and may thus, like flies in amber, be preserved for the admiration of succeeding generations; but the main cause, in comparison with which all others are insignificant, appears to be the mosaic, conglomerate, piecemeal character of the work. A phrase from one source, another from another, adopted without alteration, insufficiently harmonized by editorial supervision, here appears to be the secret of the inequalities in the Authorized Version. The same process adopted in making the Revised Version has produced the same result,—a noble work marred by faults, microscopic if you will, but none the less blemishes. If I am told “A friendly eye could never see such faults,” I have only to reply “A flatterer’s would not, though they do appear As huge as high Olympus.”

XVII.—NOTES ON TRANSLATIONS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT. By BENJAMIN DAWSON, B.A.

IN the discussion which followed the reading of my paper “Notes on the *n* of *an*, etc., in the Authorized and Revised Versions of the Bible,” Dr. Murray remarked that a comparison of the editions of 1611 and 1612 showed that many scores of alterations were made in the Authorized Version after its first publication. There is no reason to suppose that the Revisers of 1881 will not follow the excellent example of those of 1611, more particularly as some little adjustment may be rendered desirable, if not imperative, when the new version of the Old Testament appears. The present therefore seems to be a suitable time for all those who are not satisfied with the Revised Version in its present form to point out the causes of their dissatisfaction, and to suggest any alterations which would in their opinion be improvements. It required many years of agitation to get the Revision undertaken, it has taken ten years to produce the New Testament, therefore no pains should be spared in its

perfection. Nor need a layman think it out of his province to say a word on the subject, for the laity as a body must be more affected by the quality of a translation than the clergy, seeing that the clergy have their Greek Testaments to refer to, with which they are, or are supposed to be, familiar. An English translation is for the body of the English laity.

A great deal has been written for and against the R. V. As I have read but little of the discussion, it may very possibly happen that some things may be repeated here which have been already said elsewhere. Since reading my last paper, however, I have seen the bitter and savage attack of the *Quarterly Review* of October, 1881, on the Text adopted by the Revisers, and that of January, 1882, on the English of the R. V. The first article has been ably answered in the *Contemporary Review* of December, 1881; and in a tone more consonant with the feeling of our time. The *Quarterly Reviewer* proves too much,—it is impossible to believe him,—and as to tone, he reminds one of the discussions of the sixteenth century, and the style in vogue 300 years ago! Martin and Fulke bandied such compliments as these in the sixteenth century,—“If you be so blind that you cannot see a comparison in the word ‘worthy,’ at least shore up your eyes, and behold it in those words, ‘of like or equal value’”¹ (p. 348). The *Quarterly Review* of the nineteenth century gives us (p. 9, Jan. 1882), “It is clear, therefore, that *caprice*—not *Necessity*—has determined not a few of the alterations which molest us in every part of the present work”—and (p. 21), “Their work is disfigured throughout by changes which convict the majority of their body alike of an imperfect acquaintance with the genius of the Greek language, and of scarcely a moderate appreciation of the idiomatic proprieties of their own.”

Mr. G. Washington Moon, author of *The Dean's English*, published at the beginning of this year a little book called *The Revisers' English*, in which he adversely criticizes their

¹ A Defence of the sincere and true Translations of the Holy Scriptures into the English Tongue, against the cavils of Gregory Martin, by William Fulke, D.D., Master of Pembroke Hall, Cambridge, 1583 (*The Parker Society*, 1843).

translation. The book consists of a series of letters reprinted from *Public Opinion*. The fact of their having been originally written for a weekly paper probably accounts to some extent for their rather flippant and arrogant tone. Mr. Washington Moon reminds one somewhat of William Cobbett,—his castigation is always severe, and sometimes deserved, but the wrongness of what he condemns is frequently proved by his own *ipse dixit* alone. As an example of this characteristic a quotation from p. 120 may serve: "The error of spelling '*ought*' with an '*o*,' and thus confusing it with the verb '*ought*,' is very usual, but that it should be spelt with an '*a*' is evident from its derivation: A.-S. *aht*, written also *auht* and *auhit*. Its negative, '*naught*,' should certainly agree with it." Perhaps it is a pity *nought* has been preferred to *naught*, but Mr. Moon's is a very cavalier way of treating the matter, for a reference to Dr. R. Morris's *Outlines of English Accidence* shows both forms in use in Middle English. That *nought* was the more usual might be inferred from its getting shortened into *not*. And if we go back to A.-S., we find the four forms *aciht*, *owiht*, *nawiht*, *nowiht*—and their contracted forms *aht*, *naht*, *noht*—all in common use; v. Sweet's *Anglo-Saxon Reader*, 3rd ed. Glossary.

Mr. Moon is also very indignant with the Revisers for following the A. V. in such sentences as: "His face was as the sun, and his feet as pillars of fire," Rev. x. 1, where the verb is expressed with the first Subject, but understood with the second, although that is of a different number. This English idiom is fully illustrated in Maetzner's *English Grammar* (Grece's Translation, vol. ii. p. 151) by examples from various authors of different times, beginning with Ang.-Sax. and coming through Milton ("So *doth* the prince of Hell And his adherents," *Paradise Lost* x. 621), Young, Earl of Chatham, down to Leigh Hunt. But Mr. Moon seems to disallow what is generally admitted as a principle, that the rules of grammarians are of no value unless they are founded on the usage of good authors. He quotes (p. 51) with approval from Rev. M. Harrison's *The Rise of the*

English Language: "That which is right is right, without any authority at all, and that which is wrong cannot be made right by any authority." A general principle in which we should all agree; the only difficulty is to find any other rule than the usage of good writers to determine what is right in a matter of language. Certainly not the *ipse dixit* of Lindley Murray, or of Rev. M. Harrison, his favourite authorities, nor that of Mr. Moon himself. If the Revisers had repeated the emphatic word and omitted the Conjunction, this kind of sentence would, I submit, in many cases have been greatly improved; for repetition is often the best way of conveying in English that emphasis which is denoted in Latin and Greek by position. Thus I would suggest as an improvement of R. V. Luke xi. 27, "Blessed is the womb that bare thee, blessed the breasts which thou didst suck."

But it is not my business to defend the Revisers against Mr. Washington Moon. They will doubtless correct some of the inconsistencies pointed out by him, some of those mentioned in the *Quarterly Review*, and some of those referred to in my former paper. To please all parties, however, would be impossible. The *Quarterly Review* (p. 7, Jan. 1882) gives as proof of "what license the Revisionists take," their change of "all that *be*" into "all that *are*," Rom. i. 7, of "*mine* host" into "*my* host," Rom. xvi. 23; whereas in my former paper I objected to the retention of *be* as an Indicative in any passages, and that of the fuller forms *an*, *none*, *mine*, *thine*, before any words beginning with *h* aspirated. The *Quarterly Review* would, I suppose, have retained *an house* in Mark iii. 19, and *a house* six verses lower down; but what changes it would have approved of it is not easy to divine. Even doing away with the divisions into verses, divisions which so often split sentences into parts and hide their connection, incurs its censure. But the very able and exhaustive article in the *Quarterly Review* is studded with very curious passages of different sorts, amongst which may be classed those condemning the R. V. because of its departure from the phraseology of the Prayer Book! "Our whole Prayer Book breathes a different spirit and speaks a

different language" (p. 52) exclaims the Reviewer; but surely the Protestant laity will be inclined to insist that the Prayer Book shall be brought into harmony with the Bible, not the Bible be translated to suit the Prayer Book. In Mat. i. 22 the Revisers have changed "which was spoken of the Lord *by* the Prophet" into "which was spoken *by* the Lord *through* the prophet," and the Reviewer indignantly objects (p. 33), "'Who spake *by* the Prophets,' is even an article of the Faith!" Such an argument is sectarianism, not scholarship.

Passing on then from what others have said respecting the merits of the new English Version of the New Testament, I will now proceed to lay before you some notes on its Syntax and Style, confining myself to the narrative portions, in order that all questions of doctrine may be avoided.

The duties of a translator may be conveniently considered under four heads. A translator is bound (1) To ascertain as exactly as possible what was written by the author he proposes to translate; (2) To discover with the greatest care what the author meant by what he wrote; (3) To convey the author's meaning clearly in the language into which he undertakes to translate it; (4) To suit the style of his translation to the style of his author and to the subject treated of. In the case which is now before us there is further a propriety in choosing phraseology somewhat archaic, and there is an imperative necessity that the language adopted shall be simple, easy, and readily intelligible.

It will probably be generally acknowledged, notwithstanding the fury of the *Quarterly Review*,—a fury savouring of the bitterness of fanatic sectarianism rather than of the impartiality of scholarship,—that the ten years' labour of the twenty-four to twenty-seven well-known scholars has borne good fruit in weeding the Text of the New Testament of glosses and additions of various sorts, made for different reasons, good or bad. Still less doubt can there be that the Revisers, by their previous studies, and by their common work during these ten years, are in a better position than any other set of men for ascertaining the meaning of the Text they have adopted.

Two, therefore, of the essentials of a good translation have, I hold, been complied with; the Revisers have shown great discrimination in the choice of their Text, and have doubtless mastered its meaning. I pass on therefore to the third duty of a translator: To convey the author's meaning clearly in the language into which he undertakes to translate it.

In translation, as in most other things, there is a Scylla and a Charybdis, between which safely to steer requires great skill. Let literal, word for word, translation be the Scylla, and then jaunty, fly-away paraphrase will be the Charybdis. There was no probability that the Revisers would sail too near Charybdis—have they or have they not sailed too near Scylla? I hold they have; and that they have in so doing seriously damaged, though not perhaps split, their vessel. For literal translation to be possible, there must be similarity of metaphor and of construction between two languages. Let me take a simple illustration. French grammarians tell us, "*L'e muet se mange devant une voyelle.*" There is no difficulty in seizing the idea, nor in turning it into idiomatic English,—"*Silent e is dropped before a vowel.*" No sane Englishman would translate it literally and say, *Silent e eats itself before a vowel*, or even *is eaten*. Or again, suppose a Frenchman to render "*il mange ses mots*" as *he eats his words*, might he not be guilty of injustice, slander, libel, or what not? for we all know that many a worthy truthful man has a very indistinct articulation, and *clips* his words most wofully, but never has to eat them, which is the liar's privilege! Literal translation is then impossible where metaphors differ.

It is often impossible from difference in syntactical construction; such for instance as the very common *on dit*, or *Man sagt*, which cannot be turned into English more closely than *they say*, or *it is reported*, or *report says*, where the Number or the Voice must be changed. May *quinze jours* be translated *a fortnight*, or does faithful translation require it to be mimicked by *fifteen days*? Why even the order of such words as are frequently used in combination often differs in two languages! Ought a German's *Salz und Pfeffer* to be

translated *salt and pepper*, and not rather *pepper and salt*? We talk of *hunger and thirst*, but a Frenchman, following Cicero's order, says *la soif et la faim*. Cicero's "*ad ferrum et flammam*," *Pro Flacco* 40, and Voltaire's "*le fer et le feu*," *Louis XIV.*, are properly rendered by our *fire and sword*, not by *sword and fire*. In Caesar and Cicero "*ultra citroque*" is a common expression, but he would be an absurdly literal translator who should insist upon rendering the phrase *thither and hither*, instead of *hither and thither*, because *ultra* comes before *citro* in the Latin. Voltaire's "*tort ou raison*," *Louis XIV.*, is our *right or wrong*; Corneille's "*l'ame et le cœur*," *La Suite du Menteur*, v. 1, is our *heart and soul*; Voltaire's "*armé de pied en cap*," *Louis XIV.*, and Molière's "*depuis les pieds jusqu'à la tête*," *L'Avare* i. 5, could not surely be translated *from foot to head*, although we might adopt either Shakspeare's "*from head to foot*," or his "*from top to toe*." The measurement will come out the same at whichever end it is begun, and surely each nation has a right to begin at top or toe as seems to it best! "*Ego et Rex meus*," wrote Wolsey; but in English he would undoubtedly have reversed the order. If then the metaphors employed to convey ideas, the syntactical constructions, and even the order of words in the commonest phrases differ in modern French and English, it is clear that absolutely literal translation, from either language into the other, must be an impossibility; and the nearer a translation approaches to being literal, the greater will be the danger of its losing all idiomatic expression. And if this is true of English and French of the present day, how much more true is it likely to be of English and Greek, at an interval of 1800 years! It is an impossibility without a miracle; and the days of miracles are acknowledged to be past.

A very common English idiom is the joining together of two Adverbs of opposite meaning into one phrase, and using only one verb of motion, *e.g. in and out, up and down, to and fro*. We have a good example in Psalm lix. 15 (A. V.) "*Let them wander up and down for meat*;" another in Bunyan, *Pilgrim's Progress* (Christian and Faithful at

Vanity Fair), "They led them in chains up and down the fair for an example and terror to others." Examples abound in poetry: "She wandered up and down," Wordsworth, *Lucy Gray*; "I wind about, and in and out," Tennyson, *The Brook*. The same idiom, with reversed order, is common in German, where it is rendered more conspicuous by their way of putting a hyphen after the first adverb, thus: *aus- und einfließen* (p. 30), *aus- und einzuziehen* (p. 33), Goethe, *Knabenjahre* (*Pitt Press Texts*). We have an example in Luther's translation of Acts i. 21, "ist aus- und eingegangen." Now this passage is rendered in the A. V. "went in and out among us," which is unhappily changed in the R. V. into "went in and went out among us;" the latter agrees with the Rheims, the former with Tyndale. The same two Greek verbs are used in conjunction in John x. 9, and Luther again shows us the German idiom referred to, translating "wird ein- und ausgehen." Here again Tyndale's "shall go in and out," which had been retained in the A. V., is altered in the R. V. into "shall go in and go out." I fail to see any advantage whatever; and if the object was to render *καὶ εἰσελεύσεται καὶ ἐξελεύσεται* as literally as possible, even this has not been accomplished, for there is as much "shall" in the second verb as in the first, and there is no more reason for repeating the "go" than the "shall." We have lost a good English idiomatic phrase, and have got a translation which is not so literal as Wiclif's "schal go ynne and schal go out." Nor do I believe that the average Englishman will now (from the R. V.) so readily as before (from the A. V.) get the notion of daily intercourse conveyed by the Greek, Acts i. 21. Cranmer's rendering shows it, "all the tyme that the Lorde Iesus had all his conuersacyon amonge us," so does the Geneva, "all the tyme the Lorde Iesus was conuersant among us."¹ At least it is to be hoped that the

¹ The quotations (except A. V.) are taken from: (1) *The English Hexapla*, exhibiting the six important English Translations of the New Testament Scriptures, Wiclif 1380, Tyndale 1534, Cranmer 1539, Geneva 1557, Rheims 1582, Authorized 1611 (*Samuel Bagster and Sons*, 1841); (2) *The Gothic and Anglo-Saxon Gospels in Parallel Columns, with the Versions of Wycliffe* (1389) and Tyndale (1526). Edited by Dr. Bosworth and Mr. Waring. (*John Russell Smith*, 1865).

Old Testament Revisers will not find it necessary to change Job i. 7 (and similar passages) after the same fashion; it reads at present in the A. V., "And the Lord said unto Satan, Whence comest thou? Then Satan answered the Lord, and said, From going to and fro in the earth, and from walking up and down in it."

Another idiom. In Mark viii. 2 and Mat. xv. 32 the same Greek words occur: *ὅτι ἤδη ἡμέραι τρεῖς προσμένουσί μοι*. The verb *προσμένουσι* is rendered in the Latin Vulgate by *perseverant* in the first passage, and by *sustinent* in the second. Now it is a well-known rule of Latin Syntax that a Present tense joined to words denoting continuous time must be rendered in English by the Present Perfect. In Key's *Latin Grammar*, § 579, in his paradigm of a Latin verb "with the English translation," the sentence "*Jam duas horas scribo*" is translated, "I have been writing now two hours," not *I write now two hours*. Similarly the *Public School Latin Grammar*, § 127, translates "*Annum jam audis Cratippum*" as "You have been a scholar of Cratippus for a year," not *You are a scholar of Cratippus for a year*, which would indicate a future programme rather than an accomplished fact. Such is the teaching of School and College at the present day. Maetzner, ii. 71, refers to this use of the Perfect tense, quoting Shakspeare, 2 *Hy. IV.* iii. 1, "Your majesty *has been* this fortnight ill." Tyndale renders the passage in Matthew "because they have contynued with me now .iii. dayes," and that in Mark "because they have nowe bene with me .iii. dayes." Wiclif in Matthew gives "for thei han abiden now thre dayes with me," in Mark "for lo now the thridde dai thei abiden me,"—with the Ordinal a Present clearly enough conveys the same idea as a Perfect with the Cardinal number. The A. V. follows Tyndale in Mark, but in Matthew gives "they continue with me now three dayes," which appears to be Cranmer's. Strangely enough the tenses differ in the two passages in the Anglo-Saxon version. The R. V. assimilates the two passages, choosing unfortunately what appears to be the worst rendering, Cranmer's "because they continue with me now three

days." And why have they adopted this rendering? Not because it most clearly indicates to the English reader that the multitude had continuously remained in attendance during parts of three successive days,—for this is not a fact; not because in one passage the Ang.-Sax. version, made nearly 1000 years ago, uses a Present tense,—for earliest English is not intelligible to an average Englishman of the present day; not because the French idiom follows the Latin, which is the same as the Greek, "*Je l'aime depuis un jour que je la vis dans une promenade*," Molière, *L'Avare*, iv. 3,—which seems to be a rather irrelevant fact; not because the same idiom may be found in German poetry, "*Drei Jahre sitzt er auf dem Gibchenstein*," Uhland, *Ernst*, i. 1, 48,—for this, too, seems to bear but little upon the subject; but they have adopted this rendering (presumably) for a reason as bad as any of those suggested,—because the Greek verb is in the Present tense! For what does it matter to Hodge what tense of the Greek verb is used, and as for his Vicar, he knows, or ought to know, that a Greek Present has the meaning of an English Perfect in such sentences. The same construction has been similarly treated in Mark v. 25, where the Revisers have not adopted Cranmer's excellent translation, conveying most clearly to the English reader the sense of the Greek text,—"*And ther was a certen woman, which had bene diseased of an yssue of bloude .xii. yeres*." Other examples may be found in Luke xiii. 7, xv. 29.

In Mat. xiv. 16 the A. V. gives us "They need not depart," which is changed in the R. V. into "They have no need to go away." This latter rendering is Tyndale's, but by no means better as an English sentence,—which is the sole point of interest in an English translation,—than the A. V. And what is more, if for the sake of anybody,—Tyro, let us say, that he may the more easily re-produce the Greek text from his English New Testament, for who else can require it?—it was desirable to make the translation as literal as possible, Wiclif's rendering should have been preferred, "*They han not nede to go*," from which it might

be correctly inferred that the negation is contained in an Adverb, not in an Adjective! Similarly in Mat. xv. 32 and Mark viii. 2 as compared with Mat. ix. 36; if the A. V. "have nothing to eat" is sufficiently exact for *οὐκ ἔχουσι τί φάγωσι*, what need was there to change "as sheep having no shepherd" into "as sheep not having a shepherd" for *ὥσεὶ πρόβατα μὴ ἔχοντα ποιμένα*?

Again, in Mat. xviii. 16 all the Versions agree in rendering "in the mouth of two or three witnesses" ('by,' Geneva). This the R. V. turns into the less idiomatic form "at the mouth of two witnesses or three," simply because this is the Greek order of words! But if it was desirable to indicate to Hodge, or Tyro, or "the wayfaring men though fools," the fact, important or otherwise, that in the original Greek the word for *witnesses* stands next to the word for *two*, and not to that for *three*, it was surely equally important to make it clear that the word for *three* is in the Genitive case, and the translation ought to have been *at the mouth of two witnesses or of three*. If we must have literal translation, let us have it!

This same principle and its effects may be illustrated from another well-known passage, in the parable of the Prodigal Son, Luke xv. 31. The words stand *καὶ πάντα τὰ ἐμὰ σὰ ἐστίν*. They might be rendered in very many ways according to the taste of the translator: (a) all my property is thine, (b) all my goods are thine, (c) all my belongings are thine, (d) all my things are thine, (e) everything that is mine is thine, (f) all that is mine is thine, (g) all mine is thine, (h) all that I possess is thine, (i) all that I have is thine. The last (i) is Tyndale's and the A. V.'s. For this the R. V. substitutes (f), which resembles Luther's "*alles was mein ist, das ist dein*." Now tastes will of course differ as to which is the best, if not as to which is the worst, of these nine renderings, but to those who prefer Tyndale's "all that I have is thine," it is vexatious to see the well-known beautiful phrase removed for no other reason (presumably) than that the verb *εἶναι* *to have* is not used in the Greek! And even now it is not so literally rendered as it might be,—

"all mine is thine" would be closer, or Wiclif's "all my thinges ben thine"; nor does it match with John xvii. 10, where the R. V. gives "and all things that are mine are thine, and thine are mine," there being no *things* in the one passage more than in the other.

Determination to preserve the Greek order of words as far as possible (if not farther) is apparently the only reason for the change of the A. V. "And whatsoever thou spendest more, when I come again I will repay thee," Luke x. 35, into R. V. "And whatsoever thou spendest more, I, when I come back again, will repay thee." This separation of the Subject from its verb by an Adverbial clause, so characteristic of some languages, but not of English, may be seen in very many other passages: *e.g.* Mat. ii. 9, "And they, having heard the King, went their way" R. V., for "When they had heard the King, they departed" A. V.; Mark vi. 49, "But they, when they saw him walking on the sea, supposed that it was an apparition" R. V., for "But when they saw him walking upon the sea, they supposed it had been a spirit" A. V.; Luke vii. 4, "And they, when they came to Jesus, besought him earnestly" R. V., for "And when they came to Jesus, they besought him instantly" A. V. Cf. also Mark ii. 16, v. 40.

Another change of order, of a different sort, but merely to suit the order of words in the Greek text, will be found in Mark vii. 21. This reads in the A. V. "For from within, out of the heart of men, proceed evil thoughts, adulteries, fornications, murders, thefts, covetousness, wickedness, deceit," etc., the Subject, because consisting of many words, being placed after the verb according to a well-known English idiom. This English order of words, the order in all the English Versions, is changed in the R. V. into "For from within, out of the heart of men, evil thoughts proceed, fornications, thefts, murders," etc. True, this is the order in the Ang.-Sax. Version of 995 A.D., but this can hardly be the reason for the change, although even that would be a better reason than imitation of the Greek order! How can a comparatively uninflected language successfully imitate the order of words

in an inflected language? The Greek order of words is responsible also for the change in Luke ix. 11, xiv. 2, etc. But for the change of "therefore they shall be your judges" into "therefore shall they be your judges," Mat. xii. 27, I am unable to discover any reason, either in any of the Versions, or in the Greek text. The same remark applies to Mat. xiii. 18, "Hear ye therefore the parable of the sower" A. V., changed into "Hear then ye the parable of the sower." Cf. also Mark x. 26.

It is open to question, too, whether the R. V. rendering of Mark xv. 5, *ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς οὐκέτι οὐδὲν ἀπεκρίθη*, "But Jesus no more answered anything," is preferable to the A. V. "But Jesus yet answered nothing"; it certainly must be admitted to be inferior to Wiclif's "But ihesus answerid no more."

Again, in Mat. xxiii. 4 *τῷ δακτύλῳ αὐτῶν*, the advantage is hard to find of substituting "with their finger" R. V. for "with one of their fingers" A. V. The R. V. follows Wiclif; the A. V. follows Tyndale, Cranmer, and Geneva, which the Rheims nearly resembles "vvith a finger of their ovvne."

A Participle is not generally held to be the best way of translating such phrases as *καθὼς ἐμὲ θεωρεῖτε ἔχοντα*, Luke xxiv. 39, yet the A. V. "as ye see me have" is changed into "as ye behold me having" R. V. As however there may be some theological hair-splitting involved in the way of rendering *ἔχοντα* (matters with which I have no desire to meddle), I will merely observe that all the Versions read *have* except Wiclif's, his rendering agrees with Luther's, "as ye see that I haue."

In Luke xviii. 11, for *ὅτι οὐκ εἰμι ὡς περ οἱ λοιποὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων* the R. V. has adopted the Rheims "that I am not as the rest of men," and rejected the old "that I am not as other men," which is the rendering of Wiclif, Tyndale, Cranmer, and Geneva, as well as the A. V. Probably many will think "the old is better," although it does not show the utterly unimportant (to the English reader) fact that the Greek word for *man* is in the Genitive case.

But this mode of illustrating the prejudicial effects of aiming at literal translation might easily be continued

ad nauseam, I propose therefore to change my point of view, and to indicate some instances of gain through neglecting it. Whenever the Revisers lose sight of their self-imposed Herculean task, *Literal Translation*,—whenever they dare to leave off, for ever so short a time, hugging the shore where Scylla frowns, and venture out into deeper water,—one breathes more freely. Thus for instance—in Luke xv. 27, *ὅτι ὑγιαίνοντα αὐτὸν ἀπέλαβεν* is closely rendered by the Ang.-Sax. “forðam ðe he hyne halne onfeng,” by Wiclif “for he resceyued hym saaf,” and by Luther “dass er ihn gesund wieder hat.” But Tyndale, of translators *facile princeps*, boldly renders it “because he hath receaved him safe and sounde,” translating the Aorist by a Present Perfect and uniting Wiclif’s *safe* and Luther’s *sound*. Tyndale’s rendering was retained by the A. V. and *mirabile dictu* the Revisers have allowed it to remain,—“because he hath received him safe and sound,”—unliteral as it is!

The force of the Greek Imperfect has been occasionally well brought out by the insertion of some English word for which there is no Greek equivalent except the tense itself. Thus in Mark xv. 6 “Now at the feast he used to release unto them one prisoner” instead of “now at that feast he released unto them one prisoner” A. V.; the fact of its being an annual custom is readily conveyed by the word *used*. Similarly by the insertion of *oft* in Luke xviii. 3 “and she came oft unto him” *ἤρχετο*, the repeated worrying of the widow is shown more forcibly than in the A. V. “and she came unto him.” But there is no Greek adverb answering to *oft* in the sentence! Cf. also Mark xi. 19.

In Mark ii. 16, “When the scribes and Pharisees saw him eat with publicans and sinners” A. V. is better rendered in the R. V. “When they saw that he was eating.” Similar improvements are “was standing” for “stood” A. V. John i. 35, “were standing” for “stood” John xix. 25. But in Acts iii. 1 and 2 the general result seems unsatisfactory. The Imperf. *ἀνέβαινον*, v. 1, is rendered “were going up” instead of “went up,” which greatly improves that verse taken by itself, “Now Peter and John were going up into the

temple at the hour of prayer, being the ninth hour." Here the courage of the Revisers has failed them, and they have not introduced *used to*, or any other phrase, to show the force of the Imperfects in *v. 2*. The result is that though *v. 1* may be itself improved, its relation to *v. 2* is made less clear than in the A. V. Do the Revisers understand that the lame man *was being carried* to his station as the apostles *were going up* to the temple? or that on one occasion when the apostles *were going up* there was a man there who was *always* carried about, and *used to* take up his station at the gate? Tyndale joins the two verbs together (although they are separated by (;) in the A. V. text, by (,) in the R. V. text) and translates "whom they brought and laid at the gate," and the same sense is given in "qu'on portait et qu'on mettait tous les jours." This sense is clear; the R. V. is not.

The disagreeable combination of tenses in the A. V. and the Geneva (alone of other Versions) in Luke xvi. 30, "if one went unto them from the dead they will repent," is removed; the R. V. reads "if one go to them from the dead they will repent."

In Luke xi. 27 the alteration is not great,—as I have pointed out minute blemishes, it is but fair to point out minute improvements,—but clearly "didst suck" is better than "hast sucked" A. V. A literal translation of Mat. viii. 14, *εἶδε τὴν πενθερὰν αὐτοῦ βεβλημένην καὶ πυρέσσουσαν* is more than even the Revisers would attempt! They give us Tyndale's happy rendering "He saw his wife's mother lying sick of a fever," which is certainly clearer than the A. V. "He saw his wife's mother laid, and sick of a fever." Cranmer's translation is "He sawe his wyues mother lyinge in bed, and sycke of a feuer." If the Revisers had translated this passage as literally as many others, they must have said something of this sort,—He saw his wife's mother having been knocked up and suffering from fever. Happily they retained Tyndale's less literal, but infinitely superior rendering. In Mat. vi. 5 they have wisely followed the Rheims "they haue receiued their revvard," although the Greek verb is in the Present.

A little more boldness in indicating the meaning of the Greek text by means of inserted words might have removed ambiguity from some passages where at present the meaning is not so clear in the English as in the Greek. Where the meaning is ambiguous in the Greek, it should of course be left so in the English; but if the meaning is clear in the Greek, why should it not be made so in the English? In Mark ii. 18 for example,—“And John’s disciples and the Pharisees were fasting: and they come and say unto him,” R. V. Who are the *they*? Luther introduces “*Etliche*.” In Mark i. 32, *ὅτε ἔδυν ὁ ἥλιος*, “when the sun did set,”—does this mean *whilst the sun was setting*, or *when the sun had set*? The meaning of the Greek is clear, and it is clearly expressed in all the Versions except the A. V., followed here by R. V. Tyndale, Cranmer, and Geneva read “when the sunne was downe,” which the Revisers might have adopted, if their love of literal translation would not allow them to use the tense required by the English idiom *had set*, or to translate *ὅτε* *after* for once. In John xxi. 15, “Lovest thou me more than these?”—all uncertainty as to whether *these* is Subject or Complement might have been easily removed, by the insertion of *do* after *these*, or of *thou dost* before it. Luther makes the meaning clear, “Hast du mich lieber, denn mich diese haben.”

There is no ambiguity whatever in the Greek *πίετε ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες*, Mat. xxvi. 27. There need be none in English. “Drink of it, all of you,” it might be rendered, if it were allowable to insert *of you* to show that the word rendered *all* refers to those addressed. In Luther it is as plain as in the Greek—“Trinket Alle daraus”; so it is in Tyndale “Drinke of it every one,” and in Geneva “Drinke ye every-one of it”; but the R. V., following the A. V., more literally, but not more faithfully, gives “Drink ye all of it.”

If the Greek text must be exactly represented even at the risk of uncertainty of meaning, and such clear and simple statements as Mark i. 16, “He saw Simon and Andrew his brother” A. V. must be changed into “He saw Simon and Andrew the brother of Simon” R. V., and “thy footstool”

A. V. into "the footstool of thy feet" R. V. Luke xx. 43, and "sheepfold" A. V. (which is Tyndale's) into "the fold of the sheep" R. V. John x. 1, in order to represent the Greek text more exactly, then surely the Relative inserted in the A. V. in Mark i. 19 ought not to have been allowed to remain. "He saw James the son of Zebedee and John his brother, who also were in the ship mending their nets," is a correct translation on the principles adopted by the "Translators" of 1611, but the Revisers of 1881 ought on their principles to have given us,—He saw James the son of Zebedee and John his brother, these also being in the boat mending their nets; or with the Rheims, "and them repairing their nettes in the shippe."

One experiences almost a feeling of surprise that the Revisers should have ventured to translate πάντας τοὺς παῖδας Mat. ii. 16 "all the male children," and wonders if they would have been so bold, notwithstanding the τοὺς, if the Rheims had not set them the example with "all the men children."

Such deteriorating changes have been made under the influence of this determination to imitate the Greek text, that if the Negatives had been doubled it would scarcely have caused surprise. Literal translation requires double negatives, by what right have the Revisers omitted them? Mark vi. 5 literally translated is, *And he could not there do no mighty work.* Happily the Revisers have not elected to follow the Greek in this respect; but if they had determined differently they might have defended their proceeding by a better reason than Greek usage. They might have quoted from *Hamlet*—a line which well applies to their method of translation (so-called)—"It is not, nor it cannot come to good," or from Latimer's *The Ploughers*, "nor do not theyr dueties," or "nor no man wyll herken." That double negatives are absent in the A. V. is matter for surprise,—perhaps it was due to Tyndale's bold initiative—that they have not been inserted in the R. V. is matter for congratulation.

A remarkable example of spoiling a simple sentence is

shown in the change in Luke vii. 33, where the A. V. agrees with all the other Versions. "For John the Baptist came neither eating bread nor drinking wine" is a very exact translation of *μήτε ἄρτον ἐσθίων μήτε οἶνον πίνων*; this is changed in the R. V. into "For John the Baptist is come eating no bread nor drinking wine." Why? Because the R. V. text gives *μὴ* instead of the first *μήτε*! But surely even this difference might have been better indicated by *not eating bread and not drinking wine*, or else *not eating bread nor drinking wine*.

Luther is not a translator who is slavishly tied and bound to his Greek text; but his literal translation of *ἐγώ εἰμι τὸ Α καὶ τὸ Ω* (Rev. i. 8, etc.) as "Ich bin das A und das O," must have necessitated a deal of explanation to successive generations of Germans, for O does not happen to be the last letter of their alphabet. Wiclif made a step towards our present rendering when he wrote "I am alpha and O." If Tyndale instead of writing "I am Alpha and Omega" had written *I am A and Z*, this would probably now stand in the R. V. of 1881; for A B C has been a household word for years, and there appears to be no particular reason for poor A and Z losing the honour which of right belongs to them as the advance and rear guards of the alphabet, but which Tyndale and all his successors have given to Alpha and Omega.

There are, it need scarcely be stated, very many improvements of a minor character in the R. V. Of these it will suffice to mention a few by way of example. In Mat. v. 1, "when he was set" A. V. is modernized into "when he had sat down." In Luke xix. 7, and other passages, clearness is gained by the omission of the *ὅτι* "that," which introduces a sentence. Again, in Mark i. 5 the R. V. gives us "in the river Jordan" instead of "in the river of Jordan" A. V., going back to Tyndale. In different editions of Wiclif it is found as "flum Jordan," or "flom Jordan," or "flood of Jordan." Wiclif's *flum*, however, has given place to Tyndale's *river*. Similarly Wiclif's "higheth himsilf" 1380, and "shal hie himsilf" 1389, have given place to Tyndale's

"exalteth," which now appears in the R. V. as "shall exalt himself," Mat. xxiii. 12.

The weakened force of *will* as now used required such changes as: "willeth to reveal" for "will reveal" A. V. Mat. xi. 27; "are ye willing to give" for "will ye give" A. V. Mat. xvi. 15; "willeth to do" for "will do" A. V. John vii. 17; "desired to eat" for "would have eaten" A. V. Acts x. 10.

The special excellences of the R. V. are not to be found in its Style. In all instances which I have seen where passages from the A. V. and the R. V. have been arranged in parallel columns, the A. V. appears superior. It is rather in another direction that its excellences must be looked for—in the improved text translated; in the corrections and alterations rendered important by the change of meaning which many words have undergone; in the avoidance of anachronisms and misleading phrases. Such changes are so numerous and so patent that they need hardly be referred to: thus *place* for "rooms," *crowd* for "press," *boat* for "ship," *set sail* for "launch," *baggage* for "carriages," etc. One class of improvements may be represented by the change of "And the times of this ignorance God winked at," Acts xvii. 30, changed into "overlooked" in the R. V.; "regarded not" is the phrase used in Tyndale, Cranmer, and Geneva; the A. V. alone has "winked at." Whether or not *talk* is an improvement on *words* in Mark xii. 13 is perhaps open to question; so also whether Tyndale's *voice* adopted by the R. V. is better than the *sound* of the A. V. in 1 Cor. xiv. 8.

And in order to appreciate the good taste shown by the Revisers in the choice of words which do not shock the taste of the nineteenth century, it is only necessary to note what they might have surprised their readers with, without departing from the phraseology of the old Versions to which they were directed to refer; e.g. *wench*, *womb*, *gildyngis*, from Wiclif in place of *damsel*, *belly*, *eunuchs*; *privy* from Rheims for *draught*, etc. And in this connection one cannot but hope that the Old Testament Revisers will show their good taste by using euphemistic phrases in sundry

passages, amongst which may be mentioned those defining the male human animal, 1 Kings xiv. 10, etc.

My contention then is briefly this: (1) That the Revisers have not always selected the best of extant renderings; (2) That in their slavish imitation of the Greek text, they have removed many of Tyndale's good idiomatic English phrases and substituted others having a foreign ring about them; (3) That the R. V. might be made still more literal without any damage to its style, such as it is, if that is a desideratum.

And now, having sufficiently taxed your patience with my somewhat disjointed paper,—a criticism of this nature must necessarily be disjointed and disconnected,—I will briefly remark in conclusion, that I cannot admit that the various points I have touched on, and illustrated by one or two examples, are unimportant. Such minute points are among those niceties of style which form the distinctive difference between the idiomatic ease of the native and the comparative awkwardness of the foreigner. Not one of the Revisers would write such English as they have collectively put forward. Nor would any one of them translate English sentences into Latin or Greek on the same principles they have adopted in making their Revised Version of the New Testament. Niceties are not unimportant. Report says that the Poet Laureate is a cormorant with respect to Proofs, that he never tires of polishing and re-polishing his works,—it is told of Gibbon that he spared no pains in bringing his writings to a state of perfection,—can it then be said that any point is too minute to deserve the attention of the Revisers? Certainly not. The translation of the New Testament ought to be so good, so perfect, that not only the religious world should be satisfied with it, but that the agnostic and the atheist should be bound to admire it as a literary work. Carlyle sometimes wrote in an artificial, unnatural, unnatural style,—a kind of German-English,—and many of his admirers greatly regretted it, but his audience was comparatively small; the Revisers give us an un-English style,

although their work is intended for the mass of the people. To accuse the Revisers of ignorance of Greek or of English, or to charge them with carelessness, is to shoot beside the mark. It is moreover to insult men who do not deserve insult. The Revisers have, it appears to me, erred in the goal selected and in the manner of aiming at it. What was wanted in the R.V. was—the Wisdom of Many in the Words of One; the wisdom of many to determine the text and its meaning, the words of one to make that meaning clear to the mass of the people. No system of voting could give literary homogeneity without an editor invested with somewhat autocratic powers, and no imitation of the Greek could produce idiomatic English.

They have undertaken an impossibility—Literal Translation; and that too for the use of the uneducated! How is it that Tyndale towers so high above other translators of the Bible? Partly no doubt from natural gifts; but also, I believe, because he felt—what the Reformers keenly felt, but what our Revisers would seem utterly to have lost sight of—that they were writing for the mass of the English people. If the words of that Book, Tyndale felt, were to become household words in England, they must be English, real English, —English-English; not something calling itself English, but having a foreign ring about it. Who cares for the Greek? Those who want Greek have the Greek Text to go to. In the English Version we want English, and nothing but English. In the Revised Version we have had the wisdom of many, but we lack the words of one. Is there no Tyndale amongst the Revisers? Let one be looked for then outside their body, be he cleric or laic. Such a one might still make the R. V. worthy of the nineteenth century.