

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php

ARTICLE III.

THE LATEST TRANSLATION OF THE BIBLE.

BY HENRY M. WHITNEY.

VI. ADDITIONAL POINTS,—CHIEFLY AS TO RHETORICAL METHOD.

WE have spoken of the relation of the figures and the literary methods of the Bible to the task of making a good translation. We have discussed hyperbole, ellipsis, paronomasia, metaphor, the remarkable class of metaphorical "sons," the substitution of a genitive noun for an adjective, hendiadys, personification, and the attribution to the volition or the activity of God of everything, good or bad, that God permits to take place. These unfamiliar terms apply to very real and very important matters in the rhetorical or literary form.¹ It requires something more than acquaintance with Hebrew and Greek to enable a man to catch the real idea lying in the use of any one of these figures or methods, and to bring it over in the best possible form into our mother-tongue.

1. For instance, if Huxley grew hot over Paul's assertion, "If the dead rise not, let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die," one is tempted to speculate upon the question what he thought of Ps. li. 4: David has ruined a home, and has murdered the man whom he has unspeakably wronged; then he turns his eyes away from the scene of his wrong-doing, to look up to God and exclaim, "Against thee, thee only, have

¹ We might have spoken of even less familiar methods, such as aposiopesis, anacoluthon, and onomatopoeia, but for the purpose of these papers their content is relatively small.

I sinned." From Huxley's standpoint these words are simply sardonic; as Hebrew *hyperbole* they are, in their own way, right.

In these days of revived interest in Emerson and his work, it may be well to note that his power of arresting attention was partly, if not largely, due to his use of hyperbole that went even beyond all biblical examples,—hyperbole that was audacious in the extreme. He said that the young man of the present day "should be taught all skepticisms, all unbeliefs"; and again: "Adhere to your own act, and congratulate yourself if you have done something strange and extravagant, and broken the monotony of a decorous age." What would Huxley have thought of such utterances as those? Indeed, they seem to us to go beyond the limits of reason or taste: is it remarkable that such expressions led many to distrust the influence of Emerson over the unreflecting?

2. We may add some notable examples in which the *ellipsis* is so large or so daring that multitudes of people fail to get the sense: 2 Sam. vi. 23: "Michal the daughter of Saul had no child [after that] unto the day of her death"; Ps. x. 4: "[There is] no God: [such are] all his thoughts"; Matt. vi. 25: "Is not the life more than the food [that sustains it], and the body than the raiment [that covers it]?"—without the bracketed words the use of *the* before the nouns, as by the Revisions, is awkward and puzzling; Mark ix. 37: "Whosoever receiveth me receiveth not [only] me, but him that sent me"—this is rarely explained; Luke xi. 13: "If ye then being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your heavenly Father give [the chief of good gifts,] the Holy Spirit to them that ask him?"—in this verse the sudden but unemphasized turn from what the reader

expects is peculiarly Oriental; xv. 29: "Thou never gavest me [even] a kid"; John v. 31: "If [only] I testify concerning myself, my testimony [unsupported] is [according to the law] not [necessarily to be accepted as] true"; vi. 32: "It was not Moses that gave you the bread out of heaven; but my Father [not only gave you that bread, but also] giveth you the true bread out of heaven"; Rom. vii. 24, 25: "Who shall deliver me out of this dead body? I thank God, [it shall be], through Jesus Christ our Lord"; 1 Cor. viii. 3: "If, however, a man loves God, he [not only has known as a man ought to know, including the knowledge of God, but he] has been known by him." In Acts i. 1 how many readers think to supply the omission?—"The former treatise I made . . . concerning all that *Jesus began* . . . [; the present treatise I make concerning all that *the Holy Spirit continued*": the "Twentieth Century" people and Weymouth show by their versions that they did not see this point.

Some of the cases are euphemisms, as in John xii. 32: "I, if I be lifted up from the earth [on a cross], shall draw all men to myself"; and in Acts xii. 19: Herod commanded that the guards "should be led away [to be put to death]." All these cases, and those that we gave before, illustrate the terseness, many of them illustrate the extreme terseness, that is a chief mark and difficulty of Hebrew style,

"Where more is meant than meets the ear."

In Mark ix. 28, the American Revisers, evidently on account of the verb "asked," treated the matter as a case of bold ellipsis: "His disciples asked him privately, [How is it] that we could not cast it out?" The English Revisers seem to have thought this too marked a departure from the text, and made the utterance only an exclamation, crestfallen or admir-

ing: "We could not cast it out!" In Mark xvi. 4 there may be held to be a large ellipsis; the "for" can hardly be made to seem right in any other way: "They beheld that the stone has been rolled away, [and that is at once a marvel and a great relief to them,] *for* the stone is exceeding great." One such ellipsis was too hard even for the Twelve, and Jesus had to expand it for them himself: "With what difficulty will they that have riches [,—they that trust in their riches,—] enter into the Kingdom of God!" (Mark x. 23, 24.)

There are many more such cases, but we have given enough to re-emphasize the lesson that the translator and the commentator and the simple reader alike must be constantly on the watch for ellipsis, and especially must study the dark places of the Bible with reference to a possible clearing of them up by this means. These are important facts in the case: (1) The Old Testament is much more marked, bold, frequent, and yet subtle in its ellipsis, but it must never be forgotten that the New Testament is at heart, in spite of its language, not a Greek but a Hebrew book, and that therefore it has its own examples of every literary or linguistic method that was used by those who wrote in the mother-tongue; (2) no peculiarity of the original Bible carries to a higher degree than does ellipsis the combination of frequency with unexpectedness and with unlikeness to modern casts of thought; (3) ellipsis is most likely to be found in emotional or rhetorical passages, but it may occur suddenly at any point.

3. We have said that *hendiadys* is common in the Bible, but have given no idea of its frequency or of the variety of its forms. Perhaps, also, we have failed to suggest that it is not easily recognized, or understood, even by one who is familiar with the figure in the classics. To emphasize these points we may mass a few additional examples. It is agreed by all stu-

dents that in Gen. i. 14 "for signs and for seasons" means "for signs of the seasons," and that in iii. 16 "thy pain and thy conception" means "the pain of thy conception [and later, to the birth]." Job v. 18 ("For he maketh sore, and bindeth up; he woundeth, and his hands make whole") makes sense only when understood as meaning, "Although he maketh sore, he bindeth up; although he woundeth, yet his hands make whole." In Mark i. 7 "the latchet of whose sandals I am not worthy to stoop down and unloose" would be, of course, more exactly, "worthy, stooping, to unloose"; in xi. 24 "pray and ask for" means "ask for when praying." In Acts vii. 36 at least the spirit of "wonders and signs" is "wonderful signs"; in xi. 1 "threatening and slaughter" probably means "threats of slaughter"; in xxiii. 6 "hope and resurrection of the dead" apparently means "hope of the resurrection of the dead." In Rom. i. 5 "grace and apostleship" is, almost certainly, "the grace [gracious gift] of apostleship"; in viii. 22 "groaneth and travaileth" evidently means "groaneth in its [unavailing] birth-pangs." In 1 Cor. ii. 4 "in demonstration of the Spirit and of power" makes the best sense when interpreted as "in demonstration of the power of the Spirit." In 1 Thess. i. 5 "in power and in the Holy Spirit" means "in the power of the Holy Spirit"; in ii. 12 "into his own kingdom and glory" means "into his own glorious kingdom." In each of these cases the sense suggested is entirely in keeping with the methods of the original tongue, but extraordinarily far from the methods of English expression, in any mood, or in any age.

It is curious that the makers of the various versions have not flinched from the Hibernicism of the literal rendering of Luke xi. 49: "Some of them they shall kill *and* persecute";

can a man be persecuted after he is killed? Neither is the real sense “kill *or* persecute,” but, by hendiadys, “persecute to the death.”

We have already noted Rom. viii. 10 as containing an hendiadys that would be detected by few: this is resolved by the “Twentieth Century,” but not by any of its predecessors. In this connection we may say that one of the best things about the “Twentieth Century” is its treatment of hendiadys, a figure so unfamiliar and so baffling to the Occidental mind. For example, in Acts xvi. 6, etc., “Phrygia and Galatia” is considered by the “Twentieth Century” as “the Phrygian district of Galatia,”—a view that happily meets the difficulties of those who think that Phrygia and Galatia overlapped.

It is a satisfaction to note that the Revisions and the “Twentieth Century” are agreed in clearing up one of the most important of these cases,—that in Rom. vi. 17. We give, in parallel columns, the rendering of 1611, which is literal to the Greek, and that of 1885 and 1901, which is literal to the English tongue:—

God be thanked, that ye were the servants of sin, but ye have obeyed from the heart	Thanks be to God, that, <i>whereas</i> ye were servants of sin, ye became obedient from the heart
---	---

The second would be still more literal as English, if, as in the “Twentieth Century,” “whereas” should give place to “though.” But, even with “whereas,” we may rejoice that one more stumbling-block is removed from the path of the non-erudite student of the Word.

We give two cases that illustrate how hendiadys may be found, unsuspected, in the most familiar parts of the Bible:—

John ii. 13. (Revs.) And the pass-over of the Jews was at hand, and Jesus went up to Jerusalem.

iii. 19. This is the judgment, that the light is come into the world, and men loved the darkness.

(T. C.) Then, as the Jewish Pass-over was near, Jesus went up to Jerusalem.

Their condemnation lies in this, that, *though* the Light has come into the world, men liked the darkness.

The practical character of the matter may be illustrated by the following cases: In any other language than Hebrew or Hebraized Greek "cursing and bitterness" (Rom. iii. 14) would have to stand as it is, but in the Bible it may mean "bitter cursing." In xiii. 13 the presumption has to be in favor of a similar treatment of "reveling *and* drunkenness, chambering *and* wantonness, strife *and* jealousy,"—drunken reveling, wanton chambering, and strife produced by jealousy being the real thought. In Matt. iii. 11 "He shall baptize you in the Holy Spirit and in fire" would thus be turned into—what?

From all these cases the inference is immediate and urgent, that almost every verse in the Bible should be tested, by translator and by ordinary reader alike, to see whether it contains an hendiadys that is hopelessly dark to the unskilled, and that therefore, if it is to be really translated, needs to be adjusted to modern powers of comprehension through adjustment to modern methods of expression.

4. We have not mentioned *paradox* as a biblical figure, yet no account of the figures of the Bible would be adequate if it failed at least to mention that special aspect of paradox by which it is a contradiction in terms.¹ It is only lately that this name has come to be recognized as having any place in rhetoric at all: a turning-over of the text-books in rhetoric and of all but the latest dictionaries would emphasize this fact.

¹In technical rhetoric it is known as "oxymoron"; as in Milton's "L'Allegro": "Wanton heed and giddy cunning."

Yet every one feels the pungency, and therefore, more keenly, the truth, of such contradictions as these: "Nothing is constant in nature except change"; "The more we know of ancient literature, the more we are struck with its modernness"; "He is never thoroughly happy, except when he is a little miserable"; Swift was "a generous miser, a skeptical believer, a devout scoffer, a tender-hearted misanthrope."¹ And only the superficial reader can have failed to feel the power of Acts v. 41: "They therefore departed from the presence of the council, rejoicing that they were [had been] counted *worthy* to suffer *dishonor* for the Name." There is humor in the exhortation (1 Thess. iv. 11) that we "be *ambitious* to be *quiet*." There is cumulation and a towering climax of contradiction in 2 Cor. vi. 8-10: "As deceivers, and yet true; as unknown, and yet well known; as dying, and behold we live; . . . as sorrowful, yet always rejoicing; as poor, yet making many rich; as having nothing, and yet possessing all things."²

The matter may be passed with four obvious remarks: (1) that this figure, also, is a marked characteristic of the Bible, and, when met, should be recognized as such; (2) that it is thoroughly and especially Oriental, and yet appeals to men in every part of the world; (3) that it is perfectly translatable, so that it cannot possibly give trouble to any discerning translator; and (4) that, nevertheless, it should be watched for and carefully brought out in translation, instead of being, as in 1 Thess. iv. 11, misapprehended and buried out of sight.

5. We emphasized the extreme distance of some of the

¹ This last is the beginning of a long and remarkable series of entirely true contradictions concerning Swift, given in the *Nation* for April 13, 1876, pp. 248-249.

² Mark ix. 37, already quoted as a case of ellipsis, is by ellipsis also a case of paradox.

Bible-metaphors. A curious and really a very extraordinary group of this kind may be found in Eccl. xii.,—if it is true, as many assert, that “the strong men” are the legs of a man, and “the grinders” (grinding women?) are his teeth, and “those that look out of the windows” are his eyes, and “the doors” that are shut are his lips, and the blossoming “almond-tree” represents his whitening hair;—and so on. It is impossible to make sense of the details of the passage unless this is what they mean. Yet how extraordinarily far-fetched it is! Even Shakespeare, with the far leaps of his imagination, never quite equaled this.

In Ps. xxii. 3 we read: “Thou that *inhabitest* the *praises* of Israel,” that is, the temple, the center of the national worship;¹ and in xx. 20: “Deliver . . . my darling [perhaps, my dear life] from the power of the dog [the prowling foe].”

As we have said, by Hebraism this far-away kind of metaphor crept into the New Testament Greek. In 2 Cor. v. 21, it is said of Christ that he was “made *sin* [a sin-offering?] on our behalf.” In 1 Cor. iv. 3, Paul refuses to be judged by “[any other] man’s *day*,”—an expression that is given literally by the Bible Union, but in the Revisions appears as “man’s judgment.” It is likely that there will always be an unsolvable remainder of biblical riddles, due simply to the fact that it is too late for us to find their clues: there was a far-off analogy: the writer was impressed with it, and used its terms in place of those of his original idea. But every worthy translator and commentator will feel himself challenged, will respond to the challenge, to help to reduce the number of these riddles to the lowest possible terms. The ordinary student or reader needs help here quite as much as at any other point in the Word.

¹ This may, however, be regarded as a case of marked ellipsis for “inhabitest the [place where are especially given the] praises of Israel.”

6. We have spoken of the fact that there are many places in which there is likely always to be uncertainty as to the rendering which is right or, even, is to be preferred. This also it may be worth while to illustrate more fully, with emphasis upon the fact that it is in the Old Testament that we are much less certain as to the exact field of the meaning of words.

A good example is the case of the "virtuous" or "worthy" woman in Prov. xxxi. 10. She is *'esheth hhayil*,—that is, by the Hebrew lexicon, a woman of strength, might, valor; forces, army, host; ability, wealth, riches; good quality, integrity, virtue; vital force, fruit. And worth and capability might just as well have been added. On the whole, is the moral element included? or is she only "smart"? This is only one of many instances of the difficulty, in translating the Old Testament, produced by the great variety of meanings that has resulted, with all the parts of speech, from the boldness with which the users of that language threw themselves upon the figurative possibilities of words.

As to zoölogy,—which is a matter of less consequence,—a recent scholarly account of "the animals of the Bible" gives the following as part of the changes that translators have decided to make in the rendering of animal-names:—

Porcupine, } now bittern.
 Hedgehog, }
 Ossifrage, now bearded vulture.
 "Eagle which stirreth up her nest," now griffon-vulture.
 Chameleon, now monitor-lizard.
 Ferret, now gecko.
 "Adder in the path," now horned snake.
 "Doleful creature," } now hyena.
 "Speckled bird," }
 "Fowls that creep," now bats.
 Pygarg, now addax-antelope.
 Coney, now hyrax or dyman.
 Glede, now red buzzard.

Gier-eagle, now Egyptian vulture.
 Osprey, now short-toed eagle.
 Mole, now chameleon.
 Cockatrice, now yellow-streaked snake.
 Leviathan, } now crocodile.
 Dragon, }
 Deaf adder, now Egyptian cobra.
 Badger, now dugong or seal.
 Unicorn, now European bison.
 Behemoth, now hippopotamus.

As to petrography: in the "breastplate of judgment" (Ex. xxviii. 17-28) six of the twelve stones are noted by the American Revision as uncertain.

In such cases as Ex. xxxii. 1 when shall we call the plural a "plural of majesty," meaning "god," and when a real plural, meaning "gods"? In such cases as Ex. xxii. 9, shall we read "god," "gods," "God," or "judges"? How much of the globe was included in the "earth" or "land" (Gen. vii.) that was covered by Noah's flood? Is *na'ar* in Eccl. x. 16 (like *παῖς* in the New Testament) a "child," or a "servant"?—or is he a "soldier"?

In the New Testament: there is, for instance, the remarkable freedom with which, by Hebraism, the passive is doubtless used for the reflexive verb.¹ In some places translators have recognized the fact; in some they have not; and in some they evidently have hardly known what to do. They recognized the fact in Mark vi. 53, where "they *were brought* to the land" is rendered by the Revisions "They *moored* to the shore"; and in John xii. 36: where "Jesus . . . *was hidden*" is rendered "Jesus . . . *hid himself*." In other places the fact has been at least left unexpressed; in Matt. i. 18, we can hardly escape from reading, as Dr. Weston suggests: "Mary *found herself* with child of [by] the Holy Spirit"; in Luke xv. 16 it is bet-

¹ Winer, *Grammar of the New Testament* (Edinburgh, 1870), § 39, 2; see also Buttman, Jelf, etc.

ter to read: "He would fain have *filled himself* with the husks [pods]"; in Rev. xxii. 11 the most truthful and powerful conception of the matter is that he who is "made filthy" or "holy" is made filthy or holy primarily by himself. But there are other cases that are not so clear. It is an almost startling experience to go through the passives of the New Testament, proving with how many of them the substitution of a reflexive verb would furnish a more penetrating sense, and with how many the sense must be left uncertain between the two.¹

But, more specifically: in Matt. xiii. 35, did Jesus go "home," "into his house," or only "into the house"? Did Herod (xiv. 6) celebrate his "birthday," or only the anniversary of his accession to the throne? Is the blessing (v. 5) pronounced upon the "meek," or the "gentle," or both? In Mark x. 14 does Jesus mean "to such belongs" (B. U.), or "of such is composed" (apparently the sense in most versions) "the Kingdom of heaven"? In xiii. 9, why should we not read, "Ye shall be beaten *into* the synagogues"? In John xii. 3 was Mary's nard "genuine," or "liquid," or what? Was Apollos (Acts xviii. 24) "eloquent," or "learned," or both? In xviii. 18 most versions make Paul the one who had just completed the rites of a vow by shaving his head, but

¹ These facts will not seem quite so strange if we remember a parallel fact in our own language, namely, that "Shakespeare often uses the active and [the] passive participles indiscriminately" (Steevens),—that is, the one for the other. Examples are:—

M. of V. i. 3. 106: "Well, Shylock, shall we be *beholding* to you?"

Cor. iii. 1. 292: "Gratitude towards her *deserved* children."

Cf. Lear i. 1. 231: "Dishonour'd *step*"; Cor. iii. 1. 72: "Honour'd *number*"; Oth. i. 3. 290: "Delighted *beauty*"; R. and J. iv. 2. 26: "Becomed *love*." Similar cases may be found in other Elizabethan writers.

There are curious things to be found in the history of every language, and some of them are strange enough to make this biblical peculiarity seem alight.

many high authorities, as Conybeare and Howson, hold that Aquila was the man.¹ In xxii. 25 was Paul stretched out "with" or "for" the thongs? In Rom. xvi. 21 were Lucius and the rest real "kinsmen" (*συγγενεῖς*) or only "countrymen" (T. C.) of Paul's? How long are the "ages" (*αἰών*), and the "eternal" (*αἰώνιος*) periods, of which the New Testament tells? In 1 Tim. iv 8 does bodily exercise profit "little" (A. V.), or "a little" (A. R.)?—these are two very different things. When does *πιστός* mean "faithful," and when "believing"? Where, in the long range between mere "sir" and "Jehovah," does each use of *κύριος* come in? When is *χριστός* a proper name, "Christ," and when an adjective, "anointed"? When do *πειράζω*, *πειρασμός*, refer to trial, when to temptation, when to both?—in Jas. i. 2-14 the reference seems to be to trial at first and to temptation at last. When do *ἔρημος*, *ἐρημία*, stand for a desert, and when for a wilderness?—in Mark vi. 35 "desert" (Revisions) is presumably wrong, as villages were near; the uniform use of "desert" by the "Twentieth Century" is certainly wrong; in fact, we have no word that describes the region where the Baptist taught. Similarly, we have no word that describes the slavery of New Testament times; the use of "bond-servant" in the margin of the Revisions is only a suggestion of the difficulty; it gives no help.

¹This case is due to a participle appended loosely at the end of a sentence, with "Aquila" as the nearest noun. It is the dictionary-makers that at the present day seem to have most conspicuously the infirmity of hanging at the end of a sentence a doubtfully related word or clause,—thus producing a puzzling or a ludicrous effect. Examples might be quoted from living dictionaries; we quote the following from one that is recent but is virtually dead: "*Varvels*. Rings, usually of silver, placed on the legs of a hunting[-] hawk, on which the owner's name is engraved." "*Water-yam* . . . It has a root-stock about 6 or 9 inches long and about the thickness of a man's thumb, which is farinaceous and used for food."

It would have saved much wretched and divisive controversy if three points as to baptism had been cleared,—whether the baptizer and the baptized went (*εἰς*) *to* or *into* the water, whether they came (*ἐξ*) *from* or *out of* the water, and whether βαπτίζω means *immerse* or only *baptize-in-any-fashion*. There are in the Bible many puzzles like these. The margin, especially in the Old Testament, shows how uncertain the translators often were. They were uncertain, and they had the courage and the frankness to show it.

Probably as curious a case of uncertainty as can be found in the whole Bible is in Mark xi. 3: "If any one say unto you, Why do ye this? say ye, The Lord hath need of him; and straightway he will send him back hither." Who will send him back? and whither? It used to be thought that it was the owner leading, but there is no denying that it may be Jesus promptly returning, the beast.

Upon one point we would not be misunderstood: the uncertainties of meaning, the difficulties of translation, do not involve any of the great vital points, or the main outlines, of the Scripture. But they do involve ten thousand minor points, as to which the translator needs to be profoundly wise and yet can never hope to be wise enough. The great company of the untaught are waiting for his work.

7. We have spoken of the importance of having the words used in translation match the original not only in content but in degree of intensity and in grade of dignity.

Under intensity we gave only the painful case in John ii. 4: "Woman, what have I to do with thee?"—for which Fenton's "What is that to you and me, Mother?" is vastly better. But a plenty of other cases might be given.

"Hell" is a word that became over-intense with the lapse of time: in King James's version, in forty-three of the fifty-four

places where "hell" was used, it stood merely for "sheol" or "hades," that is, the unseen world: "It was the almost universal belief that Adam and all his descendants (with the exception of Enoch, Elijah, and the penitent thief) descended into hell, and there remained till Christ fetched them thence after his crucifixion."¹ The word "hell" has very properly been given up in these forty-three places; it is less unfit where it stands for "Gehenna," or "Tartarus," but it has become so intense a word, and it has been so much a storm-center for the theological world, that it had better be given up altogether and a fresh start taken with other words. The facts of human destiny will remain.

Like things may be said of "damnation" and "damned," as in 1 Cor. xi. 29: "He that eateth and drinketh unworthily eateth and drinketh damnation to himself." How much needless pain and how much needless repulsion from the Bible have been caused by that text! The two words were always far too strong; they grew more intense and terrible with the intensity of the effort to make them a means to repentance. Happily, they went out of the Bible with the English Revision. The facts of the divine judgment upon man will remain.

Under dignity we gave no examples at all. The "Twentieth Century" and the "American Bible" are monumental object-lessons of the effect of using words that are below the level of the thought. But, we might have said of the more dignified versions that, for instance, the official in Acts xix. 35 was far too important a man to be called a "townclerk"; he was the executive of the great city of Ephesus. The "Twentieth Century" and the "American Bible" call him "the Mayor," and that is better, except for being inexact. We should call him "the recorder."

¹W. W. Skeat: note on "Vision of William," C. xxi. 147.

On the other hand, "communed" (Acts xxiv. 26) is far too lofty and intimate a word, it is a ludicrously stilted word, for the interviews in which Felix hinted to Paul that some of the money that the Apostle had brought from the west might help him to shake off his chains. Similarly (1 Sam. x. 2, A. V., Revs.) the Queen of Sheba did not "commune" with Solomon "of all that was in her heart"; the original word is the commonest one in the Old Testament for merely *saying*: she *said* to Solomon whatever came into her *mind*, including the asking of questions. In each of these cases there has never been any excuse for "commune."

In the Gospels a great many small places are called *πόλις*: this the old versions and the Revisions have uniformly rendered "city," as in Luke vii. 11: "a *city* called Nain." It is an error, a misnomer, and the "Twentieth Century" does well to call them "towns."

8. We have spoken of the importance of bringing the rendering into conformity to English idiom, instead of transferring the idiom of the original tongues.

This applies pointedly to disagreeable expressions: it is a pity, for instance, to keep up the locution by which a man's offspring are said (2 Sam. vii. 12, etc.) to "proceed out of [his] bowels."

It applies to using "of" for "by," as in Acts xxiii. 27: "slain of them."

It applies to the epistolary standpoint: it is well known that ancient letters were written as though spoken to the receiver at the moment of receipt, as throughout the letter of Claudius Lysias to Felix in Acts xxiii.; for example in verse 30: "When it *was* shown to me that there would be¹ a plot against the

¹This "would be" is also unidiomatic in English. The "plot" existed already. The "would be" reaches forward to the endeavor to carry out the plot by murdering Paul.

man, I sent him to thee forthwith." Modern idiom requires that the standpoint be that of the writer as he writes: "Since I *have been* informed . . . I *send* him to thee at once." Few readers, even among those who once studied the classics, know why it is that this letter to Felix seems somehow out of joint.

In Rom. xvi. 22 this epistolary principle is recognized by the Revisions; it used to read: "I Tertius who wrote," but now it reads: "I Tertius who write." The Epistle to Philemon has been partially but not sufficiently reconstructed with the epistolary standpoint in mind. For example: 12f. "Onesimus, . . . whom I have sent back,"—"whom I send"; "whom I would fain have kept,"—"whom I would fain keep"; without thy mind [consent] I would do nothing"—"am unwilling to do anything," "that thy goodness should [may] not be as of necessity."

There are two striking cases in 1 Cor. v. 3-5, 9. If *κέραια* and *ἔγραψα* are treated as being, by the ancient epistolary manner, equivalent to the modern present, the sense in 3-5 would be something like this: "For I myself, though absent in body, yet being present with you in spirit, *do now*, in the name of our Lord Jesus, pass judgment, just as if I were present, upon the man who has done this thing: being present in spirit when you are gathered together, the power of the Lord being with us, I *decide* to deliver such a man [the man who has done such a thing] to Satan, that what in him is carnal may be destroyed, and so his soul be saved on the day of the Lord." Conybeare and Howson have a curious half-way-adoption of this view of the matter. Similarly, verse 9, which is commonly referred to a message in a previous letter, would then be: "I *write* to you in *this* letter not to have to do . . .". These are worth remembering as alternate forms. Can it be said that they are certainly wrong?

We group a number of cases, and more might be given, in which the "Twentieth Century" shows greater sensitiveness to modern idiom as determining whether the singular or the plural shall be used:—

Mark vii. 6: Their <i>heart</i> is far from me.	Their hearts are far removed from me.
viii. 17: Have ye your <i>heart</i> hardened?	Are your minds so slow of comprehension [deadened?]?
Luke xxiv. 32, 38: Was not our <i>heart</i> burning within us? . . . Wherefore do questionings arise in your <i>heart</i> ?	How our hearts glowed! . . . Why do doubts arise in your minds?

It is rather amusing to think of one heart as having to function for so many different people.

Conversely:—

Gal. ii. 9: James and Cephas and John . . . gave to me and Barnabas the right hands of fellowship.	James, Peter, and John . . . gave Barnabas and me their hands in acknowledgement of us as fellow-workers.
--	---

It is "the right *hand* of fellowship" that is given, whether by one or by many.

As to the idiom that requires "Barnabas and me" instead of "me and Barnabas," and "my Father and I" instead of "I and my Father," we would add Genesis xxxi. 49: "Jehovah watch between me and thee [thee and me]," and Joshua xiv. 6: "Concerning me and concerning thee." Shall we make these speakers seem ill-mannered?

Of idiom as affecting structure we may give a single example:—

2 Peter iii. 4: Where is the promise of his coming?	What has become of his promised Coming?
---	---

The second, though marred in euphony by the nearness of "become" to "coming," is at least clear, by being in idiom,

and that is the primary thing. The first is not good idiom, and therefore is not readily understood.

It was a frequent remark in regard to the English Revision that it seemed to have been "made by men who were devoid of the literary sense." We wish that both they and the American Revisers had realized how much more their two versions would be worth to people of these later days if they should utilize every resource of idiom, and every other resource, to give not only beauty to the form, but clearness to the thought, of the Scripture.

9. Not least important is the question of the form of the Old Testament poetry in the various versions. In this the two Revisions seem substantially alike. A change that came in with the English Revision was the casting of the poetry in poetic lines; the change was greatly needed, and was joyfully received. There was also a grouping of the verses into sections, separated by the space of a line; some of these are for topics, as in Ps. xlii.; they answer to the paragraphs of prose, and, as with the paragraphs, some of the sections seem to us too long. In Ps. xxiv. there is an excellent separation of the first speaker, who is didactic, from the second, who is emotional and hortatory;—of course, in saying "speaker" we know that, even when "I" is used, it may be the voice of a chorus, perhaps representing the nation. There should be a break whenever there is a change of speaker, but we doubt whether all such places have been noted: in Ps. xxxii. 1-7 the Psalmist has been addressing God; at verse 8 another, apparently God, begins, but there is no break.

In Proverbs the topics are much more evident, and they are carefully broken apart.

In the Song of Songs the running analysis placed at the top of the pages in the American Revision recognizes only

two speakers, the royal lover and the Shulamite, with no hint of a shepherd-lover, whom we suppose the great body of critics now believe in as appearing in the background and as being steadily preferred to the king. In the English Revision there is no such analysis, to guide or to mislead. In both Revisions the successive utterances are separated. In the Bible, when printed as a mere rendering of the original, we suppose there should be no furnishing of helpful clues; but there is no part of the Bible in which the reader more needs a guide; in this case it would be an account of the best theories as to the action and the participants. It was only by learning of these theories that we were able to overcome our repugnance to what had seemed merely a sensuous love-song and to find in it instead a beautiful union of the lyric, the dramatic, and the pastoral in celebration of the mutual love of one man and one maid. The Song of Songs is in this respect an exact antithesis to the book of Job; in Job each speaker is emphatically announced, and the action is perfectly clear.

For ourselves, we think highly of the views of Richard G. Moulton as to the desirability of making more of the possibilities of indention and "centering" of lines for bringing out the relations among clauses or parts; the Hebrew parallelism is sometimes peculiarly intricate, and often very carefully wrought.

10. Another point that we may name is in the field of rhetorical form. It is a question of the way in which one shall bring before his readers or hearers proposals or beliefs that he knows they do not or will not like. There is as to this a fundamental difference between Oriental and Occidental usage. The ancient, the Oriental, way is that of suavity, of extreme complaisance of manner, and hence of holding back the announcement of anything disagreeable, of coming at it induct-

ively, of giving it the softest possible introduction and a softened statement throughout. The modern, the Occidental, way is that of vivacity, pungency, of frank and courageous emphasis upon the main heads and upon the details of that which one wishes to press upon unbelieving or unconsenting hearers: it is deductive, stating the point frankly, and then proceeding to expound or to prove it. The Oriental way was used, of course, in the Bible, and thus far it has always gone over into English translations, and has not been exchanged for the Occidental way.

To illustrate by two cases that do not conform to the rule: any one who has read the "Panegyricus" of Isocrates will remember that it was constructed in the modern way; so was Cicero's oration "For the Manilian Law"; but both these orators prepared their words for audiences who were already on the orator's side. Our present question is as to the method that is actual or is wisest in saying unacceptable things.

We may illustrate the difference in the two methods by comparing Milton's "Areopagitica" with Paul's so-called first (really his second) letter to the Corinthian church.

Milton wished to persuade Parliament to give up the system of requiring authors to submit their writings to the public censor before sending them to press. This system was fully entrenched in the habits, the fears, and the prejudices of Parliament, and Milton had need of his utmost tact and skill if he was to make even a beginning toward a change. Yet he told them frankly at the outset what he wanted and the points that he meant to make: "I . . . shall lay before ye, *first* the inventors of [the licensing-system] to bee those whom ye will be loath to own; *next* what is to be thought in generall of reading, what ever sort the Books be; and *that* this Order avails nothing to the suppressing of scandalous, seditious, and libel-

lous Books, which were mainly intended to be suppress; *last*, that it will be primely to the discouragement of all learning and the stop of Truth . . ." That Milton entirely failed to move Parliament to do as he wished we attribute not to his frankness, nor to his emphasis, but to the fact that he attempted something that no one could have accomplished then; the system had to be left to break down, half a century later, under its own weight.

In First Corinthians we find exactly the opposite course. Only the student can find any plan in the letter, because the plan, although carefully wrought out, is as carefully concealed. It is substantially this: (1) He attacks certain evils, in the church at Corinth, of which he has learned through the "household" of Chloe; namely, (*a*) faction; (*b*) sensuality,—in one case incest; (*c*) litigiousness,—especially before heathen courts; (*d*) disorder in worship,—especially in connection with the Lord's Supper. (2) He answers questions received from them: (*a*) as to eating food that has been offered to idols; (*b*) as to whether celibacy is a holier state than marriage; (*c*) as to the relative value and excellence of the various spiritual gifts. All these delicate points are touched, with an unmistakable judgment upon each, but of abrupt announcement there is none; only the rebuke to the offender against social decency is pungently expressed. Every point is led up to with the utmost care. If we think that our way is better, we must remember that it is better only for us. If the Apostle had used our method, he would in those times have seemed rude and blunt, and thus, by giving offense, would have hindered the acceptance of his words.

We may mention a few other illustrations of the Oriental-Biblical way. Of course, Nathan, speaking, though a prophet, at the risk of his life, when he condemned the taking of Bath-

sheba, had to come darkly to his final outburst, "Thou art the man." Stephen, addressing the Sanhedrin, gave a long review of the national history, but, when he was stopped, he had not yet said, what he really meant, "You see that I am loyal to our national history and faith." Paul, on Mars Hill, in an address of which we doubtless have only a synopsis, works up by cautious and disguised approaches to the assertion that the risen Christ ought to be the object of faith to the Greek. Paul, writing to Philemon, makes a long but exquisitely skillful preface to his request that Onesimus be forgiven and freed; the request itself, when it comes, is hardly more than a hint. There is more of this sort in the Bible; so that we are obliged to infer that such was the established way; current notions and expectations would have made any other method seem an actual affront to the persons addressed. Yet it is exactly opposite to the frankness and pungency of Milton; it is exactly opposite to the course of Burke when, in the face of an almost omnipotent ministry, backed by a subservient Parliament and a nation furiously hostile to America, he made,¹ with the utmost frankness and vigor and with free use of ridicule, his great exposition of the reasons why the insurgent Americans could never be brought into subjection by British arms.

Now, in the translation of such Bible-passages as we have named, what shall be done? To transfer the cautious inductive method seems flat, if not cowardly, to one who is familiar with the spirited way. In some cases, as in First Corinthians, and perhaps in Philemon, if the reader does not understand the method, he fails to get the sense,—and so far forth the Bible is a sealed book to him. To bring out for him the sense that is in the text would require a paraphrase of the

¹Speech on moving resolutions for conciliation with America, March 22, 1775.

most liberal kind, but paraphrases are not the Bible, and that fact closes the case.

We doubt if much can be done to help the reader by means of the text itself. We cannot turn the Bible-methods wrong-side-out; we must not reconstruct the material on modern lines. The intaglio cannot be changed to a relieve, and still be the veritable thing. To our thinking, although paragraphing, italicizing, capitalizing, may help a little, the margin and the commentary must in this matter be the chief resource. In this respect the Bible-authors must be left, without anachronism, speaking in the way that was required by their times; it is the commentator who must tell how their message would sound in the manner of to-day.

Thus we have one more class of cases excellently illustrating the fact of the impossibility of making a really adequate translation of the Bible. It reminds us also of the greatness of the task of so getting the Bible-standpoint that one constantly feels the sense, even when the form is diametrically opposite to his own.