

eternity, when we are taken to dwell in the many mansions of the Father's House,—in which there surely must be room for all the Gospels ever written or spoken, even though they would make a book too big for this world to contain.

ALMONI PELONI.

*THE REVISED VERSION OF THE NEW
TESTAMENT.*

THE STYLE.

THERE are two competing theories of translation: one, in which the predominant object is to express as exactly as possible the full force and meaning of every turn of phrase in the original, and the other in which the predominant object is to produce a result which shall not read like a translation at all, but which shall move in its new dress with the same ease as in that which is native to it. I say in each case the predominant object; for in the hands of good translators neither the one nor the other of these two things can ever be entirely ignored. The question would be merely which should come first, and which second, in the translator's mind; and when the two conflict and it is necessary to make a choice between them, on which side the sacrifice should be made.

Very roughly speaking, it may be said that these two theories have their head-quarters in our two oldest universities. At Cambridge, scholarship is more exact and close; at Oxford, it is looser but has in it larger affinities with general literary culture. It is quite possible that this distinction may not be permanent, and that it may be due in a measure to personal influences which may be changed and even reversed in the future; and yet it would seem to be not without connexion with the traditional lines of

study pursued respectively on the Isis and on the Cam. Anyhow, the distinction is, I believe, generally recognized as a fact. It will be sufficiently clear to any one who will open two such very representative books as Prof. Jowett's translations of Plato or Thucydides, and Bishop Ellicott's translations of St. Paul's Epistles. Or, again, it would be well illustrated by a piece of advice which I once heard given in a Balliol lecture-room: "Remember, gentlemen, that style is the first thing and accuracy the second"—a piece of advice which, if I am not mistaken, would shock the righteous soul of a Cambridge don, and which, it is only fair to say, had been pretty nearly inverted by a tutor of an older school not many days before.

If there is, then, such a different colour and complexion to the scholarship of the two universities, it was naturally a question of much importance to which of the two the work of revision would chiefly fall. It should be borne in mind that the movement in favour of Revision had been from the first rather specially identified with Cambridge. Prof. Scholefield, Archbishop Trench, Dean Alford, Bishops Ellicott and Lightfoot, were all Cambridge men. And among all the advocates of Revision there were none so eminent and influential as these. It was therefore not at all surprising if, in the final distribution of the work, by far the larger share fell to Cambridge men. To the New Testament Committee as originally constituted, Cambridge contributed no less than fifteen members: Archbishop Trench, Bishops Ellicott and Harold Browne, Deans Alford, Bickersteth and Merivale, Professors Hort, Kennedy, Lightfoot and Westcott, Dr. Scrivener and Dr. Vaughan, Canon Blakesley and Mr. W. G. Humphry. Of these all but two or three (Dean Alford was removed by death, and the Archbishop of Dublin retired after attending 63 sittings) took an active and energetic part in the work. The Oxford contingent on the other hand numbered from first to last

only five names, Bishops Moberly of Salisbury, and C. Wordsworth of St. Andrews, Dean Stanley, Dr. Scott Dean of Rochester, and Archdeacon Palmer. And of these it would seem that Bishop Moberly attended only on 121 occasions (out of 407) and the Bishop of St. Andrew's only on 109,¹ while Archdeacon Palmer joined the Committee some time after it began its sittings.²

As an Oxford man myself I have no wish to complain of this disproportionate representation. It was perfectly justified by the state of New Testament scholarship in the two Universities and the degree of interest taken in the question. I merely state a matter of fact. And I suspect that the real balance of voting power on the Cambridge side would be greater even than it would seem to be, for the tendency of Nonconformist scholarship appears to be all in the Cambridge direction.

We shall thus be prepared to find, as we do find, in the Revised Version a very decided leaning towards the first of the two theories of translation of which I spoke. From the results of their work, as well as from the expressed opinions of the Revisers, it is clear that accuracy has been the first and dominating consideration, and that the question of style has held a secondary place.

I have little doubt that in principle it was well that it should be so. The method of considering, as the first and main thing, how the passage translated sounds in English, is open to serious objections. It is very liable to convey a mistaken, it is sure not to convey a full, idea of the mean-

¹ These figures are taken from the *Quarterly Review*, January, 1882, p. 62.

² It is true that the paper read by Archdeacon Palmer at the Church Congress shewed that he was quite in harmony with the majority of the Committee; nor do I at all mean to imply that the Oxford members would be ranged on one side and the Cambridge members on the other. If the Bishop of St. Andrews has protested against the method pursued by the Committee, his brother of Lincoln and the Archbishop of Dublin have done very much the same thing, and it is commonly understood that Dean Merivale expressed his disapproval by withdrawing.

ing of the original. It is apt to smooth down individualities of expression and to obliterate the idiosyncrasy of the writer. But it is needless to say that if ever there was a book in which such a process was to be deprecated and avoided it was the Bible. If ever there was a book in which the minutest shades of characterization should have the fullest play, and the very maximum of meaning should be wrung out of the text, it was precisely the one the translation of which the Committee sat down to revise.

All this I acknowledge in the amplest manner possible. I believe that the Committee were bound to fix upon the very best Greek text that they could find. They were bound to seek, as well as they could, for the exact words which the Apostles and Evangelists wrote. And having ascertained these within reasonable probability, they were bound to base their translation upon them, undeterred by any consideration as to whether they were likely to be acceptable or accepted, prepared to face a certain amount of inevitable obloquy, and content to leave the ultimate result to time. Having done this, they were further bound in all places where truth of opinion was involved to give what they considered to be the best and most probable interpretation; it was, besides, highly desirable that they should do the utmost in their power to bring out any characteristic features, however seemingly insignificant. They were right to consider nothing beneath their notice; for in Scripture, as in science, experience teaches that nothing is really "common or unclean," and that points apparently trivial may at any time start up into unexpected importance.

And yet the translator must exercise a certain amount of discretion. It will be necessary for him to estimate the degree of probability which he will regard as decisive. He will have to determine what he will endeavour to convey by translation, and what he will reserve for other means of

communication—Greek Testament lectures, Bible classes, Sunday schools, and the like; and in places where there is a conflict between different considerations, he will have to decide which is to yield.

My own grounds of complaint against the Revisers would be mainly three. (i.) That they have thought themselves obliged to do what might have been safely and with advantage left to other agencies: (ii.) That they have not attached sufficient importance to a free and natural English diction and rhythm: and (iii.) that in a variety of ways they have not allowed enough for the principle of Association, either as enhancing the value of existing renderings or as raising objections to new ones.

These three counts may be summed up in the one which is so commonly heard, and to which I feel compelled to assent, that they have made a great number of needless and, on the whole, detrimental changes.

Before I proceed to enlarge further on these points, I should like to clear my conscience by saying how much I regret to find myself obliged to urge them. The very things which, from a critical point of view, I cannot help regarding as errors of judgment, from a moral point of view excite my most sincere admiration. It would have been much easier for the Revisers to make few changes than to make many. It would have cost them less trouble (though perhaps not so much as might be thought at first sight), and it would have ensured them success. If they had made a sixth part of the changes they have done, their work would have been received with acclamation. The few grumbling Progressists would have remained unnoticed, and popular gratitude would have crowned their labours. But they deliberately cast this prospect aside. They deliberately girded themselves to a much more formidable task than that of removing the more obvious blemishes. They set themselves to reconsider the Authorised Version word by word, and to

correct everything, however trivial, which seemed to need correction. It was an heroic decision; and it has been carried out with heroic patience, fidelity, and care. The result is a work of the greatest value, a work which has stirred, and will continue to stir, the English mind to its very depths, and compel men to study their Bibles in a way in which they never had studied them before. It has banished dilettantism from ministers and people for many a long day. Thirty-six thousand alterations, and each with a reason to be discovered and thought over! There is an intellectual stimulus, which cannot help becoming a moral stimulus as well. And the Version will do much to satisfy many of the questions which it raises. And yet, while fully recognizing this, and while believing most sincerely that the Revised Version has a momentous office to fulfil in the Providential ordering of events for this, and it may be for more than this, generation, I cannot at the same time resist the conclusion that viewed with reference to its avowed object, to give a Revised Bible to the English speaking peoples for general and common use, and viewed as it is in its present form, it is nothing less than a failure.

Let me distinguish. So far as the text is concerned, I think, as well as I am able to judge, that the Revisers are right in the main. But I dare not speak too positively. There are still motes here and there "to trouble the mind's eye." And I could have wished that a few more years had elapsed, so that the question might have received a thorough discussion. The Revisers have boldly anticipated the judgment of posterity, and time only can shew whether posterity will endorse what has been done.

As to the interpretative scholarship my own opinion would be worth little. But the criticisms that have been passed by eminent men like Canon Evans and Dr. Field, in by far the greater number of instances, I confess, carry conviction. They seem to shew, what is especially dis-

appointing, that the Version does not even embody the best scholarship that was to be had. And in more than one case the serious doubt is raised, whether, supposing the Revised Version to represent the scholarship of to-day, it is likely to continue to represent the scholarship of to-morrow. While the old translators trusted more to common sense and less to rigid law, the new translators have inverted these relations; and yet in not a few instances a wider learning or a more searching analysis seems to shew that after all common sense was right.

Under this head the success is less complete than I had hoped. But it is in regard to my present subject—style, that the shortcoming seems to me to be greatest. And it is here especially that there is much that I should wish to see simply undone.

The three counts mentioned above very frequently coalesce in one, and I hope to give some examples of them presently. But, as I have hinted, a shorter way of stating them would be to give utterance to the wish that the Revisers had thought rather more highly of the Authorised Version, and had been rather less sanguine as to their ability to alter it for the better.

There is another kind of truth besides verbal accuracy; there is a truth of feeling, a truth of effect; and this I cannot but think that the Revisers have too much left out of sight. The Authorised Version owed its birth to the grandest epoch in the history of the English people. Great thoughts and great emotions filled the air. There was an outburst of poetry such as had never been seen before and has not been seen since. And while men's minds were steeped in poetry, they were also steeped in religion. The distracting fields of science and business were either closed, or else, where they were open, appealed to the imagination in ways in which few things appeal to it now. The whole element of prose was much more restricted than it has since

become. Even that which was in name prose felt the poetic afflatus in every line; and with this poetic afflatus another, no less mighty, was combined,—the afflatus of faith. Is it not a perilous undertaking to correct work done under such conditions? Are the conditions of our modern life at all equally favourable? An age that seems to be incapable of composing a single prayer—that can only substitute for the fresh gush of religious feeling a cento of phrases borrowed from bygone times, or else a cold sermon in brief, lifeless and uninspired¹—was this the age to remould that which had once come warm from the pens of martyrs, the living product of the best years of English religion? I do not for a moment wish to cast a doubt upon the sincere goodness of those honoured men who formed the New Testament Committee. But their goodness is of a different and essentially more prosaic cast. In a humbler, though perhaps larger sphere, the present age has achievements of its own to record.

“But yet I know, where'er I go,
That there hath passed away a glory from the earth.”

And that glory once gone, no art and no care of man can recall.

It would be as absurd as it would be unjust to find fault with the Revisers for not possessing a qualification which they could not, by the nature of the case, possess. But that which one regrets is that they seem to have felt so little misgiving on this score. If they had felt it, they would surely have held their hand many a time when they have not done so.

The department in which the poetic sense would especially make itself felt is that of rhythm and the choice of

¹ Who, for instance, has ever seen in print or heard a contemporary prayer fit to compare for a moment with the collects in the Book of Common Prayer (translated or original), or with the “Devotions” of Bishop Andrewes and other writers of the 16th and 17th centuries?

words. And, strange to say, a number of writers and speakers have treated these as matters of quite subordinate, not to say insignificant, moment. If the Bible were a manual of science or philosophy, I should agree with this estimate. But the Bible has little to do with science or philosophy; nor yet is it, as it used to be thought, a mere storehouse of cut and dried dogmas. It is the book of religion; and of religion not stereotyped in formal phrase, but tingling with a rich and powerful life from end to end. The Bible is the book of religion, and its object is to touch and stir the hearts of men. For this end rhythm and the choice of words are far from being unimportant. They may just make all the difference between a thought falling flat and dead, and the same thought striking a spark and kindling a flame. Where would poetry be without its rhythm and without its felicities of diction? And yet the New Testament, like a great part of the Old, is really of the nature of poetry; and this is one of the secrets of its power. It hardly seems to have been realized that the task of revising the familiar version of the New Testament is, to a certain real extent, as if one should sit down to "revise" (*i.e.*, very often "re-write") "Hamlet" or "Paradise Lost." It is strange what an amount of dulness of perception there seems to be on this subject. Some one (I forget who) has somewhere said that the Charity-chapter may be read in its new form without any sense of loss—"Charity suffereth long and is kind"—"Love suffereth long and is kind." He that hath ears to hear let him hear!

I will dwell for a moment on this question of Charity or Love, because it is a good example of the point that I am urging. I had made up my mind that the change was inevitable, however much it was to be lamented. Arguments such as those ably stated by Mr. Beet in this Magazine, seemed as if they must needs overpower the less tangible reasons alleged on the other side. Even the

fact that—to say nothing of this particular chapter, itself perhaps the most exquisite piece of English prose that ever was penned—a whole train of beautiful associations, ranging from the Vulgate to the Book of Common Prayer and from Giotto to Bunyan, would be destroyed at one fell stroke; even this did not seem sufficient to sustain the weight of the theological considerations which connected the “Love” of 1 Corinthians xiii. with that of Romans xiii. and St. John. But on returning to the subject with the counter arguments of Canon Evans¹ and others before me, I am tempted to think that “Charity” might have been allowed to stand, with “Love” in the margin and a reference to Romans xiii., etc. At any rate a procedure is absolutely intolerable which leads to such a rendering as that in the Revised Version of 2 Peter i. 7, “In your faith supply virtue. . . And in your godliness love of the brethren; *and in your love of the brethren love.*” How the distinguished scholars who formed the New Testament Committee could possibly acquiesce in such a version as this, it is to me difficult to conceive.

While I am speaking of 1 Corinthians xiii. I will venture upon two observations. The first is that if in Verse 1 “a tinkling cymbal” (admirably as the sound harmonizes with the keynote of the whole chapter) is too light for the kind of noise intended, “clanging” is also too heavy, besides being awkward in itself. I would venture to suggest “clashing”² as unobjectionable on these grounds and more nearly representing the real sound of cymbals, which the Greek also well imitates. With still more diffidence I could ask whether Verse 3 is not one of those rare instances in which we might attempt to improve upon the Authorised rendering. “Bestow all my goods to feed the poor,” is

¹ See *The Speaker's Commentary, N. T.*, vol. iii. p. 376.

² A reference to Skeat's *Etymological Dictionary* will shew that the radical idea in the word is sound, and not, as might be thought, collision.

at once a cumbrous and a poor rendering of *ψωμίσω πάντα τὰ ὑπάρχοντά μου*, though it gives a breadth of phrase which comes in happily for the rhythm. Have we not a word in English which has come to mean very much the same thing as *ψωμιζειν*? We speak of "parish *doles*" for "gifts of food"; and might we not in like manner here say, "give away . . . *in doles*" or "*dole away*"? This would recall the crowds of poor gathered round the gates of a monastery or a church porch, with a kindly (or unkindly) almoner.

It will be said that the considerations on which stress has been laid above tell no more against the present Revision than against all Revision. It is true that they do tell against it, as far as they go. The scientific defects of the Old Version, however, seem as if they would make revision necessary sooner or later. We should have therefore to limit ourselves to the practical compromise, that in any Version the great object should be to obtain a maximum of accuracy with an absolute minimum of change, and that in all cases of real doubt the existing text should be left undisturbed. This is in effect very much what the Convocation of Canterbury had laid down, with that wise instinct which is so constantly found in large bodies of men. Nor would I question the fact that the Revisers have kept the rule of making none but "necessary" changes, in view, and that they have fully believed that the changes that they have made were necessary. But as to the judgment and success with which they have carried out their task, I must confess in many instances to very grave doubts indeed.

I am well aware of the excessive difficulties of the problem. The more fully that problem is realized the more formidable will it appear, and the more conscious we shall be that it is one which would tax to the uttermost the very finest scholarship that the country can produce. And yet the country *does* possess fine scholarship. To say that

the English people are not capable of revising their own Version is a confession of weakness that we are not yet compelled to make.

Let me give a few examples of what I mean by "fine scholarship," and let me illustrate at the same time the great desideratum of a "maximum of accuracy with a minimum of change." Here is an example from a recent number of the EXPOSITOR. It was shewn that ὡστε with the infinitive lays stress upon the cause in contradistinction to the effect; that therefore it was not strictly correct to say (as in both versions of Matt. xiii. 32) "it becometh a tree, *so that* the birds of the air come and lodge in the branches thereof." The difficulty is met by simply writing "*for* the birds of the air *to* come," etc. Again objection was justly taken to the uncouth and scarcely intelligible rendering of the new reading in Acts xxvi. 16 "to appoint thee a minister and a witness both *of the things wherein* thou hast seen Me, and of *the things wherein* I will appear unto thee." How much nearer to the English idiom is the simple yet accurate rendering suggested to me by Canon Evans, "*how* thou hast seen Me, and *how* I will appear to thee." Similarly in Luke xi. 41 the new Version is "give for alms *those things that are within*"; but putting aside for a moment the question of interpretation, how much better is it to say, as Canon Evans has also suggested to me, "give for alms *what you can!*" There is a clear distinction between ἰασθαι and θεραπεύειν (θεραπεία) and this both Canon Evans and Dr. Field, independently of each other, propose to express by "heal" and "cure." The mention of Dr. Field reminds me of those beautiful notes, the third part of the "Otium Norvicense," which it has been the good fortune of the Revision to call forth. They are a perfect repertory not only of wide and remarkably apposite learning, combined with originality and independence of view, but also in an especial sense of the particular quality

of which I am speaking. The force of the preposition has hitherto been lost in *προσανάβηθι ἀνώτερον*, but all the change that is needed is to substitute "come" for "go"—"*come up higher.*" *τολμήσας εἰσῆλθε* is not "went in boldly" but "*took courage and went in.*" *οὐδὲ τοῦτο ἀνέγνωτε ὃ ἐποίησε Δαβὶδ* in Luke vi. 3, is not "Have ye not read even this *what* David did"—which would be *τι ἐποίησε* as in the other Gospels—but "*this that* David did." Other proposed renderings, perhaps rather more doubtful but in style very attractive, are Matthew xiii. 12. "To him shall it be given and *given in abundance*"; Matthew xxvii. 24, "When Pilate saw that he *did no good*"; and John xii. 19, "Perceive ye that ye *do no good* at all"; Mark i. 30, *κατέκειτο* "*kept her bed*" (which is found in the Authorised Version of Exod. xxi. 18, and seems to be admissible); Mark vi. 26 "and would not *disappoint* her" (*ἀθετήσαι*); Luke xv. 13, *ζῶν ἀσώτως* "with *prodigal* living," where Dr. Field seems to have shown that "profligate expenditure" is the leading idea of the word, not to speak of the link which is thus supplied with the familiar title of the parable; 1 Corinthians iv. 6, *μετεσχημάτισα εἰς ἑμαυτόν* "I have transferred *by a fiction* to myself and Apollos." This last I cannot help thinking a specially happy and luminous translation.

Somewhat bolder and more elaborate would be the rendering "*pair or compare,*" proposed by Mr. Waite¹ for the difficult *ἐγκρίναι ἢ συγκρίναι* of 2 Cor. x. 12 where the play on words is dropped entirely in the Authorised Version and Revised Version, "We are not bold to *number* or compare ourselves with," etc. (Revised Version adding in the margin, Gr. *to judge ourselves among, or to judge ourselves with*). I very much hope that all these three names may

¹ I should have quoted more examples from Mr. Waite's excellent Commentary but that they are for the most part fitted rather for a Commentary than a Version. There is, however, abundant evidence of a remarkable command of English diction and power of moulding it into a suitable shape.

appear on the Committee which I suppose will sooner or later revise the Revision. They would strengthen it just on the point where it seems to be weakest; for, with all the learning and exegetical ability represented upon it, I fear that it cannot be credited with a very fine discretion or with great dexterity in the handling of English. How few of the renderings can be described as "felicitous!" A spirit of diligent and conscientious care reigns over all, but ease and grace are lost in the mechanical application of rules.

Errors of omission I cannot help thinking that there are some,¹ but errors of commission I suspect that there are very many more. At the head of these comes the ominously long list of passages where the Old Version might well have been allowed to stand, and where it has been altered simply for the worse. It is hard to imagine what can have induced such a change as that in 1 Corinthians v. 1, where it has been shewn² that the Authorised Version was "beautifully correct," while the new rendering is not only bad Greek, but attributes to the Apostle an indelicacy which he would have been the last to commit. Not less certainly wrong would seem to be such a rendering as "I beheld Satan *fallen*, as lightning from heaven." Nor is there any gain in accuracy to compensate for the feebleness of "Herodias *set herself against* him" (ἐνέϊχεν αὐτῷ) or for such an unwieldy phrase as, "perceiving in himself that *the power proceeding from him had gone forth*,"

¹ Of the real difficulties of New Testament translation some have been faced but with very doubtful success (e.g. σκάνδαλον, σκανδαλίζω), but many have been left untouched. Perhaps the hardest word in the whole Greek Testament is ψυχικός, and I am not at all prepared to say that in regard to this abstention was not best. And yet "natural" is hardly even a paraphrase of the Greek. Would it be possible to borrow a hint from the old rendering of Jude 19 (a typical verse for the understanding of the word) and translate not "sensual" but "sensuous"? The ψυχή expresses itself in the life of the senses. I see that δικαίωμα, in Rom. v. 18, is translated "act of righteousness"; might not "justifying act" be better?

² See the EXPOSITOR, Jan. 1882, p. 4 ff.; also March, p. 164 ff.

or for the bad grammar of "I am *he that beareth witness* of myself"; or for the contextual difficulty of "*every evening* (Gk. *whenever evening came*, margin) he went forth out of the city";¹ or for such unnatural English as "having a *great* priest over the house of God."²

It is on points like this last that the Revisers seem to me to be most at fault. They have courageously driven their ploughshare through the beautiful English of the Old Version, too little heeding what they uproot and too little sensitive as to what they put in its place. Noble idioms like "this is the Lord's doing," "neither bid him God speed"; flashes of poetry that light up all their contexts like "vials of wrath," "and the Lamb is the light thereof"; sound native forcible English, like "a strong delusion," "the string of his tongue was loosed," "enter into thy closet," "sue thee at the law," "much people," "vex certain of the church," "the birds of the air," "wages of iniquity," "brightness of his glory," must all go; and in their stead we are to have such expressions as "come and break your fast," "after they had broken their fast," "the vessels of the potter are broken to shivers." Here are some specimens of the treatment of a single word.

AUTHORISED VERSION.

Matt. vi. 25. Is not the life more than meat and the body than raiment?

Matt. x. 10. The workman is worthy of his meat.

Acts ii. 46. [They] did eat their meat with gladness and singleness of heart.

REVISED VERSION.

Is not the life more *than the food*, and the body than the raiment?

The labourer is worthy of his *food*.

They did *take their food* with gladness and singleness of heart.

¹ For the last four examples (to which many might be added, *e.g.* Acts vii. 35; x. 28; Rom. xv. 20; 1 Cor. x. 13; xiv. 8; 2 Pet. iii. 8), see Dr. Field's *Otium Norvicense*, pars tertia, which I never open without increasing admiration.

² See *The Quarterly Review*, Jan. 1882, p. 38. I have contested the views of this uncompromising critic as regards the Revised Text, but I find myself too much in sympathy with him as regards the *Translation*.

Who would not wince at hearing the new version of these passages read! It was one of the excellences of the Old Version, that with all its simplicity of speech it so seldom loses its dignity; though treating of common things it is rarely,¹ if ever, itself common. Of this the passages before us were a good example. They have just the quality of poetry. By the use of a word slightly unusual, but in no way affected or unnatural, base associations are cut away and the elevated level of the discourse or narrative is left unimpaired. For us the effect is still happier than it probably was originally, for the word has now grown thoroughly into its place; it is like a stone that is mossed and lichened over and that only adds to the beauty of its surroundings. But because there was something anomalous about it, a piece of glaring new red brick must needs be put in its place.

I shall be told no doubt that "meat" would be understood to mean "butcher's meat." In the North, where I am writing, this objection would not apply. But what else are Sunday Schools for if not to remove such elementary blunders as these? At the worst no great harm was done—nothing to compare with the harm of ruining a masterpiece and fixing a stamp of commonness and *Bavavoria* upon words to which they are utterly alien.

The rule that has worked the greatest mischief is probably that of uniform rendering. To this fetish of uniformity it is hard to say how many beauties have been sacrificed. I am not speaking now of such irregular and illicit beauties as "whether there be prophecies, they shall fail; whether there be tongues, they shall cease; whether there be knowledge, it shall vanish away." One must needs steel one's heart to the loss of these, lovely as they are, and wistfully as one cannot but think of them. It is not

¹ Just, perhaps, in such cases as Phil. ii. 1; Col. iii. 12; 1 John iii. 17; and there is an occasional lapse of another kind, like "Occupy, till I come."

however of them that I am speaking, but rather of those quiet and unobtrusive beauties which arise merely from choosing the English idiom which corresponds most nearly to the Greek, and which is most appropriate to the particular context, without being rigidly tied down by the rendering given to the same word elsewhere. On this point I would cordially echo the words of Dean Perowne. "In the case of different writers, or even in all places of the same writer, where the word is not characteristic, and where it occurs in a very different context, to attempt to render it uniformly by one English word is mere pedantry, and is the surest way to destroy all freedom, and all dignity of language. In English, as in all languages, a word takes a peculiar colouring from its neighbourhood. A light is flashed upon it, a shadow touches it, according to the place it holds in a sentence. Few words present always the same unchanging aspect. It is quite impossible, therefore, with any regard for English idiom, with any feeling for delicacy, or beauty, or strength of expression, to keep one word in one language as the sole equivalent of a word in another."¹ This is no idle æstheticism. No one knows by what subtle channels of association words have an effect upon the mind. But we may be sure that the poetical element enters in largely here, and that any harshness, stiffness, or crudity of expression will blunt its edge and destroy its force in a way for which no amount of dogmatic or exegetical accuracy can atone.

I have spoken of Dr. Perowne's criticism; and I cannot but think that of all those that the Revision has called forth, though one of the earliest, it is still one of the very best. Almost all that it contained on the subject of style I should be glad to adopt word for word. Four ways especially are pointed out in which the Revisers have erred. (i.) In the direction of too great literalism; (ii.) in the

¹ *Contemporary Review*, July, 1881, p. 163.

inversion of order (a very frequent and vexatious form of change); (iii.) in the uses of tenses; (iv.) in the use or omission of the article. The last two points may perhaps raise questions on which I should hesitate to pronounce confidently. But I should like to add to the instances given of an objectionable use of the tenses, one in particular that has struck me, and that I have not seen commented on elsewhere; I mean the attempt to reproduce exactly the historic present. There can be no doubt that the use of this tense is more common in Greek than in English; and the old translators, with the admirable instinct which characterized them, frequently ignore it. In this it is much to be regretted that their successors have not followed them. The consequence is a painful loss of solemnity in some places where it was most needed. Let any one read the fifteenth chapter of St. Mark's Gospel, and he will, I think, understand what I mean. In other ways, too, this chapter will illustrate the effect produced by petty changes. It is indeed generally in the Gospels that this is most felt. The pure pellucid flow of the old narratives is gone. The movement has become stiff and wooden, and that just where those qualities are most fatal. In the more argumentative portions of the Epistles we are often conscious of a distinct gain in clearness and accuracy, but in the Gospels the wish will many a time rise to the surface, Would that the old familiar words had been let alone!

In looking back over the Version one is reminded of the architectural restoration of some of our great churches and cathedrals. I do not mean of course the ruthless vandalism of Wyatt and the men of his day, but some of the severer restorations that have taken place within our own memory. The architect has had an ample knowledge of his craft; he has been well instructed in the true laws of Gothic; and he has applied them with a conscientiousness in which the only fault is that it is too rigorous and thorough. The

whitewash is gone and the intrusive monuments have been swept away, all manner of miscellaneous and anachronistic additions have been removed, and a fine regularity and symmetry takes the place of the old unscientific jumble of many ages and many styles. An impressive uniformity and completeness is the result. And yet, with the rubbish, not a few details have disappeared which had got naturalized in their place and possessed an interest and value and beauty of their own; and the worshipper, especially if his own hair is grey, feels less at home and less happy in the midst of these straight lines and unbroken curves than he used to do when his eyes could linger on the quaint niches and corners, and lovingly trace the historical eccentricities of the old building, as he knew it when he was a boy.

Or, again, one is reminded, with some necessary deduction from the degree of censure which they might seem to convey, of the pathetic lines in which Wordsworth describes his boyish experiences of "Nutting."

"Then up I rose
And dragged to earth both branch and bough, with crash
And merciless ravage; and the shady nook
Of hazels, and the green and mossy bower,
Deformed and sullied, patiently gave up
Their quiet being; and unless I now
Confound my present feelings with the past;
Ere from the mutilated bower I turned,
Exulting, rich beyond the wealth of kings,
I felt a sense of pain when I beheld
The silent trees, and saw the intruding sky—
Then, dearest Maiden, move along these shades
In gentleness of heart; with gentle hand
Touch—for there is a spirit in the woods."

It is impossible to praise too highly the courage, the conscientiousness, the singleness of purpose, with which the Revisers of the New Testament have accomplished what they felt to be their duty; but I could have earnestly

wished that they had had a gentler, and a lighter, and a more delicate and sensitive hand. For surely in these woods too—in these woods much more—“there is a spirit,” which a rude transplanting is only too apt to expel.

W. SANDAY.

*THE SENSE IN WHICH ST. PAUL CALLS
HIMSELF AN ECTROMA.*

1 CORINTHIANS XV. 8.

“And last of all, as if it were unto the *ectroma*, he appeared also unto me.”

I.

It is obvious that the word *ectroma* is here applied in a highly figurative sense. But in order to determine the notion which it is intended metaphorically to convey, it will be necessary, in the first instance, to ascertain as precisely as we can the sense which the writer attributed to the term taken literally. In this latter enquiry the obvious course to pursue is, first of all, to refer to its use in that Hellenistical translation of the Old Testament which both the Apostle himself and the Christians whom he was addressing were constantly in the habit of perusing. In the Septuagint, then, the word *ectroma* occurs three times. The passages as given in that translation are as follows:—

(1) Numbers xii. 12, “Lest she become,” (or, according to another reading, “Let her not become,”) “as if a thing like unto death, as if an *ectroma* coming forth out of its mother’s womb.”

(2) Job iii. 16, “or an *ectroma* coming out of its mother’s womb, or as babes which saw not the light.”