὁ Χριστὸς τὸ κατὰ σάρκα ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων Θεὸς εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας

There appear to be at least four main interpretations of this passage: (1) to place a comma after *σάρκα* and refer the whole passage to Christ as an assertion of his deity (the traditional view); (2) to place a comma after *σάρκα* and a period after *πάντων*, the passage then meaning that Christ is over all, but not necessarily *θεός*; (3) to place a period after *σάρκα* and translate, "He who is God over all be blessed for ever" (or, "is blessed"); (4) to use the same punctuation and translate, "He who is over all is God blessed for ever."

The interpretation of this passage has been debated at great

length through the centuries, perhaps more than that of any other verse in the New Testament. The discussions reached a climax after the appearance of the English Revised New Testament in 1881, considerable space being devoted to the problem in the religious journals of the day.

In the Journal of Biblical Literature of 1881 and 1883, Ezra Abbott surveys the history of the interpretation of Rom. 9:5 up to his time, listing many scholars on either side of the question. He expresses himself as strongly opposed to the traditional interpretation but concedes that the verse "grammatically admits of being punctuated and construed in at least seven different ways."<sup>1</sup>

Some scholars, however, will not admit that there is any such ambiguity in the passage, but insist that the traditional view is the only one permissible. Robertson regards the verse as "a clear statement of the deity of Christ." Riddle claims that "on no exegetical point, where there is room for discussion, has the unanimity of commentators, of all ages and confessions, been so entire, as in referring this to Christ." A few have charged that only theological bias could lead one to decide otherwise. Boylan maintains that "this passage is a clear and definite assertion of the divinity of Christ, and, for that reason, has been variously twisted by modern critics." Gifford shared a similar opinion fifty years before: "When we review the history of the interpretation, it cannot but be regarded as a remarkable fact that every objection urged against the ancient interpretation rests ultimately on dogmatic presup-

---

<sup>1</sup>Ezra Abbott, "Recent Discussions of Rom. 9:5," Journal of Biblical Literature, Vol. III (June and Dec., 1883), pp. 90-112. See also, by the same author, "On the Construction of Romans 9:5," Journal of Biblical Literature, Vol. I (June and Dec., 1881), pp. 87-154.

positions." Referring to the detailed analysis of the verse presented by Gifford in the Speaker's Commentary, Canon Cook expressed this conclusion in 1882: "I should scarcely have thought it credible, in face of the unanswered and unanswerable arguments there urged, that English divines would venture to have given their sanction to one of the most pernicious and indefensible innovations of rationalistic criticism."<sup>1</sup>

On the contrary, however, such scholars as Tischendorf, Meyer, Vincent, Denney, Jülicher, Burkitt,<sup>2</sup> Bosworth, Parry, Dodd, Kirk, and Barrett have expressed their preference for interpreting the latter half of the verse as a doxology or benediction to God the Father, rather than as a statement of the divinity of Christ. Lietzmann also interprets as a doxology to the Father, not for linguistic or theological reasons, but in view of the fact that parallel doxologies in the New Testament seem to preclude the reference of this doxology to Christ. J. Knox agrees that Lietzmann's argument "seems rather conclusive." Theissen, however, claims that the "main weakness" of this interpretation is its "artificiality which betrays itself in the far-fetched arguments necessary to make it appear plausible."

Many scholars have spoken of the difficulty of making any decision at all. Sanday and Headlam are somewhat inclined to refer the passage to Christ but admit that "throughout there has been no argument which we have felt to be quite conclusive." Kirk favors the interpretation as a doxology to the Father, but adds that "it is difficult" to

---

<sup>1</sup>F. C. Cook, The Revised Version of the First Three Gospels (London: John Murray, 1882), footnote, p. 167.

<sup>2</sup>F. C. Burkitt, "On Romans 9:5 and Mark 14:61," The Journal of Theological Studies, Vol. V (1904), pp. 451-455.

choose between the "four main possible renderings." Garvie advises that the verse is "too ambiguous" to use dogmatically. In the midst of the heated controversy in 1881, Timothy Dwight pointed out in the Journal of Biblical Literature that, although he preferred to take the passage as a statement of the divinity of Christ, "the question ceases to be one of certainties, and becomes one of probabilities."<sup>1</sup> He commends the English Revised Version translators for offering alternatives in the margin. J. H. Moulton, in his *Prolegomena*, observes that "it is exegesis rather than grammar which makes the reference to Christ probable."

The versions have translated as follows:

Wycliffe (1382), "of whom Christ aftir the fleisch, that is God above all thingis, blessid in to worldis" (Vulgate: "ex quibus Christus secundum carnem, qui est super omnia Deus benedictur in saecula." Wordsworth and White have a colon before "qui.");

Tyndale (1525), "they of whome (as concernynge the flesshe) Christ came: which is God over all thynges blessed for ever" (Luther, 1524: "aus welchen Christus herkompt nach dem fleische, der da ist gott über alles gebenedeyet in ewigkeit." The last three words are changed in Luther's 1534 edition to "gelobt inn ewigkeit.");

Coverdale (1535), "off whom (after the flesh) commeth Christ, which is God over all, blessed for ever";

Rogers (1537), same as Tyndale;

Taverner (1539), "of whome (as concernynge the flesshe) Chryste came, whiche is God over all, blessed for ever";

Great (1539), "they of whom (as concernynge the flesshe) Christ came, whych is God in all thynges to be prayسد for ever";

Geneva (1560), "of whome concerning the flesh Christ came, who is God over all blessed for ever" (margin: "Christ is verie God.");

Bishops' (1568), "of whom as concernyng the flesche, Christe (came,) which is God, in all thynges to be prayسد for ever";

---

<sup>1</sup>Timothy Dwight, "On Romans 9:5," Journal of Biblical Literature, Vol. I (June and Dec., 1881), pp. 22-55.



- Rheims (1582), "of whom Christ is according to the flesh, who is above all things God blessed for ever";
- King James (1611), "of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came, who is over all, God blessed for ever";
- English Revised (1881), "of whom is Christ as concerning the flesh, who is over all, God blessed for ever" (margin: "Some modern interpreters place a full stop after flesh, and translate, He who is God over all be (is) blessed for ever: or, He who is over all is God, blessed for ever. Others punctuate, flesh, who is over all. God be (is) blessed for ever.");
- Twentieth Century (1900), "and so far as his earthly parentage was concerned, from their nation came the Christ--he who is supreme over all things, God for ever blessed";
- American Standard (1901), same as English Revised (margin: "Or flesh; he who is over all, God, be blessed for ever.");
- Weymouth (1903), "from them in respect of His human lineage came the Christ, who is exalted above all, God blessed throughout the ages" (margin: "or 'the Christ. He who is God over all be blessed for ever.'");
- Moffatt (1913), "theirs too (so far as natural descent goes) is the Christ. (Blessed for evermore be the God who is over all!)"
- Westminster (1920), "from whom was Christ according to the flesh, who is over all, God blessed for ever" (the marginal note explaining that this is a reference to God in the flesh, "the sense urgently demanded by the context, and confirmed by considerations of grammar, as by the voice of tradition");
- Goodspeed (1923), "from them physically Christ came--God who is over all be blessed forever!";
- Ballantine (1923), "from whom by physical descent the Christ came. God who is over all be blessed through the ages!";
- Montgomery (1924), "and of them, as concerning the flesh, is Christ, who is over all, God, blessed forever";
- Williams (1937), "and from them by natural descent the Christ has come, who is exalted over all, God blessed forever";
- Spencer (1937), "from whom, as regards the flesh, is the Christ, who is God over all, blessed for all eternity";
- Confraternity (1941), "from whom is the Christ according to the flesh, who is, over all things, God blessed forever";

Basic English (1941), "and of whom came Christ in the flesh, who is over all, God, to whom be blessing for ever";

Knox (1944), "theirs is the human stock from which Christ came; Christ who rules as God over all things, blessed for ever";

Verkuyl (1945), "and from them in human lineage sprang Christ, He who is God over all, blessed forever";

Revised Standard (1946), "of their race, according to the flesh, is the Christ. God who is over all be blessed forever" (margin: "Or Christ, who is God over all blessed forever.");

Phillips (1947), "so too, as far as human descent goes, is Christ Himself, Christ, blessed be God for ever";

Lilly (1956), "and from them has been derived the human nature of Christ, who exalted above all beings, is God blessed forever."

The translations seem to come under the four classifications as follows:

1. Literal, obscure, and ambiguous: None.
2. Literal, but equivalent to an interpretation: None. A literal translation of the Greek or Latin with the traditional punctuation would result in an interpretation, but in view of the antiquity of the controversy over this verse it is more likely that even the older English translators were not unaware of the choice they were making. According to Sanday and Headlam, Erasmus had already expressed his doubts in the matter and suggested three alternative interpretations.
3. Interpretative, with at least one alternative: English Revised, American Standard, Weymouth, and Revised Standard.
4. Interpretative, with no alternative: Wycliffe, Tyndale, Coverdale, Rogers, Taverner, Great, Geneva, Bishops', Rheims, King James, Twentieth Century, Moffatt, Westminster, Goodspeed, Ballantine, Montgomery, Williams, Spencer, Confraternity, Basic English, Knox, Verkuyl, Phillips, Schonfield, and Lilly.

The passage is interpreted as a doxology to the Father by the English Revised (margin), American Standard (margin), Weymouth (margin), Moffatt, Goodspeed, Ballantine, Revised Standard, and Schonfield. All the remaining versions interpret as a statement of the deity of Christ.

Romans 9:22.--εἰ δὲ θεῶν ὁ θεὸς ἐνδεδίξασθαι τὴν ὀργὴν... ἤνεγκεν

The participle θεῶν is ambiguous. It may be interpreted as concessive, meaning "though willing," or causal, meaning "because willing." The two possible interpretations have been much discussed. Does Paul mean that because God desired to show the dreadful nature of his wrath, he bore long and patiently with sinners so that, as with Pharoah, the final display of his anger might be even more terrible? Or is it that although God wished to show his wrath, nevertheless in his longsuffering he withheld the retribution deserved by those who were fit only for destruction?

J. Knox concedes that "only a few passages in Paul are more obscure than this one, and no certainty is possible as to how it ought to be translated." He favors "because willing" as harmonizing better with the context but sees the alternative "although willing" as having "the religiously valuable effect of softening the harsh doctrine Paul has been engaged in stating." Gifford states definitely that the context makes it "certain" that Paul means "because He willed" and not "although He willed." Lietzmann and Boylan also interpret θεῶν as causal. Parry argues that the participle describes neither the reason (because) nor a contrast (although), but rather "the general condition under which the action of the main verb takes place." He translates "in willing" or "while willing." Nygren also apparently interprets θεῶν causally in his translation, "If

God, to show his wrath." Barrett regards "because he wished" as "preferable on every ground."

Sanday and Headlam acknowledge the two possible interpretations and admit that "most commentators" translate "because willing." But they then explain how the context makes it plain that the concessive "although willing" is the "correct" rendering. Denney also argues that only "although willing" is consistent with the context. The same view is held by Lange, Meyer, Riddle, Stephens, Garvie, Dummelow, and Robertson.

The versions have translated as follows:

Wycliffe (1382), "That if God willinge for to shewe wraththe . . . susteynede" (changed to "that if god willinge to shewe his wraththe . . . hath suffrid" in the Purvey 1388 revision. Vulgate: "Quod si Deus uolens ostendere iram . . . sustinuit," which is as ambiguous as the Greek);

Tyndale (1525), "Even so, God willynge to shewe his wrath . . . suffered";

Coverdale (1535), "Therefore when God wolde shewe wrath . . . he broughte forth" (Luther, 1524: "Der halben da gott wolt zorn erzeygen . . . hatt . . . erfür bracht"; the last two words being changed in the 1534 edition to "getragen");

Rogers (1537), same as Tyndale;

Taverner (1539), "That if God willynge to shew his wrath . . . suffered";

Great (1539), same as Tyndale;

Geneva (1560), "(What) and if GOD wolde, to shewe hys wrathe . . . suffre";

Bishops' (1568), "If then, God wyllyng to shewe his wrath . . . suffred" (changed to "What if God wyllyng to shewe his wrath . . . suffered" in the 1572 edition);

Rheims (1582), "And if God willing to shew wrath . . . sustained";

King James (1611), "What if God, willing to shew his wrath . . . indured";

English Revised (1881), same as King James;

Twentieth Century (1900), "And what if God, although he intended to re-

veal his displeasure . . . bore" (changed to "And what if God, intending to reveal his displeasure . . . bore" in the 1904 final edition);

American Standard (1901), same as King James (margin: "Or, although willing");

Weymouth (1903), "And what if God, while choosing to make manifest the terrors of His anger . . . has yet borne" (changed to "And what if God, while having the will to make manifest His anger . . . has yet borne" in the 1929 fifth edition);

Moffatt (1913), "What if God, though desirous to display his anger . . . has tolerated";

Westminster (1920), "And what if God, wishing to show his wrath . . . 'hath borne'";

Goodspeed (1923), "Then what if God, though he wanted to display his anger . . . has shown great patience";

Ballantine (1923), "What if God, choosing to exhibit his wrath . . . bore";

Montgomery (1924), "But what if God, while yet intending to show forth his wrath . . . yet endured";

Williams (1937), "And what if God, though wishing to display His anger . . . yet has . . . borne";

Spencer (1937), "But what if God, though willing to display His wrath . . . ENDURES";

Confraternity (1941), "But what if God, wishing to show his wrath . . . endured";

Basic English (1941), "What if God, desiring to let his wrath . . . be seen . . . put up with";

Knox (1944), "It may be that God has borne . . . meaning to give proof of that vengeance" (margin: "these words have sometimes been interpreted 'although he would have liked to give proof . . . there and then,' but the Greek does not favour this rendering.");

Verkuyl (1945), "God, minded to show His indignation . . . and yet enduring";

Revised Standard (1946), "What if God, desiring to show his wrath . . . has endured";

Phillips (1947), "May it not be that God, though He must sooner or later

expose His wrath against sin . . . has yet . . . endured";

Schonfield (1955), "Supposing that God, wishing to display his genius . . . produced" (the context showing that "wishing" is to be understood as causal);

Lilly (1956), "If God who intends to show his wrath . . . endured."

The translations seem to come under the four classifications as follows:

1. Literal, obscure, and ambiguous: None.
2. Literal, but equivalent to an interpretation: Wycliffe, Tyndale, Coverdale, Rogers, Taverner, Great, Geneva, Bishops', Rheims, King James, English Revised, Westminster, Ballantine, Confraternity, Basic English, Revised Standard, and Lilly. The literal translation is most readily understood causally to mean "because he wished." Evidence for this is the placing of the alternative concessive interpretation "although willing" in the margin of the American Standard.
3. Interpretative, with at least one alternative: American Standard and Knox.
4. Interpretative, with no alternative: Twentieth Century, Weymouth, Moffatt, Goodspeed, Montgomery, Williams, Spencer, Verkuyl, Phillips, and Schonfield.

Of the versions offering deliberately interpretative translations,  $\theta\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omega\nu$  has been interpreted as causal, "because willing," by Twentieth Century (1904), Knox, and Schonfield. It has been interpreted as concessive, "although willing," by Twentieth Century (1900), American Standard (margin), Weymouth, Moffatt, Goodspeed, Montgomery, Williams, Spencer, Verkuyl, and Phillips.

Romans 9:22.--κατηρτισμένα εἰς ἀπώλειαν

The precise meaning of the participle *κατηρτισμένα* is uncertain. If it is interpreted in the middle voice, the phrase means that the vessels of wrath have prepared themselves for destruction. If the voice is passive, the meaning is that the vessels have been prepared for destruction by someone else, presumably God. A third possibility is to translate *κατηρτισμένα* in an adjectival sense, meaning "fit," "ripe," "ready," thus not indicating who is responsible.

Arndt and Gingrich acknowledge without further comment the three possible translations, "created for destruction," "ready (ripe) for destruction," or "having prepared themselves for destruction." Sanday and Headlam admit that all three meanings are grammatically possible but explain that the context makes it apparent that Paul did not state who was responsible. "He says just what is necessary for his immediate purpose--they were fitted for eternal destruction." Robertson takes the same position but adds, "that they are responsible may be seen from 1 Thess. 2:15-16." Boylan also lists all three interpretations as "possible," concluding that "probably" it is best to understand the participle as meaning "fully disposed." The adjectival sense of *κατηρτισμένα* is also preferred by Vincent, Lagrange, Parry, and Kirk. Parry adds that the present condition of the vessels of wrath is due to "their own conduct."

Thayer explains on the contrary that the vessels represent "men whose souls God has so constituted that they cannot escape destruction." Bosworth explains that the vessels were "apparently fitted by God for destruction." Meyer supports the same view. Denney points out that Paul does not say who has done the fitting, but he still translates in the passive, "perfected, made quite fit or ripe." Abbott-Smith also lists

the participle here as passive voice. Bauer translates, "created [geschaffen] for destruction."

The versions have translated as follows:

Wycliffe (1382), "able in to pernicioun, or dampnacioun" (Vulgate: "apta in interitum," as ambiguous as the Greek);

Tyndale (1525), "ordeyned to damnacion" (Luther, 1524: "Zugericht seind zur verdammis");

Coverdale (1535), "which are ordeyned to damnacion";

Rogers (1537), same as Tyndale;

Taverner (1539), same as Tyndale;

Great (1539), same as Tyndale;

Geneva (1560), "prepared to destruction" (changed from "made ready to damnation" in Whittingham, 1557);

Bishops' (1568), "ordayned to destruction";

Rheims (1582), "apte to destruction" (changed to "fitted for destruction" in Challoner, 1749);

King James (1611), "fitted to destruction" (margin: "Or, made up");

English Revised (1881), "fitted unto destruction";

Twentieth Century (1900), "fit only for destruction";

American Standard (1901), same as English Revised;

Weymouth (1903), "who stand ready for destruction";

Moffatt (1913), "ripe and ready to be destroyed";

Westminster (1920), "fashioned unto 'destruction'";

Goodspeed (1923), "already ripe for destruction";

Ballantine (1923), "made for destruction";

Montgomery (1924), same as King James;

Williams (1937), same as Goodspeed (margin: "Lit., vessels made ready for destruction");

Spencer (1937), "fitted for DESTRUCTION";



Confraternity (1941), "ready for destruction";  
 Basic English (1941), "were ready for destruction";  
 Knox (1944), same as Twentieth Century;  
 Verkuyl (1945), "are maturing for destruction";  
 Revised Standard (1946), same as Ballantine;  
 Phillips (1947), "things that cry out to be destroyed";  
 Schonfield (1955), "[produced . . . crude articles] prepared for destruction";  
 Lilly (1956), "were ripe for destruction."

The translations seem to come under the four classifications as follows:

1. Literal, obscure, and ambiguous: None.
2. Literal, but equivalent to an interpretation: None.
3. Interpretative, with at least one alternative: Williams.
4. Interpretative, with no alternative: All versions except Williams.

Of the versions offering interpretative translations, the participle *κατηρτισμένα* has been interpreted as passive voice by Tyndale, Coverdale, Rogers, Taverner, Great, Geneva, Bishops', King James, Challoner, English Revised, American Standard, Westminster, Ballantine, Montgomery, Williams (margin), Spencer, Revised Standard, and Schonfield. In the context of Rom. 9:22, the Westminster, Ballantine, and Revised Standard translations "made," "fashioned," seem to suggest quite clearly that it was God who formed the vessels for destruction. Schonfield represents this idea very clearly with his translation "produced with immense pains crude articles prepared for destruction." The same idea seems also to be implicit in the translation "ordained" offered by Tyn-

dale, Coverdale, Rogers, Taverner, Great, and Bishops', though it seems probable that the word "ordained" is being used in these versions in the now obsolete sense of "made ready," "prepared." The translations "fitted," "prepared," should perhaps be classified as ambiguous, since they may be taken either as passive participles, or as adjectives, synonymous with "fit," "ready." However, in the context of Rom. 9:22 it seems that they would be most readily understood as passive participles, attributing the fitting and preparing to God.

The participle has been interpreted in the more strictly adjectival sense by Wycliffe, Rheims (1582), Twentieth Century, Weymouth, Moffatt, Goodspeed, Williams, Confraternity, Basic English, Knox, Verkuyl, Phillips, and Lilly.

Romans 10:4.--τέλος γὰρ νόμου Χριστός

There are two problems of translation in this passage. The first is regarding the interpretation of τέλος. It may be understood as "termination," "conclusion," or "goal," or "fulfilment." The literal translation "Christ is the end of the law" is as ambiguous as the Greek. Did Christ bring the law to an "end," or was he the "end" the law had in view? Or does τέλος include both of these ideas?

Sanday and Headlam observe that the interpretation of this verse has been "much confused" owing to such "incorrect translations" as "aim," "fulfilment." They urge that τέλος never means "fulfilment" (τελείωσις) and that syntax and context eliminate the possibility of its meaning "aim," or "goal." "The normal meaning of the word, and the correct one here, is that of 'termination.'" J. Knox argues more cautiously that Paul's meaning here is "probably that in Christ the law is superseded

. . . rather than that the goal of the law is reached, although that too is a perfectly congenial Pauline idea." With similar caution, Bauer, in defining  $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omicron\varsigma$  as meaning both "termination" and "goal," ventures that "perhaps this is the place for Rom. 10:4, in the sense that Christ is the goal and the termination of the law at the same time." Barrett also understands  $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omicron\varsigma$  here as meaning both "termination" and "purpose," "intention."

Boylan argues for the interpretation "goal" or "terminus" on the basis that Paul is "not here thinking primarily of Christ as the 'end' (abrogation) of the Law." He admits, however, that the latter implication "can scarcely be excluded from the present context." Lange and Riddle also hold the view that Paul is emphasizing here that Christ is the "aim" or "goal" of the law, and Riddle lists Chrysostom, Calvin, Alford, and others as taking the same position.

Kirk understands  $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omicron\varsigma$  to mean both the termination of the law and the fulfilment to which it pointed. Parry sees the same two meanings in  $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omicron\varsigma$  but adds that "the special point here" is that Christ "ends the dispensation of law." Vincent allows that  $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omicron\varsigma$  may mean "aim," "fulfilment," or "termination," but regards the last as preferable.

Robertson accepts Denney's interpretation that while it is both true and Pauline that Christ is the goal or aim of the law, as he is also the consummation or fulfilment of the law, nevertheless these ideas "are irrelevant here." "Paul's main idea is that Christ ended the law as a method of salvation." Stephens paraphrases, "There can be no thought of the Law as the means of salvation now that Christ has come." Cremer states definitely that  $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omicron\varsigma$  denotes "the final end, the conclusion which

the dominion of the law has found in Christ." The same interpretation is preferred by Gifford, Thayer, Dummelow, Bosworth, Lietzmann, Dodd, Abbott-Smith, Nygren, and C. F. D. Moule.

The second problem in this passage involves the translation of νόμου. The traditional interpretation has been to understand νόμος here as referring to the law of Moses, the Old Testament dispensation. But many modern commentators and translators have preferred to take νόμος in this context as representing law in its most general sense, understanding the passage to mean that Christ brought to an end the principle that law or legalism is a means of attaining to righteousness. Inasmuch as τέλος and νόμου are both anarthrous, no stress may be laid on the absence of the article with νόμου, and the correct interpretation must be determined from the context.

Sanday and Headlam argue that the context "proves" that Paul is speaking of law as a principle. They claim that νόμου has been "incorrectly interpreted" to mean the Jewish Law by "almost all commentators." They list "all the Fathers," Calvin, De Wette, Meyer, Vaughan, and others. Thayer also interprets, "the law of Moses." But Denney explains that νόμος here must be understood as law "in its widest sense," of which the Mosaic law is "only one of the most important instances." C. F. D. Moule interprets clearly, "Christ is an end of legalism."

The versions have translated as follows:

Wycliffe (1382), "Forsothe the ende of the lawe Crist" (Vulgate: "Finis enim legis Christus," as ambiguous as the Greek);

Tyndale (1525), "For Christ is the ende of the lawe" (Luther, 1524: "Christus ist des gesetz end");

Coverdale (1535), same as Tyndale;

- Rogers (1537), same as Tyndale (margin: "Christ is the ende of the lawe, that is, Christ is the fulfyllinge of the lawe");
- Taverner (1539), same as Tyndale;
- Great (1539), "For Christ is the fulfyllinge of the lawe";
- Geneva (1560), "For Christ is the end of the Law" (margin: "The end of the Lawe is to iustifie them which observe it: therefore Christ having fulfilled it for us, is made our iustice, sanctification, etc." Whittingham, 1557, did not capitalize "lawe.");
- Bishops' (1568), same as Tyndale (margin: "That is, Christ hath fulfilled the whole lawe." The marginal note to Rom. 7:1 adds that the law was "abolished for her imperfection.");
- Rheims (1582), "For the end of the Law is Christ" (margin: "The Law was not given to make a man iust or perfect by it self, but to bring us to Christ");
- King James (1611), "For Christ is the end of the Law" (Blayney, 1769, italicizes "is," the same as Geneva, 1560);
- English Revised (1881), same as King James;
- Twentieth Century (1900), "For Christ has brought Law to an end";
- American Standard (1901), same as King James;
- Weymouth (1903), "Christ is the termination of Law" (margin: "Or 'the end the Law had in view.'" Changed in the 1929 fifth edition to "For the consummation of Law is Christ," with margin: "Or 'the end that the Law had in view.'");
- Moffatt (1913), "Now Christ is an end to law";
- Westminster (1920), "For Christ is the consummation of the Law" (with a marginal note explaining that "consummation" implies "at once fulfillment and--which in this passage is primarily in question--cessation");
- Goodspeed (1923), "For Christ marks the termination of law";
- Ballantine (1923), same as King James;
- Montgomery (1924), "For . . . Christ is an end of law";
- Williams (1937), "For Christ has put an end to law" (margin: "Grk., is the end of the law");
- Spencer (1937), "for the goal of the Law is Christ";

- Confraternity (1941), same as Westminster;
- Basic English (1941), same as King James;
- Knox (1944), "Christ has superseded the law";
- Verkuyl (1945), "For Christ is . . . the completion of the Law";
- Revised Standard (1946), same as Tyndale;
- Phillips (1947), "For Christ means the end of [the struggle for righteousness-by-] the-Law";
- Schonfield (1955), "Christ is the end of law" (the context indicating that "end" here means "termination");
- Lilly (1956), "Christ has put an end to the Law" (margin: "literally, 'is the end,' which some understand as 'purpose'").

The translations of  $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omicron\varsigma$  seem to come under the four classifications as follows:

1. Literal, obscure, and ambiguous: Wycliffe, Tyndale, Coverdale, Rogers, Taverner, Geneva, Bishops', Rheims, King James, English Revised, American Standard, Ballantine, Basic English, and Revised Standard.
2. Literal, but equivalent to an interpretation: None.
3. Interpretative, with at least one alternative: Weymouth, Williams, and Lilly.
4. Interpretative, with no alternative: Great, Twentieth Century, Moffatt, Westminster, Goodspeed, Montgomery, Spencer, Confraternity, Knox, Verkuyl, Phillips, and Schonfield.

Of the versions offering interpretative translations,  $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omicron\varsigma$  has been interpreted to mean "end," "termination," by the Twentieth Century, Weymouth (1903), Moffatt, Goodspeed, Montgomery, Williams, Knox, Phillips, Schonfield, and Lilly. It has been interpreted as "consummation," "fulfilment," "completion," by the Great, Weymouth (1929), Westminster, Confraternity, and Verkuyl. Spencer alone translates as "goal," although

this is also quite evidently the meaning of "end" in Weymouth's marginal alternative "the end the Law had in view."

The translations of νόμου seem to come under the four classifications as follows:

1. Literal, obscure, and ambiguous: None.
2. Literal, but equivalent to an interpretation: Wycliffe, Tyndale, Coverdale, Rogers, Taverner, Great, Whittingham, Bishops', Knox, and Revised Standard. All of these versions translate νόμου literally as "the law." However, even though "law" is not capitalized, this translation is most naturally understood to mean the Old Testament law, and it obscures the alternative interpretation of "law" as a general principle.
3. Interpretative, with at least one alternative: Weymouth and Williams.
4. Interpretative, with no alternative: Geneva, Rheims, King James, English Revised, Twentieth Century, American Standard, Moffatt, Westminster, Goodspeed, Ballantine, Montgomery, Spencer, Confraternity, Basic English, Verkuyl, Phillips, Schonfield, and Lilly.

Of the versions offering deliberately interpretative translations, νόμου has been translated "the Law" by the Geneva, Rheims, King James, English Revised, American Standard, Westminster, Ballantine, Spencer, Confraternity, Basic English, Verkuyl, Phillips, and Lilly. It is interpreted as "law" in the general sense by the Twentieth Century, Weymouth, Moffatt, Goodspeed, Montgomery, Williams, and Schonfield.

Romans 11:13.---ὅμιν δὲ λέγω τοῖς ἔθνεσιν

In this ambiguous phrase the pronoun ὅμιν may be taken as referring to the Roman church as a whole or to only a part of the membership.

Thus the passage may be translated "I say to you, Gentiles," indicating that the Roman church was predominantly of Gentile origin. Or it may be translated, "I speak now to those of you who are Gentiles," meaning that Paul has turned his attention from the Jews to address some remarks to those members of the Roman congregation who had been Gentiles. The argument as to whether or not the church at Rome was largely made up of Jewish or Gentile converts hinges partly on the interpretation of this passage.

Sanday and Headlam claim that "this verse and the references to the Gentiles that follow seem to show conclusively that St. Paul expected the majority of his readers to be Gentiles." Hort admits that the Greek is ambiguous but concludes that the context appears "decisive" for taking  $\epsilon\upsilon\alpha\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\iota\sigma\mu\acute{o}\nu$  as "the Church itself, and not as a part of it." Gifford states that "it is rightly inferred from this passage that the Roman Christians were for the most part Gentiles." Garvie agrees that "this address suggests that . . . Paul was conscious that for the most part he was addressing Gentiles." Denney explains that "Paul does not here address a new class of readers. He has been speaking all along to a Gentile church." Dummelow infers from the passage that "the Roman Christians were chiefly Gentiles." Bosworth interprets, "I realize that I am writing to Gentiles." Stephens translates likewise, "I am writing to a Gentile church." Barrett takes the same view.

On the other hand, Lagrange explains that Paul now addresses himself especially to the Gentiles. He claims that the majority of the community was composed of Jewish converts and that after having spoken to them all the rest of the epistle, Paul addresses himself here to the minor-



ity, of pagan origin. Zahn takes a similar view. Boylan agrees that "Paul here speaks especially to the Gentile members of the Roman Church." Parry cautions that this passage must of course not be understood as implying that those to whom Paul was writing were all Gentiles.

The versions have translated as follows:

- Wycliffe (1382), "Sothli I seye to zou, hethen men" (Vulgate: "Uobis enim dico gentibus," as ambiguous as the Greek);
- Tyndale (1525), "I speake to you gentyls";
- Coverdale (1539), "I speake unto you Heythen" (Luther, 1524: "Mit euch heyden rede ich");
- Rogers (1537), same as Tyndale;
- Taverner (1539), same as Tyndale;
- Great (1539), same as Tyndale;
- Geneva (1560), "For (in that) I speak to you Gentiles";
- Bishops' (1568), "For I speake to you Gentiles";
- Rheims (1582), "For to you Gentiles I say";
- King James (1611), same as Bishops';
- English Revised (1881), "But I speak to you that are Gentiles";
- Twentieth Century (1900), "I am speaking to you who belong to a heathen nation" (changed to "But I am speaking to you who were Gentiles" in the 1904 final edition);
- American Standard (1901), same as English Revised;
- Weymouth (1903), "But to you Gentiles I say" (changed to "But I speak to you who are Gentiles" in the 1929 fifth edition);
- Moffatt (1913), "I tell you this, you Gentiles";
- Westminster (1920), "I speak now to you gentiles" (the context showing that "now" is being used in the temporal sense);
- Goodspeed (1923), "But it is to you who are of the heathen that I am speaking";
- Ballantine (1923), "But I say to you Gentiles";

- Montgomery (1924), "For to you who are Gentiles I say";
- Williams (1937), "Yes, I now am speaking to you who are a part of the heathen peoples";
- Spencer (1937), "Now I am talking to you Gentiles" (the context showing that the "now" is temporal);
- Confraternity (1941), "For I say to you Gentiles";
- Basic English (1941), "But I say to you, Gentiles";
- Knox (1944), "(I am speaking now to you Gentiles)" (the marginal note explaining that the following words are addressed to the Gentile readers. The "now" is temporal, as shown by the context.);
- Verkuyl (1945), "But I tell you, gentiles";
- Revised Standard (1946), "now I am speaking to you Gentiles" (the context indicating that "now" is probably not temporal but merely a connective. Compare the use of "now" in the preceding verse.);
- Phillips (1947), "now a word to you who are Gentiles";
- Schonfield (1955), same as Knox (the context suggesting that the "now" is probably temporal);
- Lilly (1956), "Now I say to you Gentiles" (the context indicating that "now" is probably not temporal but merely a connective).

The translations seem to come under the four classifications as follows:

1. Literal, obscure, and ambiguous: Tyndale, Coverdale, Rogers, Taverner, Great, Geneva, Bishops', Rheims, King James, Weymouth (1903), Ballantine, Confraternity, Revised Standard, and Lilly. The literal "I speak to you Gentiles" does not indicate whether Paul is addressing the church as a whole or a part of the membership.
2. Literal, but equivalent to an interpretation: None.
3. Interpretative, with at least one alternative: None.
4. Interpretative, with no alternative: Wycliffe, English Revised, Twentieth Century, American Standard, Weymouth (1929), Moffatt,

Westminster, Goodspeed, Montgomery, Williams, Spencer, Basic English, Knox, Verkuyl, Phillips, and Schonfield. It is being assumed that the translation "I speak to you who are Gentiles" means "I speak to those of you who are Gentiles," since there is no comma before the relative clause.

Of the versions offering interpretative translations, Wycliffe, Moffatt, Basic English, and Verkuyl interpret ὑμῶν as referring to a predominantly, if not entirely, Gentile congregation. ὑμῶν is taken to represent the Gentiles as but a part of the congregation, implying that a significant segment, if not the majority, of the Roman membership was Jewish, by the English Revised, Twentieth Century, American Standard, Weymouth (1929), Westminster, Goodspeed, Montgomery, Williams, Spencer, Knox, Phillips, and Schonfield.

Romans 12:16.--τοῖς ταπεινοῖς συναπαγόμενοι

The gender of the adjective ταπεινοῖς may be taken as either masculine or neuter. Interpreted as masculine, the passage would mean that Christians should be willing to associate with humble people. Interpreted as neuter, the passage would mean that believers should be willing to condescend to lowly ways, humble tasks. Either meaning would seem to suit the context equally well.

Bauer discusses the problem at some length, listing a number of scholars in favor of each view but venturing no opinion himself. Denney also cites evidence supporting each of the two possibilities and concludes that "certainty on such points must always be personal rather than scientific." His own personal preference is for the masculine, since this alternative "impresses" him as "much more in harmony with the nature of the

words used than the other." Parry acknowledges that the antithesis to τὰ ὑψηλά has led some commentators to take ταπεινοῖς as neuter here, but he urges that this view is opposed both by the context and by "biblical use." Garvie, Zahn, Lagrange, and Nygren also favor the masculine.

On the contrary, Sanday and Headlam interpret ταπεινοῖς as "probably" neuter, since "the neuter seems best to suit the contrast with τὰ ὑψηλά and the meaning of the verb." Vincent lists numerous scholars on either side of the question and expresses his own preference for the neuter. Robertson concedes that the adjective may be masculine but favors the translation "condescend to things that are lowly." Barth uses the same translation. Thayer interprets, "yield or submit one's self to lowly things, conditions, employments." Weiss, Dummelow, Kühn, and Lietzmann also prefer the neuter.

Barrett admits that "it is impossible to feel that either translation is correct to the exclusion of the other." He adds that "it is well to remember that Greek occasionally allows an ambiguity impossible in English; Paul may have been aware, and may have approved, of both ways of taking his words."

The versions have translated as follows:

Wycliffe (1382), "consentyng to meke thingis" (Vulgate: "humilibus consentientes," as ambiguous as the Greek);

Tyndale (1525), "make yourselves equall to them of the lower sorte" (Luther, 1524: "macht euch ōben dem nydringen," changed in the 1534 edition to "haltet euch herunter zu den nidrigen");

Coverdale (1535), "make youre selves equall to them of ye lowe [sic] sorte";

Rogers (1537), same as Tyndale;

Taverner (1539), same as Tyndale;

- Great (1539), same as Tyndale;
- Geneva (1560), same as Tyndale;
- Bishops' (1568), "makyng your selves equall to them of the lower sort";
- Rheims (1582), "consenting to the humble";
- King James (1611), "condescend to men of lowe estate" (margin: "Or, be contented with mean things");
- English Revised (1881), "condescend to things that are lowly" (margin: "Or, them");
- Twentieth Century (1900), "be glad to associate with the lowly";
- American Standard (1901), same as English Revised (margin: "Or, them");
- Weymouth (1903), "let humble ways content you" (margin: "Or 'associate freely with humble brethren'");
- Moffatt (1913), "associate with humble folk";
- Westminster (1920), "give yourselves over to humility";
- Goodspeed (1923), "accept humble tasks";
- Ballantine (1923), "be content with humble things";
- Montgomery (1924), "associate with lowly folk";
- Williams (1937), "keep on associating with lowly people";
- Spencer (1937), "accommodate yourselves to the lowly";
- Confraternity (1941), "condescend to the lowly";
- Basic English (1941), "keep company with those of low position";
- Knox (1944), "falling in with the opinions of common folk";
- Verkuy1 (1945), "willingly adjust yourselves to humble situations";
- Revised Standard (1946), "associate with the lowly" (margin: "Or give yourselves to humble tasks");
- Phillips (1947), "take a real interest in ordinary people";
- Schonfield (1955), "consort with the humble";
- Lilly (1956), "agreeing in thought with lowly people."

The translations seem to come under the four classifications as follows:

1. Literal, obscure, and ambiguous: Rheims, Westminster, Spencer, and Confraternity. It seems probable that these versions have made a deliberate attempt to represent the ambiguity of the original. It is interesting to note that all of these versions are Roman Catholic, two from the Latin, two from the Greek. However, Knox and Lilly interpret as masculine.

2. Literal, but equivalent to an interpretation: None.

3. Interpretative, with at least one alternative: King James, English Revised, American Standard, Weymouth, and Revised Standard.

4. Interpretative, with no alternative: Wycliffe, Tyndale, Coverdale, Rogers, Taverner, Great, Geneva, Bishops', Twentieth Century, Moffatt, Goodspeed, Ballantine, Montgomery, Williams, Basic English, Knox, Verkuyl, Phillips, Schonfield, and Lilly.

Of the versions offering interpretative translations, *ταπεινοῦς* has been interpreted as masculine by Tyndale, Coverdale, Rogers, Taverner, Great, Geneva, Bishops', King James, English Revised (margin), Twentieth Century, American Standard (margin), Weymouth (margin), Moffatt, Montgomery, Williams, Basic English, Knox, Revised Standard, Phillips, Schonfield, and Lilly. The adjective is interpreted as neuter by the King James (margin), English Revised, American Standard, Weymouth, Goodspeed, Ballantine, Verkuyl, and Revised Standard (margin).

Romans 12:19.--δότε τόπον τῷ ὀργῷ

There seems to be decreasing disagreement among translators and commentators as to the correct meaning of this phrase. The literal and

traditional "give place unto wrath" is very obscure and ambiguous. The main question is concerning the interpretation of ὀργῆ. Does it refer to the wrath of man or the wrath of God? The decision largely determines the translation of the expression ὅτε τὸ πον.

Taking ὀργῆ as human wrath, some have understood the injunction to mean, "give way before the wrath of your enemy." Others have interpreted, "leave room for your own wrath to cool." Most, however, take ὀργῆ as referring to God's wrath and interpret, "leave room for the wrath of God to have its way." All three of these interpretations are represented in the versions.

Sanday and Headlam translate "give room or place to the wrath of God," meaning "let God's wrath punish." They claim that the quotation in the next verse shows that this is the right interpretation of ὀργῆ. They cite the two main alternative interpretations, "allow space, interpose delay," meaning "check and restrain your wrath," and "yield to the anger of your opponent," but conclude that "neither of these interpretations suits the context or the Greek." Barrett states that "were it not for the quotation that follows . . . it would be possible to translate 'Avoid wrath.'"

Goodspeed claims that "in almost every place in which Paul uses ὀργῆ, it is God's wrath that is plainly intended."<sup>1</sup> Bauer interprets, "give the wrath (of God) an opportunity to work out its purpose." Thayer, Abbott-Smith, and Liddell and Scott offer similar translations. Boylan explains that the passage does not mean "give way before the wrath of

---

<sup>1</sup>E. J. Goodspeed, Problems of New Testament Translation (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1945), pp. 152-154.

your enemy" but rather that the Christian must "leave the avenging to God's 'anger.'" The same view is taken by Lange, Gifford, Denney, Garvie, Parry, Findlay, Lietzmann, Lagrange, Robertson, Boylan, and most others.

On the other hand, Eadie regards Tyndale's interpretative translation, "geve roume unto the wrath of God" as an "incorrect rendering" such as one might expect to find in "such an adventurous and untried attempt" at Bible translation.<sup>1</sup> Weymouth (1903) interprets the passage to mean "give way before the anger of your opponent." Fenton (1905) translates, "receding from fury." Schonfield (1955) interprets, "give anger a wide berth." Spencer (1937) explains in his margin that the passage may mean, "do not resist an angry person." Knox (1944) gives both alternatives in the margin, "make way before the anger (of your opponent)," and "give place for your anger (to simmer down)." Riddle lists Ewald, Jowett, and Wordsworth as supporting the interpretation, "give place to the wrath of your enemy," meaning, "let your enemy have his way." He cites Bishop Wordsworth's argument that "it would hardly be presented as a Christian duty--to make room for the Divine wrath to work against an enemy."

Riddle also alludes to Wordsworth's defence of the ambiguous traditional rendering "give place unto wrath" as "excellent from its ambiguity, from not saying too much, and thus inviting study." He further notes Wordsworth's approval of Bishop Sanderson's rule for the exposition of such difficult passages: "I ever held it a kind of honest spiritual

---

<sup>1</sup>John Eadie, The English Bible, Vol. I (London: Macmillan Co., 1876), p. 152.



thrift, when there are two senses given of one place, both agreeable to the analogy of faith and manners, to make use of both." This rule seems to be followed by other expositors than the two bishops, and Riddle observes correctly, if somewhat facetiously, that Wordsworth's "own practice of this 'spiritual thrift' may lead to spiritual wealth, but certainly seems to tend to exegetical poverty."

The versions have translated as follows:

- Wycliffe (1382), "zyue ze place to ire, or wraththe" (changed to "zeue ze place to wraththe" in the Purvey 1388 revision. Vulgate: "date locum irae");
- Tyndale (1525), "Geve roume unto the wrath of God" (Luther, 1524: "gebt raum dem zorn gottes");
- Coverdale (1535), same as Tyndale;
- Rogers (1537), same as Tyndale;
- Taverner (1539), "gyve place to wrathe";
- Great (1539), "geve place unto wrath";
- Geneva (1560), same as Great (changed from "geve roume unto wrath" in the 1557 Whittingham edition);
- Bishops' (1568), same as Great;
- Rheims (1582), same as Great;
- King James (1611), same as Great;
- English Revised (1881), same as Great (margin: "Or, the wrath of God");
- Twentieth Century (1900), "leave room for God's judgment" (changed to "make way for the Wrath of God" in the 1904 final edition);
- American Standard (1901), "give place unto the wrath of God" (margin: "Or, wrath");
- Weymouth (1903), "give way before anger" (margin: "Lit. 'the anger,' of your opponent. Or 'leave room for the anger' of God, so that He may punish." This is changed to "leave it to God's wrath," with no marginal alternative, in the 1929 fifth edition);
- Moffatt (1913), "let the Wrath of God have its way";

- Westminster (1920), "give room to the wrath of God" (margin: "'Of God' is not in the Greek, but gives the sense, as the quotation shows.");
- Goodspeed (1923), "leave room for God's anger";
- Ballantine (1923), "give place to God's wrath";
- Montgomery (1924), "leave the field clear for God's wrath";
- Williams (1937), "leave a place for God's anger" (margin: "Implied," referring to the word "God's");
- Spencer (1937), "give place to the divine wrath" (margin: "Or, according to some, omitting the word divine, the sense is, Do not resist an angry person.");
- Confraternity (1941), "give place to the wrath";
- Basic English (1941), "give way to the wrath of God";
- Knox (1944), "allow retribution to run its course" (margin: "others would prefer to translate 'make way before the anger' [of your opponent], or 'give space for your anger' [to simmer down]");
- Verkuyl (1945), "leave room for divine retribution";
- Revised Standard (1946), "leave it to the wrath of God" (margin: "Greek give place");
- Phillips (1947), "stand back and let God punish if He will";
- Schonfield (1955), "give anger a wide berth";
- Lilly (1956), "give place to the wrath of God."

The translations seem to come under the four classifications as follows:

1. Literal, obscure, and ambiguous: Wycliffe, Taverner, Great, Geneva, Bishops', Rheims, King James, and Confraternity.
2. Literal, but equivalent to an interpretation: None.
3. Interpretative, with at least one alternative: English Revised, American Standard, Weymouth (1903), Westminster, Williams, Spencer, and Knox. Only Weymouth, Spencer, and Knox give two clear alterna-

tives, but the others have at least suggested the possibility of other interpretations.

4. Interpretative, with no alternative: Tyndale, Coverdale, Rogers, Twentieth Century, Weymouth (1929), Moffatt, Goodspeed, Ballantine, Montgomery, Basic English, Verkuyl, Revised Standard, Phillips, Schonfield, and Lilly.

Of the versions offering interpretative translations, *ὀργῆ* has been interpreted as human wrath by Weymouth (1903), Spencer (margin), Knox (margin), and Schonfield. All others interpret as the wrath of God, assuming that the Knox translation "retribution" implies the working of divine wrath.

Romans 16:26.--*εἰς ὑπακοὴν πίστεως*

As in Rom. 1:5, the genitive case of *πίστεως* may be taken as either subjective or objective, or as genitive of apposition, or epexegetic genitive, or genitive of description or quality (attributive). But it is surprising to note the amount of inconsistency in the interpretation of these two identical passages.

The versions have translated as follows:

Wycliffe (1382), "to the obedyence of faith" (Vulgate: "ad oboeditionem fidei," as ambiguous as the Greek. Rom. 1:5, "to obeische to the faith");

Tyndale (1525), "to stere uppe obediencie to the faythe" (Rom. 1:5, "that . . . shulde obeye to the faith," changed in 1534 to "to bring . . . unto obediencie of the fayth");

Coverdale (1535), "to set up the obediencie of the faith" (Luther, 1524: "den gehorsam des glaubens auffzurichten." Rom. 1:5, "to set up the obediencie of faith");

Rogers (1537), same as Tyndale (Rom. 1:5, "to bring . . . unto the obedyence of the fayth");

- Taverner (1539), same as Tyndale (Rom. 1:5, "to bring . . . unto the obedience of the fayth," the same as Rogers);
- Great (1539), same as Tyndale;
- Geneva (1560), "for the obedience of faith" (changed from Whittingham, 1557, "to stere up obedience to the fayth," the same as Tyndale. In Rom. 1:5, the Geneva, 1560, has "that obedience might be given unto the faith.");
- Bishops' (1568), same as Wycliffe (Rom. 1:5, "that obedience might be given unto the faith");
- Rheims (1582), same as Wycliffe (Rom. 1:5, "for obedience to the faith");
- King James (1611), same as Geneva (Rom. 1:5, "for obedience to the faith"; margin: "Or to the obedience of faith");
- English Revised (1881), "unto obedience of faith" (margin: "Or, to the faith");
- Twentieth Century (1900), "to secure submission to the Faith";
- American Revised (1901), same as English Revised (margin: "Or, to the faith");
- Weymouth (1903), "to win them to obedience to the faith" (with a note, as in Rom. 1:5, giving the literal "to obedience of faith." This time no change was made in the 1929 fifth edition, even though Rom. 1:5 was revised to "the obedience that springs from faith");
- Moffatt (1913), "for . . . obedience to the faith";
- Westminster (1920), same as English Revised;
- Goodspeed (1923), "to lead . . . to obedience and faith";
- Ballantine (1923), "to promote obedience to the faith" (Rom. 1:5, "to promote obedience of faith");
- Montgomery (1924), "so that . . . might hold obedience of the faith" (Rom. 1:5, "to promote obedience to the faith");
- Williams (1937), "to win . . . to obedience inspired by faith";
- Spencer (1937), "to bring about obedience to the faith" (Rom. 1:5, "to subdue . . . to faith");
- Confraternity (1941), "to bring about obedience to faith";
- Basic English (1941), "so that they may come under the rule of the faith"

- (Rom. 1:5, "to make disciples to the faith");
- Knox (1944), "so as to win the homage of their faith";
- Verkuyl (1945), "so that . . . shall be led to obedience of faith"  
(Rom. 1:5, "to promote a yielding in faith");
- Revised Standard (1946), same as Spencer;
- Phillips (1947), "that they may turn to Him in the obedience of faith"  
(Rom. 1:5, "to forward obedience to the Faith");
- Schonfield (1955), "to procure their loyal submission";
- Lilly (1956), "so as to bring about their submission to the faith" (Rom. 1:5, "to bring men . . . [to honor his name] by the submission of faith").

The translations seem to come under the four classifications as follows:

1. Literal, obscure, and ambiguous: Wycliffe, Coverdale, Geneva, Bishops', Rheims, King James, Westminster, Montgomery, Verkuyl, and Phillips. It is again possible, as in the translation of the same phrase in Rom. 1:5, that the rendering offered in these versions, and particularly Wycliffe, Geneva, Bishops', Rheims, King James, Westminster, Verkuyl, and Phillips, was intended to be understood as interpreting *πίστεως* in the subjective sense, or as epexegetic or attributive. Evidence for this may be the appearance of the objective interpretation "obedience to the faith" as an alternative to "obedience of faith" in the English Revised and American Standard, both for Rom. 16:26 and 1:5. The same alternatives are offered in text and margin of the King James for Rom. 1:5. However, the translations "obedience of faith" and "the obedience of the faith" could also be taken in the objective sense, and thus they deserve to be classified as literal, obscure, and ambiguous.

2. Literal, but equivalent to an interpretation: None.

3. Interpretative, with at least one alternative: English Revised, American Standard, and Weymouth. As in Rom. 1:5, the translation offered in the text of the English Revised and American Standard and in the margin of Weymouth is literal, obscure, and ambiguous. However, these versions are included in this classification since they have not only offered one clear translation in text or margin but have also at least suggested the possibility of a different interpretation.

4. Interpretative, with no alternative: Tyndale, Rogers, Taverner, Great, Whittingham, Twentieth Century, Moffatt, Goodspeed, Ballantine, Williams, Spencer, Confraternity, Basic English, Knox, Revised Standard, Schonfield, and Lilly.

Of the versions offering interpretative translations, Williams (parting company this time with Weymouth, 1929) has taken the genitive of  $\pi\rho\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\epsilon\upsilon\varsigma$  as subjective; Knox (differing this time from Lilly) has interpreted as genitive of apposition; Schonfield (differing this time from Verkuyl) has interpreted as genitive of description. Goodspeed's translation "obedience and faith" is again hard to classify grammatically, but he clearly rejects the objective interpretation. The genitive of  $\pi\rho\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\epsilon\upsilon\varsigma$  has been interpreted as objective by Tyndale, Rogers, Taverner, Great, Whittingham, Twentieth Century, Moffatt, Ballantine, Spencer, Confraternity, Basic English, Revised Standard, and Lilly. Of the latter, all but the Confraternity have interpreted  $\pi\rho\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\epsilon\upsilon\varsigma$  as "the faith" with the definite article.

A majority of the versions have offered significantly different translations in Rom. 1:5 and Rom. 16:26--Wycliffe, Tyndale (1534), Coverdale, Rogers, Taverner, Geneva, Bishops', Rheims, King James, Weymouth

(1929), Ballantine, Montgomery, Spencer, Verkuyl, Phillips, and Lilly. Of these, Weymouth (1929) has clearly switched from the subjective interpretation to the objective. Lilly has changed from the genitive of apposition to the objective genitive. Phillips has probably shifted from the objective to the subjective, though his translation "the obedience of faith" in Rom. 16:26 is classified as literal, obscure, and ambiguous. The Basic English has retained the objective interpretation in both passages but has changed the wording to an extent that seems somewhat inconsistent with the version's principle of simplicity. Spencer has changed from "faith," without the article, to "the faith," this time implying obedience to a body of doctrine rather than to the principle of faith.

## CHAPTER III

### SUMMARY OF THE COMPARISON OF TRANSLATIONS OF PROBLEM PASSAGES IN ROMANS

#### General Summary

In the preceding chapter a total of fifty-one significant but ambiguous words and passages in the book of Romans have been considered. The precise meaning of each of these must be regarded as somewhat uncertain. Among responsible and qualified scholars there is important disagreement as to the correct interpretation of each of the fifty-one passages. Equally marked is the disagreement among the versions and even editions of the same version.

The results of the comparison of the various types of translations given by the versions to these problem passages are perhaps most conveniently presented in the form of tables. Table 1 (see page 212) lists in columns 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 the total number of translations falling in each of the five classifications for each version or edition. Column 7 lists for each version the total number of deliberately interpretative translations, with or without marginal alternatives.

Column 8 lists the totals of interpretative renderings, with or without alternatives, including literal translations which suggest only one of the possible meanings and hence are equivalent to interpretations. Consequently, the figures in column 8 may serve as an index of the more



TABLE 1.--A summary of the various types of translation given by thirty-six versions and editions to fifty-one problem passages in the book of Romans

(1) The versions and editions included in the study	(2) Literal, obscure and ambiguous translations	(3) Literal, but equivalent to an interpretation	(4) Interpretative, with at least one alternative	(5) Interpretative, with no alternative	(6) Avoids the problem of interpretation	(7) Total of deliberately interpretative translations	(8) Total of interpretative translations (including column 3)	(9) Total of interp. trans. with no alternatives (incl. col.3)	(10) Rank among versions offering interpretative translations (including column 3)	(11) Rank among versions offering interp. trans. without alternatives (including column 3)
Wycliffe (1382) . . . . .	19	19	0	11	2	11	30	30	34	30
Tyndale (1525) . . . . .	11	4	0	34	2	34	38	38	23	15
Tyndale (1534) . . . . .	12	4	0	33	2	33	37	37	24	16
Coverdale (1535) . . . . .	11	6	0	33	1	33	39	39	21	14
Rogers (1537) . . . . .	12	4	0	33	2	33	37	37	24	16
Taverner (1539) . . . . .	15	4	0	30	2	30	34	34	28	23
Great (1539) . . . . .	15	4	0	30	2	30	34	34	28	23
Whittingham (1557) . . . . .	14	4	0	31	2	30	35	35	26	22
Geneva (1560) . . . . .	16	4	0	30	1	30	34	34	28	24

TABLE 1--Continued

Bishops' (1568) . . . . .	18	4	0	27	27	31	31	29	31	29
Bishops' (1572) . . . . .	18	6	0	27	27	33	33	33	31	26
Rheims (1582) . . . . .	21	18	1	11	12	30	34	29	34	31
Challoner (1749) . . . . .	21	17	1	12	13	30	34	29	34	31
King James (1611) . . . . .	19	5	9	18	27	32	32	23	32	35
Blayne (1769) . . . . .	16	5	8	22	30	35	26	27	26	33
English Revised (1881)	9	3	19	20	39	42	15	23	15	35
Twentieth Century (1900)	2	0	0	49	49	49	2	49	2	2
Twentieth Century (1904)	3	1	0	47	47	48	6	48	6	4
American Stan. (1901)	8	1	19	23	42	43	13	24	13	34
Weymouth (1903) . . . . .	2	1	16	32	48	49	2	33	2	26
Weymouth (1929) . . . . .	3	1	12	35	47	48	6	36	6	21
Moffatt (1913) . . . . .	4	0	0	45	45	45	10	45	10	6
Westminster (1920) . . . . .	10	2	4	35	39	41	16	37	16	16
Goodspeed (1923) . . . . .	2	2	0	47	47	49	2	49	2	2
Ballantine (1923) . . . . .	10	4	0	37	37	41	16	41	16	12
Montgomery (1924) . . . . .	7	1	0	43	43	44	11	44	11	7
Williams (1937) . . . . .	4	0	5	42	47	47	9	42	9	11
Spencer (1937) . . . . .	11	1	3	36	39	40	19	37	19	16
Confraternity (1941) . . . . .	12	14	2	24	25	39	21	37	21	16
Basic English (1941) . . . . .	8	3	0	38	38	41	16	41	16	12
Knox (1944) . . . . .	3	9	5	35	39	48	6	43	6	9
Verkuy1 (1945) . . . . .	6	0	0	44	44	44	11	44	11	7
Revised Stan. (1946) . . . . .	11	3	7	30	37	40	19	33	19	26
Phillips (1947) . . . . .	6	0	0	43	43	43	13	43	13	9
Schonfield (1955) . . . . .	1	2	0	48	48	50	1	50	1	1
Lilly (1956) . . . . .	2	1	2	46	48	49	2	47	2	5

or less interpretative quality of a particular version, at least in its translation of the book of Romans.

Column 9 lists for each version the total number of interpretative translations for which no alternatives are given. These totals include literal renderings which in effect are equivalent to interpretations. The figures in this column indicate the extent to which a particular version presents to the reader a more or less limited insight into the problems and potential meanings of the original text.

Column 10 ranks the versions according to the number of times each has offered an interpretative translation of an ambiguous passage, with or without marginal alternatives. This total also includes renderings which may be literal, yet suggest only one of the possible meanings. The version with the highest total of interpretative translations is ranked as number 1. Column 11 ranks the versions according to the number of times each has interpreted an ambiguous passage without offering an alternative possibility. The totals in this column likewise include translations which are literal but equivalent to interpretations.

A clearer and more ample tabulation of the information listed in columns 8, 9, 10, and 11 of table 1 is presented in tables 2 and 3 on pages 215 and 216.

It is apparent from these figures that a large amount of interpretation has entered into the translation of all major English versions of the New Testament, including such reputedly uninterpretative versions as the King James, Rheims, and Wycliffe. Especially noteworthy is the highly interpretative quality of the English and American Revised Versions, which have offered interpretative renderings of more than 80 per

TABLE 2.--The versions and editions listed in order from the most to the least interpretative

The versions and editions included in this study	Total of interpretative translations <sup>a</sup>	The versions and editions included in this study	Total of interpretative translations <sup>a</sup>
Schonfield (1955) . . . .	50	Spencer (1937) . . . .	40
Twentieth Century (1900)	49	Revised Standard (1946)	40
Weymouth (1903) . . . .	49	Coverdale (1535) . . . .	39
Goodspeed (1923) . . . .	49	Confraternity (1941) . . . .	39
Lilly (1956) . . . . .	49	Tyndale (1525) . . . . .	38
Twentieth Century (1904)	48	Tyndale (1534) . . . . .	37
Weymouth (1929) . . . . .	48	Rogers (1537) . . . . .	37
Knox (1944) . . . . .	48	Whittingham (1557) . . . . .	35
Williams (1937) . . . . .	47	Blayney (1769) . . . . .	35
Moffatt (1913) . . . . .	45	Taverner (1539) . . . . .	34
Montgomery (1924) . . . .	44	Great (1539) . . . . .	34
Verkuyyl (1945) . . . . .	44	Geneva (1560) . . . . .	34
Phillips (1947) . . . . .	43	Bishops' (1572) . . . . .	33
American Standard (1901)	43	King James (1611) . . . . .	32
English Revised (1881) . . . .	42	Bishops' (1568) . . . . .	33
Ballantine (1923) . . . . .	41	Rheims (1582) . . . . .	30
Westminster (1920) . . . . .	41	Challoner (1749) . . . . .	30
Basic English (1941) . . . . .	41	Wycliffe (1382) . . . . .	30

<sup>a</sup>This total includes literal translations which suggest only one of the possible interpretations.

TABLE 3.--The versions and editions listed in descending order according to the number of interpretative translations offered for which no alternatives are given

The versions and editions included in this study	Total of interpretative translations with no alternatives <sup>a</sup>	The versions and editions included in this study	Total of interpretative translations with no alternatives <sup>a</sup>
Schonfield (1956) . . . .	50	Spencer (1937) . . . .	37
Twentieth Century (1900)	49	Confraternity (1941) .	37
Goodspeed (1923) . . . .	49	Weymouth (1929) . . . .	36
Twentieth Century (1904)	48	Whittingham (1557) . .	35
Lilly (1956) . . . . .	46	Taverner (1539) . . . .	34
Moffatt (1913) . . . . .	45	Great (1539) . . . . .	34
Montgomery (1924) . . . .	44	Geneva (1560) . . . . .	34
Verkuyl (1945) . . . . .	44	Bishops' (1572) . . . .	33
Knox (1944) . . . . .	43	Weymouth (1903) . . . .	33
Phillips (1947) . . . . .	43	Revised Standard (1946)	33
Williams (1937) . . . . .	42	Bishops' (1568) . . . .	31
Ballantine (1923) . . . .	41	Wycliffe (1382) . . . .	30
Basic English (1941) . .	41	Rheims (1582) . . . . .	29
Coverdale (1535) . . . .	39	Challoner (1749) . . . .	29
Tyndale (1525) . . . . .	38	Blayney (1769) . . . .	26
Tyndale (1534) . . . . .	37	American Standard (1901)	24
Rogers (1537) . . . . .	37	King James (1611) . . .	23
Westminster (1920) . . .	37	English Revised (1881)	23

<sup>a</sup>This total includes literal translations which suggest only one of the possible interpretations.

cent of the fifty-one problem passages in Romans--no less than Phillips' much more idiomatic translation. Nevertheless, in spite of the presence of so much interpretation, very few versions--notably the English Revised, the American Standard, and Weymouth--have made any serious attempt to inform the reader of the possibility of other interpretations than those presented in the text. More than half of the versions included in this study offer no alternatives at all.

#### Notes on the Individual Versions

Wycliffe (1382).--Out of the 51 ambiguous passages, Wycliffe presents 30 interpretative translations that represent only 1 of the possible meanings of each passage. Nineteen of these translations are literal but equivalent to interpretations; 15 represent literally the interpretation of the Vulgate. Only once (Rom. 5:1) does Wycliffe depart from the Vulgate interpretation. Only once (Rom. 3:25) does Purvey's work of revision in 1388 result in a change of interpretation (according to the Forshall and Madden text). Purvey adds 1 doctrinal and explanatory note.

Tyndale (1525).--In his first edition, Tyndale offers a total of 38 interpretative translations. Among these he agrees 28 times with the interpretation of Luther's 1524 edition. Six times he is in disagreement. Three times Tyndale is ambiguous where Luther interprets; in 4 passages Tyndale interprets where Luther is ambiguous. Tyndale's 1534 edition makes no changes in interpretation. In 1 passage the 1534 edition is obscure where the first edition interprets, and in this change Tyndale comes further into agreement with Luther.

Coverdale (1535).--Coverdale offers 39 interpretative translations. In 30 of these he agrees in meaning with Tyndale, 14 times using

the same wording. Sixteen passages represent essentially the same interpretation as Tyndale but in different words, and in 11 of these the changes in wording are in the direction of greater similarity to Luther. Five times Coverdale rejects Tyndale's interpretation in favor of Luther's. Three times Coverdale follows Luther's interpretation where Tyndale is ambiguous. Three times Coverdale follows Luther's ambiguity where Tyndale interprets. Only once (Rom. 7:21) is Luther's interpretation rejected.

The evidence indicates some measure of truth in Coverdale's claim on his title page that he "faithfully and truly translated out of Douche." At least he certainly consulted the German in his editing of Tyndale and was more inclined to accept the interpretations--and ambiguities--of Luther.

Rogers (1537).--Compared with Tyndale's 1534 edition, the Rogers translation of the 51 problem passages shows only 2 minor modifications--the addition of a comma in Rom. 1:4 and the addition of a definite article in Rom. 1:5. In neither case is the meaning changed. There are 3 doctrinal and explanatory notes.

Taverner (1539).--Taverner offers 34 interpretative renderings. In each case his interpretation is the same as Tyndale's. Only 3 times is the wording modified. However, in 7 passages Taverner presents an ambiguous translation where either Tyndale or Coverdale has interpreted.

Great (1539).--Out of a total of 34 interpretative translations the Great Bible shows agreement with Tyndale in 28 passages. In 6 of these the wording is changed. Five times Tyndale's interpretation is rejected. Likewise in 28 passages the Great Bible presents the same interpretation as Coverdale, but in 17 of these passages the wording is modi-

fied. In 3 cases Coverdale's interpretation is rejected. Eight times the Great Bible presents an ambiguous rendering where either Tyndale or Coverdale has interpreted.

Geneva (1560).--The Geneva Version also presents 34 interpretative translations. Twenty-four of these agree with the Great Bible, with 10 using the same wording. Six times the Great Bible interpretation is rejected. There is closer agreement with Tyndale. Twenty-six passages represent the same interpretation, 12 of which are identical in wording. There are 4 disagreements. Whittingham's 1557 New Testament shows still closer affinity to Tyndale. Thirty-one passages have the same interpretation. Only 3 are different. In comparison with the Great Bible, Whittingham presents 27 similar and 6 different interpretations.

The Geneva Version agrees with Whittingham 28 times, with only 2 disagreements. There are 22 passages agreeing with Luther. Six are different. Ten times the Geneva Bible offers ambiguous translations for which previous versions have presented interpretations. There are 7 doctrinal and explanatory notes.

Bishops' (1568).--Out of 31 interpretative renderings, the Bishops' Version shows agreement with the Great Bible in 28 passages, 19 times with the same wording. There are 3 disagreements. There is almost the same degree of similarity with Tyndale, 28 agreements in meaning, 19 of which use the same wording, and but 4 disagreements. Compared with the Geneva Version, 25 passages are interpreted the same, 12 of which use the same wording. There are 4 disagreements. Twelve times the Bishops' Bible offers an obscure rendering of an ambiguous passage for which at least one previous version has given an interpretative transla-



tion. There are 7 doctrinal and explanatory notes.

The 1572 edition does not change the interpretation of any of the 51 problem passages. Four times the wording is modified, twice in the direction of a more correct translation.

Rheims (1582).--The Rheims New Testament offers 30 interpretative translations. Eighteen of these are literal but equivalent to interpretations; 16 represent literally the interpretation of the Vulgate. In 11 passages the Rhemish Version resorts to ambiguity where earlier Protestant versions interpret, which is 1 less than the Bishops' and 2 less than the King James. Compared with the Geneva Bible, the Rheims New Testament shows 21 passages with the same interpretation, 6 of which use identical wording. There are 9 disagreements. Three doctrinal and explanatory notes are included, compared with 7 in the Bishops', 7 in the Geneva, and 10 in the Westminster.

The Challoner edition of 1749 changes the interpretation of 3 passages (Rom. 7:21; 8:13; 9:22), all 3 in the direction of similarity to the King James.

King James (1611).--As is to be expected, the King James Version shows closest similarity in interpretation to the 1572 edition of the Bishops' Bible. Out of a total of 32 interpretative translations, 28 are in agreement with the Bishops' 1572 revision, 17 of them using the same words. There are only 3 different interpretations. As compared with the first edition of the Bishops', there are 26 agreements, 15 passages using the same words, and 4 disagreements. Next in similarity is the Geneva Version with 24 agreements in interpretation, 15 passages with the same wording, and 5 disagreements.

Compared with Tyndale, there are 22 agreements, 10 of which use the same wording, and 8 different interpretations, the Blayney edition differing in 9 passages. It is usually estimated that up to 90 per cent of Tyndale's translation has been retained in the King James Version. This is evidently true of Tyndale's general wording, but in the interpretation of ambiguous passages--where similarity or dissimilarity would seem to be of much greater consequence--this figure, at least for the book of Romans, is reduced to about 70 per cent.

Compared with the Rheims New Testament, 20 passages are interpreted the same, with 7 using identical words. Eight passages are interpreted differently.

Thirteen times the King James offers an ambiguous rendering where previous versions have interpreted. Blayney, in his edition of 1769, interprets 3 passages which the first edition leaves ambiguous (Rom. 1:4; 8:10; 8:13). In 2 other passages (Rom. 1:4; 8:3) he changes the punctuation but without important effect on the meaning. It is recognized, of course, that some, if not all, of these changes in the 1611 text may have been introduced by printers or earlier revisers before Blayney produced the enduring 1769 edition that has served as the basis of most modern printings of the King James Version.

The King James Version is the first to make an attempt of any consequence to offer alternative interpretations of ambiguous passages. For 9 such passages, alternatives are given in the margin.

English Revised (1881).--The publication of the English Revised Version marked a significant development in the treatment of ambiguous passages in the New Testament. Forty-two of the 51 selected ambiguous

passages in Romans are interpreted, and for these 19 alternative interpretations are given in the margin.

The English Revised Version has been generally regarded as one of the most excessively literal of all English translations--"an interlinear for schoolboys." This characterization may be valid as far as literary style is concerned, but it certainly is not correct in the area of interpretation. Twenty of the 36 versions and editions included in this study interpret less of the 51 ambiguous passages than does the English Revised.

Compared with the 1769 Blayney edition of the King James Version the English Revised shows 19 passages agreeing in interpretation, 9 of which use the same wording. Fourteen passages are interpreted differently. Nine times the King James interpretation is placed in the margin as an alternative. Three times the English Revised takes up a King James marginal alternative into the text. Once the English Revised is ambiguous where the King James interprets. Six times the English Revised interprets where the King James is obscure. In 10 passages it offers ambiguous translations where previous versions have interpreted.

It is surprising to note the amount of dissimilarity between the English Revised and Tyndale. Thirteen passages are in agreement, 3 of which use the same wording. But in 19 of the ambiguous passages the interpretation has been changed.

Twentieth Century (1900).--The 1900 "tentative" edition of the Twentieth Century New Testament is among the most highly interpretative versions included in this study, interpreting 49 of the 51 ambiguous passages. Weymouth (1903), Goodspeed, and Lilly also interpret 49 passages. Schonfield interprets 50. Only slightly less interpretative is

the 1904 "final" edition with 48 interpretative translations. Evidently the 1904 edition represents a thorough revision of the 1900 publication. In 42 translations of ambiguous passages the interpretation remains essentially the same. But in 11 of these the wording is considerably altered, and in 6 passages the interpretation has been changed. In 1 passage the 1904 edition reverts to ambiguity where the 1900 interprets. This indicates the necessity of citing the particular edition when referring to a reading in this influential modern speech translation.

Compared with the King James (Blayney), the 1900 edition shows 17 passages in agreement, 17 in disagreement. In 13 passages the 1900 edition interprets where the King James is obscure. The 1904 edition agrees with the King James in 18 passages, disagrees in 14, and interprets 12 passages left ambiguous in the older version.

Compared with the English Revised Version the 1900 edition of the Twentieth Century gives similar interpretations to 25 passages, as against 13 differences. The 1904 edition agrees with the English Revised in 29 passages, with only 8 different interpretations.

Both editions of the Twentieth Century are somewhat closer to the American Standard Version. The 1900 edition agrees in interpretation with the American Standard in 29 passages, with 10 disagreements. The 1904 edition agrees 31 times, with 9 differences.

Apparently the 1904 final edition was revised in the direction of greater similarity to the interpretations of the 1611, 1881, and 1901 authorized versions.

American Standard (1901).---The American Standard Version differs in interpretation from the English Revised in 6 passages. It also inter-

prets 1 passage left ambiguous in the English version, giving a total of 43 interpretative translations, as compared with 42 in the 1881 revision. Twice the American Standard adopts the marginal alternative of the English Revised. Five times the English Revised interpretation is relegated to the American Standard margin. Nineteen times alternative interpretations are presented, making the 1881 and 1901 revisions the outstanding versions in this respect. However, the American Standard leaves 9 passages ambiguous which previous versions have interpreted. In 1 passage it is obscure where the King James (Blayney) interprets.

In the treatment of the 51 ambiguous passages the American Standard shows considerably greater similarity to the King James and Tyndale than does the English Revised. Compared with Tyndale, the American version agrees 18 times and disagrees 13 times, against 13 agreements and 19 disagreements in the English revision. Compared with the King James (Blayney), the American Standard shows 23 agreements and 10 disagreements, as against 19 agreements and 14 disagreements in the English Revised. Four times the American Standard adopts the marginal alternative in the King James. Eight times the King James interpretation is placed in the American Standard margin.

Weymouth (1903).--In Weymouth's first edition, 48 of the 51 ambiguous passages are given interpretative translations. During the four successive revisions of Weymouth's version, these interpretations underwent extensive modification. The fifth and last edition of 1929 agrees with the 1903 edition in the interpretation of 34 passages. In 14 of these the wording has been considerably modified. In 12 passages the interpretation has been changed. In 1 passage the 1929 edition interprets

where the 1903 is ambiguous; in 1 it is ambiguous where the 1903 edition interprets. Consequently, it is even more important than with the tentative and final editions of the Twentieth Century New Testament to cite accurately the particular edition of Weymouth to which one is referring. Yet it is not uncommon to hear Weymouth's version quoted as if all five of the editions bearing his name were identical.

As in the case of the later revision of the Twentieth Century version, the last edition of Weymouth indicates revision in the direction of similarity in interpretation to the authorized versions of 1611, 1881, and 1901. Compared with the King James (Blayney), Weymouth's first edition shows 14 agreements and 21 disagreements, as against 17 agreements and 18 disagreements in the 1929 edition. The 1903 edition interprets 10 passages, the 1929 11 passages, left ambiguous in the King James. Neither edition of Weymouth is as close to the King James in interpretation as are both editions of the Twentieth Century.

The Weymouth and Twentieth Century editions, however, show an almost identical degree of similarity with the interpretations of the English Revised, though not always in the same passages. Compared with the 1881 version, Weymouth's 1903 edition agrees 25 times and disagrees 13 times. The 1929 edition agrees 29 times and disagrees 9 times.

Not so close is Weymouth's similarity to the American Standard. Compared with the 1901 version, Weymouth's first edition agrees in 24 passages and disagrees in 16. The 1929 edition agrees in 28 passages and disagrees in 12.

Most noteworthy about the Weymouth version is the fact that among the main modern speech translations, it alone makes an attempt of any

consequence to offer alternative interpretations. There are 16 of these in the 1903 edition, 12 in the 1929.

Moffatt (1913).--Moffatt interprets 45 of the 51 passages. In 4 he remains ambiguous where earlier versions have interpreted. In the 45 interpretative translations he shows remarkable independence of the three major English versions competing for public attention in the British world, the King James, English Revised, and Weymouth.

Compared with the King James (Blayney), Moffatt agrees in 12 passages and disagrees in 20. Compared with the English Revised, he agrees in 16 passages and differs in 20. Compared with Weymouth (1903), he agrees in 23 passages and disagrees in 21. The degree of Moffatt's agreement with the English Revised is notably less than that of Weymouth. Compared with the American Standard there are 22 agreements, 16 disagreements. It is interesting to observe how both these British translators, especially Moffatt, come closer in interpretation to the American than to the English revision.

Moffatt's final edition of 1935 makes no changes in the interpretations of the 1913 first edition.

Westminster (1920).--The Roman Catholic versions show a remarkable degree of independence in interpretation, except in passages related to basic dogmas. The Westminster Version interprets 41 of the 51 problem passages. Compared with the Rheims New Testament, the Westminster agrees in 17 passages and disagrees in 13. Of the latter, 2 are the same as in Challoner's 1749 edition of the Rheims. Eleven passages which the Rheims leaves ambiguous the Westminster interprets. Eight times the Westminster Version rejects the text or interpretation of the Latin Vulgate, 3 of

these in favor of the Greek. There are 10 doctrinal and explanatory notes, the highest number in any of the versions included in this study.

Compared with the King James Version (Blayney), the Westminster agrees in 19 passages and disagrees in 14.

Goodspeed (1923).--Goodspeed interprets 49 of the 51 ambiguous passages. Of these, 10 agree with Tyndale, 26 disagree. Fifteen agree with the King James (Blayney), 20 disagree. In 12 passages Goodspeed interprets where the King James is obscure.

In the translation of the problem passages in Romans, Goodspeed comes closest in meaning to the 1900 tentative edition of the Twentieth Century, and he comes closer to the American Standard than does Moffatt to either the English or American revisions. Compared with the 1900 edition of the Twentieth Century, Goodspeed interprets 30 passages the same, while 18 are different. Twenty-seven are the same as in the 1904 final edition; 20 are different. Compared with the American Standard Version, 25 passages agree and 14 disagree. Compared with Weymouth's 1903 edition, 28 passages agree and 20 disagree. Twenty-five agree with Moffatt and 19 disagree.

Ballantine (1923).--Ballantine presents interpretative translations in 41 passages. In these there is closer agreement with the King James and much closer with the American Standard than with Moffatt and Goodspeed, and considerably more with Goodspeed than Moffatt. Compared with the King James (Blayney), 21 passages are interpreted the same, 10 are different. Compared with the American Standard, 28 passages agree in interpretation, while only 8 disagree. Compared with Goodspeed, 25 passages agree, 16 disagree. Compared with Moffatt, 18 are the same,



17 are different. Ballantine is particularly close in interpretation to the 1904 final edition of the Twentieth Century, with 28 agreements and 12 disagreements.

Montgomery (1924).--Mrs. Montgomery interprets 44 of the ambiguous passages. Like Ballantine, she is closer in interpretation to the American Standard than to Goodspeed and Moffatt but closer to Moffatt than to Goodspeed and closer to either of these modern speech translations than to the King James. Compared with the American Standard, 27 passages agree, 11 disagree. Compared with Moffatt, 27 agree, 14 disagree. Compared with Goodspeed, 26 agree, 18 disagree. Compared with the King James (Blayney), 20 passages agree and 14 disagree. Mrs. Montgomery makes use of 1 explanatory note.

Williams (1937).--Williams interprets 47 of the problem passages, and in these he shows remarkable agreement with Goodspeed. Thirty-four passages have essentially the same interpretation. Only 13 are different. Compared with the American Standard, 28 passages agree while 12 disagree. Compared with Moffatt, 25 are interpreted the same, 18 are different. Compared with the King James (Blayney), 14 passages agree in interpretation, 20 disagree.

At first it might seem strange that a New Testament published by so "conservative" an institution as the Moody Bible Institute should reveal so high a degree of similarity in interpretation with a translation coming from so "liberal" a school as the University of Chicago. But it should be noted that Williams was a graduate of the Chicago New Testament department, in which Goodspeed was for so many years professor of Biblical Greek.

Spencer (1937).--As in other Roman Catholic versions, Spencer shows considerable independence in interpretation. He interprets 40 of the ambiguous passages. Of these, 18 are in agreement with the Rheims New Testament, 12 are in disagreement. Three of the latter, however, agree with Challoner's 1749 edition of the Rheims. Five times Spencer departs from the Vulgate interpretation, 2 of these in the direction of the Greek. Once he cites the Latin in the margin and makes use of 3 doctrinal and explanatory notes.

As is to be expected, Spencer is much closer in interpretation to the Westminster than to Moffatt and Goodspeed. Compared with the Westminster New Testament, Spencer agrees in 26 passages, disagreeing only in 10. Compared with Moffatt, 20 passages agree, while 19 disagree. Similarly with Goodspeed, 21 agree, while 20 disagree. It is interesting that Spencer should agree so equally with Goodspeed and Moffatt, since the latter themselves disagree in 19 passages.

Confraternity (1941).--As an official revision of the Rheims New Testament, it is only natural that the Confraternity Version should be especially close in interpretation to the 1582 translation. In 39 of the ambiguous passages the Confraternity offers interpretative renderings. Of these, 25 are in agreement with the Rheims, with only 6 in disagreement. One of the latter agrees with Challoner. Seven times the Confraternity interprets passages left obscure in the Rheims. Only once (Rom. 8:27) is the Vulgate interpretation rejected. Twice the Greek is presented in the margin. There is 1 explanatory note.

The Confraternity is also closer in interpretation to the committee-produced Westminster Version than to Spencer. Compared with the

latter, 24 passages agree, 12 disagree. Compared with the Westminster, 28 passages agree and 8 disagree.

Basic English (1941).--Forty-one of the 51 ambiguous passages are given interpretative translations in the Basic English New Testament. Twenty-nine of these agree with the interpretation of the English Revised of 1881; only 6 disagree. The agreement with the American Standard is not so close, with 26 agreements and 11 disagreements. This may reflect the fact that the Basic English Version was produced in Britain.

Of the modern speech versions collated in this study, the Weymouth 1929 fifth edition is closest in meaning to the Basic English, with 28 passages agreeing, 13 disagreeing. Compared with Goodspeed, 24 passages are the same in interpretation, 17 are different. Compared with Moffatt, 23 are the same, 18 are different. Compared with the King James (Blayney), 18 passages agree, 15 disagree.

Knox (1944).--In 48 of the 51 problem passages, Knox offers interpretative translations. In these he shows approximately the same degree of similarity to the Rheims New Testament as do the Westminster, Spencer, and Lilly translations. Nineteen passages agree, while 10 are different in meaning. Even though the Confraternity, Westminster, and Spencer New Testaments show considerable disagreement among themselves, Knox agrees almost equally with each of them. Twenty-two passages agree with the Confraternity, 15 disagree. Twenty-three agree with the Westminster, 14 disagree. Twenty-three agree with Spencer, 15 disagree.

Four times Knox seems to depart from the Vulgate interpretation. In two passages his difference from the interpretations given in the Rheims and Confraternity appear to reflect the meaning of the Greek

rather than the Latin. He makes use of 3 explanatory notes, 2 of which present the Greek.

Compared with the King James Version (Blayney), Knox agrees in 17 passages, disagrees in 16. He agrees with Moffatt in 23 passages, disagrees in 18. He agrees with Goodspeed in 25 passages and disagrees in 20.

Verkuyl (1945).--Verkuyl offers interpretative renderings of 44 of the ambiguous passages. In these he comes closest in interpretation to the American Standard with 25 passages agreeing, 11 disagreeing. Compared with Moffatt, 25 passages agree, 16 disagree. Compared with Goodspeed, 25 passages are interpreted the same, 18 are different. Compared with the 1929 fifth edition of Weymouth, 24 passages are the same, 18 are different. Compared with the King James, 16 are the same, 16 are different. Verkuyl includes 1 doctrinal note.

Revised Standard (1946).--The Revised Standard Version presents interpretative translations of 40 of the 51 ambiguous passages, making it somewhat less interpretative than the English and American Revised Versions, which offer respectively 42 and 43 interpretative renderings. Inasmuch as the Revised Standard is an official revision of the American Standard Version, it is not surprising to observe that it comes closest in interpretation to the 1901 revision. Twenty-eight passages are given essentially the same meaning, 9 of these with the same wording; 8 passages are changed in meaning. Much less is the similarity to the English Revised. Twenty-one passages are interpreted the same, 6 of them using identical wording; 15 passages are changed in meaning.

The Revised Standard is closer in interpretation to the King

James than to the English Revised. And it is considerably closer to Tyndale, Moffatt, and the Confraternity than to Goodspeed. Compared with the King James (Blayney), 22 passages agree, 7 of which have the same wording; 11 disagree. Compared with Tyndale, 20 passages agree, 3 using the same words; 13 disagree. Twenty-three passages agree with Moffatt, 5 using the same words; 15 disagree. Twenty-two passages agree with the Confraternity, 6 using the same wording; 12 disagree. Compared with Goodspeed, 20 passages agree, 3 with identical wording, while 19 disagree.

The Revised Standard is not quite as close in meaning to the King James as is the American Standard, but much closer than the English Revised. Compared with the King James (Blayney), the Revised Standard shows 22 agreements, 11 disagreements; the American Standard 23 agreements, 10 disagreements; the English Revised 19 agreements, 14 disagreements. In 3 passages the Revised Standard returns from the interpretation of the American Standard to that of the King James. Five times the Revised Standard resorts to ambiguity where the American Standard interprets. In 11 passages the Revised Standard is obscure where previous versions interpret, in 6 of these reverting to the same ambiguous wording as the King James.

Since Moffatt and Goodspeed were both members of the translation committee producing the Revised Standard Version, it is interesting to note their relative influence in the area of interpretation. Apparently the other members of the committee were more inclined to side with Moffatt, for compared with his version the Revised Standard shows 23 passages interpreted the same, with 15 different. But compared with Good-

speed's New Testament, 20 are the same and 19 different. In 16 passages the Revised Standard adopts the interpretation agreed upon by Goodspeed and Moffatt. In 12 the Revised Standard disagrees with them both. Four times the Revised Standard agrees with Goodspeed's interpretation rather than that of Moffatt. But 7 times the Revised Standard adopts Moffatt's interpretation rather than that of Goodspeed.

Phillips (1947).--Phillips interprets 43 of the 51 problem passages and shows a remarkable closeness in interpretation to Knox with 30 passages agreeing, 12 disagreeing. Compared with other British versions, Phillips agrees with Moffatt in 24 passages, disagrees in 16; agrees with the English Revised in 22 passages, disagrees in 14; agrees with the 1929 Weymouth fifth edition in 23 passages and disagrees in 17. Compared with Weymouth's first edition, Phillips agrees in 19 passages and disagrees in 21. He retains 19 of the King James (Blayney) interpretations but rejects 12.

Compared with the American Standard Version, Phillips agrees in 22 passages, disagrees in 13. Compared with the Revised Standard, 21 are the same, 14 are different. Compared with Goodspeed, 23 are the same, 18 are different.

Schonfield (1955).--In all but 1 of the 51 ambiguous passages Schonfield presents only 1 of the possible meanings, making his New Testament the most interpretative version included in this study. He also reveals considerable difference in interpretation from Weymouth, Moffatt, Goodspeed, and the Revised Standard. Compared with Moffatt, Schonfield agrees in 19 passages but disagrees in 25. He agrees with Goodspeed in 23 passages but disagrees in 25; agrees with the Revised Standard in 19

passages but disagrees in 20; agrees with Weymouth's first edition in 24 passages but disagrees in 24; agrees with the much revised fifth edition in 24 passages but disagrees in 23.

Schonfield comes somewhat closer to the King James, American Standard, and Phillips versions. He interprets 20 passages the same as the King James (Blayney) and differs in 15. He agrees with the American Standard in 23 passages, differs in 17; agrees with Phillips in 24 passages, differs in 19.

Lilly (1956).--Lilly offers 46 interpretative renderings and reveals approximately the same degree of similarity in interpretation to the Rheims New Testament as do the other Roman Catholic versions included in this study. Nineteen passages agree with Rheims and 12 disagree, one of the latter agreeing with Challoner. Among the other Catholic versions, Lilly comes closest to Knox with 30 passages interpreted the same, 14 differing. Twenty-eight passages agree with the Confraternity, 11 disagree; 26 agree with the Westminster, 13 disagree; 24 agree with Spencer, 15 disagree. In 3 passages Lilly departs from the interpretation of the Vulgate, 2 of these in favor of the Greek. Six of his interpretations are uniquely different from those given in the other Catholic versions. He makes use of 3 doctrinal and explanatory notes.

Lilly shows somewhat less agreement with the interpretations of Moffatt and Goodspeed. Twenty-three passages agree with Moffatt, 18 disagree; 25 agree with Goodspeed and 20 disagree.

#### Theological Bias in Translation

The term "theological bias" requires further definition before the question may fairly be raised as to whether or not theological pre-

judice has entered into the large number of interpretative translations given by the versions to the many ambiguous passages in the book of Romans. A distinction needs to be drawn between a translator's personal theology or religious philosophy and his scholarly understanding of the theology of the writer of the particular document being translated.

It is presumably agreed among modern scholars that the intrusion of a translator's own dogmatic convictions into the interpretation of a passage of Scripture is to be avoided--as far as humanly possible. His task is to present with the greatest possible accuracy the meaning of the author he is translating, whether he himself agrees with it or not. As Goodspeed observes, "the modern translator seeks what the ancient writer meant to say, with the same detachment with which a chemist looks at his test tube, or the biologist looks through his microscope. His aim is not to buttress a theology, but to find out what each New Testament writer had to tell."<sup>1</sup>

On the other hand, it would seem legitimate, in fact necessary, that the translator's understanding of the author's theology should be a determining factor in the interpretation of ambiguous passages of theological consequence. Without such insight into the original writer's theology, the translator has no other basis for resolving ambiguities than his own personal belief or preference.

In the introduction to the Old Testament of the Revised Standard Version, W. A. Irwin stresses the fact that:

There is no place for theology in Bible translation, whether conserva-

---

<sup>1</sup>E. J. Goodspeed, The Making of the English New Testament (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1925), pp. 114-115.



tive or radical or whatever else. A "theological translation" is not a translation at all, but merely a dogmatic perversion of the Bible. Linguistic science knows no theology; those of most contradictory views can meet on common ground devoid of polemic, agreed that Hebrew words mean such and such, and their inflection and syntactical relations imply this or that. These facts establish an agreed translation . . . . The Bible translator is not an expositor; however pronounced his views about Biblical doctrines, he has no right to intrude his opinions into the translation, or to permit his dogmatic convictions to qualify or shape its wording.<sup>1</sup>

To the extent that Irwin is referring to the illegitimate intrusion of personal theological views, his position is surely correct. However, the desirable ideal he expresses is based on the assumption that the inflection and syntactical relations of the original wording "establish an agreed translation." This would seem to presuppose the absence of ambiguity in the original.

It is probable that as linguistic science advances, passages now regarded as ambiguous may become capable of exact translation. But in the book of Romans alone there are at least fifty passages of theological and exegetical consequence which are still of such ambiguity that among translators and commentators there is no unanimity as to their correct meaning. It is true that there is disagreement as to whether or not some of these passages actually are linguistically ambiguous. But this uncertainty only serves to heighten the dilemma. Consequently, pending the discovery of further linguistic evidence, the translator is unavoidably faced with the necessity to interpret, to make a choice between two or more possible meanings, each of which may have the support of reputable scholars. And in making such a choice, the translator must inevitably

---

<sup>1</sup>W. A. Irwin, "Method and Procedure of the Revision" in An Introduction to the Revised Standard Version of the Old Testament, ed. L. A. Weigle (New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1952), p. 14.

depend upon his understanding of the theology of the original writer as expressed in the passage being translated.

This appears to be the position taken by Unger in his assertion that:

When the language allows a choice the translator's theology, whether it be conservative or liberal, is bound to influence the choice. If the translator has no theology he is unqualified to make any choice, especially in a doctrinal passage, and to that extent is rendered incompetent no matter what his purely scientific linguistic talents and equipment may be.<sup>1</sup>

Compare Nida's recognition that "every translation will to some extent represent the theological views of the translator. It is impossible to avoid this."<sup>2</sup>

A translator might be able to avoid this dilemma if it were possible to reproduce the ambiguity of the original. As mentioned in chapter i, some scholars have urged that this policy should be followed in the treatment of ambiguous passages. But the evidence presented in chapter ii shows that only in rare instances has a version succeeded in preserving the ambiguity of the original, in fairly representing, with an equally ambiguous English phrase, the two or more meanings inherent in the original ambiguity. In a majority of the fifty-one ambiguous passages in Romans, the versions have offered instead interpretative translations. Many of the remainder have been given renderings too obscure to convey much meaning to the ordinary reader.

When making a choice in the interpretation of an ambiguous pas-

<sup>1</sup>Merrill F. Unger, "A Critique of the Revised Standard Version," Bibliotheca Sacra, Vol. X (Jan., 1953), p. 56.

<sup>2</sup>E. A. Nida, Bible Translating (New York: American Bible Society, 1947), p. 21.

sage, it does not seem necessary that the translator's personal theological convictions should influence the decision. For example, in the translation of so controversial an ambiguous passage as Rom. 9:5, it should be possible for a translator who personally believes in the deity of Christ nevertheless to interpret the verse as a doxology to the Father, on the basis of his considered opinion that it was not Paul's custom specifically to designate Christ as "God." Similarly, in the interpretation of Rom. 8:16 and 26, it should be possible for a translator who himself may not believe in the personality of the Holy Spirit nevertheless to interpret  $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\tau\omicron\ \tau\omicron\ \pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$  as "the Spirit Himself," on the basis of his understanding that Paul taught the personality of the Holy Spirit.

The influence of such necessary understanding of the theology presented in the document being translated hardly merits the unfavorable characterization of "theological bias," or "theological prejudice," for such terms seem to imply the absence of scholarly consideration of evidence. However, the translator's choices will inevitably reflect his own insights into and opinions concerning the author's theology, and his decisions may reveal a pattern identifiable as, say, liberal or conservative. If this also is to be dubbed "theological bias," it is at least a bias of a different sort, in that it is held more immediately answerable to the evidence in the document being translated.

Unfortunately, it is difficult to distinguish between these two kinds of theological bias, and among the large company of very conservative readers, who tend to be particularly sensitive in this regard, any change in traditional interpretation is likely to be attributed to the personal religious prejudice of the translator.

A number of the versions have declared themselves free from theological bias. For example, Coverdale claims in the dedication of his 1535 version to Henry VIII that he has "nether wrested nor altered so moch as one word for the mayntenance of any maner of secte." Goodspeed states in the preface to his New Testament that "the aim of the present translation has been to present the meaning of the different books as faithfully as possible, without bias or prejudice."<sup>1</sup> W. R. Bowie, a member of the Revised Standard Version New Testament committee, condemns prejudice in translation as "a sin against the Spirit" and affirms that "from that sin this committee sought faithfully to keep free."<sup>2</sup> The validity of these claims has been accepted by some and vigorously denied by others.

There are seventeen of the selected fifty-one ambiguous passages in the book of Romans whose interpretation would seem to be particularly susceptible to theological bias of either kind. They are Rom. 1:4 (five problems); 2:13; 3:25 (two problems, *ἰλαστήριον* and *πάρισιν*); 3:28; 5:1; 7:25; 8:16; 8:24; 8:26; 9:5; and 10:4 (two problems). Among the versions which have deliberately or inadvertantly (by literal translation) offered interpretative renderings of these passages, there is disagreement as to the correct meaning of each of them.

For example, Rom. 9:5 is interpreted as a declaration of the deity of Christ by all but five of the versions included in this study. Only Moffatt, Goodspeed, Ballantine, the Revised Standard, and Schonfield interpret as a doxology to the Father. It has been charged that such de-

---

<sup>1</sup>Pp. v-vi.

<sup>2</sup>W. R. Bowie, "The Use of the New Testament in Worship," in An Introduction to the Revised Standard Version of the New Testament, ed. L. A. Weigle (New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1946), p. 59.

parture from the traditional interpretation is to be attributed to theological bias.<sup>1</sup>

It should be noted in the first place that in translating Rom. 9:5 as a doxology to the Father, the five versions have the support of such scholars as Tischendorf, Meyer, Vincent, Denney, Jülicher, Burkitt, Bosworth, Parry, Lietzmann, Dodd, Kirk, Knox, and Barrett. These scholars attempt to justify their preference on other grounds than mere dogmatic prejudice. For example, Lietzmann explains that his decision to interpret the passage as a doxology to the Father is not for theological nor even for linguistic reasons but in view of the fact that parallel doxologies in the New Testament seem to preclude the reference of this doxology to Christ. Knox agrees that Lietzmann's argument "seems rather conclusive."

It should also be noted that some scholars regard the passage as linguistically of such ambiguity as to allow for no definite decision at all. Sanday and Headlam express preference for the traditional interpretation but admit that "throughout there has been no argument which we have felt to be quite conclusive." Likewise Kirk, who favors the interpretation as a doxology to the Father, admits that it is difficult to choose between the "four main possible renderings." Garvie advises that the verse is "too ambiguous" to use dogmatically.

During the heated controversy around 1881 concerning the translation of Rom. 9:5 in the English Revised Version, Ezra Abbott declared himself strongly opposed to the traditional interpretation but conceded that the passage "grammatically admits of being punctuated and construed

---

<sup>1</sup>See the discussion of Rom. 9:5 in chap. ii, pp. 176-179.

in at least 7 different ways."<sup>1</sup> Timothy Dwight supported the traditional interpretation but likewise admitted that "the question ceases to be one of certainties, and becomes one of probabilities."<sup>2</sup>

Moulton, in his *Prolegomena*, observes that the interpretation of this verse is a matter of exegesis rather than grammar.

It is evident, therefore, that in the interpretation of Rom. 9:5 a particular translator's decision--if he is able to arrive at any conclusion at all--might be based primarily upon linguistic considerations. Or his choice might be made more upon exegetical grounds, comparing this with other related passages in Paul and the New Testament. It is even conceivable that in some cases personal dogmatic bias may have its influence, though it seems scarcely possible that a responsible scholar would consciously permit himself this indulgence--at the risk of his scholarly reputation.

Two of the passages of special theological interest involve the translation of the problematic verb δικαιόω (Rom. 2:13 and 3:28). Protestants have traditionally interpreted this term in the forensic sense, "account righteous," "acquit." Roman Catholics oppose this view and hold to the interpretation "make righteous," "sanctify."

In Rom. 2:13, the term is translated into the ambiguous "justify" by Tyndale, Coverdale, Rogers, Taverner, Great, Geneva, Bishops', Rheims, King James, English Revised, American Standard, Westminster, Spencer, Confraternity, Knox, Revised Standard, and Phillips--the English Revised and American Standard explaining in the margin that "to justify" means

<sup>1</sup>Abbott, *JBL*, Vol. III (June and Dec., 1883), pp. 90-112.

<sup>2</sup>Dwight, *JBL*, Vol. I (June and Dec., 1881), pp. 22-55.

"to account righteous." The forensic sense of the term is made plain in the translations of the Twentieth Century, Weymouth, Moffatt, Ballantine, Montgomery, Williams, Basic English, Verkuyl, and Schonfield. But Wycliffe, Goodspeed, and Lilly translate as "make just," "make upright," "sanctify." In a marginal comment on Rom. 1:17, Lilly explains that "sanctify" is literally "justify."

It is noteworthy that all but one of the Catholic versions make use of the ambiguous word "justify," thus leaving no room for accusation of biased translation. Only Lilly clearly represents the official Catholic viewpoint by translating, "sanctify."

In making this choice, Lilly was inescapably influenced by theological considerations. The same is true, of course, of the eleven versions clearly representing the traditional Protestant viewpoint. However, as made apparent in the discussion of this passage in chapter ii, some linguistic evidence may be cited in support of Lilly's interpretation. Thayer, Lange, Gifford, Hastings, Goodspeed, and Barrett agree that the etymological meaning of  $\delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\acute{o}\omega$  is "make righteous." Moreover, for exegetical and theological reasons different from Lilly and from each other, Goodspeed and Barrett both argue strongly for the interpretation "make righteous."

It may not be charged, therefore, that Lilly's translation, as likewise that of Wycliffe and Goodspeed, indicates gross dogmatic bias exercised without regard for evidence. But the opposing interpretations of  $\delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\acute{o}\omega$  in Rom. 2:13 and 3:28 illustrate and emphasize the extent to which theological and exegetical considerations are unavoidably involved in the translation of ambiguous passages of theological consequence.

The same is true of the interpretation of each of the ambiguous passages in Romans which are of special theological concern. As with Rom. 9:5, the translators have arrived by various means at the decisions represented in their versions. Some translators admit that their choices are often based upon their understanding of the original writer's theology. But unless it can be proved that a translator has abandoned the scholarly consideration of relevant linguistic and exegetical evidence in favor of his own dogmatic preference, the charge of gross theological bias is unjustified and may point rather to the superficiality and prejudice of the critic.

If among Protestant versions departure from traditional Protestant interpretation marks a translation as liberal rather than conservative, then the versions included in this study may be conveniently listed under these two classifications. Taking the 1769 Blayney edition of the King James Version as the standard, the versions show agreement or disagreement with the King James interpretation of the fifty-one ambiguous passages in Romans, of which Blayney interprets 35, as listed in table 4 (see p. 244).

According to this method of classification, the most liberal of the versions are Moffatt, Weymouth (1903), Williams, and Goodspeed. But surely no one would venture to charge a publication of the Moody Bible Institute with liberal theological bias! Yet Williams shows approximately the same amount of disagreement with the King James interpretation as do Weymouth (1903), Moffatt, and Goodspeed. Evidently mere frequency of departure from traditional interpretation is no adequate criterion for determining the presence of theological prejudice.



TABLE 4.--The number of passages in each of the versions agreeing or disagreeing with the 1769 Blayney edition of the King James Version in the interpretation of the fifty-one passages in Romans

The versions and editions included in this study	Agreements	Disagreements	The versions and editions included in this study	Agreements	Disagreements
Wycliffe (1382) . . . . .	18	11	Weymouth (1903) . . . . .	14	21
Tyndale (1525) . . . . .	22	9	Weymouth (1929) . . . . .	17	18
Tyndale (1534) . . . . .	22	9	Moffatt (1913) . . . . .	12	20
Coverdale (1535) . . . . .	23	7	Westminster (1920) . . . . .	19	14
Rogers (1537) . . . . .	22	9	Goodspeed (1923) . . . . .	15	20
Taverner (1539) . . . . .	22	8	Ballantine (1923) . . . . .	21	10
Great (1539) . . . . .	23	7	Montgomery (1924) . . . . .	20	14
Whittingham (1557) . . . . .	26	6	Williams (1937) . . . . .	14	20
Geneva (1560) . . . . .	24	5	Spencer (1937) . . . . .	22	10
Bishops' (1568) . . . . .	26	4	Confraternity (1941) . . . . .	18	15
Bishops' (1572) . . . . .	28	3	Basic English (1941) . . . . .	18	15
Rheims (1582) . . . . .	20	8	Knox (1944) . . . . .	17	16
Challoner (1749) . . . . .	21	11	Verkuy1 (1945) . . . . .	16	16
English Revised (1881) . . . . .	19	14	Revised Standard (1946) . . . . .	22	11
Twentieth Century (1900) . . . . .	17	17	Phillips (1947) . . . . .	19	12
Twentieth Century (1904) . . . . .	18	14	Schonfield (1955) . . . . .	20	15
American Standard (1901) . . . . .	23	10	Lilly (1956) . . . . .	17	17

Limiting the area of comparison to the 17 ambiguous passages in Romans which are of special theological concern (see p. 239), and of which the 1769 Blayney edition of the King James Version interprets 11, the versions show agreement or disagreement with the King James as listed in table 5 (see p. 246). According to these figures, the only version in complete agreement with the King James is the 1572 edition of the Bishops' Bible. All 11 passages are interpreted the same. The version most in disagreement with the King James is Moffatt, with only 1 passage given the same interpretation and 8 different. The modern version closest in agreement with the King James is Phillips, with 8 passages given the same interpretation and only 2 different.

It is significant to notice again the position of the presumably conservative Williams New Testament. Four passages agree with the King James, but 7 disagree. The Twentieth Century (1900), Weymouth (1903), Montgomery, and Lilly versions show the same amount of departure from the King James interpretation as does Williams. Goodspeed shows less, with 5 agreements and 6 disagreements. Only Moffatt shows more disagreement than Williams.

The interpretations of the 11 special passages in Williams' New Testament which differ from those in the King James Version are as follows: In Rom. 3:25, Williams prefers "sacrifice of reconciliation" to the traditional King James "propitiation"; also in 3:25, *πάρεσις* is interpreted as "passing over" rather than the King James "remission"; in 5:1, the subjunctive *ἔχωμεν* is chosen rather than the indicative; in 8:16 and 26, "the Spirit Himself" is preferred to the King James "the Spirit itself"; in 8:14, "in hope" is preferred to the King James "by hope"; and in 10:4,

TABLE 5.--The number of passages in each of the versions agreeing or disagreeing with the 1769 Blayney edition of the King James Version in the interpretation of the eleven ambiguous passages in Romans of special theological concern

The versions and editions included in this study	Agreements	Disagreements	The versions and editions included in this study	Agreements	Disagreements
Wycliffe (1382) . . . . .	5	3	Weymouth (1903) . . . . .	4	7
Tyndale (1525) . . . . .	7	2	Weymouth (1929) . . . . .	5	6
Tyndale (1534) . . . . .	7	2	Moffatt (1913) . . . . .	1	8
Coverdale (1535) . . . . .	7	3	Westminster (1920) . . . . .	6	5
Rogers (1537) . . . . .	7	2	Goodspeed (1923) . . . . .	5	6
Taverner (1539) . . . . .	7	2	Ballantine (1923) . . . . .	8	3
Great (1539) . . . . .	7	2	Montgomery (1924) . . . . .	4	7
Whittingham (1537) . . . . .	7	2	Williams (1937) . . . . .	4	7
Geneva (1560) . . . . .	9	1	Spencer (1937) . . . . .	7	4
Bishops' (1568) . . . . .	9	0	Confraternity (1941) . . . . .	6	5
Bishops' (1572) . . . . .	11	0	Basic English (1941) . . . . .	5	4
Rheims (1582) . . . . .	7	4	Knox (1944) . . . . .	6	5
Challoner (1749) . . . . .	7	4	Verkuy1 (1945) . . . . .	4	5
English Revised (1881) . . . . .	6	5	Revised Standard (1946) . . . . .	4	6
Twentieth Century (1900) . . . . .	4	7	Phillips (1947) . . . . .	8	2
Twentieth Century (1904) . . . . .	4	6	Schonfield (1955) . . . . .	7	4
American Standard (1901) . . . . .	7	4	Lilly (1956) . . . . .	4	7

*νόμος* is interpreted as the principle of law rather than the Mosaic law.

The much criticized Revised Standard Version agrees with the King James in 4 passages and disagrees in 6. In Rom. 3:25, the Revised Standard prefers "expiation" to the King James "propitiation"; also in 3:25, *παρεσις* is interpreted as "passed over" rather than the King James "remission"; in 8:16 and 26, "the Spirit Himself" is preferred to the King James "the Spirit itself"; in 8:24, "in this hope" is preferred to the King James "by hope"; 9:5 is interpreted as a doxology to the Father rather than an ascription of deity to Christ. Where Williams differs from the King James in Rom. 5:1 and 10:4, the Revised Standard agrees with the King James. Except for the interpretation of 9:5, for which the committee was careful to offer the traditional interpretation as an alternative in the margin, the Revised Standard shows somewhat closer agreement with the traditional interpretation of these passages of special theological interest than does Williams. Among the total of 35 passages interpreted in the 1769 Blayney edition of the King James Version, the Revised Standard agrees in 22 and disagrees in 11. Williams agrees in but 14 and disagrees in 20.

Moffatt disagrees with the King James interpretation in all but 1 of these ambiguous passages of special theological concern. In Rom. 1:4, he prefers "installed" to the King James "declared." Mrs. Montgomery and Lilly have the same interpretation. Also in 1:4, Moffatt interprets *ἐξ* temporally as "when" rather than the causal "by" in the King James. Tyndale, Coverdale, Rogers, Taverner, the Great Bible, Whittingham, and Verkuyl agree with him. In 3:25, Moffatt prefers "the means of propitiation" to the King James "propitiation." Also in 3:25, Moffatt

chooses "passed over" rather than the King James "remission." A majority of the versions agree with him. In 5:1, Moffatt chooses the subjunctive ἐχόμεν rather than the indicative. Half of the versions, including Montgomery, Williams, and Verkuyl, agree with him. In 8:24, Moffatt prefers "with this hope in view" to the King James "by hope." Twelve versions, including Williams and Verkuyl, agree with him. Moffatt interprets 9:5 as a doxology to the Father rather than a statement of the deity of Christ. Goodspeed, Ballantine, the Revised Standard, and Schonfield agree with him. In 10:4, Moffatt interprets νόμος as the principle of law rather than the Mosaic law. Six versions, including Montgomery and Williams, agree with him.

Among the total of 35 passages interpreted in the 1769 Blayney edition of the King James, Moffatt agrees in 12 and disagrees in 20. Williams agrees in 14 and disagrees in 20. In each passage where Moffatt departs from the traditional, there is evidence both linguistic and exegetical which may be cited in his support. Moreover, in each case there are other responsible translators and commentators who agree with him. The same is true of every other version included in this study.

An analysis of the many different interpretations given to the fifty-one ambiguous passages in Romans by each of the versions included in this study fails to reveal evidence of gross theological prejudice. If any translations come close to this at all, they would seem to be the interpretations of the verb δικαίω.

There also seems to be no adequate basis for classifying Protestant versions as characteristically biased toward liberal or conservative New Testament theology. The version offering perhaps the most striking

departures from what may be regarded in some circles as orthodox Protestant New Testament theology is that of Goodspeed. His translation of *δικαιόω* as "make upright," added to his interpretation of Rom. 9:5 as a doxology to the Father, and his retention of the King James impersonal reference to the Holy Spirit as "the Spirit itself," might give rise in some quarters to suspicion of bias toward liberal New Testament theology. In contrast, for example, the Williams New Testament, as might be expected, translates *δικαιόω* in Rom. 2:13 as "recognize as upright"; Rom. 9:5 is interpreted as a declaration of the deity of Christ; and the impersonal King James "the Spirit itself" is changed to "the Spirit Himself." However, any such attempt at characterization would need to be based upon a similar but more detailed analysis of the translations given to all ambiguous passages of important theological consequence throughout the rest of the New Testament. Such an analysis would seem to be a worthwhile undertaking.

The evidence of theological bias is naturally more pronounced in the doctrinal and explanatory notes and other accessories to the text included in some versions. But so far as the translation of the text is concerned, it appears that Farrar was correct in 1882 when he commended the fidelity of all major versions up to his time. To be sure, he regarded some readings as erroneous, but he did not consider such mistakes as intentional or malicious--just "small human infirmities."<sup>1</sup> The evidence from the translation of the book of Romans would seem to indicate that Farrar's commendation could be extended to include the nineteen other versions compared in this study which have appeared since his day.

---

<sup>1</sup>Farrar, op. cit., p. 301

The Need for a More Fully "Representative" Version

In spite of the urging of some scholars that Bible translators should not interpret ambiguous passages, but rather that all such obscurities should as far as possible be carried over into the translation English,<sup>1</sup> all of the versions included in this study have offered interpretative translations of at least 60 per cent of the fifty-one ambiguous passages of doctrinal and exegetical consequence in the book of Romans.<sup>2</sup> But if a version offers interpretative translations of a majority of ambiguous passages, it seems hard to understand what reason there might be for not interpreting the remaining 40 per cent.

A number of the versions have succeeded in presenting clear interpretations of almost all of the ambiguous passages in Romans. More than 95 per cent of such passages are given interpretative renderings by Schonfield, the Twentieth Century, Weymouth, Goodspeed, Knox, and Lilly.

To the extent, however, that versions have interpreted ambiguous passages without offering alternative meanings in the margin, they have presumed to limit the reader to their own understanding of each passage. In spite of the great divergence of scholarly opinion as to the meaning of each of the fifty-one passages in Romans, only three of the versions included in this study, the English Revised, American Standard, and Weymouth, have made any serious attempt to inform the reader that the interpretation given in the text is not the only possible meaning of the ambiguous original.<sup>3</sup> The English and American revisions offer alternatives

---

<sup>1</sup>See above, chap. i, pp. 3-10.

<sup>2</sup>See tables 1 and 2, pp. 212, 213, 215.

<sup>3</sup>See tables 1 and 3, pp. 212, 213, 216.

for about one half of their interpretative translations. Weymouth, in his 1903 edition, offers alternatives for a third of his interpretations.

It would seem to be more justifiable for versions published by individual translators to interpret ambiguities without offering marginal alternatives, providing that the unsuspecting reader is made aware of the interpretative nature of such translations. But in the case of a church authorized version designed for general public use, a version which is assumed to represent a consensus of scholarly opinion, there would seem to be no justification for presenting only one of two or more possible meanings of ambiguous passages concerning which there is marked divergence of scholarly opinion.

The average reader is inclined to accept with dogmatic finality the interpretations of his traditional "authorized" version and to regard versions with differing translations of certain passages--the ambiguity of which he is unaware--as theologically biased. Consequently, an official version should be particularly careful to avoid encouraging finality unwarranted by the original. And the inclusion of an adequate supply of marginal alternatives would go far toward educating the general public in a more enlightened attitude toward the many legitimate differences in interpretation to be found in responsible versions of the New Testament.

There would seem to be need for a version which would more fully represent the potential meaning of the Greek New Testament. To be of the greatest possible help to the general reader, it should present in the text a clear interpretation of every obscure and ambiguous passage. In ambiguous passages of theological consequence, the interpretations will



inevitably have theological implications. But the decisions would of course not be based upon mere dogmatic preference but upon the best scholarly appraisal of relevant linguistic and exegetical evidence. Then in the margin should be placed the alternative meaning or meanings which have received the serious support of other scholars and translators. In passages of special obscurity, or where it may be thought that the Greek ambiguity was intended by the original writer, the literal translation should also be given.

An alternative proposal which might prove more immediately practicable and effective is the one suggested by A. P. Wikgren in a 1947 review of the Revised Standard Version. He has suggested that:

To satisfy a majority of people at the present time . . . it seems that the English Bible should . . . have to consist of a two-column affair giving the traditional King James text, preferably in a revised and corrected form, together with an accurate but idiomatic modern-speech translation and such marginal notes and comments as would be additionally necessary to facilitate comprehension of what is being read.<sup>1</sup>

Of the modern-speech versions included in this study, Goodspeed's New Testament would seem to be the one best qualified for this purpose. He gives a clear interpretation of almost all ambiguous passages, forty-nine out of fifty-one in Romans.<sup>2</sup> His interpretations differ to a high degree from those of the King James Version, with fifteen agreements and twenty disagreements in Romans.<sup>3</sup> His translation is already well known, is recognized for accuracy, and is couched in American idiom.

---

<sup>1</sup>A. P. Wikgren, "The Revised Standard New Testament," The Journal of Religion, Vol. XXVII (Apr., 1947), p. 135.

<sup>2</sup>See table 2, p. 215.

<sup>3</sup>See table 4, p. 244.

Such a combined and well annotated version would have the advantage of making a disarming approach to the large segment of the American Bible-reading public which still adheres more or less exclusively to the King James Version. The similarities and differences of interpretation between the two parallel translations, coupled with the ample annotations, would serve a most useful and needed purpose in leading the reader to a broadening understanding of the potential meaning of the New Testament text and in helping to allay the unjustified suspicion of the many other excellent versions of the English New Testament.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### The English Versions Included in This Study

- Wycliffe, John. The Holy Bible . . . in the earliest English version made from the Latin Vulgate by John Wycliffe and His Followers. Edited by Josiah Forshall and Frederic Madden. 4 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1850. (The Purvey revision of 1388 is also included in the Forshall and Madden facsimile.)
- Tyndale, William. The Editions of the New Testament, Tindale's Versions, 1525-1566. Edited by Francis Fry. London: Henry Sotheran and Co., 1878.
- Coverdale, Myles. The Bible . . . faithfully and truly translated out of Douche and Latyn in to Englishe. Place and printer uncertain. 1535.
- Rogers, John. The Byble . . . truly and purely translated into Englysh by Thomas Matthew. London: R. Grafton and E. Whitchurch, 1537.
- Taverner, Richard. The Most Sacred Bible . . . translated into English. London: Thomas Barthlet, 1539.
- The Great Bible. The Byble in Englyshe . . . truly translated after the veryte of the Hebrue and Greke textes . . . . London: Rychard Grafton and Edward Whitchurch, 1539.
- Whittingham, William. The Neuue Testament . . . Conferred diligently with the Greke, and best approved translations . . . . Geneva: Conrad Badius, 1557.
- The Geneva Bible. The Bible . . . translated according to the Ebrue and Greke . . . . Geneva: Rouland Hall, 1560.
- The Bishops' Bible. The Holie Bible conteyning the old Testament and the new. London: Richard Jugge, 1568.
- The New Testament of Iesus Christ, Translated faithfully into English, out of the authentical Latin . . . in the English College of Rhemes . . . . Rheims: John Fogney, 1582.
- The King James Version. The Holy Bible . . . Newly Translated out of the Originall tongues . . . . London: Robert Barker, 1611.
- Challoner, R. The New Testament Newly Revised and Corrected According to

- the Clementine Edition of the Scriptures. London, 1749. (A revision of the Rheims New Testament.)
- Blayney, Benjamin. The Holy Bible . . . . Oxford: T. Wright and W. Gill, 1769. (A revision of the King James Version.)
- The New Testament of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ translated out of the Greek Being the Version set forth A. D. 1611 compared with the most ancient authorities and revised A. D. 1881. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1881.
- The Twentieth Century New Testament: A Translation into Modern English Made from the Original Greek (Westcott and Hort's Text). New York: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1903. (Tentative edition, 1903; final edition, 1904; Part II, Paul's Letters to the Churches, 1900.)
- The New Covenant commonly called the New Testament of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ . . . . Newly edited by the New Testament Members of the American Revision Committee, A. D. 1900. New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1901.
- Weymouth, R. F. The New Testament in Modern Speech. New York: Baker and Taylor Co., 1903. 5th edition revised by J. A. Robertson, 1929.
- Moffatt, James. The New Testament: A New Translation. New York: Harper and Bros., 1913. Final edition, 1935.
- The Westminster Version of the Sacred Scriptures. Cuthbert Lattey and Joseph Keating general editors. New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1913-1935. (Vol. III, St. Paul's Epistles to the Churches, 1920.)
- Goodspeed, Edgar J. The New Testament: An American Translation. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1923.
- Ballantine, William G. The Riverside New Testament: A Translation from the Original Greek into the English of To-day. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1923.
- Montgomery, Helen Barrett. Centenary Translation of the New Testament. Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1924.
- Williams, Charles B. The New Testament: A Translation in the Language of the People. Chicago: Moody Press, 1937.
- Spencer, Francis Aloysius. The New Testament of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, Translated . . . from the Original Greek. New York: Macmillan Co., 1937.
- The New Testament of Our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ. Translated from the Latin Vulgate: A Revision of the Challoner-Rheims Version Edited by Catholic Scholars under the Patronage of the Episcopal

Committee of the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine. Paterson:  
St. Anthony Guild Press, 1941.

The New Testament in Basic English. New York: E. P. Dutton and Co.,  
1941.

Knox, R. A. The New Testament . . . A New Translation. New York: Sheed  
and Ward, 1944.

Verkuyl, Gerrit. Berkeley Version of the New Testament. Berkeley:  
James J. Gillick and Co., 1945.

The New Covenant Commonly Called the New Testament of Our Lord and  
Savior Jesus Christ . . . Being the Version Set Forth A. D. 1611  
Revised A. D. 1881 and A. D. 1901 . . . and Revised A. D. 1946. New  
York: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1946.

Phillips, J. B. Letters to Young Churches. New York: Macmillan Co.,  
1947.

Schonfield, Hugh J. The Authentic New Testament. London: Dennis Dobson  
Ltd., 1955.

Kleist, James A. and Lilly, Joseph L. The New Testament. Milwaukee:  
The Bruce Publishing Co., 1956.

#### Other Sources

Abbot, Ezra. "On the Construction of Romans 9:5," Journal of Biblical  
Literature, Vol. I (June and Dec., 1881), pp. 87-154.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Recent Discussions of Rom. 9:5," Journal of Biblical Litera-  
ture, Vol. III (June and Dec., 1883), pp. 90-112.

Abbott-Smith, G. A Manual Greek Lexicon of the New Testament. 3d ed.  
Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1937.

Abel, F. Grammaire du Grec Biblique. 12th ed. Paris: Librairie Lecoffre,  
J. Gabalda et Fils, 1927.

Alford, Henry. The Greek Testament with a critically revised text . . .  
and a critical and exegetical commentary. 4 vols. 3d ed. London:  
Rivingtons, 1849-1861.

Allis, Oswald T. "Evangelicals and 'The New Version,'" United Evangelical  
ACTION, Vol. XI (Sept. 15, Oct. 1, Oct. 15, Nov. 1, Nov. 15, 1952).

\_\_\_\_\_. Revision or New Translation. Philadelphia: Presbyterian and  
Reformed Pub. Co., 1948.

- Arndt, William F., and Gingrich, F. Wilbur. A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature. A translation of Walter Bauer's Griechisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der übrigen urchristlichen Literatur. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957.
- Bagster, Samuel (ed.). The English Hexapla. London: Samuel Bagster and Sons, 1841.
- Barmby, J. A. The Epistle of Paul to the Romans. Vol. XLIII of The Pulpit Commentary. Edited by H. D. M. Spence and J. S. Exell. New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1890.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Meaning of 'Righteousness of God' in the Epistle to the Romans," The Expositor, Vol. IV (1896), pp. 124-139.
- Barnes, Albert. Notes, Explanatory and Practical, on the Epistle to the Romans. 10th ed. revised. New York: Harper and Bros., 1871.
- Barrett, C. K. A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans. New York: Harper and Bros., 1957.
- Barth, Karl. The Epistle to the Romans. Translated by Edwyn C. Hoskyns. London: Oxford University Press, 1933.
- Bauer, D. Walter. Griechisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der übrigen urchristlichen Literatur. 4th ed. revised. Berlin: Töpelmann, 1952.
- Beet, Joseph Agar. A Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans. 9th ed. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1901.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Revised Version of the New Testament," The Expositor, Vol. III (1882), pp. 380-396.
- Belloc, Hilaire. Selected Essays. Compiled by J. E. Dineen. London: J. B. Lippincott, 1936.
- Biber, G. E. A Plea for an Edition of the Authorized Version of Holy Scripture, with Explanatory and Emendatory Marginal Notes. London: Rivingtons (?), 1857.
- Blass, Friedrich. Grammar of New Testament Greek. Translated by H. St. John Thackeray. 2d ed. London: Macmillan Co., 1905.
- Blass, F.-Debrunner, A. Grammatik des Neutestamentlichen Griechisch. 9th ed. Goettingen: Vanderhoeck and Ruprecht, 1954.
- Bosworth, Edward Increase. The Epistle of Paul to the Romans. Vol. XXXI in The Bible for Home and School. Edited by S. Mathews. New York: Macmillan Co., 1919.

- Boylan, Patrick. St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans. Dublin: M. H. Gill and Son, Ltd., 1934.
- Brooks, Beatrice Allard. "In Defense of the Translator and of New Translations," Journal of Bible and Religion, Vol. V, No. 1 (1937), pp. 11ff.
- Burkitt, F. C. "On Romans 9:5 and Mark 14:61," The Journal of Theological Studies, Vol. V (1904), pp. 451-455.
- Burton, Ernest De Witt. Syntax of the Moods and Tenses. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1900.
- Cadbury, Henry J. "The Danger of Overtranslation," The Bible Translator, Vol. V (July, 1954), pp. 137-138.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Translation Principles of the Revised Standard Version," The Christian Century, Vol. LXX (Dec., 1953), pp. 1388-1390.
- Calvin, John. A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans. Translated by Francis Sibson. Philadelphia: Whethem, 1836.
- Campbell, J. Y. "The New Testament: Revised Standard Version," The Journal of Theological Studies, Vol. XLIX (1948), pp. 118-124.
- Carleton, James G. The Part of Rheims in the Making of the English Bible. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1902.
- Cartwright, Thomas. A Confutation of the Rhemists Translation, Glosses and Annotations on the New Testament. Leyden: W. Brewster, 1618.
- Chamberlain, William Douglas. An Exegetical Grammar of the Greek New Testament. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1941.
- Cheney, James L. The Sources of Tyndale's New Testament. Halle: E. Karras, 1883.
- Clarke, Adam. The New Testament . . . with a Commentary and Critical Notes. Vol. II. New York: Phillips and Hunt, 1851.
- Colwell, Ernest Cadman. What is the Best New Testament? Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1952.
- Cook, F. C. The Revised Version of the First Three Gospels. London: John Murray, 1882.
- Cowan, James. Wresting the Scriptures: The Revised Standard Version Satan's Subtle, Subversive Masterpiece. The Most Dangerous Book of the Twentieth Century. Prince Albert: By the author, n.d.
- Cox, Samuel. "Doctrinal Effects of the Revised Version," The Expositor, Vol. III (1882), pp. 434-453.

- Cragg, Gerald R. Expository comments on The Epistle to the Romans. Vol. IX of The Interpreter's Bible. Edited by G. A. Buttrick. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1954.
- Craig, Clarence T. "The Revised Standard Version," Journal of Bible and Religion, Vol. XIV (Feb., 1946), pp. 33-36.
- Creed, J. H. "Παριους in Dionysius of Halicarnassus and in St. Paul," The Journal of Theological Studies, Vol. XLI (1940), pp. 28, 29, 30.
- Cremer, Hermann. Biblico-Theological Lexicon of New Testament Greek. Translated by William Urwick. 4th ed. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1895.
- Deissmann, G. A. Bible Studies. Translated by Alexander Grieve. 2d ed. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1909.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Mercy Seat," in Vol. III of Encyclopaedia Biblica. Edited by T. K. Cheyne and J. S. Black. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1902. Cols. 3027-3035.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Paul: A Study in Social and Religious History. Translated by W. E. Wilson. 2d ed. New York: Doran and Co., 1926.
- Denney, James. St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans. Vol. II of The Expositor's Greek Testament. Edited by W. R. Nicoll. New York: Dodd, Mead and Co., 1900.
- Dobbins, R. D. C. "The Epistle to the Romans in the Revised Version," Bibliotheca Sacra, Vol. XXXIX (Oct., 1882), pp. 722-751.
- Dodd, Charles Harold. The Epistle of Paul to the Romans. Vol. VI in The Moffatt New Testament Commentary. Edited by James Moffatt. New York: Harper and Bros., 1932.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "ΙΛΑΣΚΕΙΘΑΙ, its Cognates, Derivatives, and Synonyms, in the Septuagint," The Journal of Theological Studies, Vol. XXXII (1931), pp. 352-360.
- Dummelow, John Roberts (ed.). A Commentary on the Holy Bible. New York: Macmillan Co., 1943.
- Dwight, Timothy. "On Romans 9:5," Journal of Biblical Literature, Vol. I (June and Dec., 1881), pp. 22-55.
- Eadie, John. The English Bible. 2 vols. London: Macmillan Co., 1876.
- Edmunds, James and Bell, T. A. Discussion on Revision of the Holy Oracles. Louisville: Morton and Griswold, 1856.
- Ellicott, C. J. Considerations on the Revision of the English Version of the New Testament. New York: Harper and Bros., 1873.



- Farrar, F. W. "Fidelity and Bias in Versions of the Bible," The Expositor, Vol. III (1882), pp. 280-302.
- Feinberg, Charles Lee. The Revised Standard Version: What Kind of Translation? Los Angeles: The Bible Institute of Los Angeles, 1953.
- Ferrar, Fenton. The New Testament in Modern English . . . London: Oxford University Press, 1895.
- Field, Frederick. Notes on the Translation of the New Testament. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1899.
- Findlay, G. G. Comments on Romans in A Commentary on the Bible. Edited by A. S. Peake and A. J. Grieve. New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1919.
- Fitch, W. O. "Note on Romans 3:8b," The Expository Times, Vol. LIX (Oct., 1947), p. 26.
- Ford, T. F., and Ford, R. E. The New Testament of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Letchworth, England: Letchworth Printers Ltd., 1948.
- Fry, Francis. A Bibliographical Description of the Editions of the New Testament Tyndale's Version in English. London: Henry Sotheran and Co., 1878.
- Fulke, W. Defence of the Sincere and True Translation of the Holy Scriptures into the English Tongue. Edited by C. H. Hartshorne. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1843. (First published in London in 1583.)
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Text of the New Testament of Jesus Christ, translated out of the vulgar Latine by the Papists of the traiterous Seminarie at Rhemes. London: Christopher Barker, 1589.
- Garvie, Alfred E. Romans. In The Century Bible. Edited by W. F. Adeney. New York: Henry Frowde, n.d.
- Gerberich, Albert H. Luther and the English Bible. Unpublished dissertation, Johns Hopkins University, 1933.
- Gifford, E. H. The Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans. London: John Murray, 1886.
- Godet, F. Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans. Translated by A. Cusin. 2d ed. revised by T. W. Chambers. New York: Funk and Wagnalls Co., 1883.
- Goodspeed, Edgar J. The Making of the English New Testament. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1925.

- \_\_\_\_\_. New Chapters in New Testament Study. New York: Macmillan Co., 1937.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Present State of Bible Translation," The Journal of Bible and Religion, Vol. XVIII (April, 1950), pp. 99-100.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Problems of New Testament Translation. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1945.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Some Greek Notes," Journal of Biblical Literature, Vol. LXXIII (June, 1954), pp. 86-91.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (ed.). The Translator to the Reader: Preface to the King James Version of 1611 A. D. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1935.
- Gordon, Alexander. Christian Doctrine in the Light of New Testament Revision. London: Christian Life Publishing Co., 1882.
- Greenlee, J. Harold. "Evangelicals and 'The New Version,'" United Evangelical ACTION, Vol. XI (Dec., 1952).
- Griffis, Paul. Let's Be Fair about the Versions: An Appraisal of the Criticism of the Revised Standard Version. Conklin, New York: By the author, n.d.
- Grobel, W. Kendrick. "The Revision of the English New Testament," Journal of Biblical Literature, Vol. LXVI (Dec., 1947), pp. 361-384.
- Gruber, L. Franklin. The First English New Testament and Luther. Burlington, Iowa: The Lutheran Literary Board, 1928.
- A Guide for Translators, Revisers and Editors Working in Connection with the American Bible Society. New York: The American Bible Society, 1932.
- Harris, Rendel. A note on Romans 5:1 in The Expositor, Vol. VIII, No. 8 (1914), p. 527.
- Hastings, James (ed.). The Great Texts of the Bible. 20 vols. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1910-1912.
- Haussleiter, Johannes. Der Glaube Jesu Christi und der christliche Glaube. Erlangen: Diechert Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1891.
- Heinfetter, Herman. The True Translation of the Holy Scriptures. London: Alexander Heylin, 1861.
- Henderson, R. F. "Problems of Bible Translation," The Bible Translator, Vol. VI (July, 1955), pp. 127-136.
- Hoare, H. W. The Evolution of the English Bible. New York: Dutton and Co., 1902.

- Hodge, Charles. Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans. 2d ed. revised. Philadelphia: J. S. Claxton, 1873.
- Hoekstra, Harvey T. "Theological Implications in Translation," The Bible Translator, Vol. III (Jan., 1952), pp. 17-19.
- Hort, Fenton John Anthony. Prolegomena to St. Paul's Epistles to the Romans and the Ephesians. London: Macmillan Co., 1895.
- Huffman, Jasper. The Revised Standard Version: An Appraisal. Winona Lake, Indiana: The Standard Press, 1953.
- Hunter, A. M. "The Translation of the New Testament," The Expository Times, Vol. LX (Sept., 1949), pp. 347-350.
- Ierson, Henry. Notes on the Amended English Bible with Special Reference to Certain Texts in the Revised Version of the Old and New Testaments Bearing upon the Principles of Unitarian Christianity. London: British and Foreign Unitarian Association, 1887.
- Irwin, William A. "Method and Procedure of the Revision," in An Introduction to the Revised Standard Version of the Old Testament. Edited by L. A. Weigle. New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1952. Pp. 11-20.
- Jacobs, Henry Eyster. Annotations on the Epistles of Paul to the Romans . . . Vol. VII in The Lutheran Commentary. Edited by H. E. Jacobs. New York: The Christian Literature Co., 1895.
- Jacobus, Melancthon Williams (ed.). Roman Catholic and Protestant Bibles Compared. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1915.
- Jamieson, Robert; Fausset, A. R.; and Brown, David. A Commentary, Critical and Explanatory, on the Old and New Testaments. Vol. III. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1885.
- Johnson, Anthony. An Historical Account of the Several English Translations of the Bible and the Opposition they met with from the Church of Rome. London: Rivingtons, 1730.
- Johnson, Sherman E. "The Revised Standard Version," Anglican Theological Review, Vol. XXX (Apr., 1948), pp. 81-90.
- Jülicher, Adolf. Der Brief an die Römer. Band II of Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments. Edited by J. Weiss, W. Bousset, and W. Heitmüller. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1917.
- Kennedy, H. A. A. A note on Romans 5:1 in The Expository Times, Vol. XVII (July, 1906), p. 451.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Sources of New Testament Greek. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1895.

- Kirk, K. E. The Epistle to the Romans in the Revised Version, with Introduction and Commentary. Vol. XII of The Clarendon Bible. Edited by Bishop Strong and Bishop Wild. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1937.
- Kittel, Gerhard. Bible Key Words. Translated and edited by J. E. Coates. New York: Harper and Bros., 1951.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (ed.). Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament. 5 vols. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1932-1954.
- Kittel, Gottfried. "Πίστις Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ bei Paulus," Theologische Studien und Kritiken, Vol. LXXIX, Pt. III (1906), pp. 419ff.
- Knox, John. Exegetical comments on The Epistle to the Romans. Vol. IX of The Interpreter's Bible. Edited by G. A. Buttrick. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1954.
- Knox, Ronald A. On Englishing the Bible. London: Burns, Oates, and Washbourne, 1949.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Some Problems of Bible Translation," The Clergy Review, Vol. XVIII (Feb., 1940).
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Trials of a Translator. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1949.
- Kühl, Ernst. Der Brief des Paulus an die Römer. Leipzig: Quelle and Meyer, 1913.
- Lagrange, M. -J. Saint Paul, 'Epître aux Romains. 4th ed. Paris: J. Gabalda, 1931.
- Lange, J. P., and Fay, F. R. The Epistle of Paul to the Romans. Translated by J. F. Hurst. Revised by P. Schaff and M. B. Riddle. Vol. XX of A Commentary on the Holy Scriptures. Edited by J. P. Lange. New York: Charles Scribner and Co., 1869.
- Liddell, Henry George, and Scott, Robert. A Greek-English Lexicon. Revised by H. S. Jones and R. McKenzie. 2 vols. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1940.
- Lietzmann, Hans. An die Römer. Vol. VIII of Handbuch zum Neuen Testament. Edited by Hans Lietzmann. 4th ed. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1933.
- Lightfoot, J. B. Notes on Epistles of St. Paul. London: Macmillan Co., 1904.
- \_\_\_\_\_. On a Fresh Revision of the English New Testament. 2d ed. revised. New York: Harper and Bros., 1873.
- Lincoln, C. F. (ed.). "A Critique of the Revised Standard Version," Bibliotheca Sacra, Vol. X (Jan., 1953), pp. 50-66.

- Luther, Martin. Das New Testament recht grüntlich teutsch Doctor Martin Luthers. Strassburg: Johan knobloch, 1524.
- Manson, T. W. "ΙΑΑΧΤΗΡΙΟΝ," The Journal of Theological Studies, Vol. XLVI (1945), pp. 1-10.
- Martin, Gregory. A discovery of the manifold Corruptions of the Holy Scriptures by the Heretics of our Day, especially by the English Sectaries, and of their foul dealing herein by partial and false Translations, to the advantage of their Heresies, in their English Bibles used and authorized since the Time of Schism. Rheims: Iohn Fogny, 1582.
- May, Herbert Gordon. Our English Bible in the Making. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1952.
- McClellan, J. B. "The Revised Version of the New Testament, a Plea for Hesitation as to its Adoption," The Expositor, Vol. X (1904), pp. 187-202.
- McIntire, Carl. The New Bible Revised Standard Version: Why Christians Should Not Accept It. Collingswood, New Jersey: Christian Beacon, n.d.
- McLoughlin, William A. A review of the R. A. Knox New Testament in The Thomist, Vol. VIII (Apr., 1945), pp. 285-287.
- Metzger, Bruce M. A review of E. J. Goodspeed's Problems of New Testament Translation in Theology Today, Vol. II (Jan., 1946), pp. 561-563.
- Meyer, Heinrich August Wilhelm. Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Epistle to the Romans. Translated by John C. Moore. Edited and revised by W. P. Dickson. 2 vols. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1873 and 1874.
- Milligan, George. "The Doctrinal Significance of the Revised Version," The Expository Times, Vol. VII (Oct., 1895-Sept., 1896), pp. 377-379, 452-454; Vol. VIII (Oct., 1896-Sept., 1897), pp. 171-174.
- Mombert, J. I. A Handbook of the English Versions of the Bible. 2d ed. New York: Appleton and Co., 1890.
- Morris, William. The Revised and Arianized Version of the English New Testament. London: E. Stock, 1881.
- Moule, C. F. D. An Idiom Book of New Testament Greek. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1953.
- Moule, H. C. G. The Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Romans. Vol. XLIV of The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges. Edited by J. J. S. Perowne. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1903.

- Moulton, James Hope. A Grammar of New Testament Greek, Vol. I: Prolegomena. 3d ed. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1906.
- \_\_\_\_\_, and Howard, Wilbert F. A Grammar of New Testament Greek, Vol. II: Accidence and Word Formation. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark; Pt. I, 1919; Pt. II, 1929.
- \_\_\_\_\_, and Milligan, George. The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1929.
- Moulton, W. F. The History of the English Bible. 5th ed. revised and enlarged by J. H. Moulton and W. F. Moulton. London: Charles H. Kelly, 1911.
- Nestle, D. Eberhard. Novum Testamentum Graece. 21st ed. by D. Erwin Nestle. Stuttgart: Privilegierte Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1952.
- Neuberg, Frank J. "Evangelicals and 'The New Version,'" United Evangelical ACTION, Vol. XII (Jan., 1953).
- "The New Revised Standard Version--Is It for You?" Moody Monthly, Vol. LIII (Oct., 1952), pp. 269, 309-311.
- Nida, Eugene A. Bible Translating. New York: American Bible Society, 1947.
- \_\_\_\_\_. God's Word in Man's Language. New York: Harper and Bros., 1952.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Translation or Paraphrase," The Bible Translator, Vol. I (July, 1950), pp. 97-106.
- Nygren, Anders. Commentary on Romans. Translated by Carl C. Rasmussen. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1949.
- Parry, R. St. John. The Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the ROMANS. Cambridge Greek Testament. Edited by R. St. John Parry. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1912.
- Pollard, Alfred W. Records of the English Bible. New York: H. Frowde, 1911.
- Pope, Hugh. English Versions of the Bible. Revised and enlarged by Sebastian Bullough. St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co., 1952.
- Postgate, J. P. Translation and Translations Theory and Practice. London: G. Bell and Sons, 1922.
- Price, Ira Maurice. The Ancestry of Our English Bible. 2d ed. revised by William A. Irwin and Allen P. Wikgren. New York: Harper and Bros., 1949.

- Radermacher, Ludwig. Neutestamentliche Grammatik. 2d ed. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1925.
- Richardson, Alan. Theological Wordbook of the Bible. New York: Macmillan Co., 1950.
- Rieu, E. V. The Four Gospels. London: Penguin Books, 1952.
- \_\_\_\_\_, and Phillips, J. B. "Translating the Gospels," The Bible Translator, Vol. VI (Oct., 1955), pp. 150-159.
- Robertson, A. T. A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research. 3d ed. New York: George H. Doran Co., 1919.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Epistles of Paul. Vol. IV of Word Pictures in the New Testament. New York: Richard R. Smith, Inc., 1931.
- Robinson, George L. Where Did We Get Our Bible? New York: Harper and Bros., 1928.
- Robinson, Henry Wheeler. The Bible in its Ancient and English Versions. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1940.
- Ropes, James Hardy. "'Righteousness' and 'The Righteousness of God' in the Old Testament and in St. Paul," Journal of Biblical Literature, Vol. XXII, Pt. IV (1903), pp. 211-227.
- Sadler, M. F. The Epistle to the Romans. 2d ed. revised. London: George Bell and Sons, 1889.
- Sanday, William, and Headlam, A. D. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans. The International Critical Commentary. Edited by S. R. Driver, A. Plummer, and C. A. Briggs. 5th ed. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1905.
- Schwarz, Werner. Principles and Problems of Biblical Translation. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1955.
- Scrivener, F. H. A. The Authorized Edition of the English Bible, Its Subsequent Reprints and Modern Representatives. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1854.
- Sevenster, Jan. N. "The Theological Importance of Translation," The Crozer Quarterly, Vol. XXIV (Apr., 1947), pp. 137ff.
- Smith, G. Vance. Texts and Margins of the Revised New Testament Affecting Theological Doctrine Briefly Reviewed. London: British and Foreign Unitarian Association, 1881.
- Smith, Morton. "Notes on Goodspeed's 'Problems of New Testament Translation,'" Journal of Biblical Literature, Vol. LXIV (Dec., 1945), pp. 501-514.

- Smyth, Herbert Weir. A Greek Grammar for Colleges. New York: American Book Company, 1920.
- Stevens, George B. "A Paraphrase of the Epistle to the Romans," The Biblical World, Vol. VIII (July-Dec., 1896), pp. 299-309.
- Taylor, Vincent. "Great Texts Reconsidered: Romans 3:25-26," The Expository Times, Vol. L (Oct., 1938-Sept., 1939), pp. 295-300.
- Thackeray, H. St. John. A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1909.
- Thayer, Joseph Henry. A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament. A translation and revision of Grimm's Wilke's Clavis Novi Testamenti. Corrected ed. New York: Harper and Bros., 1889.
- Theissen, A. The Epistle to the Romans. In A Catholic Commentary on Holy Scripture. Edited by D. M. Orchard, E. F. Sutcliffe, R. C. Fuller, and D. R. Russell. New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1953.
- Tischendorf, Constantinus. Novum Testamentum Graece . . . Editio Octava Critica Maior. 2 vols. Leipzig: Heinrich's, 1869-1872.
- Trench, Richard Chenevix. On the Authorized Version of the New Testament. New York: Harper and Bros., 1873.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Synonyms of the New Testament. 7th ed. London: Macmillan Co., 1871.
- Unger, Merrill F. "The Revised Standard Old Testament," Bibliotheca Sacra, Vol. X (Jan., 1953), pp. 54-61.
- Vaughan, C. J. Ἡ πρὸς Ῥωμαίους Ἐπιστολή. 6th ed. London: Macmillan Co., 1885.
- Vincent, Marvin R. The Epistles of Paul: Romans . . . Vol. III of Word Studies in the New Testament. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1900.
- Ward, Thomas. Errata of the Protestant Bible. 2d ed. revised. New York: D. and J. Sadlier, 1844.
- Warner, H. J. "Romans 9:5," The Journal of Theological Studies, Vol. XLVIII (1947), pp. 203-204.
- Waterman, Leroy. "Spiritual Gains from New Translations of the Bible," Journal of Bible and Religion, Vol. V, No. 3 (1937), pp. 120-126.
- Weigle, Luther Allan. The English New Testament from Tyndale to the Revised Standard Version. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1949.



- \_\_\_\_\_. (ed.). An Introduction to the Revised Standard Version of the Old Testament by Members of the Revision Committee. New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1952.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (ed.). An Introduction to the Revised Standard Version of the New Testament by Members of the Revision Committee. New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1946.
- Weiss, Bernhard. Der Brief an die Römer. Vol. IV in the 6th ed. of B. A. W. Meyer's Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1899.
- Westcott, Brooke Foss. A General View of the History of the English Bible. 3d ed. revised by W. A. Wright. New York: Macmillan Co., 1927.
- Westcott, Frederick Brooke. St. Paul and Justification. London: Macmillan Co., 1913.
- "What About Italics?" The Bible Translator, Vol. VII (July, 1956), pp. 114-116.
- Wikgren, Allen P. "A Critique of the Revised Standard Version of the New Testament," in The Study of the Bible Today and Tomorrow. Edited by H. R. Willoughby. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1947.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Revised Standard New Testament," The Journal of Religion, Vol. XXVII (Apr., 1947), pp. 120-125.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Use of Marginal Notes in the English Bible," The Crozer Quarterly, Vol. XXVII (Apr., 1950), pp. 143-153.
- Wilson, William E. "Redemption and Propitiation," The Interpreter, Vol. XVIII (Jan., 1922), pp. 120-129.
- Winer, G. B. A Treatise on the Grammar of New Testament Greek. Translated by W. F. Moulton. 3d ed. revised. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1882.
- Wordsworth, J., and White, H. J. Novum Testamentum Domini Jesu Christi Latine secundum editionem Sancti Hieronymi. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1889-.
- Zahn, Theodor. Der Brief des Paulus an die Römer. 3d ed. revised by Hauck. Leipzig: A. Deichert, 1925.

