

THE
PRINCETON REVIEW.

JANUARY, 1859.

No. I.

ARTICLE I.—*The Service of the House of God, according to the practice of the Church of Scotland.* By the Rev. WILLIAM LISTON, Minister of Redgorton. Edinburgh: 1858. Pp. 411. 12mo.

Presbyterian Liturgies, with specimens of Forms of Prayer for Worship, as used in the Continental Reformed and American Churches: with the Directory for the Public Worship of God, agreed upon by the Assembly of Divines at Westminster: and Forms of Prayer for Ordinary and Communion Sabbaths, and for other Services of the Church. By a Minister of the Church of Scotland. Edinburgh: 1858. Pp. 120. 8vo.

IN taking a survey of existing churches, it is curious to observe how far their maturity and strength are from bearing any uniform proportion to their age. While the largest division of the Christian world professes to have come down, almost in its actual condition, from the time of the Apostles, and the "Orthodox Oriental Church" lays claim, with equal justice, to a like antiquity; while the Vaudois place themselves as high upon the scale, and are never placed by others lower than the close of the twelfth century; while all the reformed national churches of Europe—German, Swiss, Dutch, Danish, Swedish, Scotch, and English—owe their birth to the great moral revolution of the sixteenth century, and the *Unitas Fratrum* to the

of the friends and guardians of colleges. He who should discover an effectual remedy for it, would confer upon society an inestimable boon, and be one of the greatest of public benefactors. We cordially endorse Professor Fisher, in the following remarks quoted from him, and enforced with emphasis by Professor Smyth.

“There is another class of sins, which, it is to be hoped, the good sense of young men will before long entirely banish from American colleges. They are the sins—duplicity and direct falsehood being the worst—which spring from a fancied diversity of interest between the pupil and his instructor. A little reflection in after life commonly exposes the plea on which these immoralities are justified. But the effect of them on the conscience and character is not so easily escaped. He who would respect himself, and claim respect from others, must make sincerity, integrity—open and upright dealing with all men—his first virtue.”

ART. III.—*The New Testament, Translated from the Original Greek; with Chronological arrangement of the Sacred Books, and improved divisions of Chapters and Verses.* By LEICESTER AMBROSE SAWYER. Boston: John P. Jewett & Co. 1858. 12mo. pp. 423.

MOST of our readers have already some acquaintance with this book, if not by personal inspection, yet by means of the critiques which have been published, and which very fully reproduce the first impression made on various minds by the salient features of this bold experiment, but not without an undue prominence of oddities and startling innovations, and an undue stress upon the simple violation of our old associations, which is after all a secondary ground of judgment. On the whole, however, very ample justice has been done by contemporary journals to the faults of this translation in detail, and we feel neither called by duty nor disposed by inclination to

pursue that process any further. But as all translations of the Bible have an interest for us, and some degree of influence on others, we propose, now that the first storm of derision and exposure has blown over, to supply our readers with a perfectly dispassionate and fair description of the book, with its pretensions and performances, by this means enabling and allowing all who choose to draw their own conclusions.

It is no disparagement of this or any other book, to say that it claims nothing upon any ground but that of its own merit. No appeal is made to any previous performance of the author, or the least light thrown upon his antecedents. We refer, of course, to what appears upon the face of the work itself; for we know the practice of "the trade" too well to hold the author responsible for Mr. Jewett's advertised description of the volume as "the greatest work of this age, or of any age, since King James, 1610," and as "a labour of twenty years, by one of the best Hebrew and Greek scholars in our country, an indefatigable worker and a true man." We can readily suppose that Mr. Sawyer never heard of this description till he saw it in print, and are willing to believe that he considers it as fulsome and absurd as we do. But apart from this professional fanfaronade, the public is acquainted with the author only as a writer on church-government and moral science, and perhaps some other topics of inferior importance, all which he has treated, it may be, respectably enough, but not in such a way as to bespeak for this last effort any confidence beforehand, which he therefore very prudently foregoes, and lets his new tub stand upon its own bottom. Not only is the title-page entirely free from all pretensions founded on the past, but even in the Preface, the demand for approbation rests exclusively on what has been accomplished in the case before us.

As the Preface, just referred to, has attracted much attention, and is really, though not so meant, a curious piece of self-description, we begin our notice of the book with some account of it. The first paragraph defines the author's intellectual position, and affords the key-note of the whole performance, by explaining what a good translation ought to be, and stating what this new translation actually is. The author speaks of *aiming*, it is true, but without the slightest intimation of a fear

that he has missed the mark. "This is not a work of compromises, or of conjectural interpretations of the Sacred Scriptures, neither is it a paraphrase, but a strict literal rendering. It neither adds nor takes away; but aims to express the original with the utmost clearness and force, and with the utmost precision," (p. i.) These are high pretensions—strictness, clearness, force, precision, and the uttermost degree of each—and fully justify the use of the severest tests in ascertaining their validity.

The Preface then proceeds to represent the book as being not a mere "contribution to biblical science," but "a still more important contribution to practical religion." Here again, what is formally described is the "design"; but the tone of the whole passage irresistibly applies the language to the execution. We do not question the sincerity and earnestness with which the author here anticipates a better moral and religious influence from his translation than from all before it.

The Preface then repudiates the common practice of apologizing for such efforts, and defies beforehand all attempts at opposition and resistance, very clearly showing, although in the form of a historical allusion, that the writer is prepared to brave the ordeal of "fire and sword," and even to accept the "crown of martyrdom," though not without a brave hope that his version, like those of Wiclif and Tyndale, shall live to see its persecutors in the dust, and laugh them to scorn. We regret this waste of moral heroism on so slight an occasion. We have not the least belief that Mr. Sawyer will encounter any persecution worse than that of laughter, which may possibly be unjust and malignant, but will only be promoted by these prefatory demonstrations.

After some instructive statements, clearly and concisely given, as to the dates and authors of the older English versions, with an obvious view to the conclusion, that it is high time to provide another, Mr. Sawyer, with unnecessary violence, attacks the supposed prepossession of the public mind in favour of collective and against individual labour. "Councils did not make the Bible at first." "A council did not make *Paradise Lost*, and could not; nor has a council ever produced any immortal work of genius or learning, unless it is the

English Bible of King James." "As individuals, therefore, have been eminently successful heretofore, let it be hoped that they may be so again." (P. vii.) However just all this may be, we fear that it will only serve to point the weapons of sarcastic warfare against the book thus tacitly, if not expressly, classed with *Paradise Lost* and the English Bible, as an "immortal work of genius and learning."

Having shown that a new version is required to make available the vast accumulations in biblical learning since King James's times, the Preface notifies the reader, that the text assumed in this translation is the text of Tischendorf, not merely the critical principles and general conclusions of that justly celebrated writer, but all his emendations of the text, with only two exceptions, which are specified (p. ix.) This entire renunciation of all private judgment, and this wholesale adoption of a single critic's labours, without any reference to those of others, and without distinguishing between the clearest and most doubtful cases, even those in which the critic hesitates himself, and varies in his different editions—this is something so unusual in our age of critical scepticism, that we think the author is entitled to a clear recognition of it, in defining his position and determining his literary standing. It is rendered still more striking by the fact that, while he does not think the work of criticism finished, but believes that future writers will make great advances upon Tischendorf himself, he allows no such advances to be now attempted, but practically treats the text of Tischendorf as perfect. "Readers will be able by this to see what is the Bible, and what is not." (P. ix.)

The re-arrangement of the books, announced upon the title-page, and represented in the Preface as a great improvement on the old one, claims to be "chronological." This might be understood as referring to the subjects of the several books; but as the dates of some are given in the Preface (p. x.), and as Paul's epistles are arranged in what is now very commonly regarded as the order of their origin, this would seem to determine the true sense of "chronological," as having reference to the date of composition. And yet the four historical books, though long posterior in date to most of the epistles, are placed first, as in the old arrangement.

Another "great improvement," mentioned both on the title-page and in the Preface (p. ix.), is the new division into chapters and verses. It is well known that the old divisions are entirely without authority, comparatively recent, and of no use, except as mechanical facilities for reference, precisely like the pages of a printed book. In this respect they are invaluable aids; but their value depends, not upon the skill with which they were originally made, but wholly on their long familiarity and general reception. The loss of this advantage would be dearly purchased even by the most artistical or scientific distribution of the matter, such as threw the clearest and most welcome light upon interpretation. Mr. Sawyer's change of the division into chapters seems entirely arbitrary and mechanical, intended for the most part to reduce the number, but in Luke increasing it to thirty-two, retaining some of the most awkward and unskilful of the old divisions, and introducing several still more so.* As to the verses, they are simply thrown together in larger paragraphs. The only practical effect of this "improvement" is to make collation and comparison between the old and new translations, if not utterly impossible, yet so extremely inconvenient as absolutely to prohibit it in practice. An analogous "improvement," in a different department, would be to re-arrange the alphabet in lexicons and dictionaries, so as to separate the consonants and vowels, or on any other pretext purely theoretical, without regard to the only true use of the alphabetical arrangement, namely, the facility of reference.

With a singular conception of his work as a *translator*, Mr. Sawyer undertakes, at the conclusion of his Preface, to settle one of the most vexed questions in what is technically called Introduction, by affirming that St. John was not the author of the Book of Revelation. The gratuitous nature of this dictum, its irrelevance as prefatory to a mere translation, upon which it could not possibly have any bearing, the entire omission of all other kindred questions as to authorship, (for instance in the Gospels, Acts, Epistle to the Hebrews, 2d Peter, 2d and 3d John, James, Jude,) and the one-sided argument adduced, all

* See Acts ix-xi, where the old division is retained, and p. 237, where the beginning of Paul's third foreign mission ends a paragraph and chapter.

make us fear that he has hastily caught up some partial statement of the case and swallowed it, without knowing upon what grounds it has been rejected, even by some of the latest and best German writers, and without suspecting that the very circumstance he mentions, i. e. the use of the name John without additional specification, is regarded by that class of writers as among the strongest proofs of apostolical authority and origin.

With equal coolness, and we must say shallowness, he marks two passages of some length as interpolations, without appearing to suspect that there are two sides to the question, much less that the other has been clearly proved to be the right one.

Having now allowed the author to define his own position, and to characterize his own performance, it remains to consider how far this position is tenable and this estimate correct. These questions we desire to settle, not by general and vague description, but by actual exemplification, shunning at the same time an empirical detail of insulated faults and failures, or appeals to prejudice and fixed association, and endeavouring both to save space and secure completeness, by a classification of the facts which we adduce, and an exhibition of the principles on which the version is constructed.

We begin by stating what some of Mr. Sawyer's critics have entirely ignored, if not explicitly denied, to wit, that on the supposition of a new translation being called for, or regarding this as nothing more than a corrective comment on the authorized version, there are some undeniable improvements, chiefly consisting in the change of ambiguous terms, or such as have entirely lost their ancient meaning, for unequivocal and clear equivalents. Most, if not all of these, have been suggested by preceding writers, and can scarcely be regarded as sheer innovations. Such is the change, in many passages, of *meat* to *food*, *masters* to *teachers*, *doctrine* to *teaching*, *charity* to *love*, *sitting* (at table) to *reclining*, *room* to *place*, *prevent* to *anticipate*, and several others. Sometimes the change rids us of an awkward periphrasis not in the original, as in the substitution of *paralytic* for *sick of the palsy*, *expired*

for *gave up the ghost, dysentery for bloody flux*. Sometimes a figure, not in the original and in itself objectionable, is expunged, as in the change of *winked at* (Acts xvii. 30) to *overlooked*. Sometimes, but very seldom, the correct sense, as now commonly explained, has been restored, as in the change of *all appearance to every form (of evil, 1 Thess. v. 22.)* Sometimes, where the meaning is more doubtful, the expression is at least brought nearer to the form of the original, as in the change of *private interpretation to own solution* (2 Peter i. 20,) and *the root of all evil to a root of all evils* (1 Tim. v. 10.) Sometimes the same thing is effected with respect to the precise form of the syntax or construction, where the sense remains the same, as in the substitution of the participial forms, *the lost and the saved*, for the enfeebling relative construction, *them that perish and are saved* (1 Cor. i. 18); *the multitude standing and hearing for the people that stood by and heard it* (John xii. 29.) Sometimes in addition to the restoration of the Greek construction, a material error is precluded on the part of the unlearned reader, as when *should betray him* is exchanged for *was (or was about) to betray him* (John vi. 64.) Now and then the improvement has been borrowed from the margin of the English Bible, which is part and parcel of the authorized version, as when the paraphrase, *the law is open*, is exchanged for the translation, *court-days are held* (marg. kept, Acts xix. 38.) To these may be added some few cases, one of which has been already cited for another purpose, where the version is improved by the omission or insertion of the article, according to the requisitions of the modern philology. But these cases are outnumbered by a multitude of others, where the same rule is applied empirically and without discrimination, as if an article must always stand in English where it stands in Greek, and *vice versa*, without regard to difference of idiom, which extends to this as well as to the other parts of speech.

While we recognize the merit of these changes, as improvements on the common version, most of which had already been proposed or introduced in exposition, we are bound to add that they are few in number, and that many similar amendments, no less obvious, and at least as necessary, are entirely omitted

in this new translation. It may indeed be stated still more generally, as a characteristic of the author, that he does his work by halves; that even what he seems to recognize as great improvements, he has failed to carry out, except in a few cases, which engross his whole attention, or withdraw it from a multitude of others of precisely the same nature; thus imparting to his version an unfinished and one-sided character, of which its enemies may take advantage, unless corrected in a new edition. To facilitate this process, we shall now exemplify the general description which we have just given, by enumerating some specific cases.

One of the most striking features of this version is the absolute exclusion of some words which have been hitherto considered indispensable in biblical translation, because expressive of ideas inseparable from the Christian system, because no equivalents are furnished by the language, and because the terms before used have been wrought into the very texture of religious phraseology. Among these words are *gospel*, *church*, *repentance*, and *temptation* (with the cognate verbs *repent* and *tempt*.) Some, unacquainted with the author's boldness and decision, will be slow to believe, what is nevertheless literally true, that excepting a few cases where he has forgotten his own rule and inadvertently employed the tabooed forms, and a few more where he has been forced to add the word *church* in brackets as a sort of note or comment, these familiar terms are universally replaced by *good news*, *assembly*, *change of mind*, and *trial*.

That the author should have thought it an advantage *per se* to get rid of these words, and to tear up by the roots their manifold associations, we are neither willing to believe, nor able to imagine, but are bound to take for granted that he felt himself constrained by some inexorable law of language to make this sacrifice, so painful to himself and others. If so, it is easy to perceive that this inexorable law was one requiring words to be translated in accordance with their primary and "proper" meaning, as determined by their etymology or derivation. Thus the lexicons give *change of mind*, *assembly*, *trial*, and *good news*, as the original idea or essential meaning of the Greek words, *μετάνοια*, *ἐκκλησία*, *πειρασμός*, *εὐαγγέλιον*. Mr.

Sawyer, therefore, substitutes this primary import for the conventional translation, with a care and uniformity which show how much importance he attaches to the principle.

But if the principle is sound, if words must always be translated by their primary and etymological equivalents, why is the application of this law to be restricted to the few words above given, and perhaps as many more of less importance? Why are *angel, elder, deacon, disciple, synagogue, apostle, gentiles*, and a multitude of other secondary senses, here retained, to the exclusion of the primary and strict ones, *messenger, old man, waiter, learner, meeting, missionary, nations?* Above all, how can *baptism* and *baptize* be reconciled with this inviolable canon of translation; which requires words to be taken, not in their conventional and customary but their primary and strict sense? Mr. Sawyer's practice as to *gospel, church, &c.* is a full concession of the ground on which the Baptists urge a new translation.

But while the principle, if true, must be applied to all these cases, irrespectively or recklessly of consequences, it is proved by the cases themselves to be a false one. If in all the words which have been cited, the New Testament usage is derivative and secondary; if, as a general rule, admitted by all sound philologists, classical terms, applied to Christian subjects, undergo a modification of their meaning to adapt them to their purpose; if such changes are in fact what constitute the Hellenistic dialect, as differing from the Attic, or the *κοινή διάλεκτος*; and if no reason can be given for excepting those which Mr. Sawyer has excepted; then we fear that in order to be decently consistent, he must either go a great deal further or go back to the familiar but despised words, *gospel, church, repentance, and temptation*. These are in fact the only single representatives or equivalents of the corresponding Greek words. It is just as certain and as clear as any other fact of lexicography, that *ἐκκλησία*, in the Greek of the New Testament, does not mean an assembly, simply as such, but a body of men called out and called together by divine command for a religious purpose; that *πειρασμός* never denotes trial in the general, but trial of character, especially by giving men the opportunity of doing either right or wrong, and for the most part more specific-

ally still, by direct solicitation or incitement to sin. To render such words by the vague terms *trial* and *assembly*, is as incorrect in kind, though not in degree, as it would be to render βασιλεύς a ruler, or θεός a spirit. The case is still worse with the other two words, *gospel* and *repentance*; for the sense attached to them is not the primary and strict one after all. In the classics, εὐαγγέλιον never means good news, but a reward for bringing it, and in the Greek of the New Testament, specifically good news of salvation, sent from God to man. According to the best etymological analysis of μετάνοια, its primary import is not change of mind, but afterthought, reflection, while in the New Testament it always means specifically change of mind (i. e. both of judgment and feeling) upon moral subjects, with particular reference to one's own conduct. To translate terms thus used *change of mind* and *good news* is as incorrect as it would be to exchange *prayer* and *sacrifice* for *wish* and *slaughter*. With respect to this whole notion of insisting on the primary or "proper" sense of words, without regard to their conventional or actual usage, we shall only quote (from memory) what Sydney Smith said of the Quakers' objection to the names of the days of the week, as heathen in their origin, that if we go so far back, we must take *sincere* as a synonyme of *unwaxed*, and *consider* as meaning to *put stars together*.

Another instance of one-sided inconsistency in urging some things and neglecting others of the same kind, is the constant use of the uncouth form *Nazoræan*, as an epithet of *Jesus*. What we object to here is not the restoration of the adjective or gentile form instead of that used in the common version (*Jesus of Nazareth*.) Such a change is desirable, at least in exposition, on account of the prophecy in Matt. ii. 23, *He shall be called a Nazarene*. But why must this familiar and endeared form be exchanged for *Nazoræan*? On the principle, that every proper name must be exactly reproduced as it is written in Greek letters? Even granting that the form Ναζωραῖος is the true text, has it any more claim to be thus carefully preserved than *Jesus*, *Elias*, *Eliseus*, *Osee*, *Cis*, which Mr. Sawyer has, with great alacrity and wisdom, written *Joshua*, *Elijah*, *Elisha*, *Hosea*, *Kish*? These are not even Hebrew forms, but English ones, familiar to the English

reader, although far less dear to him than *Nazarene*. After swallowing these camels of orthography, it does seem pharisaical to strain out or to strain at such a gnat as *Nazoræan*.

Another instance of this disproportionate attention to a single class of objects, while a multitude of others, not unlike them, are neglected, is afforded by the zeal and assiduity with which Mr. Sawyer explains ancient measures, weights, and coins, by printing within brackets what he takes to be their modern equivalents. It might be asked on what consistent principle these comments have been introduced at all into a simple version, and why either one or the other equivalent was not suppressed, as in the rest of the translation. But apart from this general objection to such glosses, as belonging rather to interpretation, it may still be asked what special value or importance can belong to these particular specifications, rendering it necessary to define them with elaborate precision, not omitting fractions. Even granting that the values are correctly given, which is doubtful, as the best authorities often vary as to such details, why is the reader any more interested to know how many mills would make an ancient penny, or how many pecks would make an ancient bushel, than to know a hundred other things left unexplained? The information thus imparted is by no means always necessary to the just interpretation of the passage. For example, when our Lord says that a candle is not lighted to be put under a bushel or a bed, why are the precise dimensions of the bushel any more important to the sense than the dimensions of the bed, since both are used for the same purpose, and that a purpose not at all connected with their size? In fact, the *modius* is mentioned not as a measure at all, but as a vessel or utensil, which might have been exchanged for *box* or *basket*, without any variation in the sense.

But even granting that such comments are legitimate and needed, why restrict them to this single class of words? On what intelligible principle are *metretes* and *denarii* and *stadiums* to be left in the text of the translation, with a bracketed gloss annexed, while *synagogue*, and *proselyte*, and *cohort*, and *centurion*, and *legion*, are left unexplained, and *prefect*, *lictor*, *procurator*, *proconsul*, *athlete*, *Sanhedrim*, *Tartarus*, and

Hades, are introduced for the first time without a word of explanation? It is plain that consistency requires one of these two courses; either that the same mode of explanation should be equally extended to all Greek and Latin words retained in the translation, or that those denoting coins and measures should be treated like the rest, and left to find their definition in the lexicons or expositions. The truth is, that these matters are determined by a sort of fashion, and that Mr. Sawyer, with all his independence and decision, has been led into these inconsistencies by imitating others. We are glad that he has not gone the whole length of his models, or he might have revived the inextinguishable laughter raised by Campbell in his Dissertations on the Gospels, at the expense of the unhappy Frenchman, who reduced the five and ten pounds of our Lord's instructive parable, where all depends upon proportion, not upon intrinsic value, to the fractional equivalents of French or English currency. Such cases are instructive as disclosing the false principle involved in others not so palpably absurd, or even plausibly defensible upon some utilitarian pretext.

We have hitherto left out of view one most essential feature of this version, upon which its claims as a competitor or rival of King James's Bible must materially rest. We mean the English into which it is translated. Mr. Sawyer may not be aware, but we must venture to inform him or remind him, that the English of the present day is not a single, narrow, straight canal, nor even a broad river with a single channel, but a mighty flood with many affluents and branches, overspreading a large portion of the earth, and wherever it flows, presenting some peculiarities of course or surface. Here the stream has brought down more, there less, of the old drift-wood; here it is coloured more than yonder by the soil through which it percolates, or by the scenery which overhangs it. Or to drop the metaphor, though just and natural, the dialects of English, as now spoken, even by the educated classes, differ greatly in their measure of adherence to old usage, both in lexicography and grammar. Forms are still used in New England which are elsewhere obsolete; the same is true of Virginia and Jamaica, Scotland and Ireland, and of different places, classes, and conditions in England itself. The further we depart from

the cradle of the language, the more we find a tendency to drop what still remains in use there, whether absolutely or in exchange for new and local forms. This process, naturally tending to impoverish the language, may be checked and counteracted by a common literature, and especially by cherishing the old part of the language, not attempting to accelerate, but rather to retard that process of mutation which is really essential to the life of every spoken tongue, but which will always travel fast enough, without the use of artificial means to quicken it. It will therefore be found, in every civilized nation, and especially in every English-speaking country, that while common parlance and the usage of the newspaper press are constantly producing innovations, some gratuitous and others unavoidable, the influence of scholars and of cultivated tastes is to withstand this process, so as to retard but not entirely to prevent it. This conservative tendency is powerfully aided by the continued circulation of old English books among us, by the more or less extended use of Shakspeare, Milton, Addison, the English Prayer Book, and the English Bible. These exhaustless wells of English undefiled are constantly neutralizing and diluting the new waters, fresh and bilge, flowing in from other sources.

It is natural enough for those who know all this to be a little jealous of proposed improvements, and especially when any of these ancient safeguards is attacked in this way, to inquire who it is that is attempting it, by what attainments or experience he is qualified for such a task, and by what means he undertakes to do it. Should such a reformer, in reply to these inquiries, say he knows or cares nothing about old English, that to him the language is identical with what he learnt at school and has since read in the papers, without any reference to what is used in England, India, or Australia, or to what was used a hundred years ago; the answer would be perfectly decisive, if not wholly satisfactory.

But from this ideal case we turn to that before us and endeavour to describe, as fairly as we can, the dialect in which this version is composed. And first, we may premise that there is nothing to imply unusual familiarity with English classics, old or new, nor any of that *curiosa felicitas* and *copia verborum*,

which commonly bear witness to the love and study of the best models. In addition to the meagreness arising from the absence of such culture, there is what may be called a voluntary poverty, like that of the monastic orders, a deliberate attempt to cut off all variety of forms, all choice between alternative expressions, and a settled resolution to say every thing according to the stereotyped formula of some provincial school or circle. Thus the English verb, but poor at best in temporal and modal forms, is here reduced to its most beggarly condition, stripped of its subjunctive mood and forced to be exclusively indicative or jussive, even when the sense to be expressed is a contingent one. *If it be, if it were*, which every gentleman in England, and a multitude in these United States, still use for the expression of a shade of meaning different from *if it is* and *if it was*, are here confounded with them and rejected as superfluous. This single instance may illustrate a whole class of such grammatical excisions, all resulting in a paucity of forms and a rigidity of sameness. How "thoroughly modern" this translation is in point of English Grammar, may be gathered from the constant use of *eat* as an imperfect, and the occurrence of such forms as *have drank* (p. 416,) *preach you* (p. 265,) and to *have go* (p. 231.)

As we must deal in examples, and yet cannot cite more than a few, we choose such as represent the greatest number of particular cases, or in other words, such as are most frequently repeated. One of these, which stares the reader in the face on almost every page, and which illustrates more than one point of the author's English, is the merciless proscription of the plural *brethren*, and the constant substitution of what grammarians call the "regular" form, *brothers*. We have noticed only one place where the former has been suffered to remain, but whether inadvertently, or on some secret ground of lawfulness in that one case, we dare not even guess. Now why is this change made? Not because the one form is more "regular"; for surely Mr. Sawyer would not, if he could, say *oxes*, *childs*, and *mans*, instead of *oxen*, *children*, *men*, though this is the unquestionable tendency of much that is esteemed grammatical correctness among modern pedagogues. Is it because *brethren* is not fully understood by every child and slave who

speaks the English language? The Bible itself has nullified this reason, and the same end is promoted by the use of the term, not only in religious but in social and political parlance. The only ground for the exclusion then is that the other form is younger, having come into common circulation since the Bible was translated. But this would only be a reason for preferring it, in case the other had gone out of use, or ceased to be intelligible; whereas both have continued side by side, the younger denoting the mere natural relation, while the older comprehends a variety of others, all included in the usage of the Greek ἀδελφοί, to which *brothers*, therefore, is not an equivalent. This is one out of a multitude of cases, in which overstrained precision aggravates the evil which it seeks to remedy. But over and above this reason for retaining the old word, as in many cases necessary to a strict translation, it deserves to be retained for the very reason that it is old, and has never lost its place in current English, and is just as clearly understood as *brothers*, from Valentia to Victoria, from Calcutta to Chicago. What a dialect must that be, in which *brethren* is as strange a word as *church* or *gospel*!

Another sample of the same impoverishing process, and the same provincial narrowness of usage, though unworthy of attention but for its perpetual occurrence, is the constant substitution of the pronoun *you* for *thou* and *thee* and *ye*, thus happily reducing, at a single stroke, four distinct and most familiar forms to one. It might be plausibly alleged, that this monotony ought rather to be shunned than sought; that the use of one form in so many senses is as contrary to good taste as to sound philosophy; that the change in general colloquial usage is itself a reason for maintaining the old forms in books; that their continued use among the Quakers, and in many parts of Britain, renders this still more allowable. But no, our author is inflexible. He finds one form for both the cases and both numbers of the second person to be quite enough for him and his, and he resolves that others shall have no more, either in talking or in reading the Bible. The consistency of all this is presented in a bright light by the one exception, that of prayer to God. And why is this excepted? Simply because modern English practice happens to retain it, without any valid reason,

and in opposition to the foreign papal usage, which, with some show of reason, uses the more courteous form in prayer as well as in polite conversation. Thus the tendency is still to lop off and to tear away the few remaining boughs of the old English tree, yet clinging to King James's Bible, and to make the language just as bare and lifeless as a maypole or an awning-post.

There is one prevailing weakness, as to English words, from which our author seems entirely free, the rage for Saxon vocables, to the exclusion of all French and Latin forms, as if the former by themselves would make a language worth preserving. Mr. Sawyer, far from giving into this extravagance, most evidently verges towards the opposite extreme, and always gives the preference to what is not of Saxon birth, whenever he can choose between them. To this happy prejudice we owe the introduction of such fine sonorous forms as *subjugate*, *excavate*, *circulate*, *criminate*, *extinguish*, *aliments*, *insipid*, *argument*, *precipitate*, *compensate*, *athlete*, *cauterize*, *crystallize*, *archetype*, *perceptive*, *libation*, and some others, which have too long been excluded from the English Bible. Hence the happy substitution of *collect* for *gather*, *conceal* for *hide*, *product* for *fruit*, *select* for *choose*, *exterior* for *outer*, *mortal* for *deadly*, *injure* for *hurt*, *pure* and *impure* for *clean* and *unclean*, even in speaking of corporeal washing; and of *eternal* for *everlasting*, even where the reference is only to the future. Another symptom of the author's taste is the increased number of original Greek forms retained in the translation, and to be henceforth reckoned as good English. Besides certain names of coins and measures, which have been already mentioned as accompanied by explanations, we have also, without note or comment, such euphonious forms as *athlete*, *myth*, *iris*, *chiliarch*, *hades*, *tartarus*, &c., to which may be added, drawn from oriental sources, the Hebrew *sanhedrim* and the Persian *khan*, the last as a more popular and modern synonyme of the obscure old English *inn*. Sometimes, instead of retaining the original, the translation is enriched by a supposed equivalent in Latin, such as *lictor*, *procurator*, *proconsul*, *cranium*, all which, except the last, are pure gain to the Greek text as well as to the English Bible; or by a mongrel combination of the Latin prefix *co-* (so much more modern and expressive than *fellow*)

with a Greek or English word, as in *co-laborer*, *co-presbyter*, and *co-elect*. Sometimes the improvement is in Natural History as well as English, for example in the change of *brimstone* to *sulphur*, *husks* to *carob-pods*, and *tares* to *poisonous darnel*.

Too much credit cannot be awarded to the author for his strenuous exertions to distinguish things that differ, where the difference is so important as to make it worth the trouble. We have seen that the distinction between *thou* and *thee*, *ye* and *you*, is not considered worth preserving, even in such a case as Luke xxii. 31, 32, where the line is drawn so clearly, by the use of the singular and plural pronouns, between Peter and his brethren (*O sit venia verbo!*) We have seen that *everlasting* and *eternal* are confounded as convertible expressions. But when we come to the distinction between *baskets*, there is no such indiscrimination practised. As the words used in the two creative miracles of feeding the multitudes are not the same, and as that by which Paul was let down from the wall of Damascus, is called in 2 Corinthians by a third name, the author could not conscientiously confound them, and accordingly translates them, *travelling-basket*, *store-basket*, *rope-basket*. Without stopping to dispute the truth of these distinctions, it may still be questioned whether it would not have been a more exact translation of three single words entirely unlike, to use as many corresponding forms in English, such as *hamper*, *crate* or *hurdle*, unless these are all extinct in "modern style," than to let the English reader think that a word meaning *basket* is employed in all three cases, with a qualifying epithet prefixed to each. Another nice distinction is between the words ἀγαπάω and φιλέω, both translated *love* in the common version of John xxi. 15—17. To mark this, which the author seems to think important, he translates the second verb, *I am a friend (to you)*. This singular precision as to love and baskets, makes it more unfortunate that in that famous pair of verbs (γινώσκω and ἐπίσταμαι) which no interpreter has ever thoroughly explained, the author gives it up, and modestly transcribes the common version, *Jesus I know and Paul I know* (Acts xix. 15.) Other words where he has failed to show the same discriminating gift as in the baskets, are the twenty verbs translated *show* in our Bible, the fifteen rendered *bring*

forth, the eleven answering to *consider*, the one-and-twenty to *depart*, and the same number to *take*. We do not mean to say that Mr. Sawyer has retained all these, for we have not examined; but we do make bold to say that he has not found as many corresponding terms for these important words as for those denoting baskets.

Besides the changes which appear to have resulted from the preference of Greek and Latin forms to those of Saxon origin, we now proceed to specify a few which can only be ascribed to the author's taste for "a thoroughly modern style" (Preface, p. 1), even where the sense is not materially affected. Under this head we may place such forms as *fishermen* (for *fishers of men*), *whitewashed tombs* (for *whited sepulchres*), *private rooms* (for *secret chambers*), *picking heads* (for *plucking ears*), *pasturage* (for *pasture*), *precipice* (for *steep bank*), *girl* (for *damsel*), *perform* (for *do*), *do no business* (for *have no dealings*), *on my account* (for *for my sake*), *good courage* (for *good cheer*), *avarice* (for *covetousness*), *servitude* (for *bondage*), *pious* and *piety* (for *godly* and *godliness*), *died for nothing* (for *died in vain*), *anger* (for *wrath*), *speaks still* (for *yet speaketh*), *leads off as prey* (for *carries captive*), *chief guide and perfecter* (for *author and finisher*). It would be so easy to extend this process on the same rule, or rather without any, that we know not whether to regret that it has gone so far, or to wish that it may go still further.

In this conversion of an antique into a "thoroughly modern style," it would have been surprising if he had not sometimes hit the wrong nail on the head, and changed the sense as well as the expression. Thus *brokers*, *goods*, *custom-house*, and *sailing-master*, are all thoroughly modern terms, but unfortunately not expressive of the things intended. The construction, too, is sometimes missed, as in the question of the magi, *Where is the King of the Jews born?* and in many other cases, which we have noted but need not specify, where the sense is either wrongly or inadequately given.

When we open a new version of such high pretensions and containing multitudes of changes which we are obliged to take upon the author's credit, it is natural to turn up some of the hard places, where the common version has been long

regarded as defective, in the hope of finding some desirable improvement. In pursuing this course we have found with some surprise that several of these places, and among the most important, stand unaltered, without any means of ascertaining whether they were simply overlooked, or whether we are now to look upon the old translation as the right one after all. As samples of this class we name the well known case in Matt. xxviii. 14, where the best interpreters are now agreed, that both the form and the connection peremptorily require a reference to judicial hearing in the presence of the governor, and not an accidental rumour. The new version changes the expression, but retains the sense (*if this is heard of by the procurator.*) Another is the famous phrase, *I see men, as trees walking* (Mark viii. 24), where the old ambiguity, to say the least, is still retained, and English readers left to construe *walking* not with *men* but *trees*, which is impossible in Greek. A third case is the old mistake of *cloven tongues* (Acts ii. 3), here simply changed into *divided*, whereas usage peremptorily requires *distributed* (among them.) The inexact translation, *save yourselves*, instead of *be saved*, is retained in Peter's pentecostal sermon (Acts ii. 40), in the midst of many less important changes. The paraphrastic version, *put to death* (Acts xii. 19), remains unaltered, though the literal translation (*led away*) sufficiently suggests what followed. The retention of the old phrase, *should be kept* (Acts xxv. 4), is more remarkable because it not only disturbs the sense but is also a subjunctive form, not found in the original. The only other case which we shall mention is the strongest, that of *live* in Acts xxiii. 1, where the whole sense is affected by this strangely inadequate translation of a Greek verb which can only mean to be a citizen or act as one.

It was not to be expected that the author, in adopting a "thoroughly modern style," would be able to succeed at once in purging out the old leaven of antique expression from the text of Scripture. This can only be effected in a series of editions, such as those which formed and settled the Greek text in the sixteenth and succeeding centuries. In aid of this important work, we venture to suggest the following words and phrases as scarcely falling under the description of "thoroughly

modern." *Ship* of old was equivalent to *vessel*, but is now restricted to a certain class. The word *boat* has been substituted sometimes but not always. *Fishes* is not the modern plural of *fish*, which serves both turns, as *you* does four. *Watch* is not modern in its primary sense of *wake*, but only in its secondary sense of *guard*. *Bottles* is not the modern name of skins for holding liquids, the material having now become no less essential than the use. *Legion* is not a modern military term, and ought to have been either changed or explained in brackets. *Platter* may be modern in some places, but is not so in all dialects. *Draught of fishes*, to be modern in the sense of this book, should be *haul of fish*, and *herd of many swine* should be a *large drove of hogs*. *Whomsoever* (for *whoever*), *lightly* (in the sense of easily or readily), *besought* (for *begged*), *espoused* (for *married* or *engaged*), *behold* (for *see*, or *look here*), *blessed* (for *happy*, *fortunate*, or *lucky*), *harlot* (for *prostitute*), *husbandman* (for *farmer*), *householder* (for *housekeeper*, *landlord*, or the like), *mansions* (for *residences*, *homes*, or *dwellings*), *lord* (for *master*, as opposed to *servant*), *bonds* (for *imprisonment*), *nourished* (for *supported*), *oracles* (for *words* or *revelations*), are all more or less infected with the vice of being old expressions. The same thing may be said of certain phrases, such as *bill of divorcement*, *children of the bridechamber*, *take counsel*, *set at nought*, *use it rather*, *reasonable service*, *blackness of darkness*, *come short*, *in a figure* (ἐν αἰνίγματι); and of certain collocations and inversions, such as, *neither tell I you—I go to try them—when came you hither—whence he is—him he hears—will one die—begat he us—seal not up—and all heard I*. Not one of these properly belongs to the "thoroughly modern style," in which this version is composed, and into which all this must be translated, if the work is to have any consistent uniformity of diction.

Among the old forms thus retained, we have observed a few, which do not seem to have been clearly understood, or perhaps are retained in a modern sense, distinct from that belonging to them in the common version. Such are the words *offend*, *offence*, which Mr. Sawyer seems to understand as meaning *displease*, *displeasure*, as he sometimes changes *in* or *at* to

with. We need not say that in Old English, as in Latin, these words have a far more comprehensive meaning. Another such word is the verb to *reason*, which has very sensibly modified its usage. *Injurious* now means hurtful, but of old retained more of its moral sense, implying violation of right. *Inform* is several times used in the old legal sense of accusation, whereas now it would convey the bare idea of communicating knowledge. *Ought*, the imperfect tense of *owe*, is not a mere auxiliary form, but a distinct verb, and requires to be otherwise expressed in modern English. *Ought not Christ to suffer these things?* means far more than *was it not his duty?* which is all that the translation now conveys to English readers. The retention of these old forms, which have changed their meaning, in the work before us, makes us apprehensive that the author has not constantly "translated from the Greek," but sometimes made his labour easy by attempting to improve the common version.

There is one class of changes which we must not pass unnoticed, as the author seems to have bestowed considerable care upon it, and no doubt attaches much importance to it. We refer to the euphemistic changes, or removal of indelicate expressions, which is always a severe test of the writer's taste, and serves to show whether he is really refined or only nice, according to Swift's famous definition. From the nature of the subject, we can only give a few of the substituted phrases, with a reference to the places where they are inserted. *To the earth* (Matt. xv. 17.)—*Put on manure* (Luke xiii. 8.)—*Became pregnant* (Luke i. 24.)—*Became a mother* (Heb. xi. 11.)—*Gave it birth* (Rev. xii. 2.)—*Gave me being* (Gal. i. 15.)—*Obtained him in my bonds* (Phil. 10.)—*Become an unborn infant of his mother* (John iii. 4.)—*Of foreign birth* (Heb. xii. 8.)—*Marriage life without blame* (Heb. xiii. 4.) We must confess that most of these corrections seem to us entirely gratuitous, and all of them unskilfully performed, especially the last but one, where *foreign birth*, as used in modern English, gives a sense wholly different from that of the Greek *νόθοι*, the equivalent of which is *spurious* (illegitimate), not *foreign* (or outlandish.)

Whatever be the value of the foregoing strictures, every reader will perceive that they are not the fruit of casual or cursory inspection, but of thorough and deliberate examination. All the examples cited, and a multitude of others necessarily omitted, have been noted in the course of a continuous perusal, and then carefully digested under heads, as we have here presented them. By this laborious induction of particulars, we have endeavoured to avoid a superficial and empirical mode of treatment, and to put it in the power of our readers, who are not themselves acquainted with the book before us, to sit in judgment on the truth or falsehood of a few summary conclusions, which we now feel justified in drawing, for the sake of recapitulation and conclusion, not from abstract premises, but from the very data which we have already furnished and could easily increase fourfold.

1. The first of these conclusions is, that this translation does embody a few obvious corrections and improvements, which have long been floating on the surface of our exegetical literature, consisting partly in the dropping of ambiguous or wholly unintelligible terms, and partly in a simplification of the syntax by a nearer approach to the original construction.

2. In making these legitimate corrections the translator often changes both the sense and the construction for the worse; while on the other hand defects and imperfections, no less obvious and commonly admitted than the few which have been rectified, are left entirely untouched, either through ignorance or inadvertence.

3. In many cases, where there seems to be no effort to improve the sense, the form is gratuitously marred, by the exchange of words still perfectly familiar and intelligible, either for pedantic and exotic synonymes, or for equivalents no more expressive or exact, and generally less so.

4. This arbitrary process has been pushed so far as to exclude from the translation some of the most precious and familiar terms of our religious phraseology, their places being filled by vague and inexact equivalents, and sometimes by diluted paraphrase, the whole proceeding on a false principle of lexicography and a factitious canon of translation.

5. The English dialect adopted in this version is a hard and meagre one, rejecting all variety of forms in lexicography and grammar, and excluding, as obsolete or incorrect, expressions still entirely current and familiar in the best usage both of England and America, thus assuming as the standard of the language what appears to be by no means the most eligible even of its local or provincial variations.

6. Even in carrying out the doubtful or erroneous principles already mentioned, there is no consistent uniformity, the process being pushed to an extreme in one case, or one class of cases, while in others wholly undistinguishable from them, it is either not applied at all or so imperfectly, that what is changed and what is left produce the painful and incongruous impression of an old but still sound garment gratuitously patched with undressed cloth of the crudest quality and coarsest texture. This is the secret of the shock which every cultivated reader feels on opening the book, it scarcely matters where; a shock which could not be produced by simple innovation, how extravagant soever, but which really arises from the motley piebald mixture of incongruous materials, constraining every one not "thoroughly modern" in his taste and education to cry out, in a paroxysm of æsthetic nausea, "the old is better!"

7. The impression irresistibly produced upon the mind of the unbiassed reader, in relation to the author, is extremely favourable to his honesty and courage; to his honesty, in thinking that a great and glorious work is to be done, and that he not only is raised up to do it, but has actually done it; to his courage, in deliberately setting at defiance the religious prepossessions and associations of at least two centuries and many millions; the taste of the whole English-speaking race insensibly matured and chastened by a matchless literature, secular and sacred; and, to a great extent, the actual colloquial usage of the two most enlightened and instructed nations in existence.

8. It is scarcely requisite to add, that this translation is not likely soon to supersede the English Bible; that even if its merits were as great as Mr. Jewett represents, the power of old prejudice and fixed association would be still too strong for it.

However wrong and foolish it may be, the very errors of the old translation will prove more attractive to this evil generation, and to many after it, than Mr. Sawyer's most superb improvements; so that "fire and sword" would be as powerless in forcing this new version down the throats of a regorging public, as in quelling his own manful resolution so to force it.

9. We regret to be obliged to say that, even as a modest contribution to the great work of revising and correcting the old version, Mr. Sawyer's book has no extraordinary value. This is only a corollary from the facts already stated, that he leaves untouched some of the places most in need of retraction, and that a vast proportion of the changes which he does make are either without use or for the worse, in point of taste, exactness, or correct interpretation.

10. This being the case, the interesting question, as to the retention or revision of King James's Bible, stands precisely where it did before the sudden apparition of "the greatest work of this age or of any age since King James, 1610." And as this great question must continue to increase in interest and importance for all English-speaking Christians, they will naturally look to other quarters for the hope and means of its solution. Their attention will especially be turned to the accomplished scholars of Old England, equally familiar with the ancient and the modern, with the classical and biblical authorities, a class represented by the present Dean of Westminster, nearly all whose corrections and improvements Mr. Sawyer claims to have anticipated (Preface, p. ix), but of whom we may take an early opportunity to show, that unlike his American competitor, and like a scribe disciplined into the kingdom of heaven, he brings out of his treasure things both new and old.