κει (*sic.*, not ἐκτιτρώσκει). The birth of this very vivacious god, occurring under conditions altogether extraordinary, furnishes the one exceptional case of a living product of ἔκτρωσις which has come to my knowledge. The application of the verb ἐκτιτρώσκω in this instance is further anomalous in its departure in other respects from its regular sense; for this, according to Liddell & Scott, is either *to miscarry* or *to cause miscarriage.*

Elsewhere, the verb ἐκτιτρώσκω and its derivatives appear used solely, if I mistake not, in respect to cases of miscarriage, in which the process of reproduction is frustrated.

In respect to ἀμβλίσκω, ἄμβλωμα, ἐξάμβλωμα, which the grammarian Thomas Magister insisted upon as alone the correct words to use in place of ἐκτιτρώσκω and its derivatives, the notion of *dulness, sluggishness, want of thoroughgoing efficiency,* viewed as attaching to the parent, may perhaps account for their having this specific sense; though here again the notion may be conceived of as passing on to the frustrated product.

Further illustration of the lexical question is furnished by Triller's note on the passage just now referred to in Thomas Magister, and in the following passages, likewise communicated to me by the same friend:—Aristotle, *Hist. Anim.*, vii. 8, 3; *ib.*, *De Generatione Anim.*, lib. iv. p. 291; Hippocrates, *de Aere, Aquis, et Locis*, p. 343; *ib.*, *Lib. de Sterilitate*, p. 641; *ib.*, *Libb. de Mulierum Morbis*, passim.

FIDELITY AND BIAS IN VERSIONS OF THE BIBLE.

"The expressions are as direct as strong, and a true believer will neither attempt to divert or dilute their strength"—COLERIDGE.

THE words of sacred books become necessarily more precious from their very familiarity. When the Authorised Version was published in A.D. 1611, one of the first Hebrew scholars of that age, Dr. Hugh Broughton, said that he would rather be torn to pieces by wild horses than impose such a version on the poor Churches of England. It was

attacked both on the side of scholarship, and on the side of English idiom and rhythm, both by Romanists and by scholars who had hitherto used Tyndale, or the Genevan, or the Bishop's Bible. But when, in their turn, the sentences of King James's translators had gained the charms of association, then it was justly belauded by writer after writer, from Selden to Archbishop Trench, in terms of which none seem to be too warm or too affectionate. The New Revisers speak of "its simplicity, its dignity, its power, its happy turns of expression, its general accuracy, and we must not fail to add, the music of its cadences, and the felicities of its rhythm." Faber, in a celebrated passage, often incorrectly attributed to Cardinal Newman, says, "It lives on the ear like a music that can never be forgotten, like the sound of church bells, which the convert hardly knows how he can forego. Its felicities often seem to be almost things rather than mere words. It is part of the national mind, and the anchor of the national seriousness. Nay, it is worshipped with a positive idolatry, in extenuation of whose grotesque fanaticism its intrinsic beauty pleads availingly with the man of letters and the scholar. The memory of the dead passes into it. The potent traditions of childhood are stereotyped in its verses. The power of all the griefs and trials of a man is hidden beneath its words. It is the representative of his best moments, and all that there has been about him of soft, and gentle, and pure, and penitent, and good, speaks to him for ever out of his English Bible." [1]

This passion for the sacred in familiar forms has led to curious results in all ages. On one occasion a priest, in reading the Gospel, altered the very homely word *krabbaton* —"a *mattrass*-bed"—into the more dignified and Attic word *skimpous*. Immediately the Bishop rose in his seat

[1] Faber, *On the Lives of the Saints*, prefixed to a *Life of St. Francis of Assisi*. 853.

and indignantly rebuked the reader, with the remark that if the word *krabbaton* had been good enough for the Evangelists it was surely good enough for him. In another instance, narrated by St. Augustine in a letter to St. Jerome, an African Bishop had substituted the word *hedera*, "ivy," for *cucurbita*, "gourd," in reading the third chapter of the story of Jonah. He had done this because St. Jerome had chosen the word *hedera* in his Vulgate, whereas the Old Latin Version, with which the people were familiar, had *cucurbita*. No sooner had he uttered the unlucky word, than the congregation, indignant at missing the "gourd" to which they had been so long accustomed, rose up and shouted "No! no! it was not '*ivy*' it was a '*gourd!*'" The Bishop replied that he was following the learned St. Jerome, but the Greeks declared that their LXX., which rendered the word by *kolokynthos*, or "gourd," was right. A hot discussion arose—"a tumult" says St. Augustine,—"because of the different sound of a single word."

Finally the Bishop said that he would consult the Jews. The Jews however, either from ignorance or malice, declared that the Hebrew word meant "*gourd*" and not "*ivy*"; and the poor Bishop was so shocked at having committed a crime against the majesty of the Septuagint, that he proposed at once to abdicate his bishopric, and even resign his priestly orders.[1] The story has a certain look of naturalness and probability about it, though no doubt it *may* have been invented by the enemies of the Vulgate to annoy St. Jerome. The saint, however, in his reply to St. Augustine, from his holy cavern at Bethlehem, laughs a little at the innocent and unfortunate bishop. After all, he says, his translation was perfectly right. The Hebrew word is *kikēion*. The translators of the Septuagint, not knowing what the plant really was, called it a "gourd." Properly speaking it is just as little a gourd as it is ivy,

[1] Aug. *Ep.* 71, *ad. Hieron.*, p. 610.

which latter term (*kissos*) was chosen by the careful Aquila. In choosing it he may have been influenced by the *similarity of sound* between *kikēion* and *kissos*, as (St. Jerome might have added) the LXX. themselves frequently are in other instances. The plant really is the *Ricinus, Palma Christi*, or castor-oil plant, which has large leaves, and grows rapidly to a great height; but—unlike both "gourd" and "ivy"—has no tendrils, and stands on its own stem.[1] We must however add that, since this was the case, St. Jerome might just as well have left the word alone. No good purpose was served by substituting one incorrect term for another.

But modern history furnishes us with proofs that the preference of the familiar to the correct is always a powerful feeling. We have all heard of the significant and typical anecdote of the old priest, who, in the days when the knowledge of letters began to revive, angrily refused "to exchange his old *mumpsimus* for their new *sumpsimus*." We have retained in our Prayer-book the earlier version of the Psalms written by Bishop Coverdale, because of the extraordinary sweetness of words which we have heard from childhood, although we are well aware that it is often incorrect, and occasionally meaningless. In spite of its defects we shall, perhaps, never grow weary of listening to it,—

> "As for some dear familiar strain
> Untired we ask, and ask again,
> Ever, in its melodious store,
> Finding a spell unheard before."

Can it then be said that custom is dearer to us than truth? Do we love rhythm better than accuracy? Do we desire the plain bare facts of that which we call the Word of God, or do we desire melodious glosses and mistaken interpretations?

[1] Jer., *Ep.*, 74.

Judging from the singular outcry with which the Revised Version has been received, one might be led to suppose that euphony was indeed the important matter, and exactness an entirely subordinate requirement. An analogous conclusion might be supported from the history of many other translations of the Bible. Even in this century, for instance, books have been written which deliberately support the thesis that the Septuagint Version was inspired.[1] Mr. Grinfield's "Apology for the Septuagint" may in this respect be regarded as a literary anachronism. Bishop Wordsworth seems, however, to lean towards a similar conclusion. "The story current in ancient times," he says, "concerning supernatural agency in the production of the Septuagint translation of the Old Testament, shews the sense of the ancient Church as to the need of Divine guidance in such a work."[2] Divine guidance—yes; but supernatural inspiration, no; for, as Jerome said long ago, "aliud est vatem, aliud esse interpretem."[3] If there be one thing more certain than another, it is that the Septuagint version is not inspired; its different parts are singularly unequal in merit; it abounds in errors of every description; it was carried out by translators of whom some were but very partially acquainted with Greek and some very partially acquainted with Hebrew, while some again seem to have been equally ignorant of both languages alike.[4] So completely is this the case that St. Jerome ventured to conjecture that in some instances they had purposely refrained from revealing to pagans the mysteries of their religion.[5]

[1] This was the view of some of the Fathers, as Just. Martyr, Irenæus, Augustine, *De doctr. Christ.*, iv. 15; sometimes Jerome (*Præf. in Paralip.*), etc

[2] *On the Revised Version*, p. 9.

[3] Jer. *Præf. ad. Pent.*

[4] "Septuaginta quod nesciebant dubiis protulere sententiis." Jer. *In Ruf.* ii. p. 423.

[5] Conjicio noluisse tunc temporis Septuaginta interpretes fidei suæ sacramenta Ethnicis prodere." Jer. *ib.* p. 431.

The object of my present paper is not, however, to point out the defects of this or that Version of the Bible. To do so would be an inexhaustible task. It is indeed a problem whether any book on the words of which depend issues of unspeakable importance *can* be adequately translated at all. A very painful but deeply instructive treatise might be written on the injuries to nations, and even to whole ages, which have resulted from the appeal to words supposed to be immediately inspired, which have been in reality nothing but erroneous renderings of the Original, or which have come to connote a whole range of conceptions of which the Original was entirely innocent. The most honest, the most painstaking, the most accurate of translators may yet make the sacred writers express sentiments which were far from their true meaning.[1] The best forms of language are still imperfect. They illuminate the realms of thought, not with a full noontide radiance, but only with a moonlight, which admits of many misleading shadows, and even of many inevitable illusions. To change the metaphor altogether—language, even at its best, is but an *asymptote* to thought. No language can ever speak in the identical accents of another. The words and the sentences may be rendered; but the words and sentences in their new form assume a different aspect, and imply different shades of significance. The engrafted thought is modified by the tree to which it is transferred, and of both tree and graft it may be said with great truth, "mirantur que novas frondes, et non sua poma." It is as little possible to express the thoughts of one age and tongue with absolute identity of meaning in the idioms of another—as

[1] The stories of modern versions of the Bible into heathen languages are startling. The word used for "God" in Chinese was perhaps directly suggestive of false views. The account of the original rendering chosen for "God is Love" in the Kaffir Bible is positively shocking. Gregory Martin ventured to say of our Protestant Bible that it "was not God's word, but the devil's," and Faber ends the beautiful passage above quoted, by the words, "and all this is *an unhallowed power.*"

it is to square the circle. We can get at nothing beyond approximations. If even in the same language identical formulæ may mean widely different things on the lips of contemporary speakers, how can we suppose that the sentence of an Englishman in the nineteenth century can express, in all its delicacy and with all its connotations, the thought of a Jewish Apostle who wrote in Greek at the beginning of the first?

I must not, however, be led aside from my main purpose, which is merely to touch upon the plain influence of *bias* as exhibited in different versions.

I. Of all translators I think some of the old Seventy were the freest. Yet they rendered to the world an inestimable service. They familiarized the Greeks and Romans alike with the monotheistic idea and with the historic revelations on which it was founded. They created that technical language of theology which was afterwards of infinite use to the Apostles and Evangelists. They were, on the whole, so far correct and intelligible, that even those of the New Testament writers who were familiar with Hebrew, and who in some instances correct the LXX. by the Original, were yet generally content to avail themselves of the Greek version which they found in possession of the popular ear. Even to the Jews of Palestine it had the charm of familiarity. It is probable that in most parts of Palestine, much more in all other countries, it was "read in the synagogues every Sabbath day." By a most interesting coincidence, arising from the juxtaposition of two rare expressions, we are able to prove that St. Paul must have heard the *Parashah* and *Haphtarah*, or what we should call the first and second Lessons, read *from the Septuagint* in the synagogue of Antioch in Pisidia on a certain Sunday more than eighteen centuries ago.[1] And yet the theory of

[1] I may perhaps refer to my *Life of St. Paul*, vol. i. p. 369, to elucidate what is here said.

translation which the Seventy adopted—or at any rate the practice followed by the ablest of them—was in some instances radically unsound.

I will say nothing of the text which they had before them. It was without any question exceedingly corrupt. In no other way can we account for a host of divergences which arise from the resemblances between different Hebrew letters. But besides this, they do not seem to have recognised the rule that a translator is not an expounder or a commentator, and that it is his first duty to be rigidly faithful.[1]

There are three theories which a translator may adopt.

(1) He may think himself entitled to translate freely, giving his impression of the general sense, and even modifying the original by addition, omission, or substitution when he thinks it expedient to do so. If he be a man of genius he may thus produce a remarkable work, such for instance as Coleridge's Wallenstein, of which even Schiller availed himself in later editions. But translations produced on this plan are very unsatisfactory *as* translations. We are, for instance, to this day uncertain in reading the Latin translation of some of the works of Origen whether what we read is the opinion of Origen or only the opinion of the Presbyter Rufinus. "*Aliud est vatem,*" says St. Jerome, "*aliud esse interpretem.*"

(2) He may keep to his original with such bald slavish accuracy as even to sacrifice the sense and idiom of the language into which he is translating. This is the characteristic of the Greek translation of Aquila, which proposed to represent more closely than all others "the Hebrew verity."

[1] St. Jerome, after carefully examining the Psalter in the LXX. for the purpose of his version says, "Longum est revolvere quanta Septuaginta de suo addiderint, quanta dimiserint quæ in exemplaribus ecclesiae obelis asteriscisque distincta sunt." *Ep.* 34.

(3) He may steer an intermediate course between these extremes, as has been done in the majority of English versions, as well as in the Greek versions of Theodotion and Symmachus, in the Vulgate, and in Luther's German Bible.

The Alexandrian translators took the first view of their duty.

(i.) For instance, they sometimes *omit*.

The omission from some MSS. of 1 Samuel xvii. 12–31 and 55–58 can only be due to the desire of avoiding a contradiction. The omission of Exodus xxxii. 9, "And the Lord said unto Moses, I have seen this people and behold it is a stiffnecked people," can only have risen from the same national vanity which led them to alter the fact that they were "set on mischief" (Exod. xxxii. 22) into the mild remark that "they were impetuous."

(ii.) Much more frequently they *add particulars of their own*. These are sometimes in the direction of the Halachah,—that is, they consist of traditional minutiæ connected with the ceremonial law; and sometimes in the direction of the Hagadah—or traditional particulars connected with the narrative. The reader may be glad, perhaps, to be furnished with specimens of both.

a. To the number of *Halachic* additions—little clauses and expressions intended to convey minute Levitical prescriptions such as formed part of the oral law—belong the following.[1]

In Exodus xii. 15, "Ye shall *put away* leaven," becomes "Ye shall *destroy* leaven."

In Verse 18 we find "*Beginning* on the fourteenth day, ye shall eat unleavened bread." There is no *beginning* in the original. It is an Halachic addition, intended to emphasize the traditional prohibition to touch unleavened bread on that day at all.

[1] See Frankel, *Vorstudien*, pp. 86–92.

In Chapter xiii. 16 they render "frontlets" by *asaleuta*, literally "things unshaken," as Aquila does by *atinakta*, which has the same meaning, implying apparently the firmness with which the phylacteries should be fastened.

One more instance may suffice. In Exodus xxii. 9 we have, "For any manner of lost thing, which another challengeth to be his, the cause of both parties shall come before the judges; and he whom the judges shall condemn shall pay double unto his neighbour." This in the LXX. becomes by a very curious change, "About every loss that is proclaimed, whatever it be, the judgment of both shall come before God, and the one convicted by God shall pay double to his neighbour." It might seem that here we have an allusion to some form of trial by ordeal. But "God" is merely Elohim, *i.e.*, in this instance the Judges. It is however probable that there is an allusion to some curious rules and customs about the discovery of lost goods which are mentioned in the Talmud.

β. Among *Hagadistic* additions—those which preserve for us some Jewish legend and tradition—are the following:

In Genesis ii. 2, they change the "seventh day" into "the sixth day."

In Exodus xiii. 18, they tell us that the Israelites left Egypt "*five abreast.*"

In Deuteronomy xxxii. 8, they say that "He set bounds to the people *according to the number of the angels of God.*"

In Joshua xiii. 22, they imply that Balaam (like Simon Magus in later days) was dashed to the earth *in an attempt to fly* (ἐν τῇ ῥοπῇ).

In Joshua xxiv. 30, they recorded that the flint knives with which the Israelites had been circumcised in the wilderness were buried in Joshua's grave.

In 1 Samuel xix. 13–16, they tell us that Michal put a still palpitating *goat's liver* on David's bed.

In 1 Samuel xx. 30, they infer that Jonathan was de-

scended from one of the maidens seized at the dance at Shiloh.

In 1 Samuel xxi. 13, they make David show his madness by *running on all fours.*

In 1 Samuel v. 4, 5, they tell us that Dagon's priests never stepped *upon* his threshold after

> "The captive ark
> Maimed his brute image, head and hands lopped off,
> In his own temple, on the grunsel edge
> Where he fell flat and shamed his worshippers."

In 1 Samuel v. 9, they think it worth their while to inform us that the Gittites, afflicted with hæmorrhoids, "made themselves seats to sit upon."

(iii.) In instances far more frequent they *explain or modify.* Some of these glosses are harmless enough. If a Greek reader in studying the list of clean and unclean animals suddenly stumbled across the word *dasupous*, or "rough-foot," and was puzzled for a moment at this odd rendering of the Hebrew *arnebeth*, or "hare," he would soon recall with a smile that the courtly translator, who was working for Ptolemy Philadelphus or Philometor, and whose work was to be placed in the Royal Alexandrian Library, would hardly render the word by the Greek *Lagos*, because if he did he would offend the king by shewing that the title of his dynasty—the Lagidæ, so called from Ptolemy Lagos —was derived from the name of an unclean animal!

Again, if he found Moses, or Balaam, or the sons of Jair, not mounted on "*asses*," as they were in the original, but accommodated with "*beasts of burden*," or even with prancing "*steeds*," he would not forget that, though the ass is in the East a valuable and honoured animal, it excited the ridicule of Greeks and Romans, who associated it with poverty and degradation.

Again, when a reader finds that they transfer from Eli

to Eli's "little servant" (*παιδάριον*) the utterance of the rebuke to Hannah about her supposed intoxication, or that they accommodate Samuel with a chariot in 1 Samuel xv. 12, he would not be very indignant at these minute proprieties.

A similar bias—a bias however of national pride and a tendency to euphemism—is traceable again and again. In Exodus iv. 6 they avoid the notion that the hand of Moses became *leprous* by simply saying that it "became as snow." Nor in Exodus ii. 1 will they suffer him to be "of *uncircumcised* lips," but only "thin-voiced." In Exodus vi. 12, by a dexterous interpolation they save Amram from marrying his aunt. In Exodus vi. 20 they only allow that Simeon had a son by a *Phœnician*, not by a *Canaanitish* woman.

If a Jewish student of the LXX. found that the Egyptian name of Joseph was not Zaphnath Paaneah but Psonthomphanēch, he would be glad of the preservation of an accurate local tradition; and he would find some interest in the rendering of Urim and Thummim by "*Manifestation and Truth*," in which perhaps there is a suggestion that the pectoral of the High Priest was analogous to the sapphire pectoral—a symbol of truth—worn by the Egyptian hierarchs.

These tamperings with the original, though they shew bias and literary unfaithfulness, were comparatively venial eccentricities. But the alterations introduced by the Alexandrian scholars were far more serious and even fundamental, and they furnish us with an instructive example of the effect which may be produced on the minds of translators by the views of their age and nation.

If the question be asked "Do the Seventy—apart from their other variations—go so far as to shew *distinct theological bias?*" the answer must be that they shew it to a marked extent; to such an extent that they never

hesitated to alter the words of the Original in favour of their own prepossessions.

For instance, the representation of God to man in the Scriptures of the Old Testament was inevitably, and to the unspeakable benefit of mankind in all ages, but especially in early ages, a representation of the Divine under human aspects. In other words it was marked by the two tendencies which have been technically described as "*Anthropomorphism*" and "*Anthropopathy.*" Anthropomorphism is the description of God by means of physical and human attributes. Anthropopathy is the description of the mind of God as swayed by human emotions,—as subject to wrath, change, repentance, joy, jealousy, and grief.

Both of these ancient tendencies—so reverent from their very simplicity—were alien from the Alexandrian philosophy. They jarred upon the primary tenet of that philosophy, which was the supreme exaltation of the Divine into an awful Abstraction, removed indefinitely far from the possibility of any contact with matter or with man. It was this conception of an immeasurable abyss between God and our earth which made them embrace with so much avidity the notion of intermediate agencies—Mêmra and "Wisdom," and the *Logos*, and multitudes of inferior *logoi*. It may be thought strange that under these circumstances they left untouched such expressions as "the arm," "the finger," "the eye" of God. This, however, they could do, because the philosopher Aristobulus, who was perhaps the translator of Exodus, had in his *Syngramma* or Introduction, expressly warned Ptolemy Philometór that these must simply be regarded as pictorial phrases. Such a phrase as "God stands" meant, he said, that there is a fixed order of the Universe. Such a phrase as "God spake" merely indicates the law of causation.

It will be seen that in passage after passage the influence of this Alexandrian theosophy has shewn itself in unfaith-

ful renderings. In Genesis xviii. 30, "Oh let not the Lord be angry," is softened into "*Is it anything, Lord, if I should speak?*" Thus, Exodus iv. 16., "Thou shalt be to him instead of God," becomes "Thou shalt be to him *all that concerns God*" (*τὰ πρὸς τὸν Θεόν*).

Exodus iii. 1. "The mountain *of God*, even Horeb," is only called "the mountain Horeb."

In iv. 20. "The rod of God" is amplified into "the rod (received) *from* God."

In iv. 24, Moses is met, not by "the Lord," but by "*an Angel of* the Lord."

In v. 3, "Lest He (Jehovah) fall upon us with pestilence or with the sword," becomes "*Lest perchance death or massacre should befall us.*"

In xix. 13, for "When the trumpet *soundeth long* they shall come up to the mount," we have "When the voices and the trumpets and the mist *goes away from the mount*, they shall go up to the mount."

In xxiv. 10, 11, instead of "They saw the God of Israel. . . . And upon the nobles of the children of Israel He laid not his hand; also they saw God," we find "They saw *the place where the God of Israel stood;* . . . And of the elders of Israel not one perished, and *they were seen in the place of God.*"

In xxv. 8, "That I may dwell among them," becomes "And I will be seen among you."

In xvii. 16, the Hebrew has (literally) "Because the hand upon the throne of the Lord." This becomes "Because the Lord wars *with a secret hand.*"

The instances in which the Seventy can be charged with deliberate falsification seem to lie chiefly in this direction. In all matters which affected the subsequent controversies between Judaism and Christianity they were faithful guides. In point of fact, the Christians found the Greek version so useful to them, as representing in many important

passages not only the Hebrew text, but also the opinions of learned Jews as to its meaning more than two centuries before Christ, that the Jews gladly availed themselves of Aquila's bald, unidiomatic, and almost unintelligible version instead of it. They called it "the Hebrew verity." Aquila was charged with unfaithful bias when he translated *gnalemāh* in Isaiah vii. 14, not as the LXX. did by "a virgin" (παρθένος), but by "*a young woman*," (νεᾶνις) in order that Christians might not appeal to this prophecy.[1] Theodotion, who revised the LXX., did so in the interest of *his* views. But, besides this, the Fathers accuse the Jews of directly tampering with the text of the LXX. The most famous instance of this is to be found in Psalm xcvi. 10, where in the days of Justin Martyr, and even in those of Tertullian and Augustine, was found the reading "He reigned *from the wood*" (ἐβασίλευσεν ἀπὸ τοῦ ξύλου), *i.e.*, from the Tree or the Cross,—a reading which found its way into the *Vetus Itala*.[2] The absence however of the phrase from the Greek manuscripts seems to shew that it was not suppressed by Jewish fraud, but that it originated in a Christian gloss.

II. I am not aware that the influence of *bias* has ever been charged on the Vulgate translation, the work of the great St. Jerome. Even Augustine, so morbidly jealous of variations, congratulated Jerome on his rendering of the New Testament,—thanking God for the work, and admitting that when it was compared with the Greek it contained scarcely anything to complain of. There might, indeed, he said, be some few things which might raise an objection, but the utility of the work in general was so great that no one could without ungraciousness dwell upon them. Defects of course there are in the Vulgate, but they do not arise from any bias or unfaithfulness. Taking it all

[1] Iren., *adv. Hær.*, iii. 24. Euseb., *ad. Ps.* xc. 4, and Jerome, in various passages, speaks unfavourably of Aquila's version, because of its Jewish prepossessions. [2] Just. Mart., *Dial. c. Tryph.*, § 73. Tert., *adv. Marc.*, iii. 19.

in all, it is an astonishing monument of the learning, candour, and diligence of its illustrious author.

III. In the fourth century lived a good man and a devoted missionary, the Arian bishop, Ulphilas. He was the apostle of the Goths, and translated the Bible into Gothic. It is from his version that our only knowledge of the Gothic language is obtained. Although he was an Arian, no charge of unfaithful bias has been brought against him. It is however a curious and significant fact that he left such stories as those in the Book of Judges purposely untranslated, because he was afraid that they would kindle the wildest passions of his turbulent converts. He felt that for *them* at any rate it would be impossible to draw profit from the record of fierce animosities and exterminating wars. Such omissions cannot however be put down to "bias." They rather fall under the head of "œconomy" and "accommodation." I do not know that Ulphilas can be blamed for them any more than the compilers of any Lectionary who choose out some portions of Scripture as more edifying than others, and who have sometimes passed over whole books without selecting from them a single Scripture Lesson.

IV. The Version of Luther—which did more than any other book to fix the standard of the German language—has never been charged with many instances of wilful bias. Coleridge, indeed, in an interesting passage, describes Luther sitting in his room in the Castle at Wartburg, perplexed and tormented by some text which seemed to tell directly against his own most cherished views, and so convinced that he is in some way under the glamour of that Satanic foe in whose constant presence he firmly believed, that, at last, he seizes his inkstand and hurls it at the head of the insulting fiend. The fiend, we gladly admit, was fairly put to the rout. But there was one reason why Luther was little tempted in general to play fast and loose

with the text, were it in ever so slight a respect. It is because his faith—being deeper and wider than that of most modern theologians—was not pinned to a Book but to a Person. That modern and unreasoning worship of the letter which has been so pregnant of disasters, and against which we are so solemnly warned in Scripture itself, existed as little for him as for Calvin. It is a growth of later and corrupted Protestantism.[1] If any one were now to write as those great men and great Christians wrote about various passages of Scripture, he would in these days call down upon his head—if that be worth considering—the whole thunder of such artillery as the "religious newspapers" could summon for his demolition; he would hear in all the voices of the religious critics alike "the *Damnamus* of Augsburg and the *Anathema* of Trent." Luther felt the less temptation to introduce any bias of his own into the words which he was translating, because he openly professed—as did other great theologians of that day—"to find the Canon *in* the Canon." Take as a specimen of his style of criticism the remarks which he makes on the Epistle of James, and on the Revelation of St. John. Of the former, as every one knows, he had but a low opinion, and went so far as to call it "a mere Epistle of Straw," which "throws one thing into another without order." Of the latter he said that he held it to be "neither apostolic nor prophetic," and that he could "find no reason for believing that it was set forth by the Holy Spirit." "My spirit," he adds, "cannot adapt itself to the production; and *this is reason enough for me that I should not highly esteem it*, that Christ is neither thought nor perceived in it."

[1] "The Judaising spirit in this matter," says Dean Plumptre, "culminated in the *Formula Helvetici Consensus* which pronounces the existing Old Testament text to be "tum quoad consonas, tum quoad vocalia, sive puncta ipsa, sive punctorum potestatem, tum quoad res, tum quoad verba, *θεόπνευστος*." Dean Burgon has also declared the very sentences, words, and letters of the Bible to be inspired. To talk thus is fetich-worship.

There was, however, one very memorable instance in which even Luther was not strictly faithful to the Original. It is in the word "*alone*" which he interpolates into Romans iii. 28. "Therefore we reckon that a man is justified by faith [ALONE] without the works of the Law." It originated the term *Solifidian*, and is what Erasmus called the "*vox sola tot clamoribus lapidata.*" Luther might indeed have pleaded that it was a legitimate *inference*, and even that he found it already existed in the Nuremburg Bible (1483)[1] and the Genoese (1476).[2] Still the fact remains. The word was *not* in the original. Whether it is or is not an appropriate *gloss*,—whether it would or would not be legitimate *in a paraphrase*—is an entirely different question. The one thing certain is that all such interpolations are unjustifiable in any faithful translation.

We will now come to our Authorised Version, since space does not allow me to speak of the Rheims and Douay Versions, and of the English Bibles which preceded that of 1611. There are nine or ten instances in which King James's translators are accused of shewing the influence of bias chiefly in (i.) absolutist, (ii.) Calvinistic, (iii.) prelatical, and (iv.) anti-Romish directions. It is a token of English honesty and faithfulness, of which we may well be proud, that in scarcely one of these instances can it be maintained that they were really guilty of bending their Version, as though it were some Lesbian rule,—some κανὼν μολύβδινος —to suit their own dogmatic prepossessions.

(i.) *α*. One of the charges against them was that they were guilty of flattery in the inaccurate rendering "*God save the king.*" But the rendering is an idiomatic equivalent to the original, and they found it in older versions.

β. A more serious charge was that they had introduced the words "*wizard*," "*witch*," "*witchcraft*," and "*familiar*

[1] "Nur durch der Glauben." [2] "Per la *sola* fede."

spirit," out of complaisance to the well-known demonology of King James. Much indeed might be urged against these renderings. The word rendered "*wizard*" (Lev. xix. 31; xx. 6, etc.), simply means "a *wise man*." Countless horrors, continued for generations—down even to 1720 when the last witch was burnt in Scotland—might have been spared to the human race if instead of the word "*witch*," could have been substituted—according to the true meaning of the original—some word like "enchantress," or the φαρμάκος of the LXX. Again, the word for "*familiar spirit*" means properly "*a bottle*," and the "consulters of evil spirits" are called by the LXX. "*ventriloquists*" (ἐγγαστρίμυθοι). It is indeed terrible to think that by virtue of wrong or highly uncertain translations, a new terror should have been added to millions of human lives. But in this respect our translators erred quite innocently, as the renderings already existed in older versions; they accorded with a belief then all but universal; and *if* the translators were, as Bishop Hutchinson declared, influenced "by the great reverence which they had to the King's judgment, and the testimony he gave them of facts in Scotland," there is at least no tittle of proof that such was the case. And they certainly removed from the margin in Exodus xxii. 18, a description of the doing of witches which, as Dr. Eadie justly says, would have been very acceptable to the British Solomon.

(ii.) The unfair influence of Calvinistic views is charged upon them in their version of the following passages.

α. Acts ii. 47, "And the Lord added to the Church daily *such as should be saved*" (τοὺς σωζομένους).

β. Hebrews vi. 4 ("For it is impossible for those who were once enlightened etc.), . . . *if they shall fall away* (καὶ παραπεσόντας) to renew them again unto repentance."

γ. Heb. x. 38, "Now the just shall live by faith; but if *any man* draw back (καὶ ἐὰν ὑποστείληται), my soul shall

[1] *Historical Essay on Witches.*

have no pleasure in him." (The *Italics*, which shew that "any man" is not in the Original, were not added till 1638.)

That these versions are positively wrong and misleading is admitted. In our Revised Version they are corrected and altered into "*those who were being saved*," "*and* then *fall away*," and "*if he shrink back*." The charge of Calvinistic bias may be strengthened, perhaps, by the unfaithful renderings admitted by the translators into the margin of Romans iii. 25 "*foreordained*" (for προέθετο), and v. 12 "*in whom*" (ἐφ' ᾧ). Yet two powerful considerations may be pleaded in their favour. One is that even in these renderings they have followed older authorities, and may even have been persuaded that they were not departing from the true sense of the Original. The other is that they have again and again resisted the very powerful influence exercised over them by Beza. The high reputation of Beza, both as a Greek scholar and a great theologian, could hardly fail to make itself felt among them. Yet how successfully they protected themselves from the gross instances of unfaithfulness into which his authority would have led them! If they had followed his guidance we should have been robbed of two doctrines which are unspeakably precious. One is the doctrine of Christ's descent into hell, which, in Acts ii. 31, becomes in the hands of Beza merely the leaving of "*his corpse in the grave*." The other is the doctrine of the universal offer of salvation. In 1 Timothy ii. 4, "who willeth *all men* should be saved," becomes with Beza "*quosvis homines*." In 1 Timothy iv. 10, "the *Saviour* of all men" is wantonly altered into "the *Preserver* of all men." In 1 Timothy ii. 6, "Christ Jesus gave Himself a ransom" not "for all" but "*pro quibusdam*." In Romans xi. 32, "God hath shut up all unto disobedience *that He might have mercy upon all*," becomes "that He might have mercy on all *these*." Now these can only be called wanton and perilous perversions of the Word of Life. They should be

as warning beacons to shew all later translators into what quagmires of human system and human falsity they may be led by the prepossessions of a dogmatic theology. But in each of these instances our translators refused to be made unfaithful by the Calvinistic bias. Even in James ii. 14 they were bold enough to render "Can faith save him," in spite of Beza's "fides *illa*," and in spite of the Greek article which has induced even our Revisers in this instance to accept Beza's rendering as correct.[1]

(iii.) The Translators of the Authorised Version have been accused of Anti-Romish bias specially in three or four instances.

α. They render 1 Corinthians xi. 27, "Shall eat this bread *and* drink this cup," where they unwarrantably substitute "*and*" for the "*or*" of the original.

β. In Galatians i. 18 they render *ἱστορῆσαι Πέτρον* by "to *see* Peter," instead of "*to visit*," where they seem purposely to have chosen too mild a word.

γ. In Matthew xix. 11, they render *οὐ πάντες χωροῦσι* by "all men *cannot* receive this saying," an inaccuracy for "all men *receive not*," though the fact that it is not indefensible is shewn by its acceptance by our Revisers.

δ. In Hebrews xiii. 4, they have "marriage is honourable in all," where others, and among them our Revisers, think that the ellipse should be supplied by *ἔστω* not *ἔστι*, and render it "Let marriage be honourable in all." If however there *was* an anti-Romish bias at work in these passages let it be again remembered to the credit of the Translators, (i.) that they removed many renderings which were known to give offence to Romanists, such as the word "images" for "idols" in 2 Cor. vi. 16; Eph. v. 5; 1 John v. 21; and (ii.) that in the case of renderings to which Romanists had objected, they put an end to all

[1] Other notable instances in which the Translators refused to follow Beza, are in his view of Rom. ii. 7, v. 16; 1 Cor. xiii. 2.

cavil by adopting the renderings of the Rhemish Version. In this way they freely admitted such terms as "*ordained.*" Acts xiv. 23 (omitting "*by election*"); "*confess,*" in James v. 16; "*tradition,*" in 2 Thess. ii. 15; "*regeneration,*" in Titus iii. 5, and "*church*" in Hebrews xii. 23.[1]

(iv.) A fourth set of translations have been attributed to *ecclesiastical* bias. Dr. Hill, in a famous Spital sermon, said that he had been told that the somewhat imperious Bancroft had ordered the Translators to make the Version "*speak prelatical language,*" and that Bancroft had himself altered the Version to this end in no less than fourteen places. If the charge be true, the blame of it must lie at the door of Bancroft, of whom it seems to have been the general opinion that "there was no withstanding him." It can hardly be doubted that the translators avoided the word "Bishops" in Acts xx. 28 and put "*overseers*" instead, because otherwise it would have been obvious that in the Apostolic age the words "presbyter" and "bishop" were practically identical. Nor is it easy to excuse the adoption of "*oversight*" in 1 Peter v. 2, for the "bishopric," of Acts i. 20. All that can be said is that Bancroft exercised a strong authority, and that the organization of the early Church was less clearly understood in King James's time than it has become in our own day.

I think that it will be clear, even from this rapid sketch that, in spite of small human infirmities, we have every reason to be proud of the fidelity of King James's translators. But, if so, we have yet deeper cause for thankfulness at the courageous fidelity displayed by our Revisers. Nothing could more admirably shew the confidence of faith than the fact that scholars of all denominations, and among them Unitarians and Romanists, were invited to sit on the Revision Committee. Dogmatic bias has not led them to retain the interpolation of the three

[1] See Westcott, *Hist. of the Eng. Bible*, p. 280.

witnesses in 1 John v. 7; or to pass over the later additions to the text of the Gospels in Mark xvi. or in John viii. or the marginal gloss of half a verse in Romans xiv. 6. Nor has it led them to spare the spurious baptismal confession of Acts viii. 37; nor the "fasting" of Matthew xvii. 21; Mark ix. 29; 1 Corinthians vii. 5; nor the inexcusable mistranslation of "*for Christ's sake,*" instead of "*in Christ,*" in Ephesians iv. 32; nor the angel that troubled the water in John v. 4. Nor have they preserved the Θεὸς for ὃς in 1 Timothy iii. 16; nor the familiar melody of the Angels' song in Luke ii. 14; nor even the century-honoured clauses and cadences of the Lord's prayer. Respecting some of these points—and many more instances might be cited in which they have sought truth only—the judgment of some may differ from them; but another generation will see that the Revisers were at least actuated by an heroic fidelity, and that though they clearly foresaw the outburst of objection—often bitter and petulant—which their labours would provoke, they were quite willing to be of those—

> "Whose sinewy wings by choice do fly
> In the fine mountain air of public obloquy."

Probably every scholar finds something here and there in the work of the Revisers which he would gladly have seen altered. There are one or two points in their work—though only one or two—which I for one deeply regret. But at present, while they are being assailed from so many quarters, and especially in such articles as those which have appeared in the *Quarterly Review*, I will confine myself to a very humble testimony to their courage and fidelity, and will only express for my own part that sense of profound gratitude to them for their patient, disinterested, and admirable labours which will I believe be expressed more emphatically and more unanimously by generations yet to come.

F. W. FARRAR.