

ARTICLE IV.

THE LATEST TRANSLATION OF THE BIBLE.

BY HENRY M. WHITNEY.

III. FROM ANOTHER STANDPOINT.

THE American Revision is manifestly a great improvement upon its English predecessor, especially in the Old Testament, but in each Testament in a multitude of points. We believe that it has at least destroyed the chance of the English Revision to become the recognized successor, in American respect and affection, of the version of 1611. British conservatism, the failure to be determined to be intelligible and interesting to the average man,—these have settled the case, and even the exclusion of the American text from the British islands will not save the day. The more the two versions are compared by the scholar or used by the masses, the more this conclusion will appear.

But will the American version be that successor? How good is the work in itself? The answer to these questions has already, in this discussion, been partly brought out. For further light it may be well to go around on the other side of the subject and to look at the American New Testament in comparison with a version that is antipodal to the English Revision in that it undertakes to be perfectly modern in form. "About twenty persons, members of various sections of the Christian church," issued, in 1898, the Gospels and the book of Acts under the name of the "Twentieth Century New Testament: a translation into modern English; Part I." The rest of the New Testament has since been brought out. The authors say: "The

translation now offered to the public had its origin in the discovery that the English of the Authorized Version (closely followed in that of the [English] Revised Version), though valued by the more educated reader for its antique charm, is in many passages difficult for those who are less educated, or is even unintelligible to them. The retention, too, of a form of English no longer in common use not only gives the impression that the contents of the Bible have little to do with the life of our own day, but also requires the expenditure of much time and labor on the part of those who wish to understand or explain it. . . . We believe that the New Testament will be better understood by modern readers if presented in a modern form. . . . Our constant effort . . . has been to exclude all words and phrases not used in current English. . . . In this translation not only every word, but also the emphasis placed upon every word, has been carefully weighed, and an effort made to give the exact force and meaning in modern English." The reception given to this version shows not only that its serious intent has been recognized, but that, in some degree at least, it meets a want that is felt; as a candidate for public acceptance, it is not to be despised.

We note, however, the following reasons why it cannot, as we believe, until radically reconstructed, make any approach to being regarded as the English New Testament of the future, the heir to the loyalty that the version of 1611 has largely lost:—

1. It carries plainness, homeliness, of diction to the degree of seeming affectation; as in Luke xiv. 17: "*Things* were quite ready"; xv. 2: "This man actually welcomes godless people, and *has meals* with them"; Acts viii. 29: "carriage" for the eunuch's "chariot."

2. It often seems to use trivial words by preference; as in Mark vi. 8: "stick" for "staff"; Acts iii. 8: "jumping" for "leaping"; "The *Doings* of the Apostles" for

"Acts": Wycliffe's word, "Deeds," would be better than "Doings."

3. It uses undignified ellipsis; as in Acts v. 25: "The men [whom] they had put in prison"; 2 Cor. ii. 11: "To prevent Satan [from] taking advantage of us."

4. It uses disputed or distinctly colloquial forms or expressions; as in Luke ix. 23, the "cleft infinitive": "To always go"; in Mark iii. 26, "split particles": "In opposition *to* and at variance *with* himself"; Romans i. 22: "They *claimed* [professed] to be wise"; Luke ii. 9: "They were *very* frightened."

5. *Per contra*, it sometimes uses stiff or stilted words or phrases; as in Acts v. 10: "Sapphira . . . *expired*"; Luke v. 32: "I have not come to *invite* the *pious*"; and, notably, Mark v. 30: "Jesus instantly became conscious [sensible?] that there had been a demand upon his powers."

This last is delightfully suggestive of the contribution by one Rodolphus Dickinson, seventy years ago, to the elevation of the diction of the Bible: he published a version of the New Testament, containing many such improvements as this: "Then his disciples approaching him said to him, Art thou conscious [aware?] that the Pharisees were offended when they heard this observation? But he answering said, Every plantation, which my father has not cultivated, shall be extirpated." Happily for the acceptance of the "Twentieth Century," its editors had more humor than Mr. Dickinson, and so made few sentences so bad as that in Mark v. 30. But, on the other hand, one cannot tell where, in a style set studiously at a very low pitch, a stilted sentence may suddenly appear. The Bible of 1611 is totally free from this fault. In the Bibles of 1885 and 1901 there are sentences that, in the effort to be exact, are stiff, as in Rev. xxii. 11, but we have yet to find one that is stilted. In Acts xiii. 50 the "Twentieth Century" comes too suggestively near to saying "men and ladies,"—

a combination that should be left to the "Imperial Dictionary"¹ and to the dialect of the feminized coeducational college.

6. It fails to maintain the real modern manner; as in Acts v. 28: "You *are wishing* to make us responsible."

7. It imports ideas into the text; as in Acts v. 20: "Tell the people all [that] *you* [Why "you" more than others?] have to say about the new Life"; Mark iv. 31: "By what story [parable] can we explain it? *Perhaps* by the growth of a mustard seed"; John iv. 50: "You *can* go"; xix. 24: "Do not let us tear it, but let us *draw* for it": they probably threw dice; Acts xii. 19: Herod "*cross-questioned* the Guard": it was not necessarily that, and it certainly was a good deal else.

8. It blunders in its English diction; as in Mark iii. 27: "he" refers to "no one"; v. 14: "herdsmen" of pigs; ix. 36: "Jesus . . . placed it in the middle[!] of them"; John xix. 24: "They shared my clothes *between* them": there were more than two soldiers; Rom. xii. 19: "Take revenge" for "Avenge"; Rev. xxii. 12: "Give *every one* just what *their* actions deserve."

9. It mistranslates; as in Mark iv. 4: "Seed fell *along* the path"; Acts ix. 1: "Saul, still *uttering* murderous threats": the sense of the original is deeper, as though "threatening and slaughter" were the vital breath that he drew *in* (*ἐνπνεῖον*); Rom. xv. 12: "scion" for "root," "stock"; Luke vii. 37: "A woman who was *leading a bad life*": there is no certainty that she was a "sinner" in that sense; John xx. 5: "Linen wrappings lying on the *ground*": it was doubtless a stone floor or table.

10. It laboriously and often injuriously avoids the words used in the versions of 1611 and 1885; as in "loaf" for "bread," "story" for "parable," "snake" for "serpent," "pigs" for "swine"; Matt. v. 5: "gentle" for "meek";

¹*Sandwich*, n., def. 2: "A man placed between two ladies."

vii. 3, 4: "splinter" for "mote": this is also a bad mis-translation; vi. 15: "rescue" for "deliver" (us from evil); vii. 13: "Go in by the *small* gate"; there are at least ten cases under 1-9. It is to be hoped that there is no worse case than in 1 Cor. xv. 33, where that fine epigram, so close to the original, "Evil communications [companionships?] corrupt good manners," has become "Good ways are spoiled by evil friends."

11. It overworks certain expressions; as, "for his part," and "indeed."

12. It is sometimes clumsy, or even incorrect, in structure; as in Mark iv. 14-20: the whole "story" of the sower; Rom. v. 20: "Only added" for "Added only"; 1 Cor. ii. 14: "Only to be understood" for "To be understood only."

And this suggests the fact that, in English usage, there has been a tightening of the lines in regard to *only* and *alone*. In the synonymy of the Century Dictionary we read: "In the Bible and earlier English *alone* is often used for the adverb *only*, but it is now becoming restricted to its own sense of solitary, unaccompanied by other persons or things; as, 'he went *alone*.'" Hence it is not now universally accepted English to say with Shakespeare (K. J. i. 1. 210): "Not *alone* in habit," or (J. C. iv. 3. 94), "Revenge yourselves *alone* on Cassius." Ps. lxxxiii. 18, which used to read: "Thou, whose name *alone* is Jehovah," has been changed in the two Revisions to "Thou *alone* whose name is Jehovah," which is certainly better, but not right. The versions of 1611, 1885, and 1901 agree in their rendering of the following verses,—Ps. cxxxvi. 4: "To him who *alone* doeth great wonders"; Luke v. 21: "Who can forgive sins but God *alone*?" vi. 4: "For the priests *alone*"; Matt. iv. 4: "Man shall not live by bread *alone*"; Acts xix. 26: "Not *alone* at Ephesus"; but is it overnice to think that they might be bettered in regard to the use

of *alone*? In Job ix. 8 the versions of 1611, 1885, and 1901, while differing in other respects, agree in this awkward and undesirable use of *alone*.¹ A good example of present usage, although unpleasantly redundant,² occurs three times in Job i. 15-17: "I *only* am left *alone* to bring thee word." As the American Revisers made a marked improvement by recognizing the distinction, now fully established, between *beside* and *besides*, so we should be glad if they had conformed to the movement for the "desynonymizing," as Coleridge would say, of *only* and *alone*.

In this connection we may note a bad change for the worse in the American Revision. In 1 Cor. xv. 19 we used to read: "If in this life *only* we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable." The English Revision gives the same form, except that "hope" becomes "hoped,"—a necessary change. The Americans say: "If we have *only* hoped in Christ in this life": do they really mean "only hoped"?—which makes little or no sense; or have they simply blundered, like the "Twentieth Century" men, by getting "only" into an improper place?

13. In the "Twentieth Century" the effects are sometimes ludicrous; as in Acts xxiv. 22: "*Colonel* Lysias"; Rev. v. 8: "The four *Creatures* and the twenty-four *Senators*."

Probably, however, the most serious indictments of this version would be these:—

¹ A. R.: "That *alone* stretcheth out the heavens"—meaning that it is *only* he that does or can. Austin Phelps says, in his "English Style": "*Alone* and *only* are not synonyms."

² Austin Phelps says again, "A good general rule in composition is to check one's pen in the writing of any phrase which seems to be redundant." There are too many such expressions in the versions of the Bible; it is a part of the ancientness of their form. The worst case that we have noticed as left uncorrected in both Revisions is in John xx. 14: Mary "turned herself back,"—of which two-thirds could be spared with profit: she "turned and beheld." In 2 Cor. viii. 2 "how that" is also both awkward and redundant, and should not have been retained.

14. That, in many places, in spite of the disclaimer in the preface, the translation is too free, not more than a paraphrase. It is hard to account for some of these.

15. That there seems sometimes to be an intentional avoidance of music in the style. Whether intentionally or not, there is very little agreeable rhythm, from the beginning to the end of the work.

When the question of rhythm is raised, it is natural to compare the "Twentieth Century" with other versions in the rendering of those passages that, by the perfection of their rhythm and especially of their cadence, not only have long been reckoned among the masterpieces of English expression, but have become inexpressibly dear to the heart of the church. In the forefront of these is, of course, the lesson of the lilies (Matt. vi. 28 f.): "And why take ye thought for raiment? Consider the lilies of the field, how they grow; they toil not, neither do they spin: and yet I say unto you, That even Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these. Wherefore, if God so clothe the grass of the field, which to day is, and to morrow is cast into the oven, shall he not much more clothe you, O ye of little faith?" This is substantially the form in the two Revisions, with the necessary change of "take ye thought" to "are ye anxious," and the unnecessary insertion of "doth" before "so clothe." In the "Twentieth Century" there is a tone suggesting that the translators felt that they must retain what they could of the beauty of the form, and they did better than was usual with them, but they did not do well: "What use either is there in being anxious about clothing? Mark the wild lilies, how they grow! They neither toil nor spin; yet, I tell you, even Solomon in all his grandeur was not robed like one of them. If, then, God clothes in this way the very wild-flowers, which are living to-day, and will be used for the

oven to-morrow, will he not much more do the same for you, you who have so little faith?"

We wonder what they would have done with the twenty-third psalm, or with Hooker's great peal of organ-music concerning law.

16. That there seems to be, almost constantly, an intentional selection of the less noble expression, the meaner diction, even sometimes the colloquial word: Peter's mother-in-law was "*down* [why not *sick*?] with a fever"; she "got well"; in Acts xxiv. 27 Felix wished "to curry favour." In 1 Cor. xv. 40 the "glory" of the stars is reduced to "beauty": they might at least have made it "splendor," but people of humble intelligence know the word "glory" quite as well as they know "beauty"; and "glory" is a correct translation, while "beauty" is not. We have previously noted that in the beatitudes *μακάριοι*, a singularly lofty word, is not rendered by "blessed," which is an admirable fit, but by "happy," which is lower—and different. Hence we are obliged to say that the work in certain parts,—especially in the Gospels, the part most likely to be read,—does not give the impression of having been made by men having breadth or, especially, elevation of diction, or even perception of the relative dignity of words; it is what might have been expected from one having only a go-afoot style. Did the makers of this version fail to realize that uneducated people recognize, understand, and enjoy noble words, and wish that they knew how to use them? Did they fail to realize that, when an educated man "talks down" to the level of the uneducated, in order to please them, they are not pleased? They recognize the condescension, and they are quick to resent it.

All these things being true, there would seem to be very little reason to read or study this version of the New Testament; it must have been a failure from the start. On

the contrary, it has been the object of a great deal of interest; it has been heard from the pulpit with attention and respect; it has been found to be full of suggestiveness; and we wish that every translator of the New Testament, in either the English or the American Company, could have read it through carefully before entering upon his work, and then had studied its renderings at every stage of his own translation. Our reasons for so wishing are especially these:—

1. Its authors, with all their crudenesses, were thoroughly in earnest to be understood. Hence they had the courage to strike straight for the idea all the time, refusing to be literal or even to be dignified when they thought that literalness or dignity would hinder the idea in getting home to the mind. We have already implied that just this would not do for one's best-beloved Bible, but it is an excellent thing in a Bible that one uses as a cross-light upon the Bible of his heart. The French Bible lacks dignity, but it is suggestive. A man should read the Bible, for suggestion, in as many languages as he can at all understand, and especially in the English language in its earlier stages and in any of its dialects; the "Twentieth Century" is in a sort of dialect, a brawny, colloquial dialect, that by its very novelty and its earnestness is full of stimulus to comprehension and to thought.

We put a few examples in parallel columns with the American Revision, giving first several from the Epistle to the Romans; the second column is from the "Twentieth Century":—

i. 11, 12: I long to see you that I may impart unto you some spiritual gift, to the end [that] ye may be established; that is, that I with you may be comforted in you, each of us by the other's faith, both yours and mine.

I am longing to see you, in order to impart to you some spiritual gift and so give you fresh strength—in other words, that both you and I may find encouragement in each other's faith.

The first carries literalness to such a degree as to bury the idea under words. The second, although not perfect, is the clearer, and it has an especial merit in bringing out the idea of courage, which is believed to lie in *παρακαλεῖν* and its derivatives, rendered in previous versions by softer words, such as "comfort," "consolation," and "comforter."

iii. 16: Destruction and misery Distress and trouble dog their
are in their ways. steps.

The second is too loose a rendering, but it is nearer to the idea, which is that of lying in wait in their paths.

vii. 22: I delight in the law of At heart I delight in the Law of
God after the inward man. God.

viii. 3, 10, 24, 33: What the law What Law could not do, in so
could not do, in that it was weak far as our earthly nature weakened
through the flesh, God, sending its action, God *did*, by sending his
his own Son in the likeness of sin- own Son, with a nature like our
ful flesh and for sin, condemned sinful nature, to atone for sin. He
sin in the flesh. doomed sin in that earthly nature.

The word "did" and other changes have always been needed in this verse.

If Christ is in you, the body is If Christ is within you, then,
dead because of sin; but the spirit *though* the body is dead as a con-
is life because of righteousness. sequence of sin, the spirit is full of
Life as a consequence of righteous-
ness.

Here, by resolution of the hendiadys, is a brilliant bringing out of a meaning that before was completely hid; Christ's being in them had nothing to do with the death of the body through sin. The mischief made by the semicolon in the first column may well be noticed: it completely severs the connection between "If Christ is in you" and the only clause upon which this *if*-clause bears.

In hope were we saved: but hope In this hope we were saved. But
that is seen is not hope. hope is hope no longer when the
thing hoped for is before our eyes.

The first has too much of the Hebrew extremeness of ellipsis.

It is God that justifieth.

God acquits them.

xi. 16: If the firstfruit is holy, so is the lump.

If the first handful of dough is holy, so is the whole mass.

xi. 20: Be not high-minded, but fear.

Do not think too highly of yourselves, but take warning.

“High-minded” is not the right word here, as it is now always used in a good sense.

xi. 29: The gifts and the calling of God are not repented of.

God never regrets his gifts or his Call.

The second is too loose, but is more likely to be felt and dwelt upon, on account of its epigrammatic point.

xii. 17: Take thought for things honorable in the sight of all men.

Aim at doing what all men will recognize as honourable.

xiii. 6: For for this cause ye pay tribute also; for they are ministers of God's service, attending continually upon this very thing.

This, too, is the reason for your paying taxes; for the officials are God's officers, devoting themselves to this special work.

Besides the great improvement in clearness in the second form, the opening “for for” in the first form is a glaring defect in euphony, and should have been removed in each of the Revisions.

xiii. 14: Put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ, and make no provision for the flesh, to fulfil the lusts thereof.

Arm yourselves with the spirit of the Lord Jesus Christ, and spend no thought on your earthly nature and the gratification of its cravings.

It is a fine discovery that “putting on” means arming oneself; and “cravings” is much better than “lusts.”

xv. 2: Let each one of us please his neighbor for that which is good, unto edifying.

Let us each try to please his neighbour for his neighbour's good, to help in the building up of his character.

“Edifying” suppresses the figure; those who first heard this letter thought immediately of the building of a house.

xv. 31: That I may be delivered from them that are disobedient in Judæa.

That I may be rescued from those in Judæa who reject the Faith.

Here is the old question whether ἀπειθέω and ἀπειθήσῃς refer to unbelief, disobedience, or both. Since one must be

chosen, we hold that in this case "reject the Faith" is better, if only because it is the more inclusive.

xvi. 4: Who for my life laid down their own necks. Who risked their own lives to save mine.

It is hard, not to say ludicrous, to imagine the act of laying down one's neck; also, the expression carries, incorrectly, the idea of laying down life.

Much of the Epistle to the Romans, even in the American Revision, is hopelessly dark to the average man, and indeed to many that are above the average; we have heard college-trained men confess their inability to get much out of it, even by study. For this reason the utmost care should be given to the securing of clearness and simplicity in the English form. Psychologically speaking, the mind of the reader, and especially of the hearer, is inhibited from attending at once to the two tasks of making out the sense of ancient, Hebraized English, however beautiful, and of following the logic which in Romans is extremely close. We hold that in the "Twentieth Century" the treatment of the whole epistle is peculiarly illuminative and suggestive,—far more so than in any other English version that we know. For a good illustrative chapter the reader may well choose the seventh.

There is an almost equal amount of help in First Corinthians. We give a few passages, prefacing them with a verse (vii. 16) in which English idiom requires the adding of two *nots* to all the versions since 1557: "How knowest thou, O wife, whether thou shalt [not] save thy husband? or how knowest thou, O husband, whether thou shalt [not] save thy wife?" Tyndale would have been, for this, a safer guide.

vii. 21: Wast thou called being a bond-servant? care not for it: nay, even if thou canst become free, use it rather.

Were you a slave at the time when you were called? Do not let that trouble you. No, prefer to make use of that position even if you are able to gain your freedom.

The first form has a particularly blind and futile ending.

ix. 6: Or I only and Barnabas, have we not a right to forbear working?	Or is it only Barnabas and I who have no right to give up manual labor?
--	---

The second is a great improvement in clearness over all other versions.

x. 1: I would not, brethren, have you ignorant, that our fathers . . . all passed through the sea.	I want you to recollect . . .
--	-------------------------------

Of course they were not ignorant: it is Paul's figurative way of saying: "Do not forget."

x. 15, 16: I speak as to wise men. The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not a communion of the blood of Christ?	I speak to you as sensible men. In the cup of Blessing which we bless, is there not fellowship through sharing in the body of Christ?
---	---

This raises the old question of the direction of the *κοινωνία*, whether toward God, or man, or both. The "Twentieth Century," as usual, differs from the older rendering, putting the manward relation to the front.

xi, 16, 17, 27, 30: If any man <i>seemeth</i> to be contentious, we have no such custom, neither the churches of God.	If, however, any one still <i>thinks</i> it right to contest the point—well, we have no such custom, nor <i>have</i> the Churches of God.
--	--

Here is an excellent use of the other sense of *δοκεῖ*. The repetition of "have" is a gain.

Ye come together not for the bet- ter but for the worse.	Your meetings do more harm than good.
Whosoever shall eat the bread or drink the cup of the Lord in an unworthy <i>manner</i> .	Whoever in an unworthy <i>spirit</i> eats the bread . . .

It is not to be supposed that the American Revisers meant "manner" as opposed to "spirit"; it is unfortunate that they said it. "Unworthily," the word used in 1611 and 1885, would have been better than "manner."

For this cause many among you are weak and sickly, and not a few sleep.	This is why so many among you . . . are falling asleep.
---	--

Here is raised another old question, the exact sense of *κοιμῶμαι*,—whether in a given case it is “sleeping” or “falling asleep.” It can never be settled, except possibly sometimes by the context; in unsettled cases one sense must be taken, even if arbitrarily, for the text, and the other should appear in the margin; the “Twentieth Century” men chose the livelier form.

xv. 3: I delivered unto you first of all that which also I received.	In the forefront of my teaching I gave you the account which I had myself received.
--	---

Here is time *versus* prominence, each being a possible translation; we prefer the second.

xvi. 18: Acknowledge ye therefore them that are such.	Cultivate friendships with such men as these.
---	---

Would this be a still better translation?—“Be quick to recognize such men as these.” The Greek verb—as, indeed, is true of “recognize”—has considerable range of meaning. The reading of the American Bible Union¹ is: “Recognize those who are such.”

We give a few passages also from other places, especially from the Acts:—

xvi. 19: The churches of Asia.	The churches in Roman Asia.
2 Cor. xi. 4: If he that cometh preacheth another Jesus whom we did not preach, . . . ye do well to bear with him.	If some new-comer is proclaiming a Jesus other than the one whom we proclaimed, . . . you are marvelously tolerant!

In this difficult passage, with its doubtful text, whatever Paul meant, we do not believe the Americans have hit it; their form has not a Pauline tone, and it does not go with the context. But the second sounds very much like Paul:

¹This society issued a revised New Testament in 1865; later, their version was somewhat radically remade by Drs. Hovey, Broadus, and Weston. Although much in bondage to previous versions, and to the irregular Hellenistic tenses, the second form is relatively an excellent work. It is decidedly modern in form,—most notably, perhaps, in its discarding of *-eth* for *-s* in the verb, as in “calls” for “calleth,” “sends” for “sendeth.”

it is a fair rendering of what may be the original text. "New-comer" is a happy choice for $\delta \epsilon\rho\chi\acute{o}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$.

Acts iii. 22: A prophet shall the Lord God raise up . . . like unto me. The Lord your God will raise up . . . a Prophet as he did me.

The first is virtually a mistranslation; the second is exact. The American Bible Union has: "A prophet will the Lord your God raise up, . . . as he did me." It is hard to see how the two Revisions failed to make this correction.

xiv. 8-10: At Lystra there sat a certain man, impotent in his feet. . . . The same heard Paul speaking: who, fastening his eyes upon him, and seeing that he had faith to be made whole, said with a loud voice, Stand upright on thy feet. And he leaped up and walked. There used to sit in the streets of Lystra a man who had no power in his feet. . . . This man was listening to Paul speaking, when Paul, fixing his eyes on him, and seeing that he had faith to be healed, said loudly: "Stand up on your feet." The man jumped up, and began walking about.

"Used to sit" is better than "sat," as the verb is in the imperfect; it is a correct rendering, and so would be "was sitting": Paul was speaking, and the man "was sitting" at one side, where he could hear. "Was listening" is right, and "heard" is wrong. "Upright" should be brought to the end of its sentence: "Stand on thy feet, upright"; the word came to the man like an electric shock, and brought him with a leap to his feet. "Began walking about" is better than "walked," for this verb also is in the imperfect; it represents a considerable number of New Testament imperfects for which "began to" is a proper and almost the necessary expression. The second rendering of this passage, with all its obvious defects, has thus the merit of getting decidedly nearer to the sense, besides making a livelier picture.

xv. 10: Wilt thou not cease to pervert the right ways of the Lord? Will you never cease *diverting* the *straight* paths of the Lord?

The majority of the versions and of the authorities favor "straight"; diverting paths is much more obviously figur-

ative and therefore much more intelligible than perverting ways. "Pervert" here is a marked example of the undue influence of the Latinisms of the earlier versions.

Luke xxiv. 23: Saying that they had *also* seen a vision of angels. Told us that they had *actually* seen a vision of angels.

"Actually" is founded on the other sense of *καί*, that of "even": there are a good many places where "even" might well be given the preference, and certainly ought at least to appear in the margin; as in Acts x. 45; xi. 18: "*Even* to the gentiles."

In this connection we may say that we wish that all the versions had given more recognition to the possibility of rendering *οὐδέ* by "not even." There is one place where it would have brought out a particularly felicitous sense (Matt. vi. 15): "If ye forgive not men their trespasses, *not even* your Father will forgive your trespasses." The "Twentieth Century" might have been expected to pick up this.

John v. 39: *These* are they which bear witness of me. *It* is those very Scriptures that bear testimony to me.

The second is good idiom; the first is not.

xxi. 15: Lovest thou me more than these? Are you more devoted to me than the others are?

The first is often misunderstood as meaning: Do you love me more than you love these, your fellow-disciples? The second cannot be misunderstood.

Heb. xii. 17: [Esau] found no place for a change of mind in his father. He never found an opportunity for repairing his error.

The first is a startling change from the familiar earlier form, but it cannot be gainsaid as at least a possibility; nor can the second, with its interesting treatment of repentance as conduct.

John x. 30: I and the Father are one. The Father and I are one.

Here is, we think, the first recognition, in an English New Testament, of the fact that the Saviour is made to appear in a wrong light if the order of English usage is not followed. Dr. Weston well says: "The law which made Christ say 'I and my Father' makes me translate those words 'My Father and I.' What is forbidden in Greek and Latin is imperative in English." We add that it is one of the uncertainties of the Bible that $\delta\ \pi\alpha\tau\epsilon\rho\varsigma$ may be either "the Father" or "my Father."

In this connection the student will do well to look up a matter in which Hebrew idiom has, at many points, put permanent uncertainty into the New Testament text. It is a familiar fact that in Hebrew a noun modified by another noun in the "construct"-relation cannot have an article with it: "a son of God" and "the son of God" would therefore be the same in Hebrew, and, by Hebraism, might be the same in New Testament Greek. In Matt. iv. 3 the American Revision and the "Twentieth Century" make Satan call Christ "*the* Son of God"; in xxvii. 54 the former makes the centurion and the multitude call him "the Son," with "a son" in the margin; the latter makes them call him "a son"; the American Bible Union, by intention, evades the question between "a" and "the" by making the expression, in each place, "God's Son." In such cases a statement of the uncertainty or an evasion is the only possible way.

"Questioning," in the older versions, is an infelicitous word, for which the "Twentieth Century" substitutes "discussion" (as in Acts xv. 2); "discussion" is better.

Similarly "sect" is happily changed to "party" (xv. 5).

In Acts xv. 13 is a signal case of one who "answered" when no one had asked: this use of "answered" is frequent in the older versions, especially with reference to Christ. It has always been a blemish, and should have been removed; the "Twentieth Century" steadily avoids

it; in the present case we read that James "addressed the meeting."

In the parable of the ten virgins (Matt. xxv. 5) is an interesting case in which both companies of New Testament Revisers failed to realize the need of a change, leaving the credit of the correction to be picked up by the men of the "Twentieth Century." Said Wycliffe: "Whilis the hose-bonde tariede, alle thei *nappiden* and slepten"; that was right, for "nappen" then meant "to be drowsy." Tyndale started the use of "slumbered": "Whyll the brydgrome taried, all *slombred* and slepte"; that also was right in its time. The sense of "slumber" then and long after may be inferred from the following quotation, to which many others might be added:

"*Corb.* Does he sleep well?

"*Mosca.* No wink, sir, all this night,
Nor yesterday; but *slumbers.*"

(Ben Jonson, *Volpone*, i. 1.)

That is, "slumber" was drowsiness, and that is the meaning of the Greek in Matt. xxv. 5, and of the corresponding Hebrew, *yanum*, in Ps. cxxi. 3, 4. The dictionaries, with their customary slowness to recognize the death of a word or of a particular sense of a word, still retain this definition, but we have asked many people how they understood *slumber* in the parable, and have yet to find one, not acquainted with the original, who had caught the idea. To almost every one *slumber* is now either a quiet or a heavy sleep; so that, to the multitude, the passage practically means, "They slept and they slept." Obviously, it is high time to change the word in the parable. The "x virgins," as Tyndale called them, grew sleepy with waiting; they "nappiden" first, but at last fell asleep. By the Revisions, unhappily, they "slumbered and slept." By the "Twentieth Century," "they all became drowsy, and went to sleep." This is one of a good many cases of excellent,

and sometimes superior, alertness to the fact that the old word, the word of 1611, will no longer serve, because it no longer fits.

In this connection we venture to raise a question about the word "virgin" in this parable and elsewhere in the Bible. Is it understood? It was once a synonym for "maiden," but is it so now? To us it suggests rather a woman set apart religiously to maidenhood, as with the vestal virgins; and this is not at all meant in the parable. It must have been a sense of this that led the "Twentieth Century" men to use the word "bridesmaids" here; these maidens were the bridesmaids of the Saviour's time, if not of ours. Our ideas would soon adapt themselves to either "bridesmaids" or "maidens," and it would then seem right. At any rate, we regret the change, in Ps. cxlviii. 12, by which that beautiful expression, "young men and maidens," has become (A.R.) "young men and virgins." "Maiden" is a stately and beautiful word.

There is a curious case of inversion of rendering, between the American Revision and the "Twentieth Century," in Rom. xvi. 18, 19:—

<p>They beguile the hearts of the <i>innocent</i> (<i>ἀκάκους</i>). . . . I would have you <i>simple</i> (<i>ἀκερалоῦς</i>) unto that which is evil.</p>	<p>They deceive <i>simple-minded</i> peo- ple. . . . I want you to be . . . <i>in-</i> <i>nocent</i> of all that is bad.</p>
--	--

The "Twentieth Century" seems to have in each case the better sense. For *ἀκάκους* we may compare the LXX, Prov. xiv. 15: "Ἀκακος πιστεύει παντὶ λόγῳ, and for *ἀκερалоῦς* Matt. x. 16.

In one respect the "Twentieth Century" harks back to the infelicities of the past. In Acts xiii. 7 Sergius Paulus used to be a "deputy"; in the Revisions he is a "proconsul," and that is just what he was; in the "Twentieth Century" he is a "governor." It is a pity to revert to indefinite names, when the definite names are known. Sergius

Paulus, Gallio (xviii. 12), and the people in xix. 38 (A.R., not E.R.) were proconsuls, and they should be known by their name. It is a mistake to think that the plain people to whom the "Twentieth Century" is addressed are afraid of grand or specific titles; in their lodges and granges they get up grand names for themselves; and, besides, they are fond of facts, and they want to know just what offices the Bible-persons held. They would like to hear, by text or by margin, in Luke ii. 2, that, in strictness, Quirinius (A.V., "Cyrenius") was a *proprætor*, and, in various places, that "procurator" was the style of Pilate, and Festus, and Felix.

The reading of Acts xvii. reminds us that it is interesting to trace the record of a group of errors that, like Charles II., have been "an unconscionable time in dying," but, unlike him, have still a little life remaining. On the Areopagus Paul was face to face with an intensely critical and supercilious audience, an audience that in setting him up to speak had been prompted only by an idle curiosity: "What would this babbler say?" But to Paul the chief thing was that, in the very center of the æsthetic and intellectual world, they had given him a chance to testify for Christ. Like Stephen before the Sanhedrin, like Paul himself at that less difficult time in the Pisidian Antioch,¹ he must begin with suavity and proceed with the utmost tact, or his chance would be gone: indeed, it vanished the instant he spoke of the resurrection of the dead. Every practiced orator knows that, in such a case, the prime endeavor should be to make the hearer feel that he and the speaker are on common ground. Paul knew this, and, with the instinct of one who is an orator by nature as well as by breeding, he began with consummate skill. He had noticed the immense number of their "objects of reverence,"—altars, votive offerings, and the like; he said so,

¹ Acts xiii. 16 f.

and implied that he thought that these things were due to a feeling that was right. One of the altars, he said, had an inscription that pointed to his theme: it was dedicated "to the unknown god": this God he, Paul, was able to make known. It is impossible to imagine a way in which, while yielding no jot of his own convictions, he could have been more skillful to attract the interest and win the regard of his hearers. Every translator might well feel spurred to equal with the skill of his rendering the skill of the original words.

But what do we find? Wycliffe puts it (xvii. 22): "Men of Athenys, bi alle thingis Y se you as *veyn worschippers*." If Paul had said the Greek equivalent of that, he would not have been allowed to say any more. Tyndale puts it: "I perceave that in all thynges ye are somewhat *supersticious*"; but that also would have put a summary end to his speech. To be brief, it is curious how general has been this tactless slur. It is found in some form in all the texts of the "English Hexapla" and in the Douay version; in a handful of versions in the languages of Continental Europe we find but one that credits the Apostle with the tact or the courtesy to say a civil word at the start.¹ And there are a good many authors who say that Paul told the Athenians that they were given to worshipping demons! Yet all the while the Greek word has plain-

¹ E.g.: "allzu abergläubig," "trop dévots," "dévots jusqu'à l'excès," "mas supersticiosos," "demasidamente religiosos," "troppo religiosi," "omgån med wantro." The one exception is the Danish version, which holds a very high rank for its possession of the qualities that a translation of the Bible should have; its rendering is: "Ivrige for Gudsdyrkelsen."

It is refreshing to find also the simplicity and the exactness with which Weizsäcker puts it: "Ihr Männer von Athen, ich finde euch durchweg sehr religiös. Denn da ich herumgieng und mir eure Heiligtümer betrachtete, fand ich auch einen Altar mit der Inschrift: einem unbekanntem Gott. Nun, was ihr ohne es zu kennen verehrt, das verkündige ich euch."

ly meant, "more disposed [than most people] to reverence divinities"!—an assertion with which the Athenians who heard him were doubtless pleased.¹

But this is not all. In the next verse Wycliffe makes Paul say: "For I passide and siy youre *maumetis*," that is, idols: the word is founded on the name of Mohammed, under the notion that Mohammed taught idolatry; it is a particularly insulting word. Except that the Douay translators were misled, like Wycliffe, by the Vulgate, the other versions have kept out of this mistake. The men of 1611 wrote "devotions," but that was simply an error, not an imputation upon the character of the Apostle as a gentleman.

But, just beyond, as though there had not been blunders enough, Tyndale started an infelicity that Wycliffe and the Douay escaped: "Whom ye then *ignorantly* worship, hym shewe I unto you,"—a form that also would have put an immediate end to the speech. This third breach of both tact and courtesy has had an even more persistent life than the first: the version of 1885 says: "Ye are somewhat superstitious [margin, 'somewhat religious': how thoroughly 'caddish' that sounds!]. . . . What therefore ye worship in ignorance. . . ." The version of 1901 says: "Ye are very religious [margin, 'somewhat superstitious']. . . . What therefore ye worship in ignorance. . . ." The Conybeare-and-Howson version is perfectly courteous, and it has this footnote: "The mistranslation . . . in the Authorized Version is much to be regretted, because it entirely destroys the graceful courtesy of St. Paul's opening address, and represents him as beginning his speech by offending his audience." The present point is that the Americans should not have admitted "somewhat superstitious" even into the margin, nor "worship in ignorance" into the text; and it is also that the "Twentieth Century"

¹In this connection see Bloomfield, Albert Barnes, and many others.

is, so far as we happen to know, the only full English version of the New Testament that admits nothing untactful or discourteous into its rendering of the Apostle's speech. This is the "Twentieth Century" form: "Men of Athens, on every hand I see signs of your being very religious. Indeed as I was going about and looking at the objects that you worship, I observed an altar on which the dedication was inscribed 'TO AN UNKNOWN GOD.' What then you are 'worshipping without knowledge, is what I am now preaching to you." The last sentence is stiff, and "preaching" would not have been a wise word before that audience, but the form contains nothing that an Athenian would have considered an affront.

We have given much space to this matter, because it remarkably illustrates the slowness of even the most obviously needed reform in the rendering of the Bible into English. The passage is one of the jewels of the Scripture, and its luster should not have been kept so persistently dimmed. It seems, however, to have been easy to secure a vote to ruin the Lord's prayer.

There has been similar slowness with Acts ix. 36. There is no point, for the English reader, in saying: "Tabitha, which by interpretation is called Dorcas." If we are to think the words as Theophilus thought them, we must be told in the text that "Tabitha" means "gazelle." The "Twentieth Century" did not try to bring this out.¹

In John xiii. 3 it went beyond previous versions by making an attempt to bring out the sense by using dashes, but dashes are not enough. We give its rendering, but add the one necessary word: "At supper, Jesus—[although] knowing that the Father had put everything into his hands, and that he had come from God, and was returning to God—got up from his place and [assumed a menial garb and did for his disciples menial work]." "Al-

¹ Cf. Weizsäcker: "Tabitha, das heisst übersetzt Reh."

though" is needed, for it is only by very rare exception that any one realizes that the sense is just what it is. The common thought—when there is any thought—is that Jesus washed his disciples' feet *because*, not *although*, he knew his own rank as the Son of God.

This comparison and comment might be continued almost indefinitely, but the passages that we have quoted are representative; they are sufficient to prove and to emphasize the fact that the makers of the "Twentieth Century," with all their ineptitudes, tried with earnestness and, in many places, with great success to reach the central ideas of the original and to express them with living words. In this respect the work is not only an excellent commentary upon previous versions, but one of the very best helps for the further revision that the New Testament imperatively needs.

In this connection it is well to be reminded of a trend in American character, having very close relation to the question whether the Bible shall be translated into language that is easily understood by the average man. No people in the world are quicker than Americans at what is popularly known as "catching on"; they sense a situation, they get the idea, as if by an intuition; but, on the other hand, they are equally ready to be impatient and to lose interest if they cannot get promptly into the thought. They need to be caught and held from the outset, if they are to be caught and held at all. In America the proportion of those who will stay to dig out buried meanings is no longer large, and it is constantly growing less.

And, again, people do not any longer come to the Bible,—or, rather, the Bible does not find them,—profoundly impressed with the conviction that they must, for their souls' welfare, make out what the Bible means: as with Chaucer's physician, but for a different reason, their "studie is but litel on the Bible"; they have not been trained to

render the sacred diction—shall we say “dialect”?—into the vernacular. The reasons intensify every year for getting the Bible into the words that the masses understand at once. An English Bible constructed upon the idea of simply transferring the words and leaving the commentator to translate them might in these days almost as well be left unmade.

This discussion has, necessarily, been taken up mainly with the question of diction. A few other points need attention, but in much briefer space.

2. We name three passages, five sentences, in which the “*Twentieth Century*” furnishes us grammar that is a relief as compared with the older forms.

Mark xii. 33: To love his [whose? there is no antecedent] neighbor as himself [whom?] is much more than all whole burnt offerings and sacrifices.

To “love one’s neighbour as if he were one’s self” is far beyond all “burnt offerings and sacrifices.”

Rom. xiii. 9-11: For this [there is no government for “this”] thou shalt not [four commandments given], and if there be any other commandment, it is summed up in this word, namely, Love worketh no ill to his [whose?] neighbor. . . And this [what? there is no government for “this”], knowing [who knew?] that already it is time for you to awake out of sleep.

The commandments [the four named] and any other that there is, are all summed up in the words—“Thou shalt love thy neighbour as if he were thyself.” Love never wrongs a neighbour. Therefore Love fully satisfies the Law. What I have said is the more urgent because you know the crisis we have reached, for the time has already come for you to rouse yourselves from sleep.

I Cor. vii. 34: So also the woman that is unmarried and the virgin [how many?] is careful for the things of the Lord.

Again, unmarried women, whether old or young, care for the Master’s interests.

The grammar or the rhetoric of the left column is defective, uncouth, in each of the five verses; in the right column the grammar and the rhetoric are faultless, except, perhaps, for the informality of the omission of “that” after “crisis.” English rules need not have been violated

in any one of these cases. We have said that the style of the English Bible should be perfect, and grammar is now an essential element of style. The American New Testament Committee seem to have made the same mistake in regard to the grammar as in regard to the tenses,—that of a slavish adherence to the forms of the Greek.

3. The matter of the "Twentieth Century" has an open aspect on the page. We have already dwelt on this fact.

4. It copies the Westcott-and-Hort Greek Testament in noting quotations from the Old Testament by putting them in special type. This is a very desirable thing. The working of it out is well known to be a very difficult matter, on account of the freedom with which the Old Testament is treated, the quotations being sometimes a mosaic and sometimes an adaptation and sometimes the enlargement of a hint;¹ but, with the line drawn somewhere, the passages that are founded on the Old Testament should by all means be given some distinctive and conspicuous mark. In the "Twentieth Century" these quotations are put in italics; in all other versions they are not even in quotation-marks; in the Westcott-and-Hort text they are in uncial type.

5. We name one other, a very significant, point. The "Twentieth Century" men say in their preface: "When the Revised Version of 1881 was in progress, it was proposed . . . that it should first appear in a Tentative Edition, as had been the case with the German Revised Bible, so that it might 'circulate experimentally for two or three years.' The difficulties of the plan thus proposed appeared to the English Revisers to be insurmountable. We, however, have adopted it, and issue this Edition as a Tentative Edition only." The Americans may have entertained a similar plan, and have come to the same result as

¹ E.g., Matt. ii. 23: "He shall be called a Nazarene."

did the English Committee: publishers have to be reckoned with in such a matter. We could wish that the Americans had been both minded and able to bring out their work first in a tentative way. Suggestions by others, now left unspoken as being too late, would then have come in freely; the sentiment of the public would have been inquired into, whereas now the Committee must shrink from knowing of unfavorable judgments upon points of any moment,—except where the suggestions can be used by making small changes in the plates. The Committee of course would have bowed to the deliberate judgment of a considerable majority of those who have a right to be heard.

We hold that the Old Testament is now much nearer than the New Testament to such final form as a translation of the Bible can ever attain, but there are at least two general points as to which we should have liked to have the Committee hear not only from Christian people but from Jews as well,—for why should not a Jew accept a finished and masterly work at their hands? One of these is their substitution of "Jehovah" for "LORD": the report on this will be a matter of time; the other is as to the paragraphing: this, we believe, is settled already: the number of paragraphs should be trebled at least.

In the New Testament there are six things that imperatively need to be done. We have named them already: *καί* must be rendered "but" whenever that will give a better sense; *οὐν* must be rendered "then" in a large proportion of the cases, presumably in those in which it was so rendered in 1611; the number of paragraphs must be largely increased; the tenses must be thoroughly revised with a view to English idiom and to English sense; the carelessness of the original as to grammar must be corrected so as to bring the structure within English rules and to make it acceptable to the best English taste; and the

whole vocabulary must be re-studied, especially in the light of the best examples, that it may be kept from being deceptive by an illusory clearness or blind by the use of words that no longer fit. Through all, not the scholar, not the man trained in the Bible, but the man of humble understanding, the man who has to have things made very plain to him, the man who will neither read nor listen unless he can easily catch the sense,—in short, the child in years or intelligence or purpose or piety,—must be the object of chief concern. That was certainly the mind of Paul: "I had rather speak five words with my understanding, that I may instruct others also, than ten thousand words in a tongue."

We remember, from childhood, a picture of learned and venerable men, gathered about a table, translating the Bible into Arabic. It was said of them that they worked with the utmost care to produce a version as pure and as strong as the very highest Arabic classics; for, so far as their book fell short of those standards, it would be rejected with contempt, but, if it could be put upon the highest plane, it would have free course and be glorified among untold millions throughout half of Africa to the Atlantic, and throughout the Turkish empire, and beyond. Having this acceptance, it would become a great evangelizing force. The spiritual destiny of the great Arabic-speaking races turned upon the success of their task. The vision of such an Arabic Bible and of such a potency embodied in it must have been constantly before that group of translators, and must have constantly inspired their work.

But, if this was true, what shall we say of the importance of a consummate translation of the Bible into our English speech, of the toil with which it may well be striven for, of the inspiration that the vision of it should give to those who attempt the task? The number of those

now using the English language is far beyond that of the peoples who speak the tongue of Mohammed, and, more important yet, the great future is theirs. Every gain in the worldwide spread of our language is an advance into wider opportunity for the English Bible, and especially for that perfect Bible which is the ideal of the translator's art. And just in proportion to its perfection will be its appeal to the intelligence, to the affections, and to the loyalty of men.

The dear old version of our childhood had, in its day, because of its grandeur and its beauty, a wonderful spell for the heart; it still rings in the heart like the peal of remembered bells. In the strength of it men bore hardness, and resisted temptation, fighting the good fight, and then going undismayed to their death. This, and more, is what we still want in the Bible, as, under the progress of knowledge, we are obliged to subject the old text to change. It must be more and more faithful to the original ideas, more and more transparent in its clearness, more and more vigorous in its portrayal of the great truths and duties of which it tells, more and more gracious in its invitations, more and more beautiful—whether grandly or tenderly—in the music of its words. To this ideal every fresh translation brings us nearer. With such a Bible, it would seem as though the victories of the cross would be visibly greater, and the cry of "Lord, how long?" would not be quite so bitter as men look forward to the millennial day.