

ARTICLE V.

THE LATEST TRANSLATION OF THE BIBLE.

BY HENRY M. WHITNEY, BRANFORD, CONN.

X. THE AMERICAN REVISION: A FURTHER ESTIMATE.

THERE has been a great deal of general commendation of the American Revision, but there has been very little statement of reasons, very little judgment of details. Just as the publishers of dictionaries or encyclopedias give out many letters of prominent men who prefer their work, and many newspaper-commendations of an entirely general character, betraying entire ignorance of the real quality of the work and leaving one altogether in doubt as to the departments in which, if in any, the work excels, so the publishers of the American Revision tell us what professors and what religious newspapers think it better than its predecessors, with little or no indication of the respects in which their Revision is a gain.

The purpose of this paper is to illustrate three classes of cases: (1) those in which the American Revision has made a change for the better, as compared with the English Revision; (2) those in which it has made a change for the worse; and (3) those in which it should make a further change. Wherever we quote in parallel columns, the column at the left is from the English Revision; the one at the right is the American form. Where there is a single form, it is, unless otherwise indicated, from the American text. The cases used are, of course, what have been found by only one casual reader, but they are not all that this reader has found. None of the examples given have appeared before in this series of papers.

I. CASES OF IMPROVEMENT.

We may begin by illustrating one general point by a series of verses:—

Lev. vi. 7: The priest shall make atonement for him before Jehovah; and he shall be forgiven concerning whatsoever he doeth so as to be guilty thereby.

Ps. cii. 7: I watch, and am become like a sparrow
That is alone upon the housetop.

Prov. ix. 3: She hath sent forth her maidens;
She crieth upon the highest places of the city.

If the reader will look at these verses in the English Revision, he will be on the track of an unfortunate influence that affected that work, namely, an undue regard for the *athnahh*, which is the primary divider of a verse in the Hebrew punctuation. In the sense in the passage from Leviticus, in the form in the other two passages, the English Revision appears greatly at disadvantage. A still more marked case is in *Zech. xi. 16* (E. R.), where “neither shall he feed that which is sound” is, on account of the *athnahh*, thrown out of its proper connection and thus deprived of meaning: this blunder also was set right in the American text.

The Hebrew punctuation, it is well known, was, like the division of the English Bible into chapters and verses, an afterthought, centuries later, and, like that, it is also sometimes, as in these cases, misleading.

Another interesting point is illustrated by *Gen. xliii. 20*; *Ex. iv. 10, 13*; *Dan. ix. 4*, etc. At many such points in the original an exclamation is connected with a strenuous or emotional word (as *bi* or *anna*). This touch of feeling the Americans represented by changing *O* to *Oh*. The difference is delicate, but it is real; and the care given to the matter illustrates the minuteness of attention given by the Americans to their task.

A small point of improvement is the uniformity of the use of *the* before the word "Jordan."

As specific cases of improvement we quote:—

Lev. xviii. 30: *Practise* not any of these abominable customs, which were *practised* before you.

The English Revision has *do* and *done*, but one does not do a custom.

Num. xviii. 17: The firstling of a *cow* [formerly, *ox*].

This change was not needed under English usage, but it was needed for American readers.

1 Sam. iv. 18: When he made mention of the ark of God, *It* fell. . . .

Formerly "*he* fell," the pronoun seeming to refer to the runner. There are in the American version a good many cases where a pronoun is similarly defined. The value of it is well shown in Hosea xi. 2:—

As <i>they</i> called them, so they went from them.	The more <i>the prophets</i> called them, the more they went from them.
---	---

1 Kings v. 4: There is neither adversary nor evil occurrent. evil occurrence.
--	--------------------------

It is like British conservatism generally, refusing to change minutiae but making radical changes at a stroke, that the English Revision retains the utterly obsolete noun "occurrent" and ruins "the Lord's prayer."

We make a group of three related forms:—

1 Kings xix. 13: The *entrance* of the cave [formerly, *entering in*].

Ezek. xl. 31: The *ascent* to it had eight steps [formerly, *going up*].

xlii. 11: All their *egresses* were [formerly, *goings out*].

Comment on the improvement in these cases is needless.

2 Kings xv. 5: He dwelt in a <i>several</i> house. <i>separate</i> house [margin, infirmary].
--	--

Job xix. 25-27: This passage has been at once one of the most thrilling in the Old Testament, one most suggestive of

a future life, and one most difficult to bring to an exclusively certain sense. A comparison of the following forms seems to us to result in a decided preference for the second:—

I know that my redeemer liveth,	As for me I know that my Redeemer liveth,
And that he shall stand up at the last upon the earth :	And at last he will stand up upon the earth :
And after my skin hath been thus destroyed,	And after my skin, even this body, is destroyed,
Yet from my flesh shall I see God :	Then without my flesh shall I see God ;
Whom I shall see for myself,	Whom I, even I, shall see, on my side,
And mine eyes shall behold, and not another.	And mine eyes shall behold, and not as a stranger.

The passage certainly illustrates the variety of rendering possible in the most difficult parts of the Bible.

Job xl. 19 [of the hippopotamus]:—

He only that made him can make his sword to approach unto him.	He only that made him giveth him his sword.
--	---

The second form is better, because the "sword" is believed (Gesenius, etc.) to be the curved tusk of the creature. It would be better yet to make the tenses agree: "He only that made him gave him his tusk."

Ps. II. 7: *Purify* me with hyssop, and I shall be clean.

Formerly, *purge*. The sense of *purge* has changed too much to allow it to stand in the Bible for *purify* or *cleanse*.

Isa. xxx. 32: In battles *with the brandishing of his arm* will he fight with them.

Formerly, "In battles *of shaking*." It may be said that in this the Americans made a guess, but a guess founded on a comprehension of the Semitic methods of expression is better than making no sense at all.

Isa. xlii. 3: A bruised reed will he not break, and a *dimly burning wick* will he not quench.

Formerly, *the smoking flax*,—an unfortunate expression, as fire in flax is proverbially a thing to be most promptly put out.

Isa. ix. 5: Then thou shalt see Then thou shalt see and be
and be *lightened*, and thy heart *radiant*, and thy heart shall
shall *tremble*. *thrill*.

Here too the second form may be called a guess, but it is a pretty good guess, for it matches the context.

Ezek. xxx. 2: *Howl ye, Woe* *Wail ye, Alas for the day.*
worth the day!

Howl is no longer usable of dignified human grief, but we have a fondness for *Woe worth the day*; there is a fine use of the phrase in "The Lady of the Lake," where Fitz-James laments the death of his horse: it adds dignity to the lament. The student of language rejoices in the phrase because it embalms in the word *worth* a verb once frequent in the language but now in all other uses lost. Here, for once, we should have kept a totally obsolete word, and have laid upon the reader the necessity of finding out what it meant.

Micah i. 6: I will *uncover* the foundations thereof.
Formerly, *discover*.

Matt. xii. 1: Jesus went through the *grainfields*.
Formerly, *cornfields*. In America the small-grains of Palestine are not corn.

xv. 22: grievously vexed with a *demon*.
Formerly, *devil*. The Greek words are different, the original of *devil* being limited to Satan.

xxii. 19: Show me the tribute money. And they brought him a *denarius*.
Formerly, *penny*. *Penny* is absurdly inadequate, for the coin would have paid the wages of a man for a day, and it is incorrect, for the coin had to be a denarius and nothing else.

There is nothing gained by keeping down the local color in the Bible. The "Twentieth Century" carries this to a ludi-

crous degree, doing its utmost to turn the characters of the New Testament into British citizens; in this case it makes the coin "a florin"! Removing local color from the Bible is like "touching up" a photographic negative in such a way as to take out of the face every distinctive line, reducing the person well toward the generic man.

On the contrary, the reader of the Bible should saturate himself with the spirit of the Bible-times, by knowing of the times and the places through history, travel, and the photographs and paintings that best reproduce the life of those who figure in the Bible-story.

As to xxii. 19 we may add that the sense would be still more clearly brought out if "Show me the tribute[-]money" were changed to "Show me the coin of the poll-tax."

John xvi. 25: These things have I spoken unto you in *dark sayings*. Formerly, *proverbs*, or *parables*. The Americans have the real idea.

John xvii. 2: That whatsoever thou hast given him, to them he should give eternal life. That to all whom thou hast given him, he should give eternal life.

The former is uncouth, because it transfers instead of translating. The latter, barring the comma, is better, because it uses English idiom and thus makes the sense more immediately clear.

Acts xli. 10: When they were past the first and the second card the first and the second guard. . . .

xxiv. 25: As he reasoned of righteousness and temperance. righteousness and self-control.

The word that cannot be misunderstood is better.

Rom. xiv. 1: Him that is weak in faith receive ye, yet not for decision of scruples.

Formerly, *to doubtful disputations*. The context calls for the American form.

1 Cor. xi. 19: There must be also *factions* among you.

Formerly, *heresies*. It is doubtful whether the conception that we now express by *heresy* existed then.

<p>Heb. x. 2: Else would they not have ceased to be offered, because the worshippers, having been once cleansed, would have had no more <i>conscience</i> of sins?</p>	<p>Else would they not have ceased to be offered? because the worshippers, having been once cleansed, would have had no more <i>consciousness</i> of sins.</p>
--	--

It is an interesting study,—just what is meant by *συνείδησις* in each of its thirty-odd cases of occurrence in the New Testament. *Consciousness* seems to be the generic sense, with moral consciousness,—that is, conscience,—as the special sense. Here certainly *consciousness* seems to be the better word, although there may not be another place where it is; it seems also to be a place where the old-fashioned phrase *sense of sin* would apply.

As to the punctuation of the verse, we prefer the American way.

<p>Rev. iii. 2: I have found no works of thine <i>fulfilled</i> before my God.</p>	<p>I have found no works of thine <i>perfected</i>. . . .</p>
--	---

Each of these is an improvement on the earlier form, but we think that the second is a little sharper reënforcement to that sentiment by which, it is said, "the whole world hates a 'quitter.'" In either form it has become a pungent text for the preacher.

x. 6: And swear. . . . that there shall be *delay* no longer.
Formerly, *time*.

The reader may care to look up the following passages in which the Revisions are agreed in making interesting or important changes from the earlier form:—

Job xiii. 5: *I had heard of thee by the hearing of the ear,*
But now mine eye seeth thee.

Formerly, ". . . *have heard*. . . ."

Mark xii. 26: Have ye not read in the book of Moses, in the place concerning the Bush, how God spake. . . .

Formerly, “. . . how in the bush God spake. . . .”

Luke i. 37: No word from God shall be void of power.

Formerly, “With God nothing shall be impossible.”

John xi. 37: . . . who opened the eyes of him that was blind. . . .

Formerly, “. . . the eyes of the blind. . . .” The idiom that once permitted an adjective with “the,” as in “the blind,” “the rich” (Isa. liii. 9), to stand for a single person is now too completely dead to be tolerated, even in archaic diction. “Was blind,” however, should be “had been blind.”

Acts v. 26: They feared the people, lest they should be stoned.

Formerly, “. . . lest they should have been stoned”: a strangely and uncouthly redundant form. A good many of this kind have been reformed in the Revisions, but we still read in Josh. ix. 4: “They also did work wilyly, and went and made as if they had been ambassadors.” Read, “. . . as if they were ambassadors.”

vi. 1: The number of the disciples was multiplying.

Formerly, *multiplied*. The present form utilizes one of the new resources for expression.

1 Cor. iii. 9: We are God's fellow-workers.

Formerly, “We are laborers together with God.” It being doubtful whether the original means, as in the old version, that we work with God, or that we work together and belong to God, a form has been ingeniously devised that preserves the uncertainty.

xlii. 11: I spake as a child, I felt as a child, I thought as a child.

Formerly, *understood*. This change illustrates two striking facts that have come into being since 1611: the much greater comprehension of the sense of the words of the Bible, and the wealth of differentiated expression that has come into our

English speech and is now available for bringing out the meaning of the Bible.

Eph. ii. 21: In whom *each several building*, fitly framed together, groweth. . . .

Formerly, *all the building*. "Each several building," although not the sense under the usage of classic Greek, is argued from the context here and the necessary sense in similar passages.

2 Tim. ii. 3: Suffer hardship *with me*, as a good soldier of Christ Jesus.

In the margin is a variant: "Take thy part in suffering hardship, as. . . ." The point is in the *with* somebody, but who the fellow-sufferer is we are left to supply for ourselves; it may be with all believers.

Jas. i. 11: The sun ariseth with *the scorching wind*. . . .

Formerly, *a burning heat*. The Orient knows well that "scorching wind," knows it as well as it knows the long and furious northeaster that once drove an Apostle in a staggering ship from the lee of Crete to the shoals of Malta.

All these cases and a multitude of others show the indefatigable painstaking of both companies of Revisers in trying to perfect their work; many of them show that the Americans addressed themselves to their task with greater emancipation of mind and with more of the courage of their convictions.

The English Revisers say in their preface that they did not think it necessary to change obsolete expressions that would be understood: it is an interesting question whom they had in mind as likely to understand great numbers of the words that they left in the text. It certainly could not have been those who are popularly supposed to be most in need of the Bible.

In Hastings's one-volume Dictionary of the Bible, just issued, (article on "English Versions") one may read: "Though the alterations introduced by the American revisers eminently deserve consideration on their merits, it may be doubted

whether the net result is important enough to justify the existence of a separate version." This tone has been heard before when an American work has broken into the field of an English work that was not thorough enough. In this case the answer is that any new version is justified if it is more correct or if it adds substantially to men's comprehension of the Scriptures; and the evidence is superabundant that the American version is much the better in both these respects. And, further, we venture the prophecy that these differences will give the American version an acknowledged supremacy, if not exclusive use, and in a much shorter time than it took the Authorized Version to become "the Bible" to all people of English speech.

2. CHANGES FOR THE WORSE.

We have not found very much to put under this head. Mention has already been made of the putting of "young men and *virgins*" for "young men and *maidens*." That was an unfortunate slip: "maiden" is one of the words that every high soul delights in.

There is in both the Revisions, but especially in the American, a very great amount of use of the colon where we understand the semi-colon to be needed. The semi-colon continues a sentence but makes a greater pause than the comma, and may require a new start in the grammar. The colon properly functions as a pivot, antithesizing somehow what precedes to what follows. Here is an illustrative case:—

Ex. xxiv. 12, 13: Jehovah said unto Moses, Come up to me into the mount and be there: and I will give thee. . . . And Moses rose up, and Joshua his minister: and Moses went up into the mount of God.

For each of these colons it seems to us that only the semi-colon is in accordance with standard usage. The effect is unfortunate at times.

In Jas. ii. 16 are two semi-colons that, according to present usage, should be commas. It is not now correct to carry a grammatical structure beyond a semi-colon, but the Revisions often disregard this rule.

Of changes that the Americans made or acquiesced in we note:—

Isa. xxxviii. 12: I have rolled up, like a weaver, my life.

It is not the practice of weavers in any country to roll up their lives. There seems to be no escape from this infelicity, except by amplifying the form: "As a weaver [rolleth up his cloth], so have I rolled up my life."

Dan. iii. 27: Neither were their *hosen* changed.

Why so ancient a word?

Luke viii. 45: Master, the multitudes press thee and crush thee. The word in the original is a strong one, but *crush* is too strong. *Crowd* would be nearer to the sense.

1 Cor. xii. 26: *Whether* one member suffereth.

Whether is now uncouth; also return the verb to the subjunctive: hence, read: "If one member suffer."

xiii. 1-3: *If* I speak with the tongues . . . [four cases of "if"]. In each of these cases read *although*; also change *but* to *and yet*: "Though I speak with the tongues of men and angels and yet have not love, I am become sounding brass or a clanging [clashing?] cymbal."

Jas. i. 17: . . . the Father of lights, with whom can be no variation, neither *shadow that is cast by turning*.

This change, made by the English Revisers, has been the mark of incredulous, not to say indignant, criticism: "How could they do it?" "What do they think it means?" "The old form, 'shadow of turning,' meant something, but we can make nothing of this."

3. CHANGES STILL NEEDED.

(1) We may begin with questions of *tense*. The fundamental fact is that the Hebrew language, having only a past and a future, left exceptional freedom of tense to the translator of the Old Testament, and, by its influence over the modes of thought of the users of Hellenistic Greek, an almost equal freedom in the New Testament. We say an almost equal freedom, because, while the aorist can be very freely translated, the field of the imperfect was certainly in their minds much more clearly defined. For instance:—

Luke xxiii. 35: The rulers also *scoffed* [began to scoff] at him.

John xiii. 22: The disciples *looked* [began to look] one on another. . . .

Acts v. 26: They *feared* [perhaps, were beginning to fear] the people.

vii. 58: They cast him out of the city, and *stoned* [T. C.: began to stone] him.

ix. 21: All that heard him were amazed and *said* [kept saying, or, possibly, began to say]. . . .

xiii. 25: As John was fulfilling his course, he *said* [used to say]. . . .

xv. 12: All the multitude *kept silence: and they hearkened to* [were silent, and began to listen to]. . . .

As to other tenses, we quote two additional cases of the interjection of a present into a list of another kind:—

Present with preterits:

Matt. xxvii. 38: Then *are* [were] there crucified with him. . . .

Present with futures:

Rev. xxii. 5: There shall be night no more; and they *need* [shall need] no light of lamp, neither [read, *nor*] light of sun. . . .

As to past tenses we quote:—

Matt. xxvii. 3: Then Judas, who *betrayed* [had betrayed] him, when he saw that he *was* [had been] condemned, repented himself [omit *himself*]. . . .

Mark viii. 14: They *forgot* [had forgotten] to take bread.

Luke xxiii. 8: When Herod saw Jesus, he was exceeding glad: for he *was* [had been] of [read, *for*] a long time desirous to see him.

John xix. 11: Thou wouldest have no power against [over?] me except it *were* [had been] given thee from above.

Rev. vi. 11: They should rest yet for a little time, until their fellow-servants. . . . who should be killed even as they *were* [had been] *should have* [had] fulfilled their course.

We have in previous papers sufficiently emphasized the unfortunateness of the changes by which the Hellenistic aorist has been, in the Revisions, yet more frequently represented by the past. In 1 Cor. i. 27- (quoted later in this paper in a different connection) it will be noticed how much "hath chosen" is better than "did choose,"—the great truth seeming thus a part of "the eternal counsels," and not a sudden administrative act, changing a previous order.

We add two errors not based on an original tense:—

Matt. xi. 14: This is Elijah, that *is* to come.

Read, "This is the Elijah that *was* to come."

Rev. xx. 5: The rest of the dead lived not [that is, came not back to life] until the thousand years *should be* [were] finished.

There evidently was much latitude in the sense of the present participle: In Acts ii. 9 Harnack says that the present participle, translated "dwellers," is certainly "pluperfect" in sense: as if "we who had lived in Mesopotamia," etc. It might be translated as aorist (once lived), or imperfect (used to live, but now are settled in Jerusalem): this, however, has not been the general idea of the passage. There is, in Acts x. 7 a present participle ("speaking") that certainly has the pluperfect sense: "When the angel that *had spoken* to him was gone."

(2) Proceeding to questions of *number*, we note:—

Mark viii. 3: If I send them away fasting to their *home*. . . .

1 Thess. v. 23: May your *spirit* and *soul* and *body* be preserved. . . .

Rev. xvii. 8: They whose *name* hath not been written in the book of life.

xx. 4: such as received not [had not received] the mark upon their *forehead* and [nor?] upon their *hand*.

It would be idiomatic to say "upon forehead or hand," but otherwise it is, in English, very awkward to allow but a single home, spirit, soul, body, name, forehead, hand, to many. Yet each of the languages of the Bible had an idiom of the kind: hence we read in Acts xiii. 25: "the *shoe* of whose feet"; in Matt. v. 8: the thought probably is "Blessed are they who are pure in their heart"; in Gal. v. 22 ("the *fruit* of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, . . .") it would be nearer to English usage to say, "fruits are."

In 2 Pet. iii. 1 the old standard versions are divided, three against three, as to whether the multitude of the believers were to be considered as having "minds" or a "mind": the Revisions have "mind"; it should be "minds," as each was to be "stirred up" in his personal mind. All such cases of reduction from plural to singular might have been classed in this paper under the heading of "changes for the worse."

Yet such are the vagaries of usage, of that distinctive, unassimilated, usage that we call idiom, that a case of exactly opposite character in both Greek and English may be found in

Jas. iii. 7: Every kind of beasts, and birds, and creeping things, . . . is tamed.

We now should say "beast and bird and creeping thing."

As cases of grammar under number, we add:—

2 Tim. ii. 17: . . . of whom ~~is~~ Hymenæus and Philetus.

This was good grammar three hundred years ago, but it is inadmissible now.

Rev. vi. 14: Every mountain and island *were* [was] moved out of *their places* [its place].

(3) It is an interesting question, just what can be done to bring out the *paradox* which is an occasional feature and a very real intention in biblical style. For example, in Ps. xix. 3, it is said that the stars have no voice, no speech, no language, and yet in neighboring verses it is said that they are

eloquent, that they make music which is heard throughout the earth.

Again:—

Matt. vi. 23: If therefore the light that is in thee be darkness. . . . This, however, may read “the light that *was* in thee.”

Rom. viii. 26: groanings which cannot be uttered.

xii. 11: In diligence not slothful.

Formerly, “not slothful in business”: few in recent years have realized that “business” once meant busyness.

xiv. 22: Happy is he that judgeth [presumably, *condemneth*] not himself in that which he *approveth*.

Eph. iii. 19: to know the love of Christ which passeth knowledge.

Phil. iii. 15—: [Men are not perfect unless they think themselves imperfect and still press on toward perfection].

Heb. xi. 27: seeing him who is invisible.

2 Pet. iii. 5: They wilfully forget.

This is evidently meant to be a sarcastic paradox of the sharpest kind: they want it to escape their notice.

Rev. xiv. 10: [Is there paradox in the wine “mixed unmixd,” as in Milton’s “numbers numberless”?]

Early translators of the Bible do not seem to have thought of rhetorical devices as consistent with the inspiration of the book; the Revisers evidently took the paradoxes as they found them, neither evading them nor carefully bringing them out. Perhaps they hardly sensed the delightful contradiction in the terms of Ps. lxvi. 18–20: the major and the minor premise point infallibly to the self-righteous conclusion: “Therefore I know that I do not even secretly regard iniquity in my heart”: but the Psalmist, discovering that such is the natural conclusion of his syllogism, forgets the logic of his intellect in the logic of his heart. It is a paradox that leaves him looking very much like a Christian: “Blessed be God, who hath not turned away my prayer, nor his lovingkindness from me.”

(4) We recur to the matter of *ellipsis* in order to say that the question of supplying the omitted matter is not a thing to be settled offhand or by any general rule. Where there is certainty to the scholar but not to the casual reader, the thought may well be fully written out, but the certainty is of all degrees, down to zero. We should favor inserting *only* or *even* where it is obviously meant; as in:—

Ex. xxxiv. 21: On the seventh day thou shalt rest: [even] in plowing-time and in harvest thou shalt rest.

Ps. cxix. 19: I am [only] a sojourner in [on] the earth.¹

Luke xvii. 10: We have done [only] that which it was our duty to do.¹

Acts v. 38, 39: If this counsel or this work be [only] of men [T. C.: merely of human origin], it will be overthrown.¹

x. 28: It is an unlawful thing for a man that is a [omit "man that is a"] Jew to join himself or [even] come unto [visit] one of another nation.

1 Cor. iii. 4: When one saith, I am of Paul; and another, I am of Apollos; are ye not [mere] men?

xiii. 1: I speak with the tongues of men and of angels. . . . [T. C.: of men, or *even* of angels. . . .].

In each of these cases there can be no doubt, and yet the point would be missed by the ordinary reader.

There are other cases, ranging all the way from obvious propriety to uncertainty, and thence to impossibility. The scale may be illustrated thus:—

¹There is a rare but striking parallel to these in Shakespeare (Rich. II. v. 2, 23):—

"In a theatre the eyes of men,
After a well-graced actor leaves the stage,
Are [only] idly bent on him that enters next."

We should expect to find such things in authors that wrote for the ear and not for the eye, because they expected the inflection of the voice to bring out their meaning: on the roll of such authors are all the ancients, and, in modern times, the Elizabethan dramatists more than almost any one else. There has been a line of causation, working slowly, but directly and inevitably, connecting the cheapening of paper, the invention and evolution of printing, the growth of the practice of reading, and precision of style in print.

John i. 34: I have seen [him], and have borne witness that this is the Son of God.

Ps. cxvi. 4: Then called I upon the name of Jehovah:

O Jehovah, [I cried,] I beseech thee, deliver my soul.

Matt. xxii. 46: Neither durst any man from that day forth [omit forth] ask him any more [insidious] questions.

These insertions are no bolder, no less proper, than the one made in the Revisions in

Matt. xxviii. 15: This saying was spread abroad among the Jews, [and continueth] until this day.

Again:—

John x. 8: All that came before me [professing to be what I am] are [read, *were*] thieves and robbers.

Acts xxii. 26: What art thou about to do? [Thou mayest get thyself into trouble,] for this man is a Roman [citizen].

ix. 11: Inquire in the house of Judas for one named Saul, a man of Tarsus, [and think not that he still is what he was,] for behold he prayeth [read, at least in the margin, *he is praying*].

Rom. viii. 33: Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect? [Will God?] God is the one that justifieth. Who is he that condemneth? [Is it Christ?] Christ Jesus is the one that died. . . .

1 Cor. xiv. 25: The secrets of his heart are made manifest [to himself].

Matt. vi. 16: [It is only in this gratification of vanity that] they get their reward.

2 Sam. i. 21: [Here there is no sense unless the marginal suggestion of ellipsis be brought into the text:]

For there the shield of the mighty was vilely cast away,

The shield of Saul, [as of one] not anointed with oil.

The sense seems to be "the shields of the mighty ones, especially the shield of Saul."

2 Tim. ii. 9: Wherein I suffer hardship unto bonds, as a malefactor; but the word of God is not bound ["with me," the Spanish version has it].

1 Cor. i. 27—: The base things of the world, and the things that are despised, did God choose [hath God chosen] yea and the things that are not, that he might [may] bring to nought the things that are.

The subtler shades of the thought will be better comprehended if one carefully compares this form with that in the "Twentieth Century": "God chose what *the world counts* poor and

insignificant — things that *to it* are unreal — to bring its 'realities' to nothing."

We need not wonder that Dr. Grenfell says, in his recent book on faith, that he reads the "Twentieth Century" when he wants to feel what the New Testament really means.

The reader may care to practise his wits upon

Rev. xviii. 23: The voice[s] of the bridegroom and the bride shall be heard no more at all in thee: *for* thy merchants were the princes of the earth: *for* with thy sorcery were all the nations deceived.

The thought is remarkably fragmentary as it stands: a bold ellipsis has evidently been made before each *for*, and there may easily be wide difference of opinion as to what are the connecting links. Whatever ways may be proposed for filling the two hiatus, the forms would be too long and too conjectural to be admitted into the text or even into the margin.

Perhaps the same may be said as to the evident break in the sense before "for verily in this we groan" (2 Cor. v. 2), and "for he went on his way rejoicing" (Acts viii. 39); although this latter needs no insertion, if "went" is changed to "had gone."

(5) As to *words still used* by the Revisions *in an obsolete sense* we note:—

1 Kings xvii. 8: I have commanded a widow there to *sustain* thee.

Read, *provide for*: "sustain" in that sense is so completely obsolete as not to convey the idea to many minds.

Isa. xxix. 8: A hungry man dreameth, and, behold, he eateth; but he awaketh, and his *soul* is empty: or . . . he drinketh, but he awaketh, and, behold . . . his *soul* hath appetite.

This is a good nail upon which to hang a lesson as to the rendering of *nefesh*, for certainly *soul* is no word for it in these two cases. To Isaiah it was just a Hebrew way of saying, "he is hungry, . . . he is thirsty." *Nefesh* is, in fact, an ex-

tremely idiomatic word, with ramifications running as freakishly as a lode in a mine; and *soul* cannot cover any large part of the list: "houses of nefesh" are perfume-boxes; "a nefesh of death" is a corpse; in Gen. xii. 5, nefesh ("soul") means *slave*: compare Rev. xviii. 13: "souls of men": here, by the penetration of the Hebrew idiom into the Greek, the phrase means *slaves*. This whole subject of the rendering of *nefesh* and its Hellenistic correlative needs to be revised.

Matt. xxii. 8: *The wedding is ready.*

This is not now good idiom, nor is it correct. "Marriage-feast" is the idea. T. C.: "The banquet is prepared."

Matt. xxv. 40: *Inasmuch as ye did it unto one of these my brethren. . . .*

The sense is "In so far," but not one reader in a thousand knows it. The use of "inasmuch" is not a blunder, but it is the mistaken retention of a word that now always seems to people to mean *because*. The Bible Union version has the modern phrase, and it is strange that any one should have favored retaining *inasmuch*. The same change should be made in verse 45.

John xiii. 24: *Simon Peter . . . beckoneth to him.*

Beckon now presumably means summoning. T. C.: "made signs;" "motioned" would be good. The criticism applies also to Acts xix. 33. Here, as usual, the dictionaries fail to draw clear lines as to current English usage.

Acts x. 39: . . . on a tree.

Is it not time that the cross of Christ ceased, except in poetry, to be called a "tree"? The expression is misleading. In Isa. xl. 20, "a tree that will not rot" means a piece of wood, but such use is obsolete, except in a few compounds, as *axletree*, *whiffletree*.

xli. 4: *Four quaternions of soldiers.*

Quaternion is almost the deadest word in the language. It

would not be used by any one who was in earnest to have the Bible understood. T. C.: "four guards of four soldiers each."

xv. 27: . . . Judas and Silas, who themselves also *shall* tell you the same things by word of mouth.

This is a marked case of the insufficient concession made by the Revisers to the transfer of meaning in our language from *shall to will*. The exact word for this place is *will*, and *shall* is uncouth.¹

On the other hand, what has ever been meant by the second "will" in Gen. xviii. 21?—"I will go down now, and see whether they have done . . .; and if not, I *will* know." Apart from the question of unnecessary commas, "*shall* know" makes better sense.

1 Cor. iii. 5: What then is Apollos? and what is Paul? *Ministers* through whom ye believed.

In the old version *διάκονος* is rendered *servant* seven times, *deacon* thrice, and *minister* twenty times. The last class is always misleading: in each *minister* should give way to *servant*.

In this connection a similar thing should be said about *ὑπηρέτης*. In the old version this is rendered *servant* four times, *officer* eleven times, and *minister* five times. In Luke iv. 20 the American Revision very fitly changes "minister" to "attendant"; in the other four cases of "minister" it should become "servant."

It is curious how in Greek and in English the various words

¹ It is curious how the present tense in this verse has been misunderstood. It is really a case of "epistolary standpoint," which in a letter substituted not only the past for the present, but the present for the future. In this verse, translators, from Wiclif down, have written "shall tell," apparently just forcing the meaning, not seeing the point; like Irving, stealing the apples that were theirs by right. Welzsäcker refuses to do any forcing, and makes a present tense (*bestätigen können*); Weymouth thinks he hits the special sense of the Greek present by writing "who are themselves bringing you the same message." (See Couybeare and Howson, *Life of St. Paul*, i. 221.)

for *servant* have taken on dignity with the lapse of time: *ἐπίσκοπος* has gone up from overseer to *bishop*; English words that have had a similar accretion are *marshal, sergeant, deacon, minister, pastor, chancellor*. In all this there is, on one side, an almost sardonic comment on the infirmities of human nature, and, on the other, the recognition that service is a badge of rank. It is well to remember that the Christians of the New Testament magnified the idea that they were servants, not glorified servants, but simply servants, of Christ.

Phil. iii. 8: I count all things to be loss for the *excellency* of the knowledge of Christ Jesus.

Is not the sense here "on account of the *greater* value"? It is generally understood as meaning only "the *great* value."

(6) Passing on to *obscurity of meaning*, we note:—

Gen. ii. 18: I will make him a *help meet* for him.

It would be a help, meet for this case, if the old notion of *help-meet* here were undermined by a new form, and especially by one nearer to the sense; as, "I will make him a helper like himself."

Matt. xxvi. 27: Drink ye *all* of it.

This has always been obscure to those who could not read the original. Many consider it an injunction to drink up all the communion-wine. Read, "Drink all ye of it."

Mark xiii. 14: When ye see the abomination of desolation standing where he ought not (*let him that readeth understand*), then . . . On the principle of "idiom for idiom" we may well substitute the "Twentieth Century" form: "the reader must consider what this means." It was not prudent for Mark to speak more plainly.

Acts vii. 59: They stoned Stephen, *calling* upon the Lord. . . .

Who called?

xiv. 13: The priest of Jupiter whose temple was before the city brought oxen and garlands unto the *gates*. . . .

Conybeare and Howson call attention to the peculiar word for "gates," and infer that the gates were not those of the city but those of the house where Paul and Barnabas were.

Rom. iii. 25: to show his righteousness because of the passing over of the sins done aforetime, in the forbearance of God.

Conybeare and Howson (i. 195) long ago complained of the bad work made with this passage in the Authorized Version, but it is not much bettered by the Revisions. The last clause is far out of place; it is not idiom to say that a sin is "done." Conybeare and Howson render it: "God in his forbearance had passed over the former sins of men, in the times that were gone by"; the "Twentieth Century" has a form that is better yet.

2 Tim. ii. 13: *If we are faithless, he abideth faithful.*

Wherever *if* is adversative, it should be changed to *even if*, or *although*, — whichever the connection seems to require. There are other places where this criticism applies.

2 Pet. iii. 4: *Where is the promise of his coming?*

The Bible Union version, under the principle of "idiom for idiom," brings out, instead of obscuring, the sense: "Where is his promised coming?"

(7) Under *mistranslation* we place:—

Matt. vii. 19: *Every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down.*

Cut out is required by the original, and it brings out the implication that the trees bearing good fruit were left standing.

xix. 28: *In the regeneration when the Son of man shall sit on the throne of his glory. . . .*

Tit. iii. 5: through the washing of *regeneration*. . . .

There is no generation or regeneration in the word used in either of these verses: it is primarily a beginning again, and at most, by extreme figure, a new birth. A learned article in the London *Quarterly* (January, 1882, p. 3) says: "There is all

the difference in the world between St. Matthew's *γένεσις* [in i. 1] and *γέννησις* [in i. 18]," the latter referring to the human birth of Christ, the former linking the new creation with the old. Palingenesis is a re-becoming, a fresh start, a second creation.

Matt. xxvi. 45: *Sleep on now, and take your rest.*

Substitute the marginal reading: "Do ye sleep on, then, and take your rest?" This goes much better with verse 46: "Arise, let us be going."

xxviii. 14: *If this comes to the governor's ears, we will persuade him.*

The preposition that is preferred for the original of the first clause requires this to be, as in the margin and in the Bible Union version, "If this come to a hearing before the governor [procurator]. . . ." So Erasmus: "Si res apud illum judicem agatur"; so also Meyer, and many others.

Luke xv. 20: . . . ran, and fell on his neck, and *kissed him.*

Read, *kissed him again and again.* So with the act of Judas in Matt. xxvi. 49.

John xxi. 3: *Simon Peter saith unto them, I go a fishing. They say unto him, We also come with thee.*

This odd contradiction is one more case of the erroneous idea that *ἔρχομαι* must always be translated *come*. It is hard to account for this. In the present case the effect is really ludicrous; it makes especial trouble in John iii. 26: "The same baptizeth, and all men *come* to him": the point was that the disciples were alarmed by the idea, or fact, that people were turning from Jesus to *go* to the Baptist. There is a very bad case in John xvii. 13: "Now I *come* to thee."

Acts ix. 39: . . . showing the *coats* and *garments* which Dorcas made [had made].

Read, *tunics and mantles.* With us a coat is a garment: so that, as the expression stands, it is puzzling, he who has no

Greek thinking that perhaps it is a case of ellipsis: "coats and [other] garments." This is incorrect.

x. 33: Thou hast *well done* that thou art come.

Read, "Thou hast been very kind to come."

xvi. 38: The *serjeants* reported these words unto the *magistrates*.

Substitute from the margin the official titles of these people: *lictors* and *prators*.

Rom. xi. 11: To provoke them [the Jews] to *jealousy*. . . .

2 Cor. xi. 2: I am *jealous* over you with a godly *jealousy*.

The idea in the first of these two verses is evidently that of emulation, which is a good frame of mind; in the second it is that of warm desire. The root-idea is apparently affected by the breadth of the Hebrew *qana'*, which covers jealousy, envy, emulation, and zeal. In another paper we have shown that in many places the rendering *envy* should give place to *hatred* or *spite*. The sense of warm desire is found in 1 Cor. xii. 31: "Desire earnestly the greater gifts"; which reappears in xiv. 1, 39. Jealousy and envy should be dissociated from ζήλος and its derivative forms.

1 Cor. xiv. 1: Desire earnestly spiritual gifts, but *rather* that ye may prophesy.

Read, *especially*, or *most of all*. The reason for this is that *rather* makes prophecy seem not a spiritual gift, which the context says it is; also, by a dialectal peculiarity, in which the Hellenistic Greek does not stand alone, it often, as here, uses the comparative for the superlative degree. In this case "more [than the others]" is used for "most [of all]"; just as in xii. 31 "greater gifts" is presumably "greatest gifts," and in Matt. xi. 11 the change of "least" to "but little" was a blunder. He who is misled by this Hellenistic idiom has hardly begun to be qualified for translating the Bible.

It is curious that in Acts xvii. 21 the Revisers should have written "to tell or to hear some *new* thing." The word is a

comparative, evidently used for the superlative: "some *newest* thing,"—the latest novelty; T. C.: "the latest new thing."

Col. iii. 14: *Above* all these things put on love.

Read, *over*: the figure is that of putting on an outer garment or a piece of armor.

Rev. iv. 8: The four living creatures *have no rest day and [read, or] night, saying,*

This suggests that they were not allowed time for needed rest.

Read, *cease not*. That is all that the words have to mean.

Acts vi. 1: There arose a murmuring of the Grecian Jews against the Hebrews, because their widows were neglected in the daily ministration.

The "Twentieth Century" improves upon this form in six respects: "Complaints were made by the Jews of foreign birth against the native Jews, that their widows were being overlooked in the daily distribution." The book has some such clearing, defining, or correction, of the sense on almost every page; it would be a pity to leave the "Twentieth Century" in the position of chief help toward finding out what the New Testament really means.

In this connection we may say that there is in the English New Testament a considerable list of words that need to be

¹Those who think that *καί* must always be translated *and* have failed to notice the history of the word in Acts ix. 2: the Greek is literally "both men *and* women." Wiclif (about 1380) wrote "ony men *and* women of this liff"; but Tyndale (1534) changed it, in spite of his knowledge of Greek, to "whether they wer men *or* wemen," and in this he was followed, substantially, by Cranmer (1539), the Genevan (1557), the "Authorized," and both the Revisions. The "Edition of Paris" (1805) has "*hommes ou femmes*." Idiom for idiom, *καί* may be rendered *and*, *but*, *or*, *nor*, according to the context. Its sense of *even* would come in most properly and felicitously in Jas. ii. 23: "Abraham believed God, and it was reckoned unto him for righteousness; he was *even* called the friend of God." So in Acts xvii. 23 we may well read: "I found *even* an altar. . . ."

changed, and yet there is no better word or phrase to be offered. In Jude 19 is a case: Alford has called attention to our lack of a word to cover the people who are "psychic": the English word used has long been "sensual," which is not a good fit; Wiclif had "beestli," which was pretty near to the sense in its time; the Revisions put "natural or animal" in the margin; the "Twentieth Century" offers a doublet, "animal and unspiritual," which is the best form that we know of, and certainly is much better than any one word that can be found.

We have no equivalents for "prophet" and "prophesy," as found in the New Testament. Especial trouble is made by this fact in 1 Cor. xiv. "Preacher" and "preach" will not do, for the original words cover the humblest and most informal utterance of a believer. "Testifying" is the best word that we have. If "worship" and "servant" are so perseveringly explained in the margin, it would seem that "prophet" and "prophesy" might, at least once, have their gloss as well.

And certainly to any one but a Hindu the highly technical sense of "sinner" in the Gospels needs to be explained. R. A. Hume, in "Missions from a Modern View" (p. 63), says of India: "Sin was not primarily unethical conduct, but the omission of ceremonials and the disregard of custom," and this wonderfully fits the Pharisaic sense. In John ix. 16 Christ is called a sinner because he did not keep the Sabbath according to the code; the "sinner" who, in Luke vii. 36-38, kissed the feet of Jesus again and again may have been one of the best citizens of Jerusalem according to our ideas. In conduct "sinner" might stand for one who ate an egg that had been laid on the Sabbath, or, technically, for one whom the Pharisees for some such little breach of an intolerable code had forbidden to come into the synagogue. In no version that we

have seen is there, even in the margin, any hint of these facts. In the "Twentieth Century" the woman with the alabaster box is aptly called an "outcast," but that needs a gloss, for she may have been blameless in the eyes of Jesus.

It is high time that "preach" had in many cases given way to something less conventional or formal: "proclaim" would not always fit, as implying too loud or general a cry. Sometimes it means simply "make known." In Jonah iii. 2: "Arise, go unto Nineveh, that great city, and *preach* unto it the *preaching* that I bid thee"; the picture becomes thrilling if we read: ". . . cry unto it the *cry* that I bade thee."

The inadequacy of English, as indeed of any other language, to express transferred conceptions exactly is well illustrated by Matt. xxiii. 23: "Ye have left undone the weightier matters of the law, justice, and mercy, and *faith*." The Genevan version has *fidelity* instead of *faith*, and there is no gainsaying it as a possible sense. The word may mean faith toward God, or good-faith toward man, or both. It is suggestive and quickening to go over the cases where *faith* is used in the Bible and see in which of them *fidelity* or *good-faith*, or a phrase combining faith and fidelity, would fit.

(8) We may put under the heading of *infelicity* a few additional cases:—

Jer. II. 13: My people have committed two evils: they have forsaken me, the fountain of living waters, and hewed them out cisterns. . . .

Read, *and they have hewn*. . . . This gives proper emphasis to the second of the evil acts.

Coördination of parts is even more needed in

Acts xiv. 22: Exhorting them to *continue* in the faith, *and that through* many tribulations we must enter into the kingdom of God. Besides the coördination of the clauses, the emphasis of the second clause should be transferred from "enter" to "tribu-

lations"; "Exhorting them to continue in the faith, and [to remember] that it must be through many tribulations that we enter the kingdom of God."

Matt. vi. 24: Either he will hate the one, and love the other; or else he will hold to one, and despise the other.

The commas make this seem to represent four acts: omit them, and bring out the sharpest possible antithesis between the two acts.

xx. 17: He *took* the twelve disciples *apart*.

It is a good principle that, in avoiding forms that have a possible alternate sense, one should especially avoid those of the mirthful sort. Were the apostles clocks, in need of repair? Those whose mirth is easily stirred should be given no chance to catch on such things.

xxii. 25: The first married and *deceased*.

Some people have an odd way of stiffening up in their vocabulary the moment any mention is made of death. Wiclif was not fond of stiff and feeble euphemisms: he said in this verse that the man "is deed."

Acts viii. 16: *Only* they had been baptized into the name of the Lord Jesus.

Some people, a large part of the human race, have no sense as to the proper position of *only*: so they just get rid of it soon. Read, "They had *only*. . . ." So Weizsäcker: "Sie waren *nur* getauft."

xv. 7: Peter rose up.

Why "up"? He could not rise down or sideways. In Parliament or Congress a man *rises* to speak. Redundant English is not good English now. Wiclif has "petir roos."

Matt xiv. 23: After he had sent the multitudes away,

He went up into the mountain apart to pray.

Here are unwelcome rhyme and meter: rhyme should always be avoided in prose, especially if the structure is made metri-

cal, and also especially if the passage is one of marked solemnity. Too great care is not likely to be paid to the oral properties of style in the translation of the Bible. Cases of a different sort occur in

Jonah i. 15: The *sea* ceased.

Rom. xlii. 6: *For for* this cause ye pay tribute also.

Masters in style avoid the immediate repetition of a word, as in *for for, do do, had had*; or a conspicuous repetition of a sound, as in *or ornament or order* (Charles Phillips), *sold* by his *soldiers* (Burke), *one wonders* how *one* has dared (F. D. Maurice); or stray rhymes, as in "Is the *scer here?*" (1 Sam. ix. 11).

It may be remarked, by the way, that in the Spanish version there are some curious cases of awkward assonance; as in

Matt. xxiii. 4: . . . y las ponen sobre los hombros de los hombres.

Acts x. 1: . . . un hombre por nombre.

Lowell calls rhythm "the higher mystery of versification"; but why not also of prose, and especially of the highest prose? And why is not euphony in all its aspects, including the absence of an assonance that affronts the ear, another higher mystery of both verse and prose? To take a slight but significant example (1 Kings xiv. 10), if "till it be all gone" is changed to "till it all be gone," the rhythm is better without being too regular, the euphony is better by the separation of the rhyming words, and the whole effect is heightened.

The same thing might be shown in more signal cases. These things help to make plain words into literature, and literature gives delight. Therefore not only the substance of the Bible but its form, its sound, should minister to a lofty delight. Fine oral qualities are recognized by the eye as well as by the ear, and hence for the reader as well as for the hearer the translator should seek to phrase the Bible in "large, divine, and comfortable words."

One closing thought: "Clearness, force, and beauty" will always remain the ideal of composition, and especially of literature, in any tongue. Wonderful as our English Bible is, it still has room for improvement in each of these essential respects. Clearness is primary: we must not have the text so loaded with archaisms or so tied to Hebrew idioms that we cannot make out the sense. Force is secondary but essential: we must get the impact of the thought upon the mind, the glow of the feeling into the heart. Beauty is essential: man is made that way. To be clear is to have a certain plain kind of beauty; to be forceful is to have such beauty as we see in the athlete; and there are oral qualities and spiritual qualities leading, each in its own way, directly up to a beauty that is fairly divine.

Yet there is one thing that is deeper, higher, greater, than these. It has been said of the way in which Shintoism has in Japan given way to Buddhism: "If a majority eventually gave preference to the Buddhist rite, this preference was due in large measure to the peculiar *emotional charm* which Buddhism had infused into the cult." This far-found bit of experience points to a universal susceptibility,—a fact, in human nature, of the deepest significance, of the utmost importance: its effects are felt in the affairs of the world in a thousand ways; it bears vitally upon the question which branch of the church will finally take the lead. The problem of a cult, of a message, of a book, is the question of its power to touch the heart.

Viewing this power in its more superficial effects, we may call it "emotional charm"; viewing it as a force for winning and transforming men, we call it spiritual power. This sets the goal for every translator of the Bible: his version must have emotional charm; it must have spiritual power: the

deepest, the most enthralling emotional charm, the most compelling spiritual power.

The secret of the attainment of these is "one of the higher mysteries" of the soul: it is not found in any lexicon or textbook; it is not attached to any position; it is not conferred with any degree; if one is born with aptitude for it, it may be learned, with much painstaking, from those in whom greatness and fineness of soul have produced this result; without such aptitude and such tutelage it cannot be learned at all.