

ARCHAIC or ACCURATE?

Inside Front Cover:

THE BIBLE LEAGUE was founded on 3rd May 1892, with one object: To promote the Reverent Study of the Holy Scriptures, and to resist the varied attacks made upon their Inspiration, Infallibility and Sole Sufficiency as the Word of God.

All who are in agreement with this aim are invited to support the League, which is undenominational and has subscribers throughout the world. Annual subscription (which includes the four issues of the Quarterly sent by post) is £4.00 in the U.K. and £5.00 for overseas subscribers. Payment is required in **sterling**, either by cheque or International Money Order, made payable to "The Bible League" and crossed "a/c payee". Please send to Mrs. R. Ward, 20 Thistlebarrow Road, Salisbury, Wiltshire, SP1 3RT.

CONTENTS

	Page
Foreword	1
Thou — Thee — Thine	4
Thou Versus You	5
Addressing God in Prayer and Worship	10
Singular and Plural -	
A Warning Against Confusion	14
The Use of Thee and Thou in Prayer	19
Thou and You in Bible Translations	22
Thee or You in Addressing the Almighty	37
Is a Pronominal Revision of the	
Authorised Version Desirable?	40
Why the Ye's and Thou's?	43
Changes of Person and Number	
in Paul's Epistles	44
Why Thou should be Retained	45

Foreword

The translation of the Scriptures we use, and how we address the Triune God in praise and prayer, are among the most sensitive and controversial issues facing the Church today. It was not always so. Until well into this century the almost uniform practice of English-speaking Christians was to use the Authorised Version, and to invoke the Lord accordingly with the pronouns *thee*, *thou*, and *thine*. This, it was believed, ensured an accurate version of the Bible and a reverence of approach to Him who "is exalted above all blessing and praise" (Nehemiah 9:5).

Nowadays God's people are in different camps over these matters. Precious things which ought to be the ingredients of our unity have been cleverly used by Satan to come between us. What version of Scripture we use, and whether we pray *thou*, *thee*, or *you*, *your*, tragically causes endless difficulties in the Church of God. We feel sure past generations of the godly would be filled with dismay at such polarisation.

The beginning of the break-up can be traced to the Revised Version of the last century, but in real terms the impact began with the appearance of the Revised Standard Version in 1952. This translation dropped the traditional pronouns *thee*, *ye* etc. when people were spoken to, and replaced them with *you* and *your*. However, when Deity was the object of address the traditional pronouns were retained. This was to be an epoch-making device. The Weymouth New Testament (1903) had done this before, but it never aspired to replace the Authorised Version and so its effect was minimal.

The Revised Standard Version enjoyed a certain vogue among IVF students in the 1960s, but its liberal credentials prevented it becoming the Bible of all evangelicals. It had, however, paved the way for this change with regard to the pronouns. The J. B. Phillips New Testament (1958) and the New English Bible (1970) followed the Revised Standard Version practice of retaining the older pronouns in reference to Deity, but the mould was broken. Around that time, and especially since, there have appeared a spate of modern-English versions, and these have replaced the traditional pronouns completely: the colloquial *you* and *your* are used whether man or God is addressed.

With the advent of the New International Version (1978) — an evangelically credible Bible at last — the shift to *you* and *your* in the things of God was virtually guaranteed. Indeed, in the Preface to the British edition of that version we read: "As for the traditional pronouns *thou*, *thee* and *thine* in reference to the Deity, the translators judged that to use these archaisms (along with old verb forms such as *doest*, *wouldest* and *hast*) would violate accuracy in translation. Neither Hebrew, Aramaic nor Greek uses special pronouns for the persons of the Godhead. A present-day translation is not enhanced by forms that in the time of the King James Version were used in everyday speech, whether referring to God or man."

Perhaps the most acceptable new Bible version to appear in recent years has been the Revised Authorised Version (New King James Version) of 1982. This is an attempt to improve the classic Authorised Version and bring it more up-to-date for today's readers. In so doing, however, the revisers have gone to the length of removing the traditional pronouns in all cases again. The Preface assures us: "The real character of the Authorised Version does not reside in its archaic pronouns or verbs or other grammatical forms of the seventeenth century, but rather in the care taken by its scholars to impart the letter and spirit of the original text in a majestic and reverent style."

So the colloquial *you* and *your* has triumphed in the Bible versions of today. And with this quiet revolution has come the tendency on the part of believers to use the **language** of these modern versions in addressing God. Many hail this development as a

necessary step along the road to being contemporary and relevant. Sadly, the question of whether this is right, or acceptable to God, never seems to be asked.

Christians who hold the Authorised Version position, in both Bible version and the use of the traditional pronouns in worship, are convinced that many today are blithely unaware of the principles at stake. We are talking about something as foundational and fundamental as the Word of God itself, and the reverence or otherwise with which we address Almighty God. These matters are too vital to be shoved to one side as irrelevant in the rush to make the Bible "user-friendly." We have no desire to make these things a test of fellowship, or to put upon the Lord's people any "other burden" (Revelation 2:24), yet the assumptions reflected in the Prefaces above confirm to us that more needs to be said on the subject.

It is for this reason that the Council of the Bible League has felt led to publish this little book. The articles contained here are drawn largely from past issues of the League's magazine, the *Quarterly*, together with other pieces which make a valuable contribution to the debate. Inevitably in a symposium like this there is some overlap of material, but rather than edit this out, it was felt that such repetition will help by underlining points which, in the present climate, need making again and again.

We send forth these articles with the earnest hope that their message may be studied prayerfully by the Lord's people and that many will be convinced. Our prayer is that God the Holy Spirit will so enlighten and direct us that, holding right views and maintaining right practices, we all may be "accepted of Him" (2 Corinthians 5:9) in our use of His Word and in our worship of His Name.

John Thackway
Editor, Bible League Quarterly.

Thou — Thee — Thine

James Payne

Some 200 years ago the English language was much more sublime than it is to-day. It then had a *complete* set of personal pronouns, each clearly distinguishable from the others. They may be listed as follows:—

		Nominative	Objective	Possessive
First Person	Singular ...	I	Me	My (or mine)
	Plural ...	We	Us	Our (ours)
Second Person	Singular ...	Thou	Thee	Thy (or thine)
	Plural ...	Ye	You	Your (yours)
Third Person	Singular	He or She	Him or Her	His or Hers
	Plural ...	They	Them	Their (theirs)

In process of time, however, all the second person singular pronouns were dropped and the words *you* and *your* had to do duty for both singular and plural and *you* came to be used in both the nominative and the objective case. This, however, was a debasement of the language, but owing to popular usage it was soon looked upon as the "norm" and the abandoned words, although more strictly correct, came to be regarded as archaic.

The Authorised Version of the Scripture, being translated over 300 years ago, makes use of the complete set of personal pronouns, as also do the original languages from which the Bible was translated. These were retained also in the Revised Version and have been still used in Christian praise and prayer until recent years. Then, with the new versions of the Scripture appearing in the more modern though incomplete language, the practice was adopted of using this language in prayer, and this is becoming more and more popular, so that *thou*, *thee* and *thine* now become *you* and *your*. We cannot, however, but ask the question, Is it desirable to use the debased form of language, now popularised, in speaking to God? We do not say that it is necessarily wrong to use the modern form, since,

Prayer is the soul's sincere desire,
Uttered or unexpressed;
The motion of a hidden fire
That trembles in the breast.

For our part, however, we prefer the old method, especially in public worship, because the debased language, though popular, seems to us to lack the desired reverence which attaches to the old and more correct method.

Thou versus You

Terence H. Brown

For several hundred years English-speaking people in all parts of the world have been accustomed to address their prayers and worship to God as *thou* and *thee*, but in recent years there has been a tendency to relinquish the use of *thou*, *thee*, and *thine* both in prayer and in modern translations of the Bible. Among the translations retaining these forms in speech addressed to God are found the Revised Standard Version and the New English Bible. The promoters of the NEB made their position clear in their Handbook: "It was thought that the public for whom the NEB was intended was not generally ready for the use of *you* in address to God, with all the overtones of familiarity and casual speech that this would bring with it". This was the view expressed with reference to the New Testament of 1961, and evidently confirmed in 1970 when the complete Bible was published, retaining *thou*, *thee*, etc.

Although several more recent modern versions, including the Good News Bible and the New International Version, have completely eliminated these forms of speech, there are no doubt many people, attending places of worship where these versions are read, quoted and expounded, who much prefer to address the Almighty as *thou*, and are disturbed to hear the more colloquial forms of speech used in public prayer. Others, after some years of practice, have accepted the innovation, and are not particularly concerned whether the person conducting a service of worship uses the language of the Authorised Version or that of the Good News Bible.

Reference in Worship

Advocates of the long-established usage, and advocates of the new, are apt to misrepresent each other's position, while maintaining their own with much feeling, but not always with much regard for the facts. Critics of the modern colloquial style sometimes assert that it is *irreverent* to address God as *you*, but God only, who is able to search the heart and mind, can see where there is reverence and where there is not. It is possible on the one hand to use the most elegant and high-sounding language in prayer, and to fall far short of a truly reverent approach to "the Majesty on high". On the other hand it is possible for a barely literate person with a very limited vocabulary, and lacking in experience of the other forms of speech, to draw near to the throne of grace with a simple prayer, poorly expressed, but heard in heaven as a reverent utterance of the heart. Reverence is indeed a most important factor in private and in public worship, in prayer, in praise, and in the reading and hearing of God's Word. In our approach to Him whose ways are above our thoughts, "as high as the heavens are above the earth", speech, thought and conduct conducive to reverence, and expressive of reverence, should be encouraged. It would ill become us to discourage or disparage a reverent approach to God expressed in either way.

Hebrew, Greek and English usage

Critics of the use of *thou* and *thee* in prayer and in the Bible often contend that there is no such distinction in the Hebrew or Greek underlying the English rendering. This argument is sometimes presented in a most misleading manner, ignoring the very clear distinction between singular and plural, which is lost in a modern English rendering. One of the many examples may be found in Luke 22:31, "Satan hath desired to have *you* (plural, referring to

the Apostles), but I have prayed for *thee* (singular, meaning Peter) that thy faith fail not." In the New International Version, which has *you* for the singular as well as for the plural, a footnote has to be added to explain that the Greek is plural. It is a fact that the English *thou* and *thee* are more distinctively singular than the ambiguous modern *you*, which may be either.

Going a step further, critics of the use of *thou*, *thee* and *thy* insist that the ancient languages did not use a different form of the personal pronouns in speech addressed to God. This is quite true, but when the Holy Scriptures are translated into another language the translators have to take into account all of the phenomena of the *receptor language*. When the Bible was first translated into English the singular forms of the pronoun *thou*, *thee*, etc. were commonly used in speech and in literature, both in relation to God and in relation to man. The translators rightly took the current phenomena of the English language into account and rendered the singular *thou* in speech addressed to God and man: "Trust thou in the LORD" (Psalm 115:9); "Be thou exalted, O God" (Psalm 57:5).

English usage in prayer and worship

For several hundred years the dominance of the English Bible secured for these forms of speech a settled place in public and private worship, in prayer, in the reading of the Scriptures, in metrical versions of the Psalms, in Christian hymns, in Christian poetry, and in preaching. During this period colloquial speech and secular literature gradually dropped *thou*, *thee* and *thy* and the related forms of the verbs, while these forms continued in use as an integral part of the language of prayer and worship throughout the English-speaking world. Their disappearance from *secular* literature did not render them obsolete, for they were still in constant daily use by millions of English-speaking Christian people all over the world.

It is not reasonable or true to describe as obsolete forms of speech that are in constant use today. Quite recently compiled hymn books furnish abundant evidence that Christians in the late twentieth century are still accustomed to addressing God in this distinctive manner. A detailed examination of *Grace Hymns (1976)*, for instance, reveals more than six hundred examples of so-called obsolete usage in the first hundred hymns alone. No doubt the compilers assumed that these hymns would be intelligible to those who use them, and that they would continue to be used in reverent worship for many years to come. (Although in fairness it has to be conceded that now, nearly twenty years later, there are calls from Grace Baptists to "update" their hymn book with one which employs the modern pronouns. – Ed.) This amounts to a tacit acknowledgement that Christian people today use distinctive forms of the personal pronoun and verb in praise and prayer. Similarly plentiful evidence will be found in *Christian Hymns (1977)*, *Gadsby's Hymns*, the *Baptist Hymnal*, *Gospel Hymns*, *Hymns of Faith*, and in the *Metrical Psalms*.

Sound principles of translation

During the last few decades there has been a gradual tendency in some quarters to use the colloquial forms of speech in prayer and worship, and to some extent the adoption of modern versions of the Holy Scriptures has accelerated the process, but in this respect the modern versions have not followed sound principles of translation. These require that in a translation all of the characteristic features of the receptor language should be considered. A translation committee undertaking a new translation in a tribal language of India, Africa or South America would not feel able to ignore such an important feature of the language of the people. If they found that in addressing God the people had used distinctive forms of speech, which had become elevated and hallowed by this use in worship only, so as to be regarded by many as the most appropriate and reverent mode of worship, the translators would not disregard such a distinctive feature, but rather endeavour to make good use of it in their translation.

The same principle should be applied in a modern English version. At present English-speaking Christians do not normally use *thou* and *thee* in ordinary conversation, and it would be no great loss in a modern English rendering of John's Gospel if the Samaritans were to say to the woman, "Now we believe, not because of *your* saying," rather than "not because of *thy* saying". Similar changes in other passages would not offend, but in passages such as "I will extol thee, O LORD", "I will sing aloud of thy mercy", "Thou art my hope, O Lord GOD", and "Thine, O LORD, is the greatness, and the power", it should be acknowledged that in this language of worship addressed to God present-day English-speaking Christians retain *thou*, *thee*, *thy*, etc.

Distinctively Christian usage

In this respect the English language has acquired, developed and retained a distinctive usage, which continues to be regarded by many as the most appropriate for all speech addressed to God the Father, God the Son and God the Holy Spirit, even when the Father speaks to the Son – "Thou art my Son", or when the Son speaks to the Father – "I come to thee". While it is true that the Greek language in the first century used the same pronoun for God and man, it is also true that the English language in the twentieth century has developed in such a way as to make the distinction possible, and this important fact should not be ignored.

When a modern version is adopted which discards this distinctively appropriate usage in speech addressed to God, the effect is that in the corporate or congregational acts of worship the people sing praise and prayer using those forms of speech, which for so long have been hallowed by their exclusive use for the high purpose of communion with God, and are then obliged to submit to hearing the Holy Scriptures, God's Word to man, in a style of English in which the time-honoured, long-established, and distinctively Christian usage has been eliminated.

A translation of the Holy Scriptures needs to be in language appropriate to the Divine Author, appropriate to the inspired writer, appropriate to the subject matter, and appropriate to the reader. In the present state of the English language, having regard to the general and continuing use of *thou* and *thee* in public worship, these forms of speech are still considered by many to be the most appropriate in each respect.

Conformity with declining standards

It is sometimes said that the Authorised Version has "failed to communicate" to the present generation, but the reception of God's Word is not guaranteed by the simplicity or modernity of a translation – for "the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God . . . neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned" (1 Corinthians 2:14).

The last thirty years have witnessed the popularisation of numerous modern English versions of the Holy Scriptures, all of which have aimed at simplicity and modernity, but it has to be acknowledged that these have not been effective in arresting the general decline in standards of conduct in every section of our society. Conformity with an inferior standard is easier than resistance to it, but the Lord's people are warmly exhorted by His Word — "Be not conformed to this world" (Romans 12:2). It is evidently not the function of the Church to catch the spirit of the age, but to correct it, with God's help. The principle is one which needs to be observed even in the matter of Bible translations, and in the conduct of public worship.

Those who retain the Authorised Version on the ground of its intrinsic superiority to the offered alternatives have sometimes been charged with following the example of 16th-century Roman Catholics, who venerated the Latin Vulgate and insisted that sacred worship should be conducted in an unknown tongue. This is not a fair criticism, as a very high proportion of the vocabulary of the Authorised Version continues in common daily use

wherever the English language is spoken. The use of *thou*, *thee*, *thy* in prayer cannot be likened to worship in an unknown tongue, while English-speaking Christians continue to use these forms in their sung praise. The words remain a distinctive part of our contemporary usage in the context of worship, being neither obsolete nor unknown.

Process of change in Christian usage

The Authorised Version is now used in very few schools, but in many the Revised Standard Version or the New English Bible has been adopted, and where these are read children will continue to be accustomed to hear *thou* and *thee* in speech addressed to God, even when the colloquial pronouns are used in prayer. It must be recognised that our language, like others, is subject to change, but changes in distinctively religious usage take place more slowly than in the secular usage. It is not unlikely that over quite a long period of time the two styles will co-exist, some Christian people using the one style, and some the other, with the newer style gradually becoming more common. This process has been taking place already for many years, and in some parts of the world the general adoption of the colloquial style in spoken prayer has been more rapid than in England, while the *thou* and *thee* forms have held their place in congregational singing. Many people who have no difficulty in understanding the *thou* and *thee* usage when the Holy Scriptures are read, or when they sing psalms and hymns, experience some difficulty in actually composing sentences in prayer consistently using these forms of speech, particularly the verbal forms associated with *thou* — *thou wast*, *thou didst*, *thou hadst*, *thou dost*, etc. Some avoid the difficulty by mingling *thee*, *thy* and *you* in public extempore prayer, while some have solved the problem by using the modern pronouns only throughout.

These problems call for mutual understanding and sympathy, rather than for mutual censure and criticism, and where the Eternal God is reverently worshipped differences of opinion on this subject should not constitute a bar to Christian fellowship, or disturb that true charity which is the bond of peace among the Lord's people. Among the various age-groups in the Christian community there are many who will never relinquish the long-established *thou* and *thee* usage in their approach to God, and there are also many who will never adopt that usage, being increasingly insulated from it, in the home, at day school, Sunday school, and in their places of worship. Paul had to remind his readers that "the kingdom of God is not meat and drink" and we have to remind ourselves that the worship of God is not merely a matter of traditional usage and forms of speech, although the language of worship should never be lacking in reverence.

© Trinitarian Bible Society. Reprinted by kind permission.

Addressing God in Prayer and Worship

T. Ernest Wilson

One of the features of our modern permissive society is the tendency to familiarity in addressing the aged or those in positions of authority. It is becoming quite common for children and young people to call old people by their first name. It is one of the results of modern revolt and the breakdown of law and order and authority, to drop the old terms of honour and respect in addressing their elders.

Conditions in the world usually have a way of manifesting themselves in the church. It is becoming increasingly common to hear God addressed with the familiar *you* instead of the reverential *thou*. The argument is that the reverential form is archaic, it was used in Shakespeare's day, and was the common form of speech when the Authorised Version of the Bible was translated in 1611. We no longer use it today in addressing each other, therefore let us drop it in addressing God! It is regarded as a mark of superior education and sophistication to avoid the old forms and use modern language in praying to the Deity. Those who do it, insist that it is not a lack of reverence, but using language that everyone understands. This is very plausible, but is it true?

The question of English grammar

We are told that the old form of the second person *thou*, and its use in everyday speech, has been dropped. Admittedly, when the Authorised Version was translated, *thou*, *thee*, etc., were simply singular forms of the pronouns, while *you* was the plural form. The translators followed this rule whether God or man was being addressed. But today the plural form *you* is commonly used as a singular. While this is true, yet the old form of the second person and its reverential use is a part of our language. We learn it in school in our verb conjugations: I am, thou art, he is, etc. In most languages, reverential forms of speech are used in addressing the Deity. For example, in the Latin languages such as Spanish and Portuguese, the second person "tu" (*thou*) is used in a three-fold way:

- (1) Endearment and intimacy, between husband and wife, to a child or intimate friend.
- (2) It is used in disparagement to one regarded as an inferior.
- (3) Always in a reverential way in addressing the Deity.

In Bantu languages used in Africa, and among so-called primitive people generally, God is addressed in majestic terms and titles. No African child would think of addressing his parent or an elder by the familiar form, and to speak to Almighty God in this way would be unthinkable!

The need for reverence

In addressing a king or the president, or a cabinet minister, or a judge on the bench when a law court is in session, it is customary to use respectful terms which we do not ordinarily use; Your Majesty, Your Honour, etc. The New Testament sanctions and gives examples of such usages. We read there of an honourable counsellor and of honourable women. Luke addresses his Gospel to the "Most Excellent Theophilus," and Paul addressing Festus the Governor, uses the term "Most Noble." It is a part of the present-day decline in respect, to despise dignities and authority. But if one were to use the language of the street or the market place in addressing a judge while he is presiding in a law court, he would be held in contempt of court, how much more the need for reverence and respect in addressing the Creator and Redeemer of the universe!

Another important point is consideration for the feelings of others. From time immemorial it has been the custom to follow the examples in Scripture in addressing Almighty

God. But this is not just mere custom or tradition. God said to the wicked in Psalm 50:21, "Thou thoughtest that I was altogether such an one as thyself." It is both the direct teaching and example of Holy Scripture. To hear anyone publicly address God in familiar language, calling Him "you," shocks the feelings of older and sensitive spiritual people, who are characterised by the fear of God in their lives and speech. It is altogether wrong to hurt and shock the feelings of the saints in this way.

One would make a distinction between a young person recently saved, who is not familiar with the teaching and language of Holy Scripture, and the mature person who uses this kind of language deliberately. There is a difference between ignorance and arrogance. The first needs teaching, the second, rebuke. A much-used and abused word today is "communication." Some have the idea that in speaking to the young and immature, we have to use the language and vocabulary of the street corner or the high school. The only way to raise the level of respect and the dignity of personality, is to use simple but dignified language in speaking to them.

Modern Bible Translations

One very serious contributing factor that has helped along this tendency of disrespect in addressing God, has been some of the modern revisions and paraphrases of Scripture. Two of the chief offenders in this respect are the Revised Standard Version of the Bible, authorised in 1951 by the National Council of Churches, and the New English Bible, the New Testament of which was published in 1961. Some of the men on the committees for translation of both of these versions were notorious liberals who did not believe in the deity of Christ, His virgin birth and other fundamentals of the faith. This decided bias came out in their translation of vital passages. Sometimes in the RSV, the formal address of *thee*, *thou* and *thine* is used, while at other times the familiar *you* and *yours* is used. Dean Weigle, the chairman of the revision committee, on page 56 of "An Introduction to the RSV," explains their use in this way: "After two years of debate and experiment, it was decided to abandon these forms, and to follow the modern usage, except in language addressed to God." Note carefully the distinction: the formal address is used in addressing God, and the informal is used in speaking to man. Let us look at one or two examples which illustrate this rule of translation:

The AV of Matthew 16:16 reads: "Thou art the Christ, the son of the living God."

The RSV reads: "You are the Christ, the son of the living God."

Does this mean that Christ is only a man and not God? According to Dean Weigle's explanation, this is the only conclusion we can reach.

The AV of Acts 9:5 reads: "Who art thou, Lord?"

The RSV reads: "Who are you, Lord?"

Did Saul of Tarsus believe that the One who spoke to him from heaven was only a man?

The New English Bible translation follows the same rule. In this version the reverential *thee* or *thou* is never used in the Gospels in addressing our Lord Jesus Christ. This distinction of pronouns has a subtle doctrinal implication, and gives the impression that the translators are trying to separate our Lord and Saviour from God and so undermine the doctrine of His deity.

The influence of theological colleges

Unfortunately, many of the teachers in academic theological circles have adopted the use of the familiar *you* in addressing both God the Father and our Lord Jesus Christ. This has helped to popularise the trend. Young people take their cue from their teachers. They can do no wrong and it sounds educated to imitate them. Leaders and teachers today have a tremendous responsibility to show an example of reverence and becoming humility in speaking to a Holy God.

We would lovingly appeal to all who know and love, worship and serve our Lord Jesus Christ, and who confess Him, not only as the unique Son of God, but as God the Son manifest in flesh, to avoid any semblance of disrespectful or slang language, either in speaking to Him in prayer and praise, or speaking about Him in the preaching of the Gospel, or in the ministry of the Word.

"Worthy is the Lamb that was slain, to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and

honour, and glory, and blessing" Revelation 5:12. Amen.

In the Psalms *you* and *your* occur 30 times, and never in addressing God; but *thy* and *thou* occur 2860 times. Solomon's great prayer, recorded in 2 Chronicles, uses *thy* 61 times but *you* is not to be found.

The prayer of our Lord Jesus in John 17 lacks a single *you*, but contains *thou* and *thine* 41 times.

Singular and Plural - A Warning against Confusion

Professor John Heading

The more inflected the language, the less likely it is that there should be any confusion between the singular and plural forms of nouns, pronouns, adjectives and verbs. The desire to avoid confusion should be particularly evident in the student of Scripture who faithfully holds to the doctrine of inspiration. Unfortunately, the English language can be deficient in this respect, and modern translations of the Scriptures appear to build on this deficiency, rather than maintain distinctions where they clearly exist in the original texts. Some readers of Scripture can immediately consult the original texts in order to seek clarity. Others, knowing that French and German, for instance, preserve in their grammatical structures this distinction more clearly than English, would consult these translations in cases of doubt. In any case, it is important to realise that uncertainties can arise, not only in modern translations, but also in the Authorised Version to a lesser extent. Hence, in this paper, we shall present some background material with copious quotations to show what is involved, thereby putting readers on their guard when they study Scripture in minute detail. The apostle Paul regarded the distinction as important, leading to vital doctrine: "Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, And to seeds, as of many, but as of one, And to thy seed, which is Christ" (Galatians 3:16). Paul had no use for the construing of "seed" in a partitive sense—the pure singular was absolutely necessary here.

Two cases arise: (i) Where the basic nature of the English vocabulary and associated grammatical structure forbids a distinction between singular and plural. Here, an enlarged paraphrase would be necessary to bring out the meaning, but this would not then be a pure translation. Often in such cases, however, the context and/or neighbouring grammatical forms remove any confusion; all the reader must do is to "read around" the offending English word, until clarity is achieved. (ii) Where English possesses adequate distinctions, although the translators' policy prevents their use. A preference is adopted that reduces inspired clarity in the original to ambiguity and confusion in the translation, deceiving the ordinary reader into a false sense of security whereby he fails to discern that his understanding of the passage may be the opposite to that implied in the original. This, we judge, is more dangerous than the first case.

Case (i): Indirect Ambiguity

Uncertainty in interpretation may arise where adjectives and participles are used as nouns (an inflected language would present no confusion here).

As an adjective used as a noun, "dead" seldom presents a problem, since the phrase "from the dead", occurring so many times, obviously means "from the dead ones". Again, the context shows immediately that "Why seek ye the living among the dead?" (Luke 24:5) properly means "Why seek ye the Living One amongst the dead ones?" the participle being singular and the adjective plural. On the other hand, in "God is not the God of the *dead*, but of the *living*" (Matthew 22:32) both words are plural.

"Just" and "righteous", adjectives used as nouns, need care. The Messianic Psalm 118 contains the words of resurrection, "Open to me the gates of righteousness: I will go into them, and I will praise the LORD: this gate of the LORD, into which the righteous shall enter" (vv. 19-20). The word "righteous" is plural, and refers to His people accompanying Him through resurrection. The same may be observed in verse 15, "the tabernacles of the righteous (ones)". In the New Testament, in the thrice-repeated quotation, "The just shall live by faith" (Romans 1:17; Galatians 3:11; Hebrews 10:38), the word "just" is singular; the individual believer is in question. Had the reader been asked to guess whether the word is singular or plural, we suspect that most would have opted for the plural meaning!

Strictly, Habakkuk 2:4, "but the just shall live by his faith", obviously conveys the singular sense as is made clear by the use of the word "his". In cases like this, the signs incorporated in Newberry's Bible show the reader immediately what is implied. In 1 Peter 4:18, "And if the righteous scarcely be saved, where shall the ungodly and the sinner appear?" all nouns are singular. The individual's responsibility is being stressed, in contrast to the plural form at the end of verse 17.

A few English words possess the same singular and plural forms. "Sheep" is a familiar Scriptural example. The context usually ensures that the meaning is unambiguous. "He calleth his own sheep by name, and leadeth them out" (John 10:3) is obviously plural, indicated by the word "them". On the other hand, the complete sentence "The good shepherd giveth his life for the sheep" (v. 11) requires the reader to go *outside* the sentence to perceive that "sheep" is plural; the word "are" in verse 12 proves this. Familiarity with the parable enables the reader to know that the word "sheep" in the sentence, "Rejoice with me; for I have found my sheep", is singular; in any case, the immediately-following clause, "which was lost", proves the point.

The word "fish" is more awkward, since the older plural form "fishes" is not in common use today. Of course, it may be to the mind saturated with the language of the Authorised Version! Many years ago, one of the author's friends was engaged in teaching practice before a class of juniors, watched by a school inspector. He was writing on the blackboard a list of slightly irregular plural forms, such as dish—dishes, wash—washes, and quite instinctively he added "fish"—"fishes". Thus "two small fishes" (John 6:9) is doubly clear, indicated by both the number "two" and the plural ending "es". On the other hand, the passage John 21:6-13 is not so obvious. The words "fish", "fishes" occur six times, two different Greek words being employed, *ichthus* three times and *opsarion* three times. The former appears in "the multitude of fishes" (v. 6), "dragging the net with fishes" (v. 8), and "full of great fishes" (v. 11), the number 153 being given. No real impairment of meaning occurs if the form "fish" is used in these three quotations.

The second Greek word occurs in "and fish laid thereon" (v.9). The Revised Version margin gives "a fish", in keeping with the Greek *singular* form. The Authorised Version and modern translations may suggest a partitive form to the present-day reader, but commentators insist that *one* fish only was being described, a miracle being involved in the Lord's distribution in verse 13, for none of the great fish that had been caught was additionally cooked. In verse 10, "Bring of the fish which ye have now caught", it may surprise the reader to know that the *plural form* is used in the Greek. Why the Authorised Version translators failed to use "fishes" we cannot say. The translators of the New English Bible remove all reference to fish, by rendering the sentence as "Bring some of your catch". No doubt in an abstract sense "the fish which ye have now caught" and "your catch" mean the same thing, but this cannot excuse the removal of a word that was divinely inspired in the original. Finally, "Jesus ... taketh ... fish likewise" (v. 13) is strictly singular with the definite article: "*the* fish", namely the one fish referred to in verse 9; the Authorised Version reads as if a partitive sense is implied. If this passage is read in a modern translation, what kind of sense can be gleaned by the reader?

The interrogative pronoun "who" is ambiguous when attached to verbs in the past or future tenses. Thus in the quotation "Lord, who hath believed our report: and to whom hath the arm of the Lord been revealed?" (John 12:38), the subject "who" is obviously singular on account of the verb "hath", but the dative form "to whom" is vague; as a matter of fact, it is singular. This quotation in the singular is remarkable, for John uses it to prove a proposition about men in the plural—verses 37 and 39 contain "they". In Stephen's quotation about Moses, "Who made thee a ruler and a judge over us?" (Acts 7:27), "who" is singular, though no doubt the one of the two Hebrews involved, and who asked the question, had no idea that God alone was behind this original manifestation of Moses' authority. In Romans 8:31, "If God be for us, who can be against us?" "who" is singular, and Paul may be referring to Satan himself standing in opposition to God, yet with no power against God's people. The same applies in verse 33 and 34. Again in verse 35, "Who shall separate us from the love of Christ?", "who" is singular, though a plurality of

possibilities is suggested in the following verses, none of which can effect any separation. Finally, "But to which of the angels said he at any time" (Hebrews 1:13) is vague as to whether one or many angels should be understood. The following messianic quotation from Psalm 110 clarifies the issue: one angel is understood, "Sit on my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool." We would suspect that Lucifer, son of the morning, is here contrasted with the Lord Jesus Himself (Isaiah 14:12-15).

Case (ii) Direct Ambiguity

The use of the Authorised Version today is maintained by many Christians, not only on account of its language bringing reverence and spiritual beauty to the soul, but also on account of the ability of its language to support greater accuracy. We are not talking about archaic words that have lost their original meanings, or that may convey no meaning at all to the modern mind. Rather we refer to the ability of the language used to convey the singular-plural distinctions in the second person forms of pronouns and verbs. This distinction is quite lost when *thou, thee, thy* are replaced by *you, your*. Under these circumstances, the translator should realise that his translation is liable to produce an erroneous impression on the reader. Such translations can have but limited value in the exact study of Scripture. Over the years, the author has made a note of verses that he has spotted that contain *both* the singular and plural forms, some of which are given below. He has not read through the whole of Scripture with the specific intent of picking out *all* such examples; that would be a major exercise! The following should both interest and warn the reader; the author has often used such examples to warn younger believers against the vagueness of modern translations.

Exodus 4:15. "*Thou* shalt speak unto him, and put words in his mouth; and I will be with *thy* mouth, and with his mouth, and will teach *you* what *ye* shall do." The *thou, thy* refer to Moses, but *you* refers to the nation which would be instructed by the spokesman Aaron.

Exodus 29:42. "This shalt be a continual burnt offering throughout *your* generations at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation before the LORD where I will meet *you*, to speak there unto *thee*." The *you*, referring to the children of Israel, is explained in the following verse, but *thee* refers to Moses, who had the holy privilege of hearing the words of God directly (Leviticus 1:1).

2 Samuel 7:23. "And what one nation in the earth is like *thy* people, even like Israel, whom God went to redeem for a people to himself, and to make him a name, and to do for *you* great things and terrible, for *thy* land, before *thy* people, which *thou* redeemedst to *thee* from Egypt." Here David is in prayer to God, thus accounting for the words *thy, thou*. Yet although speaking *to* God in the second person singular, David also speaks *about* God in the third person—"God, himself, him," a change of style that hardly marks prayers today. Similarly, "a people" is also referred to in the second person—you, even in a prayer! Consider what would happen to the meaning if *you, your* were used throughout!

Matthew 26:64. "Jesus saith unto him, *Thou* hast said: nevertheless I say unto *you*, Hereafter shall *ye* see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven." *Thou* refers to the high priest, but *you* refers to all who will see Him in the day of His glory (Revelation 1:7).

Luke 22:31-32. "The Lord said, Simon, Simon, behold, Satan hath desired to have *you*, that he may sift *you* as wheat: but I have prayed for *thee*, that *thy* faith fail not: and when *thou* art converted, strengthen *thy* brethren." Satan's desire was directed to all the apostles, but the Lord prays for each individually.

John 3:7. "Marvel not that I said unto *thee*, *Ye* must be born again." The message was spoken to an individual, Nicodemus, but the message referred to all men. The same phenomenon occurs in verse 11, where we read: "I say unto *thee* ... that *ye* receive not our witness".

1 Corinthians 8:9-12. "Take heed lest ... this liberty of *yours* ... if any man see *thee* which hast knowledge ... through *thy* knowledge ... But when *ye* sin." The plural form refers to the church members, but the singular to individuals in responsibility. In verse 13, Paul even brings the principle home to himself!

2 Timothy 4:22. "The Lord Jesus Christ be with *thy* spirit. Grace be with *you*." (Contrast 1 Timothy 6:21.) The singular refers to Timothy, to whom alone the Epistle was written (2 Timothy 1:1). But the plural refers to others who were also included in Paul's final greetings, "Prisca and Aquila, and the household of Onesiphorus" (4:19).

Titus 3:15. "All that are with me salute *thee*. Greet them that love us in the faith. Grace be with *you* all." Here, the singular refers to Titus, but the "you" to the church in Crete (1:5), and to all who loved Paul in the faith.

Philemon 21-25. "Having confidence in *thy* obedience I wrote unto *thee*, knowing that *thou* wilt also do more than I say ... I trust that through *your* prayers I shall be given unto *you* ... There salute *thee* ... the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with *your* spirit." The singular refers to Philemon, but this short letter was also addressed to "Apphia ... Archippus . . . and to the church in thy house" (v. 2). Thus the plural form is used in verses 3 and 25 where grace is offered, and in verse 22 where fellowship with the whole church is expected, as well as with Philemon as an individual.

The reader is invited to read all these ten quotations, employing the *thou* and *you* forms throughout, and to compare them with certain modern translations in order to convince himself that the latter are liable to convey muddle and half-truths, whereas exactitude is necessary when reading and studying the holy Scriptures, given by inspiration of God, these Scriptures being profitable in all their detail "for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: that the man of God may be perfect, throughly furnished unto all good works" (2 Timothy 3:16-17).

The Use of Thee and Thou In Prayer

Sumner Osborne

God the Father knows all the members of His family and delights in their prayers, no matter how faltering the words, how poor the grammar, or how improperly expressed. "For the eyes of the Lord are over the righteous, and His ears are open unto their prayers" (1 Peter 3:12). How comforting this is!

Nevertheless it is important that Christians give some thought as to how they express themselves in prayer. This ought not even to have to be said. It will be the normal feeling for any believer who has a proper outlook on things. It will be instinctive. For example, he will want to be reverent in his approach to God. He will instinctively avoid the use of slang and other vulgarisms of our times. No one needs to tell him to do this. In the presence of God he feels it and wants to do it, all the while comforted and encouraged in the knowledge that his merest stammerings and inadequate efforts to express himself are acceptable to his Heavenly Father.

English is an unusually rich language both in its origin and development. Though younger than many, its richness is partly the result of drawing upon such a variety of sources — German, Danish, French, Latin, and Old Saxon, to name only a few — and these with others have coalesced into a unified language which is very wealthy in expression. For centuries men addressed one another in the second person singular pronoun forms, *thee* and *thou*. This began to change in the sixteenth century for the use of *you* in the singular, at first especially in the language of the court. Instances of this can be found in the plays of Shakespeare. But it was generally felt that court language was hardly suitable to use in addressing God. Therefore *thee* and *thou* continued to be used in prayer.

Later, when *you* came into general use in common speech, *thee* and *thou* were still used in prayer. This was not due to a decree or decision of some ecumenical congress or linguistic committee. Rather it was the Christian consciousness throughout the English-speaking world that the more refined and reverent manner of addressing God was to use the pronoun forms *thee* and *thou*. Most of our hymns were written in the period after *you* came into common usage, yet pious hymn writers have invariably felt that *you* was not a suitable pronoun to use in addressing God.

These are the facts about English usage. Ever since there has been an English language, *thee* and *thou* have been the proper pronoun forms to use in addressing God. Even in more recent centuries, after *you* began to be used in common speech, *thee* and *thou* continued to be used in prayer. They are often used also in poetry and elevated prose. This is part of the richness of the English language, but especially has it been the universal practice in the Christian world for prayer and worship.

No one thought this strange. It was simply the character of the English language. Children growing up in Christian homes never heard their parents pray in any other way. Even little prayers for children used *thee* and *thou*. Converts newly entering the Christian circle learned to pray in this manner. Even unconverted people knew that it was the proper way in which to address God. Immigrants coming to England or America to make one of these countries the land of their adoption learned to pray in this way if they were believers. They wanted to speak English and pray in the way in which English-speaking people prayed.

In recent years a noticeable change has appeared in the Christian community, especially among Christian youth and youth leaders, a dispensing with *thee* and *thou* in the language of prayer and a replacing of them with *you*. Is this good? Is this a genuine change in the English language, or is it an indication of a diminishing reverence in the church of God? Are older Christians doing well when they join in this trend and defend it, some even making a studied effort to eliminate *thee* and *thou* from their prayer vocabulary? Is this trend merely a superficial thing of little importance, or is it a symptom of a state of soul that goes much deeper? These questions need to be prayerfully weighed before the Lord.

There will be, of course, those who dismiss this whole matter as of no consequence. That is the way it seems to them. "What difference does it make", they will say, "whether I use *thee* and *thou*, or *you*, in prayer?" But there is a difference. And to those who see this difference the appeal is here made to continue in the old paths. Do not let the thought press upon you that this is archaic and old-fashioned. English is English, and the proper way of addressing God in English has *always* been *thee* and *thou*. Some, it is true, may only be using these expressions out of good taste. They know what proper English usage is and they use it. It may only be habit with them.

But to those who still have the fine sense of discrimination regarding reverence, that sense of spiritual suitability which is gained by spending time in the sanctuary, this appeal is made. "Thus saith the LORD, Stand ye in the ways, and see, and ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and walk therein, and ye shall find rest for your souls" (Jeremiah 6:16).

Perhaps part of the reason why the young are not following in the old paths today is that we who are older are not setting them the example that we should be doing. What version do we read? What kind of language do we use in prayer? What is disappearing today is a sense of the glory and majesty of God, and disappearing along with it is the reverence that is due to God. "Be thou an example ... in word, in conversation, in charity, in spirit, in faith, in purity" (1 Timothy 4:12). "Holy and reverend is His Name" (Psalm 111:9).

Thou and You in Bible Translations

Professor John Heading

Background to the Subject

My previous article, entitled "Singular and Plural — A Warning against Confusion", was partly concerned with the difference between *thou, thee, thy, thine* for the second person singular, and *ye, you, your, yours* for the second person plural. Several quotations were given to show that this distinction is vital in any translation that is used for careful Bible study, when the reader believes in the divine inspiration of the actual words used in the original languages.

The distinction between the singular and plural forms of these words presented no difficulty to the original translators of the Bible into English, and although the use of the singular forms had almost died out in ordinary speech when the Authorised Version was published in 1611, yet no difficulty was experienced by readers and hearers when the singular forms were consistently used, and this remark applies to prayer as well. The same remark applies throughout the centuries up to a few decades ago, after which the singular forms in Bible translations and in prayer quite suddenly switched to the plural forms; thus *you* was used as in ordinary conversation (except that various pockets of local dialect in the United Kingdom may continue to use *thou* in daily speech).

There are, of course, still many Christians who use translations that employ the singular forms — whether the Authorised Version, the Revised Version of 1881, the translation by J. N. Darby in 1871 and others — and who still use *thou, thee* when addressing Deity in their prayers, and appreciating this form of address when listening to the prayers of others. But such Christians tend to be regarded as old-fashioned, using language that is dated and largely incomprehensible to the younger generation. Listen to almost any service or religious five minutes on the radio, and it will be noticed that such Christians are almost entirely forgotten. *You* is the norm, with a few exceptions perhaps when "The Lord's Prayer" is recited when *thou, thy* are used, showing that consistency is almost completely abandoned.

When the author was brought up in Sunday School and in everyday schools at morning assemblies and religious instruction lessons, it was always the Authorised Version that was used, and in prayers *thou, thee* were the singular pronouns that were employed. Whatever the age of the pupils, even the youngest, there was no difficulty in understanding, and certainly the language was not regarded as old-fashioned. It was not even questioned, being appreciated as the language appropriate to the subject, since every subject has its own specialised vocabulary and forms of expression. When the author was in the army before and after the end of the Second World War, and when Christians came together in various camps and cities for Bible teaching and prayer (including extempore prayer), it was always the Authorised Version that was used, and *thou, thee* were used in prayer, even by the most educationally ignorant of some of the men. There was no difficulty whatsoever. And the same could be said about students in the Christian Unions in universities. No one even desired to depart from the norm.

But today, how different the situation has become, both amongst religious formalists who do not appear to believe the Scriptures, and amongst evangelicals who profess to believe in the divine inspiration of the Scriptures. Not that the *you* phenomenon is particularly new, at least as far as Bible translation is concerned. Weymouth's 1903 translation is a very mixed *thou-you* translation. When men speak to God in prayer, they use *thou* (Matthew 6:10; Acts 4:24); when an address of praise is made to the Lamb in heaven, the *thou* form is used (Revelation 5:9-10), and the same applies to the conversion account of Saul of Tarsus when he used *thou* to the Lord in heaven (Acts 9:5; 26:15). But when men addressed the Lord on earth even with a most spiritual confession, the *you* form is used (Matthew 16:16,22). But when the Father addressed the Son, *thou, thee* is used (Luke 3:22), and similarly when the Son addressed the Father (John 17). One almost gains the impression that the Lord was a

different Person when on earth from when in heaven! The New English Bible largely follows Weymouth, except that Paul is made to use *you* in the account of his conversion. The New International Version has no such apparent inconsistencies, since this translation has abandoned the *thou* forms altogether.

Quite apart from the spiritual sensitivities of many Christians who feel it more appropriate to use the singular form in prayer and Bible reading, there is the vital question of being able to distinguish between singular and plural without adding words unnecessarily to a translation. Of course we admit that in certain places it is necessary to add words to make proper sentences, since Greek grammar and syntax are not the same as in English. Greek verbs that only have an ending to indicate the tense and mood must have auxiliaries such as "shall", "have", etc. inserted in English. But when such additions are not necessary, we must bear in mind the teaching of the Lord, "The words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life" (John 6:63).

Words are therefore important, as distinct from the same idea expressed in different ways. The former is the prerogative of a translation, the latter of helpful exposition. The distinction is important, as explained by Robert Martin in his book "Accuracy of Translation" (Banner of Truth, 1989). A close adherence to words is called "formal equivalence", this being the policy of the AV translators, while the latter is called "dynamic equivalence", this being the policy of modern translators, who often have no inhibition regarding the addition of extra words and of using paraphrases and sometimes rather vulgar expressions.

The implication is that if the *thou*, *thee* forms are abandoned, and if *you* is used both for singular and plural, then other words must be added or paraphrases adopted to denote the distinction. In some verses, no particular method may be used to denote the distinction, in which case the reader is left wondering whether a singular or plural form is intended. In fact, the reader may be left in a state of confusion, or even ignorance that he is misunderstanding the verse. Thus two kinds of danger exist: firstly, words may be added that are not in the original Greek text, and secondly, even a devout reader may be misled regarding the meaning intended.

In the first part of this article, we propose to give examples where singular and plural forms exist in the same verse or paragraph. The AV and RV translations are completely clear, and we shall note how more recent translators overcome the difficulties of their own making. In particular, we shall use Weymouth's 1903 translation of the New Testament, the New English Bible 1961 translation of the New Testament, and the New International Version of the complete Bible first published in 1978. We shall also include some of the examples given in our previous article on the subject.

Since the word "all" is sometimes added to indicate a plural form of *you*, we shall in the second part of the article examine the proper rendering of the words *you all*, as distinct from an artificial rendering. We shall produce **a table** (see page 35) of verse-references, in which the Greek word "all" occurs with the words *ye*, *you*, the latter words occurring explicitly or through the verb's ending in the nominative case. The table will be described in some detail, though the Bible student can spend hours examining the details of the implications of the table.

The Plural Form that is Singular

The following list of examples is certainly not complete; they arise from notes that the author has kept while reading the Bible. We provide seven examples from the Old Testament, a larger portion being taken from the New Testament. The AV is quite clear throughout; so too is the RV to which no reference will therefore be made.

(1) Exodus 4:15. God is speaking to Moses about Aaron. "And thou shalt speak unto him, and put words in his mouth: and I will be with thy mouth, and with his mouth, and will teach you what ye shall do" (AV). This is clear; the last *ye* refers to Moses and Aaron. The NIV provides a paraphrase of this, "You shall speak to him and put words in his mouth; I will help both of you speak and will teach you what to do". The word "mouth" occurs three times in the AV, but only once in the NIV. What, then, is the use of a concordance to the NIV if the word "mouth"

is under consideration? "Both of you" is substituted for *thy, his* with other words omitted, but the last word *you* is left vague — does it refer to Moses only or to Moses and Aaron? The AV presents no such ambiguity, and also contains the word "mouth" the right number of times, as a glance at Young's Concordance will show. The vital point is, How many earnest seekers after truth who use the NIV realise the many dangers that lurk before them?

(2) **Exodus 29:42.** "This shall be a continual burnt offering throughout your generations at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation before the LORD: where I will meet with you, to speak there unto thee" (AV). In other words, the LORD met with the people, but He spoke to Moses. In the NIV the first *your* is omitted by the use of the words "the generations to come", while the last part of the verse containing *you, thee* is rendered by "There I will meet with you and speak to you". In other words, no attempt whatsoever has been made to distinguish singular from plural, and the situation is made worse by the use of inverted commas commencing at 25:1, as if the word *you* refers to Moses throughout.

(3) **Numbers 16:8-11.** We shall not quote the whole of these verses, but only relevant groups of words from the AV, giving the corresponding NIV rendering in brackets. The verses refer to the rebellion of Korah and his company. "Ye sons of Levi" (you Levites); "unto you" (for you); "separated you" (separated you); "to bring you near to himself" (brought you near himself); "he hath brought thee to himself" (brought you near himself); "he hath brought thee near to him, and all thy brethren the sons of Levi with thee" (He has brought you and all your fellow Levites near himself); "seek ye the priesthood also?" (you are trying to get the priesthood also). We can rightly ask, What does the word *you* mean in the NIV? Although Moses is speaking to "Korah and unto all his company" (v.5), clearly certain remarks are made to Korah alone. No reader of the NIV will perceive this fact.

(4) **Deuteronomy 4:3.** "Your eyes have seen what the LORD did because of Baal-peor ... the LORD thy God hath destroyed them from among you" (AV). The NIV adopts the translation, "The LORD your God destroyed from among you everyone who followed the Baal of Peor". The *thy* suggests the God of the nation as a unified whole, but the *you* in the AV suggests individual responsibility of those composing the nation. The NIV makes no attempt to make a distinction. Note the four-fold title in the AV, "the LORD your God" (v.2); "the LORD thy God" (vv. 3,10); "the LORD my God" (v.5); "the LORD our God" (v.7). This is maintained in the NIV except in verses 3,10 where *your* is used in both cases. So the four-fold title becomes a three-fold title, and the reader is provided with no clue that this has happened. Again in this chapter, in the AV "I set before you" occurs in v.8, while "take heed to thyself, and keep thy soul diligently" occurs in v.9. In the NIV "before you" is then followed by "Only be careful, and watch yourselves". In other words, the singular "thyself" is deliberately changed to the plural "yourselves", no doubt to fit on to the singular *you* in the rest of the verse so that the reader may think it is plural.

(5) **2 Samuel 7:23.** David is speaking to the LORD, "And what nation in the earth is like thy people, even like Israel, whom God went to redeem for a people to himself, and to make him a name, and to do for you great things and terrible, for thy land, before thy people" (AV). Even in prayer, David refers to the nation as *you*, though he is speaking to God as *thy* and "himself". The NIV omits this plural word *you*, reserving *you, your* for God only. The wording is, "to perform great and awesome wonders". It appears that the translators preferred to omit a word rather than to add one to indicate the existence of "for you".

(6) **1 Kings 9:5-6.** God appeared to Solomon the second time, saying, "I will establish the throne of thy kingdom upon Israel for ever, as I promised to David thy father ... But if ye shall at all turn from following me, ye or your children, and will not keep my commandments which I have set before you" (AV). The two verses distinguish carefully between Solomon and the people. But the NIV makes no distinction; the verses read as if the reference was to Solomon only: "I will establish your royal throne over Israel for ever . . . But if you or your sons turn away from me". No reader can possibly realise that a distinction is being made.

(7) **Isaiah 33:2-4.** Isaiah is speaking, partially to God in prayer and partially to the people. "O LORD, be gracious unto us; we have waited for thee: be thou their arm every morning, our salvation also in the time of trouble. At the noise of the tumult the people fled; at the lifting up

of thyself the nations were scattered. And your spoil shall be gathered like the gathering of the caterpillar: as the running to and fro of locusts shall he run upon them" (AV). "Your spoil" resumes the address to Assyria (see "The Prophecies of Isaiah" by F. Delitzsch). The NIV makes the distinction by inserting words, "Your plunder, O nations, is harvested", the words *you*, *your* being reserved for the LORD. But why not "O Assyria"?

We now provide many examples of this phenomenon extracted from the New Testament.

(8) Matthew 5:39. "But I say unto you, That ye resist not evil: but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also" (AV). The LORD speaks to people generally, and states a principle for all, but then applies it to an individual. (Contrast this with vv. 43-44, where the singular changes to the plural). Weymouth uses *you* throughout, but the singular is suggested by the words "if any one strikes you on the right cheek". But in v.43, the OT quotation has *thy*, and to indicate that the plural then follows, the word "all" is added, "I command you all". The NEB suggests the singular in v.39 by the words, "If someone slaps you on the right cheek", though where the singular commences is left vague. But the difference between v.43 and v.44 appears as if it does not exist. The same observation applies to the NIV.

(9) Matthew 6:4-7. "Thy Father which seeth in secret himself shall reward thee openly. And when thou prayest, thou shalt not be as the hypocrites are ... They have their reward. But thou, when thou prayest, enter into thy closet ... But when ye pray, use not vain repetitions" (AV). This is perfectly clear: *thee, thou, they, thou, ye*. Weymouth uses *you* throughout; the idea of a singular form occurs in the words "go into your own room", but after that the reader is left wondering whether the singular continues into v.7, which it does not. The NEB suggests the singular by the words "go into a room by yourself", but again the following change to the plural is left unnoticed. The NIV uses the words, "go into your room, close the door", implying the singular, but there is no indication that the plural follows in v.7. All this is inexcusable.

(10) Matthew 11:23-24. "And thou, Capernaum, which art exalted unto heaven, shalt be brought down to hell ... in thee ... But I say unto you, that it shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom in the day of judgment, than for thee" (AV). Note that in vv. 21-22, two cities are addressed, so *you* is used in addressing them and in the forecast of judgment. Weymouth strangely enough uses *thee* for the singular, so no confusion arises, though in v.24 we find "you all" (but only *you* in v.22); this word "all" is completely unnecessary, and is not present in the Greek text. The NEB uses *you* throughout these verses, so any distinction is completely lost (though it is refreshing to find *thee* in v.25 when the Son addresses the Father). The same complete lack of differentiation applies to the NIV, except the Lord is made to say *you* to the Father. In other words, the more recent translations are completely unreliable.

(11) Matthew 18:9-10. "If thine eye offend thee, pluck it out, and cast it from thee ... Take heed that ye despise not one of these little ones" (AV). Here we have a single person involved in an offence, and then several in something rather despicable. In v.9, Weymouth's rendering "if your eye is causing you to fall into sin" sounds singular, but the *you* in v.10 suggests that the singular is continuing rather than changing to the plural. The same vagueness is found in both the NEB and the NIV without any extra word being added to denote a change to the plural in v.10.

(12) Matthew 18:22-35. The vital verses are 22 and 35, since a parable occurs in between. The verses contain the words, "I say not unto thee" (referring to Peter), and "So likewise shall my heavenly Father do also unto you, if ye from your hearts forgive not" (AV). In other words, the Lord's first answer to Peter is expanded as a lesson to everyone. Weymouth omits "unto thee" in v.22, but expands v.35 "unto you, if ye from your hearts" to "with you, if you do not all of you forgive"; certainly this is plural! The NEB again omits any rendering of "unto thee" in v.22, but makes v.35 definitely plural by the words "with you, unless you each". The NIV has "I tell you" in v.22 in answer to Peter, but v.35 is rendered plural with the form of words "each of you unless you", though the word "each" is attached to a different "you" than in the NEB. The AV and RV follow the Greek text closely, "if ye from your hearts forgive not every one his brother". There seems to be no reason, apart

from style, as to why the words "unto thee" (or "unto you") are omitted in v.22 by Weymouth and the NEB.

(13) Matthew 20:21-22. The Lord is speaking to the mother of James and John, "What wilt thou? ... Ye know not what ye ask" (AV) The mother is seen as asking the question, but the Lord replies to James and John. Weymouth's translation is clear in spite of the *you* form, "What is it you desire?" (addressed to the mother in the context), and "None of you know what you are asking for" (obviously plural). The NEB has the strange paraphrase (or, perhaps, unwarranted addition of words), "Jesus turned to the brothers and said, You do not understand what you are asking." The addition of the words "to the brothers" occurs merely to undo the fallacy of the policy of using *you* as often as possible. The NIV gets over its own ambiguity by adding the words "to them" in v.22, "Jesus said to them". These devices can cause grave concern to readers of the AV or Greek text, but readers of modern translations remain happy in their ignorance.

(14) Matthew 23:37-38. "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets, and stonest them which are sent unto thee ... and ye would not! Behold, your house is left unto you desolate" (AV). The city is first addressed, and the personal responsibility of those who rejected Him is then stated in the plural. Weymouth has no difficulty here; he uses *thou* and *you* just as the AV does. The NEB changes the second person "thou that killest the prophets" to the third person, "the city that murders the prophets", though no reader would then appreciate that the following "your children, you, your temple" should be singular-plural-plural. This is neither translation nor paraphrase. As far as the NIV is concerned, *you, your* is used throughout, and no other words give any clue as to the proper meaning. The translators evidently thought that the difference was irrelevant, not even meriting an addition of words. "Ye would not" certainly applies to them as well!

(15) Matthew 26:64. The high priest had put the Lord Jesus on oath; His reply was, "Thou hast said: nevertheless I say unto you, Hereafter shall ye see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven" (AV). He spoke to the high priest personally as leader of the Sanhedrin, though He then spoke of all the council and indeed of all the nation when every eye would see Him (Matthew 24:30). The Greek is properly "Thou hast said". Weymouth translates this as "I am He", continuing "But I tell you all". In other words, Weymouth provides us with an interpretation and the addition of the word "all" to ensure that the reader understands "you" as plural. The NEB contains a complete ambiguity here, "The words are yours. But I tell you this". The NIV gives the sense by the addition of the word "all", "Yes, it is as you say ... But I say to all of you". The difficulty about the addition of "all" is whether *you* by itself can be construed as "all of you" without exception.

(16) Mark 14:37-38. This reference relates to the garden of Gethsemane, "he cometh, and findeth them sleeping, and saith unto Peter, Simon, sleepest thou? couldest not thou watch one hour? Watch ye and pray, lest ye enter into temptation" (AV). The first questions were to Peter, but the commands were to the three apostles. Weymouth adds "all" to make the distinction, "Simon, are you asleep? ... Be wakeful all of you". The NEB adopts a similar device, "Asleep, Simon? Were you not able to keep awake for one hour? Stay awake, all of you". This word "Asleep" forms very stilted prose, for there is a verb in the Greek text! The NIV fails to make any distinction, "Simon ... are you asleep? ... Watch and pray so that you will not fall into temptation".

(17) Luke 5:4. "He said unto Simon, Launch out into the deep, and let down your nets for a draught" (AV), the verb "launch" being singular and the verb "let down" being plural. Although Simon was spoken to, at least one other was in the boat, no doubt Andrew, and the second command was to them. Weymouth makes no distinction, "He said unto Simon, Push out into deep water, and let down your nets for a haul". But the following verses use the plural "they", though this still leaves the Lord's words ambiguous. The same may be said about the NEB and the NIV. We admit that it is difficult to see how even the AV could overcome this difficulty in v.4. However, other languages, such as e.g. German and French, have no difficulty in making the matter clear.

(18) Luke 6:30-31. "Give to every man that asketh of thee ... And as ye would that men should do to you, do ye also to them likewise" (AV). In fact, vv. 29-30 form an interlude in

the singular, surrounded by verses in the plural. Weymouth uses *you* throughout this interlude of two verses, and the fact that the singular is implied may be discerned by the reader through words such as "a blow on the side of the face", "your outer garment" and "your property". But it is not clear that the plural recommences in v.31. The NEB is even vaguer, though "the other cheek", "your coat" and "what is yours" may suggest the singular. The same may be said of the NIV, where we have "one cheek, your cloak, what belongs to you". "Do to others as you would have them do to you" terminates a paragraph, giving a completely wrong impression, since this sentence is plural. In other words, these translations are completely useless when exactness is required.

(19) Luke 9:41. To the man at the foot of the mount of transfiguration, whose son had an unclean spirit, the Lord said, "O faithless and perverse generation, how long shall I be with you, and suffer you? Bring thy son hither" (AV). Even the nine disciples could be classified as faithless on this occasion. Admittedly, the context is clear, but Weymouth renders this as, "How long shall I be with you and bear with you? Bring your son here to me". By themselves, this question and command are not clear. The NEB attempts to clarify the situation by inserting the word "all", "How long shall I be with you and endure you all? Bring your son here". But the NIV is vague, "how long shall I stay with you and put up with you? Bring your son here". In other words, translation policies (if they ever existed in cases such as this) are inconsistent amongst themselves.

(20) Luke 10:13-14. This repeats Matthew 11:21-23. Weymouth uses the *thee, you* forms, so everything is clear. The NEB and NIV use *you* throughout, but without ambiguity since the names of the cities involved are stated.

(21) Luke 16:25-26. This is the story of the rich man and Lazarus after death. Abraham said to the rich man, "Son, remember that thou in thy lifetime receivedst thy good things . . . thou art tormented. And beside all this, between us and you there is a great gulf fixed" (AV). This is spoken to the rich man, but the word *you* implies that the contents of hades are being referred to directly. Weymouth uses *you* in all places, suggesting that "between us and you" refers to the rich man. This amounts, of course, to confusion. The NEB overcomes this by omitting the plural form *you*, using only "a great chasm fixed between us". The NIV allows an ambiguity that would not be noticed by the reader, "you are in agony ... between us and you a great chasm has been fixed". Exact exegesis cannot be based on renderings such as these!

(22) Luke 22:31-32. "And the Lord said, Simon, Simon, behold, Satan hath desired to have you, that he may sift you as wheat: but I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not" (AV). Simon was particularly under the Lord's observation, but Satan's sifting process applied to all the apostles who were with the Lord. Yet the Lord's prayer was for Peter explicitly since He was addressing him, though we can be certain that the prayer would be for the others also. But we cannot tamper with the Lord's words. Weymouth adds the word "all", producing "Satan has obtained permission to have all of you to sift as wheat is sifted", using *you* to refer to Peter. But this is paraphrase indeed! The NEB also uses "all of you", though one must read on to understand that the following *you* refers to Peter alone, namely, "when you have come to yourself". The NIV leaves the first part completely wrong, but adds "Simon" so as to clarify the second part — a remarkable feat indeed: "Simon, Simon, Satan has asked to sift you as wheat. But I have prayed for you, Simon, that your faith may not fail". Could any reader take the NIV seriously, if they knew what was going on behind the scenes ?

(23) John 1:50-51. Speaking to Nathanael, the Lord said, "thou shalt see greater things than these ... Verily, verily, I say unto you, Hereafter ye shall see heaven open" (AV). Quite apart from any interpretation of these verses, the promise made first to Nathanael is then made to others by the use of the words *you, ye*. Weymouth adds "all" to v. 51, "I tell you all in most solemn truth. . . that you shall see Heaven opened wide"; this at least makes the distinction, though at the expense of adding a word. The NEB adopts the same procedure. But the NIV does not add any word, so the reader gains the impression that v.51 refers to Nathanael only.

(24) John 3:7. Speaking to Nicodemus, the Lord said, "Marvel not that I said unto thee, Ye must be born again" (AV). General truth is being expressed to an individual. Weymouth translates this as if the truth was being given to Nicodemus only, "Do not be astonished at my telling you, You must be

born anew". Verse 8 returns to the singular again, but Weymouth's rendering cannot bring this out. The NEB is just as uncertain, "You ought not to be astonished, then, when I tell you that you must be born over again". The NIV adopts equally vague wording, "You should not be surprised at my saying, You must be born again". One can conclude that the translators did not believe that the Lord's exact words really mattered!

(25) **John 14:9-11.** In reply to Philip in the upper room, the Lord said, "Have I been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known me, Philip?" Then v.10 commences in the singular, "Believest", but this is followed by "I speak unto you" in the plural, and v.11 commences with the plural "Believe". To overcome these variations, Weymouth uses "among you" in v.9, but then inserts the word Philip in a different position, "yet you, Philip, do not know me?" Then "you all" occurs in v.10 to indicate the plural, and "all of you" is added in v. 11. Which words are inspired, and which are not? we must ask. The NEB gives the impression that *you* refers solely to Philip throughout these verses. The same remark applies to the NIV. In the Preface to the NIV, the Committee assert that the use of *thou, thee, thine* would "violate accuracy in translation", and "To achieve clarity the translators sometimes supplied words not in the original texts but required in the context"; clearly both statements cannot be trusted.

(26) **1 Corinthians 8:9-12.** "But take heed lest by any means this liberty of yours become a stumblingblock to them that are weak. For if any man see thee which hast knowledge sit at meat in the idol's temple . . . and through thy knowledge shall the weak brother perish, for whom Christ died?" (AV). A general principle is then applied to any individual Christian. Verse 12 then continues in the plural. Weymouth's translation reads as if the passage were plural throughout. The same must be said about both the NEB and the NIV. It is strange that none of the translators involved have made any attempt to be accurate in this passage. In all three translations it appears that individual responsibility has given way to collective responsibility, and that an individual can hide behind a majority, namely the church at Corinth.

(27) **2 Timothy 4:22.** The last written words of the apostle Paul were, "The Lord Jesus Christ be with thy spirit. Grace be with you". It was written to Timothy personally. Although not stated, some assert that the destination of the letter was Ephesus. In any case, the last "Grace" was to the whole church where Timothy was, and not just to him personally. [This is in contrast to 1 Timothy 6:21, "Grace be with thee" (AV); Greek manuscripts differ here, and the RV, Weymouth and the NEB use the plural (the last two by adding "all"), while the NIV has *you* as if it refers to Timothy alone]. Weymouth shows that 2 Timothy 4:22 is plural by translating it as "Grace be with you all" (though his verse numbering differs in these last verses), followed by the NEB. But again the NIV leaves the point unresolved, "The Lord be with your spirit. Grace be with you

(28) **Titus 3:15.** "All that are with me salute thee ... Grace be with you all". The words "you all" are genuine, not being a device to denote the plural. Weymouth has the rendering, "Every one here sends you greeting ... May grace be with you all". The first *you* is singular because Paul was writing to Titus alone. The same distinction has been maintained in the NEB and the NIV; the word "all" in Greek could not be overlooked, and nothing had to be added.

(29) **Philemon 21-25.** The Epistle was written to Philemon, to two other named believers and to the church in his house. Thus in v.3, the greetings were in the plural, "to you". But vv. 4-21 are in the singular, and refer to Philemon throughout. But halfway through v. 22, Paul reverts to the plural, "I trust that through your prayers". Yet v. 23 is again singular, "There salute thee", while v. 25 is again plural, "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with your spirit". All this is clear in the AV. Weymouth uses "you all" in v. 3; makes no distinction in v. 22, but at the end of v. 25 makes a distinction by the words "every one of you". The NEB makes no distinction anywhere, using *you* throughout; neither does the NIV. The fine detail of the last verses is therefore invisible.

(30) **James 2:16.** "And one of you say unto them, Depart in peace, be ye warmed and filled; notwithstanding ye give them not those things which are needful to the body, what doth it profit?" (AV). So one person offers feigned comfort, but many should be responsible to offer help. Weymouth leaves the matter vague, "one of you says to them . . . yet you do not give them what they need". This is misleading, but the NEB is worse by deliberately using

the singular, "and one of you says ... but *does* nothing to supply their bodily needs". The NIV adopts the same procedure, for which the author can provide no explanation.

These thirty examples show how exact the AV is, while other translations which refuse to use *thou* are sometimes completely misleading, and cannot therefore be used with any confidence in detailed Bible study.

The "All You" Phrase

Since the phrase "all you" (or "you all") properly occurs many times in the AV New Testament, while on other occasions, as we have seen, it occurs only artificially in modern translations, we now provide a **table** where it occurs properly in the Greek text. We have extracted these references from the entry *pas* in Wigram's "Englishman's Greek Concordance of the New Testament", when the plural form occurs with *you* adjoined. A description of the table is as follows:

Column 1. This shows the New Testament reference. The few in brackets show that there are variants in the Greek manuscripts, and this fact accounts for the difference between the AV translation and the others listed.

Column 2. This shows the reader what the Greek text actually is. The capital letter shows the case: Nominative, Accusative, Genitive or Dative. Where both words "all" and *you* occur, they are always in the same case. The Genitive and Dative cases follow prepositions. The Nominative is the subject of a verb, but the few instances where **N** occurs in brackets contain a flavour of the Vocative case (those addressed). However, Professor B. C. Dietrich, professor of classics at Aberystwyth University College has assured the author that they can properly be described as Nominative. The letter **p** stands for "all" in the plural, *pantes*, in the appropriate case; the letters **hu** stand for *ye, you* in the plural, *humeis*, in the appropriate case. Those readers with a knowledge of Greek will know the endings for the other three cases, though this is irrelevant for our particular purpose. The letter **p** is present in every reference, though sometimes **hu** is missing when the case is Nominative. This is certainly true when (**N**) occurs, and in several other instances where the English *you* is implied as the subject of the verb by its ending. The order of the words is usually always **p hu**, though occasionally this is reversed, and in a few examples another word or words come between **p** and **hu**.

Column 3. Here we have the AV translation. *Ye* implies the Nominative as the subject of the verb or the persons addressed, while *you* denotes the English Accusative as the object of a verb or a preposition. (The verse must be read as a whole to see which is which). When *ye* is in italics (as in the AV) the word has been added to the translation (since **hu** is missing in the Greek), though not with complete consistency as Matthew 26:27 and Revelation 19:5 show. When *ye* occurs in the Nominative case in bold type, the pronoun is emphatic, shown by the existence of **hu** explicitly as the subject in Greek. This fact is brought out clearly by the symbolism used in "The Newberry Bible" edition of the AV.

Column 4. Here the RV translation is given. It largely follows the AV in Column 3, except when different Greek manuscripts were used. The policy of the majority of the panel of translators was achieved by the constant process of overruling. The difference in case in 1 Corinthians 14:5 is particularly interesting to note.

Columns 5, 6, 7. Here we have the translations of Weymouth, the New English Bible and the New International Version, those that can be described as "modern". The rendering *you* is employed throughout in these verses, and it is interesting to note the variations adopted. We have added the case **N** or **A**, since otherwise it is not obvious which is which apart from examining the sentences in which they occur; the case refers to the word "all" or its equivalent word. In one or two instances, the author was doubtful which was implied, owing to the peculiarity of the wording used. The variations "you all" and "all of you" appear to be quite haphazard, following no particular pattern. (The AV and RV are quite consistent.) Certainly the use of "all of you" places *you* in a different case from "all", though in the Greek both

words are in the same case. In Revelation 22:21, the rendering "God's people" instead of "saints" for the alternative Greek text is interesting, for "saints" would be correct, while "God's people" suggests a deliberate avoidance of the word "saints". After all, both apply to Christians, but the difference is great, showing why such translations cannot be used with confidence in accurate Bible study. If interested, the reader is invited to take time to examine the table in detail, and to read the complete verses involved.

If such differences exist for the exact Greek words *pantes* and *pantes humeis* (and their other three cases), the question remains, What happens in other small groups of Greek words? Some readers may care to examine other word-groups following the same pattern. And the situation is made worse by adding words in translations thereby to resemble other forms that are exact. It is almost like the parable of the tares amongst the wheat; they look the same apart from a detailed examination. But that is what Bible study is all about — not heartless, cold, formal and academic, but a seeking after divine truth, not being discouraged by the maze of alternative translations, often pushed by various publishers with much propaganda, evidently for the pursuit of financial gain. And the attractive, glossy advertiser's book "A Bible for Today and Tomorrow: The Story of the English Bible and the New International Version" (Hodder and Stoughton, 1989) cannot be helpful when placed in the wrong hands.

Young Christians generally have no idea as to what is taking place in the world of Bible translation, and their choice of translation is dictated often by ignorance, or by that Bible used at the time of their conversion, or even of their pre-conversion days. The prevailing fashion of the day usually has a devastating effect, even amongst those who should know better. Those who produce these recent translations (which sometimes contain heresy as in Psalm 2:7; Acts 13:33; Hebrews 1:5; 5:5 concerning the relationship between the Father and the Son) are shown to be Christians with high academic qualifications, and hence can be seen as authoritative, but the author prefers the attitude of the psalmist, "I have more understanding than all my teachers" (Psalm 119:99), when it comes to any conflict with Bible teachers who insist on using modern translations without any rational explanation. "Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock" (Acts 20:28) should be the spiritual attitude taken by all Bible teachers.

Verse	Greek	AV 1611	RV 1881 (NT)	Weymouth 1903	NEB 1961	NIV 1978
Matt. 11.28	(N) p	all <i>ye</i>	all <i>ye</i>	all you N	all N	all you N
Matt. 26.27	(N) p	<i>ye</i> all	<i>ye</i> all	all of you N	all of you N	all of you N
Matt. 26.31	N p hu	all <i>ye</i>	all <i>ye</i>	all of you N	you will all N	you will all N
Mark 14.27	N p	all <i>ye</i>	all <i>ye</i>	you will all N	you will all N	you will all N
Luke 9.48	D p hu	you all	you all	you all A	you all A	you all A
Luke 13.3	N p	<i>ye</i> shall all	<i>ye</i> shall all	you will all N	you will all of you N	you too will all N
Luke 13.5	N p	<i>ye</i> shall all	<i>ye</i> shall all	you will all N	you will all of you N	you too will all N
Luke 13.27	(N) p	all <i>ye</i>	all <i>ye</i>	all of you N	all of you N	all you N
John 7.21	N p	<i>ye</i> all	<i>ye</i> all	you are all N	you are all N	you are all N
John 13.10	N hu...p	<i>ye</i> ... all	<i>ye</i> . . . all	you ... all of you N,G	every one of you N	you ... every one of you N
John 13.11	N p	<i>ye</i> ... all	<i>ye</i> ... all	all of you N	every one of you A	everyone N
John 13.18	G p hu	you all	you all	all of you A	all of you A	all of you A
Acts 3.16	G p hu	you all	you all	you can all N	you can all N	you can all N
Acts 4.10	D p hu	you all	you all	you all A	all of you A	you N
Acts 20.25	N hu p	<i>ye</i> all	<i>ye</i> all	none of you N	none of you N	none of you N
Acts 22.3	N p hu	<i>ye</i> all	<i>ye</i> all	all of you N	you all N	any of you N
Rom. 1.8	G p hu	you all	you all	all of you A	you all A	all of you A
Rom. 15.33	G p hu	you all	you all	you all A	you all A	you all A
(Rom. 16.24)	G p hu	you all	you all (marg)	you all (note) A	you all (note) A	[all of you] A
I Cor. 1.10	N p	<i>ye</i> all	<i>ye</i> all	all of you A	yourselves A	all of you N
1 Cor. 14.5	A p hu	<i>ye</i> all	you all	you all N	you all N	every one of you A
1 Cor. 14.18	G p hu	<i>ye</i> all	you all	all of you N	any of you N	all of you N
1 Cor. 14.31	N p	<i>ye</i> may all	<i>ye</i> all	you can all N	you can all N	you can all N
1 Cor. 16.24	G p hu	you all	you all	you all A	you all A	all of you A
2 Cor. 2.3	A p hu	you all	you all	all of you A	you all A	all of you A
2 Cor. 2.3	G p hu	you all	you all	you all A	all of you A	you would all N
2 Cor. 2.5	A p hu	you all	you all	all of you A	you all A	all of you A
2 Cor. 7.13	G p hu	you all	you all	you all A	you have all N	all of you A
2 Cor. 7.15	G p hu	you all	you all	all of you N	you all N	you were all N
2 Cor. 13.14	G p hu	you all	you all	you all N	you all A	you all A
Gal. 3.26	N p	<i>ye</i> are all	<i>ye</i> are all	all of you N	you are all N	you are all N
Gal. 3.28	N p...hu	<i>ye</i> are all	<i>ye</i> all	you are all N	you are all N	you are all N
(Eph. 4.6)	D p hu	you all	all	all A	all A	all A
Phil. 1.4	G p hu	you all	you all	you all A	you all A	all of you A
Phil. 1.7	G p hu	you all	you all	you all A	you all A	all of you A
Phil. 1.7	A p hu	<i>ye</i> all	<i>ye</i> all	you all N	you all N	all of you N
Phil. 1.8	A p hu	you all	you all	all of you A	you all A	all of you A
Phil. 1.25	D p hu	you all	you all	you all A	you all A	all of you A
Phil. 2.17	D p hu	you all	you all	you all A	you all A	all of you A
Phil. 2.26	A p hu	you all	you all	you all A	all of you A	all of you A
(Phil. 4.23)	G p hu	you all	your spirit	your spirits A	your spirit A	your spirit A
1 Thess. 1.2	G p hu	you all	you all	you all A	you all A	all of you A
1 Thess. 5.5	N p hu	<i>ye</i> are all	<i>ye</i> are all	all of you N	you are all N	you are all N
2 Thess. 1.3	G p hu	you all	you all	every one of you A	each for all A	every one of you N
2 Thess. 3.16	G p hu	you all	you all	you all A	you all A	all of you A
2 Thess. 3.18	G p hu	you all	you all	you all A	you all A	you all A
Tit. 3.15	G p hu	you all	you all	you all A	you all A	you all A
1 Pet. 3.8	(N) p	<i>ye</i> all	<i>ye</i> all	all of you N	all of you N	all of you N
1 Pet. 5.5	N p	all <i>of you</i>	all of you	all of you N	all of you N	all of you N
1 Pet. 5.14	D hu p	you all	you all	all of you A	all of you A	all of you A
Rev. 19.5	(N) p	all <i>ye</i>	all <i>ye</i>	all you N	all you N	all you N
(Rev. 22.21)	G p hu	you all	the saints	God's people A	you all A	God's people A

Thee or You in Addressing The Almighty

H. F. MacEwen

In recent years there has been a prevalence of addressing God in prayer by the use of the second personal plural pronoun *you*. Not so many years ago this was little-heard, except from some ignorant or untutored person. The Authorised Version of the English Bible formed the basis for Scripture quotation and the language of prayer. In this version *thee* and *thou* are always used in addressing the second person singular, whether it be in reference to God or to man. But the claim is made to-day that the Authorised Version does not use the language of the twentieth century and that so many of its speech forms are out of date. Particularly does the *thee* and *thou* come in for castigation. And so we have a common usage of addressing the Almighty by the common *you*, which is used in ordinary speech of the day.

We observed while attending sessions of the Annual Convention of the Canadian Evangelical Fellowship and the sessions of the Congress on Evangelism that all the platform speakers who led in prayer – every one of them – used *you* in their prayer speech when addressing God. These were not men who did not know better; they were men who take a foremost position among so-called Evangelical leaders of that country and elsewhere.

It is well known that in common English usage *thee* and *thou* in addressing individuals went out of use many years ago, but for addressing God its usage was retained as the best-suited idiom for the language of prayer. Kitteridge and Arnold in *The Mother Tongue* state, "The forms *thou*, *thy*, *thine*, *thee*, and *ye* are seldom used except in poetry and in solemn language like that of prayer. Members of the Society of Friends (commonly called Quakers) and some other religious bodies use *thee* and *thy* in their ordinary conversation" (page 159). The last edition of this book was brought out in 1910, so it might be classified as obsolete by opinionated progressivists of to-day. But we do claim its basic tenet is correct. *thee* and *thou* are best suited for the solemn language of prayer.

Here we must remember that it is the creature, who is but dust and ashes, calling upon the Creator, who deigns to behold the things in heaven and on earth. Abraham, who is the father of the faithful, when addressing God said, "Behold now, I have taken upon me to speak unto the Lord, which am but dust and ashes" (Genesis 18:27). It is when one feels this creaturehood and its perishability that he will call upon God in such language as David speaks, "Out of the depths have I cried unto thee, O LORD. Lord, hear my voice: let thine ears be attentive to the voice of my supplications. If thou, LORD, shouldest mark iniquities, O Lord, who shall stand? But there is forgiveness with thee, that thou mayest be feared" (Psalm 130:1-3). Thank God there is mercy for human failure and presumption, for if there were not grace bestowed, who should be able to face the Lord? Nevertheless, it is needful for Christians to know that "God is greatly to be feared in the assembly of the saints, and to be had in reverence of all them that are about him" (Psalm 89:7). There is a decided drop in reverence in coming before the Lord to address Him as *you*.

Some are claiming that it makes no difference to address God in this fashion. New translations of the Bible are appearing on the market with the *you* used throughout in all speech, whether to individuals or to God. The Amplified New Testament (1958), a work recommended by many Evangelical leaders, does this entirely. Its Research Secretary, Francis E. Siewert, B.Lit., B.D., M.A., D.Lit., who is referred to in the preface as being "with training far beyond the suggestion of these listed degrees," would tell us, "The Greek language has no *thee*, *thou* and *thine* reverential distinctions from the singular words *you* and *your*, so we have not used these forms. Jesus used the same pronouns in addressing the Father that He did in speaking to a disciple, to Pilate or even to a demon."

We maintain that the Greek and Hebrew do, as a matter of fact, have both the second person singular personal pronouns as well as the second person plural pronouns. Yes, the usage of the time, as in Old English, was expressed in the second person singular pronoun in addressing individuals. But in addressing more than one person, the second person plural pronoun was used. There is both the singular and plural second personal pronouns in these two original languages of Scripture. In addressing God, however, nowhere do we find the usage of the second person plural in these tongues. Never. It is always *thee* and *thou* in the language of original Scripture whenever the Deity is spoken to. To translate these pronouns as *you* is not, strictly speaking, accurate.

Both the Revised Standard Version and the New English Bible use *you* in addressing Christ and *thee* and *thou* in addressing God. Why is this done? There must be a subtle reason for it. The reply of Professor Craig, one of the translators of the RSV, is noteworthy. He stated, "Would you have casual bystanders address Jesus in His historical life on earth as if they believed in the Trinitarian theology of the Nicene Creed? Would you have the disciples, described by the evangelists as 'without understanding', speak as if they, at that time, ascribed deity to Christ? When the Lamb sits on the throne, He is addressed as *thou* (Revelation 5:9)", (Quoted in Mr. Poole- Connor's tract on The Revised Standard Version). Here we see a bold attempt made on the part of translators to distinguish when Christ is Divine and when He is not. As a Man on earth they would have him addressed as *you*, but as the ascended Lord they would acknowledge a *thou*. Not even when Peter confessed that He was "the Christ, the Son of the living God", do they permit Him to be addressed as *thou*. Not even when Thomas confessed Him as "My Lord and my God" are the disciples permitted to speak to him as *thou*. In these versions, it is *you* all the way through the earthly life of our Lord. *You* as used by these translators is clearly a title to be addressed to human beings only, and the attempt is made to put Christ on the same level. Christ is "God blessed for ever" (Romans 9:5) and "The same yesterday, and to-day, and for ever" (Hebrews 13:8). He is not to be put on a plane with any mortal. To do so is blasphemous.

It is since these versions of the Bible have been circulated, anti-Christ versions as they actually are, that many Evangelical Christians have adopted the practice of using *you* in praying to God and to Christ in public prayer. The Lord's people may well take heed. They are not to run with a multitude to practise sin (Exodus 23:2). They are to keep the Word of God. They are not to address the Almighty as *you*, for to do so drags Him down to the common level of mankind, as these anti-Christ versions do. We believe His Holy Spirit is quite grieved at such practice.

Prayer must be couched in the language of Scripture. It is a taking of God at His Word. Therefore, let us hold fast to its original language. The Authorised Version is infinitely better for closeness to the original languages than many of the dangerous translations of recent years. Let us not be ashamed to use it in private devotion and study. Let us not be ashamed to speak to God in language becoming His infinite majesty and holiness. The Lord teach His people according to His truth.

Is a Pronominal Revision of the Authorised Version Desirable?

Oswald T. Allis

The farther translators depart from the style of the document they are translating, the more complicated does their problem become, the greater will be the variety in the translations proposed, and the greater will be the danger of the translation becoming an interpretation. Dr. Burrows lays down what we believe to be the true governing principle for all accurate translating, when he says, "The translator can only follow his text, leaving it for the commentator to explain". Many of the difficulties in which revisers have become involved are the direct result of their failure to observe this fundamental rule. An especially important example of this, because of its doctrinal implications, is their rendering of the second person singular where it occurs in the Greek text.

The forms *thou, thy, thine*.

It is a well-known fact that in contemporary English the forms *thou, thy, thine* have almost disappeared from secular use. They are largely restricted to the language of religious devotion, in which they are constantly employed, and which is largely formed by, and owes its peculiarities to, the Authorised Version. Consequently, it is often asserted or assumed that the usage of the AV represents the speech of 300 years ago, and that now, three centuries later, it should be changed to accord with contemporary usage. But this is not at all a correct statement of the problem. The important fact is this. The usage of the AV is *not* the ordinary usage of the early seventeenth century: it *is* the Biblical usage based on the style of the Hebrew and the Greek Scriptures. The second part of this statement needs no proof and will be challenged by no one. It is undeniable that where the Hebrew and Greek use the singular of the pronoun the AV regularly uses the singular, and where they use the plural it uses the plural. Even in Deuteronomy where in his addresses, and apparently for rhetorical and pedagogical effect, Moses often changes suddenly, and seemingly arbitrarily, from singular to plural or from plural to singular, the AV reproduces the style of the text with fidelity. That is to say, the usage of the AV is *strictly Biblical*.

The first part of the above statement is not quite so easy to prove, but there is abundant evidence to support it. According to the late Professor Lounsbury of Yale, the substitution of the plural for the singular in addressing an individual, "made its appearance in the English language toward the close of the thirteenth century ... In the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries the use of the plural steadily increased, and in the sixteenth century it became the standard form of polite conversation ... For some two centuries it may be said that in a general way they (the *thou* and *thee*) were employed to denote affection or inferiority or contempt." Examples of these three uses are to be found in Shakespeare, for example, in *Henry V*. Lounsbury was especially concerned to illustrate the last of the three, contempt. If the correctness of Lounsbury's statement is admitted, it is quite obvious that the AV did not attempt to make the usage of the Hebrew and Greek conform to the usage of the Elizabethan or early Jacobean period. It simply followed the Biblical usage, despite the fact that for some three hundred years the trend had been increasingly away from it. Needless to say, the two earlier revisions — the English Revised Version of 1881 and the American Revised Version of 1901 — followed the AV in this regard, despite the fact that the ordinary usage in the years 1880-1900 was much the same as it is today.

The following words of A. T. Robertson are worthy of careful pondering in this connection: "No one today speaks the English of the Authorised Version, or ever did for that matter, for though, like Shakespeare, it is the pure Anglo-Saxon, yet unlike Shakespeare it reproduces to a remarkable extent the spirit and language of the Bible" (A Grammar of the Greek NT. p. 56). This is its great claim to distinction, the reason it has endeared itself to

multitudes of English-speaking people for more than three centuries: *it reproduces to a remarkable extent the spirit and language of the Bible.*

Language Addressed to the Lord Jesus

There is another very important consideration. If the second person singular is to be used only "in language addressed to God," what is to be done in the case of language addressed to Jesus the Christ? Is *thou* to be used regularly, because He is God, whether so regarded by the speaker or not? Is *you* to be used regularly, because He was, or, it is assumed, was regarded by the speaker as man? Or, is the translator to exegete each passage and decide dogmatically which of these pronouns is to be used in a given case? For example, in Matthew 16:16 the words of Peter's confession at Caesarea Philippi are rendered in the Revised Standard Version (RSV), "You are the Christ, the Son of the living God". Here, in reply to a direct question as to what Jesus' apostles and immediate followers held Him to be, Peter affirms that He is the Messiah of Old Testament prophecy, that He is the Son of the living God. Yet several modern versions use *you* here instead of *thou* (cf. also Matthew 14:33; 20:21). We turn to Mark 1:11 and Luke 3:22 and there, according to the RSV, the living God addresses His "Son" with *thou*. Does this affirm Jesus' Deity, or does it not? In Acts 1:24 the "Lord" is addressed with *thou* (RSV). Does this mean that *God* is addressed, or that Jesus is addressed *as God*? Since Jesus chose His twelve apostles while He was on earth, it would be natural to suppose that this prayer for guidance in the choice of a successor to Judas would be addressed to Him in heaven (cf. Acts 9:13 with 4:24-27). Is such the intent of the revisers? We note in this connection that the risen but not yet ascended Christ is addressed as *you* in Acts 1:6 (RSV). Finally, we turn to Hebrews where, in the first chapter, the unique dignity of this Son of the living God is elaborately proved by six or seven quotations from the Old Testament. In four of these the pronoun of the second singular is used. RSV renders it here by *thou* or *thy*.

It is important to remember that the retention of the distinction between the singular and the plural is sometimes quite essential to accuracy of rendering *You*, as both singular and plural is at times confusing in English, as in French and German, and requires explanation if used for both, as for instance in Luke 22:31,32, where by the use of *you*, the distinction between the apostles (or disciples) and *thee* (Peter) disappears.

In Acts 13:47 Paul introduces a quotation from the Old Testament with the words, "For so the Lord hath commanded us, saying". Then follow the familiar words from Isaiah 49:6 which a modern translation renders, "I have set you to be a light for the Gentiles that you may bring salvation to the uttermost parts of the earth". *You* suggests Paul and Barnabas and by implication every ambassador of Christ. Hence, it is important to note that in the Hebrew and the Greek the pronoun is not plural but singular, and the *thou* suggests an individual, primarily the Messiah.

The Real Issue

The real issue is whether or not we are prepared to give up the use of the singular of the pronoun entirely, and to this there are two main objections. The first is that it gives up the attempt to retain in English a distinction which is clearly drawn in Hebrew and in Greek. The second is that it means that *thou* and *thee* and *thy* are to pass completely out of twentieth-century English. The singular form of the pronoun is not even to be tolerated in the language of devotion and worship. It is to disappear from the Lord's Prayer and give place to "Your name be revered", "Your kingdom come"! Scores of our most familiar and best-loved hymns will then have to be discarded or more or less drastically edited. And the liturgies of the liturgical churches (e.g. the Te Deum) will need a thorough overhauling, if such a radical change is to be carried through. It is only in very recent days that Christian people have raised objections to the former language of devotion and worship. When the present century

began people did not raise objections to what we may call a Scriptural and Biblical style as the language of devotion and worship. They liked it. They did not want the Bible to read just like any other book, to have the up-to-the-minute style of the daily newspaper. They loved its quaint, if you wish to call it that, its distinctive, its Biblical way of putting things. And we believe that the great majority of them do so today.

Why should the *thou* which is reserved for Deity be used in quotations from the Old Testament which speak of the Messiah, if it is not to be used in a New Testament passage which expressly affirms the Messiahship of Jesus as the Son of the living God? Is the Old Testament in the RSV to have a more archaic style than the New Testament? Hardly, for *you* appears in some quotations from it. If "Thou art my Son, today I have begotten thee" (a quotation from a Psalm), is a proper rendering for Hebrews 1:5 in the RSV, why should we read, "You are the Christ, the son of the living God" in Matthew 16:16? To prove that the rendering in RSV is arbitrary, inconsistent, and highly interpretive, it is sufficient to compare Matthew 20:21 with Matthew 25:37-45.

Why The Ye's And Thou's?

Dr. Bruce Cummons

One of the most criticized characteristics of the Authorised Version of the Bible is the use of English pronouns. Some unlearned scholars go to great lengths to make fun of *thee's*, *thou's*, and *ye's*. "Why not just use *you*?" they say. Yet this is one of the strongest points of the Authorised Version.

In the language of the Greek New Testament and Hebrew Old Testament there is a very distinct difference between the second person singular and the second person plural pronouns. We make no difference in modern English — both singular and plural are translated *you*. However, in old English there exists a difference just as there is in Greek and Hebrew. As a result the old English used in the Authorised Version gives far more precise translation than would modern English.

In our Authorised Version, *thee*, *thou*, *thy*, and *thine* are always singular. *You*, *ye*, and *your* are always plural. If the second person pronoun starts with a "t" (in the English translation) then it is singular. If it starts with a "y" it is plural. This information helps us to better interpret God's Word.

It is interesting to note that, contrary to popular opinion, the word *you* is used in the Authorised Version of the Bible 2,004 times in fact. The *thee's* and the *ye's* are used also for accuracy and directness of translation; perhaps the so-called "old" English could better be described as good old "Bible" English.

Praise the Lord for it.

Changes of Person and Number in Paul's Epistles

Dr. C. E. B. Cranfield

It is our conviction that the jettisoning of the second person singular in recent English Versions (of the New Testament) has not just resulted in a lessening of accuracy in detail and a considerable literary impoverishment, but has also effected a much more serious and substantial loss. By obliterating what we would call "the evangelical second person singular", that use of the second person singular which so often, both in the Old Testament and in the New, expresses with pointed directness and haunting appeal the truth that God's grace and judgment concern not just men in general but each individual man in particular, it has obscured something utterly essential to the gospel, which it is always the Church's duty to try to declare as unambiguously as possible. In a day when the individual, unless he happens to belong to a privileged elite of power, wealth or ability, tends to count for less and less, and is often oppressed by his consciousness of the fact, one might have expected the Church to cherish every resource at its disposal for emphasizing the direct appeal of the gospel to the individual.

It is, in our view, an extraordinary ineptitude hastily to throw away the means our language possesses for expressing directly that gospel truth which cannot be so readily or effectively expressed without it, on the ground that it seems archaic to our bourgeois taste (it is still to be heard in ordinary use in some parts of the country among manual workers), and to insist on preferring to it the plural of politeness which originated as a servile plural in the rigid class distinctions of a feudal society (the serf addressing his manor lord in the plural while the lord addressed his serf in the singular). That we also regard the deferential plural as a thoroughly inappropriate form of address to the God whose oneness is fundamental to the faith of Christians need hardly be said!

The disastrously flattening effect of the abandonment of the second person singular in translation may be vividly illustrated by setting side by side the 1611 rendering of 1 Corinthians 15:35-37. ('But some *man* will say, How are the dead raised up? ... *Thou* fool, that which thou sowest . . .') and the translation in the New English Bible ('But, you may ask, how are the dead raised? ... How foolish! The seed you sow. .').

There is an interesting and significant variation between the second person singular and the second person plural in the Epistle to Philemon. In vv. 2,4,22a and 23, the second person singular is used, the reference being to Philemon himself; but in vv.3,22b and 25, where Paul is associating with Philemon the other people mentioned in v. 2 (Apphia, Archippus and the church meeting in Philemon's house), the second plural is used. The distinction disappears in the modern English versions — without trace!

Why Thou should be Retained

Iain H. Murray

(The concluding part of an article entitled "Which Version? A Continuing Debate..." This first appeared in The Banner of Truth magazine, issue 157, and is reproduced here by permission — Ed.).

Before leaving the subject of accuracy, reference needs to be made to one word which more than any other is generally urged as proof of the obsolescence of the AV. We refer to the pronoun *thou*. A tide of opinion for the uniform replacement of *thou* by *you* is now so strong that it is often presumed that it is only from sentiment or eccentricity that anyone can defend the retention of *thou*. That is not true. Its use can also be defended on the grounds of accuracy. O. T. Allis has written: "It is incorrect to claim that the *thou* represents the usage of the 1611 period when the AV was prepared and that that usage is out of date and should be rejected for that very reason. Such a claim misrepresents the facts. The AV usage is not Jacobean or 17th-Century English. It is Biblical English. The Greek of the New Testament like the Hebrew of the Old Testament distinguishes between the singular and the plural forms of the second person. The AV makes this distinction simply because NT Greek does so, and because that is the only way to translate the Bible correctly." ¹

Allis also shows from the Bible why it is not a matter of insignificance whether the distinction between the singular *thou* and the plural *you* is retained. When the ambiguous *you* is used to cover both singular and plural, important aspects of a text can be lost, for example, Luke 22:31 "Satan hath desired to have *you* ... but I have prayed for *thee* . . .". Or again, in Acts 13:47, where Paul and Barnabas say, "For so the Lord has commanded us," and quote, "I have set *thee* to be a light of the Gentiles . . ." from Isaiah 49:6; if the *thee* is changed, as in modern versions to *you*, the context can easily lead readers to suppose that *you* refers to Paul and Barnabas; whereas the correct singular pronoun points to *one* individual primarily, namely, Christ.

As Allis also convincingly argues, the AV translators did not use the *thou* form when God himself is addressed because they supposed it to be more reverent, but because they wished to maintain an inbuilt distinction in the Hebrew and Greek originals. Dr Kuschke, Librarian of Westminster Seminary, makes the same point in *The Presbyterian Guardian*:

"The Bible tells us that God is one, and in the original languages the Bible invariably addresses God in the second person singular. Even when God is called by the plural name Elohim, the singular rather than the plural in verb and pronoun is used, and this is revelatory of God's unity. God is one and undivided. The distinction of three persons in the Triune God should never distract us from God as one.

"We should address God as the Bible does. If we use *you* we fail to identify God as he has identified himself to us, and as he has required us to worship him.

"Only *thou* is unambiguously singular. If we do not wish to coin a new second person singular pronoun, we should retain the singular *thou*."

There ought to be enough force in this to demonstrate that the case for the universal adoption of *you* in religious language, regardless of singular or plural, is not so compelling as it may seem. And the person who knows how English-speaking Protestantism has so often evangelized effectively without dropping *thou* or *thee* from its Bible should be forgiven for doubting whether these pronouns contribute to a major barrier of communication.

One thing is certain, if *thou* and *thee* are abandoned it is not only the Authorised Version that must go. A great deal else would need to be re-written, or forgotten. What would many of the great hymns of the Church look like if they were only acceptable in the modern style? For example,

*Jesus, You joy of loving hearts,
You fount of life, You light of men ...*

Is it mere sentiment which shrinks from driving "a wedge between the devotional language of today and that of the past"?

There is sound cause not to change traditional language when the only reason offered to warrant such a change is the opinion that the change will secure a better hearing for the Bible from the unconverted. After all, the Bible is the book of the Church; it feeds and nourishes disciples.² Its message, indeed, has to go to all the world, but primarily it is to go to the ungodly as the *preached* word. The great problem in evangelism today is not that the Church is not using the right version of the Bible; it is that she has retreated from that full proclamation of the truth which in other ages has turned the world upside down. If publishing companies had given the same attention to the restoration of New Testament preaching which they have given to the selling of New Testament versions, our spiritual situation would be far healthier. On this theme the words of Dr Noel Weeks of Sydney form a fitting conclusion:

"Why this emphasis on simplicity in translation? Is it not a result of the fact that the prime means of converting the unbeliever has changed from the preaching and teaching of the gospel to the distribution of literature, especially of Scripture portions? Let us have translations in modern English by all means. But if the unbeliever is unable to understand the Bible as easily as his pulp novel, the cause is not lost. Let us go back to preaching the gospel as our prime means of evangelism . . . I cannot be convinced by arguments that Scripture must read like any other book if it is to have force. The New Testament was written in Hebraized Greek. The AV with its literalism is Hebraized English. Rather than being passed by as unreadable, the Authorised Version has shaped our whole language. I do not think we need a modern translation. But I would like to see a greater concern for accuracy. Whether people read it will ultimately depend upon whether God gives us power to preach it with boldness and conviction, rather than upon its simplicity and lack of technical words."

¹ *The New English Bible, The NT of 1961, A Comparative Study*, 1963, 69.

In his larger work, *Revision or New Translation, A Critique of the RSV*, 1948, pp 55-56, Allis writes that there is "abundant evidence" to support his claim that "the usage of AV *is not* the ordinary usage of the early seventeenth century". He quotes Professor Lounsbury of Yale, who says that the substitution of the plural for the singular in addressing an individual "made its appearance in the English language towards the close of the thirteenth century ... In the fourteenth and fifteenth century the use of the plural steadily increased, and in the sixteenth century it became the standard form of polite conversation ... For some two centuries it may be said that in a general way they (the *thou* and *thee*) were employed to denote affection or inferiority or contempt." Examples of these three uses, Allis continues, are to be found in Shakespeare's Plays, e.g. , *Henry V*. "That *you* was not merely polite but also formal and reverential is made evident by the fact that when the Quaker Movement arose in the middle of the seventeenth century, George Fox and his followers, refusing to recognize social distinctions and declaring that all men were on an equality before God, insisted on using the intimate *thou* and *thee* in addressing individuals of every class and condition." The primary concern of the AV translators, he thus argues, was to follow the Hebrew and Greek Scriptures and he quotes the words of the eminent New Testament scholar, A. T. Robertson: "No one today speaks the English of the Authorised Version, or ever did for that matter, for, though like Shakespeare, it is the pure Anglo-Saxon, yet unlike Shakespeare, it reproduces to a remarkable extent the spirit and language of the Bible."

² Duncan Lowe comments in reply to Dr. Dillard that if the preparation of a translation is over-influenced by consideration for its "communicative efficiency" with the unconverted, "it may well happen that as those to whom such a version is addressed grow in faith they will come to desire another kind of version, one that does not cover over or disguise the technical terms the Bible itself employs in setting forth the great themes of redemption." (These men were scholars engaged in correspondence over the merits and demerits of the NIV New Testament. The letters were to the Editor of the *Presbyterian Guardian* in 1975. At that time the NIV New Testament had only recently appeared — Ed.)

Note on Back Cover

Recent decades have seen the arrival of many new translations of the Bible, and with them the increasing tendency to use the pronouns *you* and *your* when addressing God.

Is this a healthy bringing up-to-date of a Christianity that is too often seen as old-fashioned and irrelevant? Or is it a serious departure from timeless principles, both in accuracy of translation and in reverence when calling upon the Lord?

The articles of this book, written by different authors at different times, maintain that we are witnessing today a modern Downgrade which is scarcely appreciated by the Lord's people in their eagerness to be "contemporary".

With a Foreword which sets the scene, we have here perhaps the most comprehensive treatment of this subject available today.

John Thackway is Minister of Holywell Evangelical Church in North Wales, and Editor of the Bible League Quarterly.