does not associate the rest; he thinks only of Philemon and himself. There are no plurals, but intimate personal greetings.

It would thus appear that in Paul's use of the singular and plural there is neither caprice nor carelessness. When he says 'I', he means 'I' — there can be no doubt about that. But the barrier between singular and plural is constantly breaking down. So far from being self-centred or occupied with himself, the Apostle habitually links himself with others; the friends at his side, the recipients, whether they will welcome his letters or criticize them, or the whole company of the faithful through all the world. The one identification never expressed in so many words — reverence would forbid it — is that with God the Father or the Lord Jesus Christ. When we follow these almost lightning transitions, we find him letting out the secret of his intense sympathies by a door the handle of which he never consciously turned. The usage is as unique in the New Testament as it is illuminating for the passionate invasiveness, as we may perhaps venture to call it, of one who sought to be all things to all men, though he never ceased to be either himself or the servant of Jesus the Christ.

---

# Salute to Translators

*R. A. Ward*

*(Reproduced by permission from* Interpretation, *Volume VIII, No. 3, July 1954.)*

In the "Prologue to the Reader" of the Coverdale Bible (1535), Coverdale states that "he has been unwilling to set himself up as translator of the Bible, feeling himself unequal to the work . . . It is a good thing to have a multitude of translations. In the early ages they had many versions, and the church was never in better health. We ought to thank God for the men of our day who undertake this great task, and not least in our own language. A translator may not always hit the mark, yet one man may improve on another. Differing interpretations bring the truth to light, and if only a man is doing his best he should be commended and encouraged".[1]

Two years later Archbishop Cranmer wrote to Cromwell to commend to him a new Bible — the so-called Matthew Bible. "You shall receive," he writes, "by the bringer hereof a Bible in English . . . And as for the translation, so far as I have read thereof, I like it better than any other translation heretofore made, yet not doubting but that there may and will be found some faults therein, as you know no man ever did or can do so well but it may be from time to time amended".[2]

This reluctance to regard any translation as the last word is reiterated by Coverdale in the short "Prologue to the Reader", following the dedication to Cromwell, in the Paris edition of the Coverdale diglot (1538):

[1] J. F. Mozley, *Coverdale and His Bibles* (London: The Lutterworth Press, 1953), p. 69.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 125.

" . . . if thou open thine eyes and consider well the gift of the Holy Ghost therein, thou shalt see that one translation declareth, openeth and illustrateth another, and that in many places one is a plain commentary unto another".[3]

This is no false modesty, but rather a sober realism, the considered opinion of a man who has set his hand to the task and knows the dangers. A man who undertakes the work of translation takes his reputation, if not his life, into his hands. For he is attempting the impossible. In all translation something is omitted, something is therefore lost. If the translator pay due attention to the tense system of the Greek Testament, for instance, he may be accused of over-emphasis. It is all right for the preacher, it may be said, but wrong for the translator. And so he writes that "Jesus looked at [the rich young ruler] and loved him" (Mark 10 : 21), when he might have written that he "turned his eyes upon him and fell in love with him". An ingressive aorist surely demands that. Or if he feel that paraphrase is the only safe course, he will be accused of adding to the text. "What one thing am I to do and have done with it, that I may inherit eternal life?" "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God . . . Go on doing this and thou shalt gain life" (Luke 10 : 25). I am sure that this is the right interpretation, but someone will observe that "one thing" is not in the Greek text. Better is the question of the jailer of Philippi: "Sirs, what must I keep on doing in order to gain salvation?" with the apostles' answer, "Set your faith on the Lord Jesus" (Acts 15 : 30). Not, you notice, "Go on believing on the Lord Jesus", though we must all do that. St. Paul and Silas are thinking of the start of the Christian life, of the decisive act of faith: "hand yourself over in trust to the Lord Jesus". A thousand pictures spring to the mind, but the translator must not use them. The preacher's treasure is the translator's temptation: and in repelling the temptation the honest translator loses, the more, perhaps, as he improves his English style.

Again, words have associations which cannot be banished. St. Paul prays, in regard to the Thessalonian Christians (I Thess. 3 : 10), that he may have a glimpse of their face and may "perfect that which is lacking" in their faith (A.V.). Now the word "to perfect" is used in St. Mark 1 : 19 for "mending" fishing nets. May we not translate "mend the gaps in your faith"? No, says someone, how do you know that the apostle was thinking of fishing nets? Perhaps he was not; and yet it does catch the spirit of his thought.

Take the apostle Paul's burning phrase, "necessity is laid upon me; yea, woe is unto me, if I preach not the gospel!" (I Cor. 9 : 16). This rendering of the Authorized Version cannot convey to the English reader all that it means to the translator who knows his Greek Testament. "Laid upon me", it is true, does suggest a heavy weight, a burden. But what if there flashes into the mind of the translator some of the other contexts of the Greek verb (*epikeitai*)? In Acts 27 : 20 "no small tempest lay on [us]"; in Luke 5 : 1 "The people pressed upon him", and Luke means the crowd, the mob; in Luke 23 : 23 "they were instant with loud voices, requiring that he might be crucified", a rendering, I fancy, influenced by

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 187.

the Vulgate Version (*instabant*). Any translator who is an authentic preacher will be able to enter into the apostle's experience;[4] he *must* preach; it is agony to be silent. Necessity beats about him with the violence of a mighty storm which may not be stilled, with the pressure of a crowd which will not withdraw, with the clamour of a mob which will have its way. But what is he to write down as his translation?

Or think of Philippians 4 : 11 "I have learnt in the state in which I am to be . . ." what? The Authorized Version says "content", and it has been used by parents and grandparents as an argument for refusing their children's request. But St. Paul is using a Stoic word, which he has baptized into Christ. It means 'self-sufficient', and was used of the Stoic 'wise man' who grimly turned aside from the amenities of life. St. Paul does not mean that, but rather he is 'self-contained'. Germany aimed at *autarky* before the war, so that even if blockaded all her resources would be within her. Such is the apostle's spiritual state: wherever he goes, in whatever prison he languishes, in hunger and cold and nakedness, he 'travels light', as we say, because all that he needs is within: "Christ in you" (Col. 1 : 27). Even if 'blockaded', his sufficiency is not of self but is within self. In the deepest sense he is 'independent'. All this comes to us as we read the Greek, but, short of a brief exposition or paraphrase, it is lost in translation.

Even a simple juxtaposition may be a puzzle. St. Paul's "living sacrifice" (Romans 12 : 1) *(thusian zôsan)* means more than will be realized by everybody. A sacrifice, a *thusia*, is related to the verb *thuô*, used in Acts 10 : 13, "Rise, Peter; kill, and eat". Thus a sacrifice is a dead thing. "Present your bodies a living dead thing". In English it may fall rather flat; but there is the Greek, with its associations. How is it to be rendered?

Even the meaning of the original may cause perplexity, but the translator must write something. In the Preface to his New Testament, James Moffatt warns us that "a translator appears to be more dogmatic than he really is. He must come down on one side of the fence or on the other. He has often to decide on a rendering, or even on the text of a passage, when his own mind is by no means clear and certain". What are we to use, then, to translate such a word as *huparchô*? In a number of instances scholars will tell us that it means no more than 'to be'. But I believe that in fact it means 'to be in a state arising out of the previous same state', and thus is the very opposite of a 'flash in the pan'. "If ye, then, being evil . . ." (Luke 11 : 13). When? at a quarter to eleven on a certain Sunday morning? Last pay day? When you turned into the Club for Dinner? No; your continued state is evil. But how can we bring this out without a long paraphrase or murdering the style?

Another question which must be faced is this: how far must a translator be faithful to the figures of speech of the original? I am thinking particularly of the Hebrew love of the pun. "Gilgal shall surely

[4] J. Moffatt, *The Approach to the New Testament* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1922), p. 173, "The distance of centuries between us and the New Testament age is reduced by the essential identity of religious experience, which has lasted in a continuity of life within the Church".

go into captivity" (Amos 5 : 5) says our Authorized Version. Is the pun to be ignored? Dare we say "Gilgal shall suffer the gall of captivity"? Or, "Gilgal, the rolling city, will roll on"?[5] There are illustrations suggested by E. B. Pusey:[6] Paris *périra* and London is undone. The spirit of the Hebrew is caught by some such barbarism as "England (pronounce it 'Ingle-land') shall go into tingle-land", but how far this may be used in a dignified rendering is another matter. We may associate with this the Semitic 'impersonal plural' or 'indefinite third plural'. In Luke 12 : 20 (a Gentile evangelist, interestingly enough, though he can write Semitic Greek competently when he wants to do so) we have "Fool, this night they are requiring from thee thy soul". Who are "they"? For him, nobody: it is a Semitic mode of speech, best rendered here by the passive, "Thy soul is required of thee", leaving the author of the call in terrifying anonymity. But what are we to make of II Kings 19 : 35, "And when men arose early in the morning, behold, they were all dead corpses"? My point is not that the difficulties here are insuperable, but that they must be faced, and that the translator must be ready to give an answer to anyone who enquires about the linguistic hope that is in him.

It would seem superfluous to ask if the translator should take account of scholarship. But in fact there is no such thing as scholarship. There exist only scholars, and their views in scholarly books. How far must the views of scholars, even of the greatest, come into a translation? Consider the famous text, thrice sanctified through the piety of centuries: "Behold the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world" (John 1 : 29). Dr. C. H. Dodd sees here an allusion to the Maccabean leader, the leader of the flock or the military host, the 'bell-wether'.[7] Is there no escape from the dilemma? Either we must disagree with Dr. Dodd, or use this objectionable word, to the undoubted trouble and pain of the faithful. Or if we agree with him and retain the word "lamb" then we see once more that translation loses something.

There are other associations also. What does "taketh away" mean? The Greek word means to raise or to take away, that is, to lift or to shift. "Take up thy bed" (John 5 : 8) has the former sense, to lift; "take these things hence" (John 2 : 16) has the latter, to shift. The Latin equivalent is the verb *'tollo'*, used in the story of Augustine's conversion, when the voice as of a boy or girl sang *"tolle, lege,"* "take up and read".[8] The Vulgate reads *"Ecce agnus Dei qui tollit peccatum mundi"*. I infer that sin is a burden pressing upon us which must be lifted, an unseemly presence which must be removed. But what is the translator to write? It is interesting to notice that Wiclif renders the text "lo he that doith awei the synnes of the world", and that in John 19 : 15 the Jews shouted "Away with him, away with him, crucify him" (*aron, aron, staurôson auton — tolle, tolle, crucifige eum).* He who did away with the sin of the world paid the price of so doing when men did away with him.

[5] H. K. Orelli, *Twelve Minor Prophets* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1883), p. 128.
[6] E. B. Pusey, *The Minor Prophets* (New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1885), Vol. I, p. 290.
[7] *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge: University Press, 1953), pp. 232-8.
[8] *Confessions* VIII, Chap. 12 (29).

Or take the words from the Grace, "the fellowship of the Holy Ghost". Some would suggest that the *koinonia* in question means "participation in" the Holy Ghost; others favour "fellowship created by the Holy Ghost". Both are feasible.[9] Are we to leave the phrase as it is, and so lose much, or are we to paraphrase and say "the fellowship created by the Holy Ghost to participate in him"?

We speak of our Lord as "Christ the Wisdom of God". But what is meant by wisdom? Professor W. D. Davies believes that our Lord is identified with the Hebrew Torah, which, though we tend to think of it as the Law, is the whole content of God's revelation.[10] There is a whole history of thought behind the word. But we dare not say "Christ the Torah of God", without a long explanation — which is not translation. There is no one English word which conveys the rich meaning of *sophia* which St. Paul uses.

A living issue in New Testament scholarship is the extent of Semitic influence behind the Greek text. This seems to have been suspected as long ago as Tyndale, for in his Preface to the New Testament (1534) he says: "If aught seem changed or not altogether agreeing with the Greek, let the finder of the fault consider the Hebrew phrase or manner of speech left in the Greek words".[11] A famous example is Luke 11: 41, which reads literally "give as alms the things that are within": a puzzling text. The parallel version in Matthew 23 : 26 is "cleanse . . . the inside [of the cup]". Wellhausen ingeniously suggested that as the Aramaic for 'cleanse' is *dakki* and for 'give alms' is *zakki,* a simple correction will clear up the difficulty of the Lukan version, which must mean "cleanse the things that are within". This emendation, according to Dr. Matthew Black, one of the few scholars working in this field, "has survived criticism", and Professor A. M. Hunter regards it as of all such conjectures the most certain. But Dr. Dodd's Seminar has raised serious doubts, and there are other possibilities as well.[12] In the meantime, what is the translator to do?

Another such *crux interpretum* is Mark 4 : 11-12, ". . . in order that seeing they may see and not perceive and hearing they may hear and not understand, lest at any time they turn and it is forgiven them". This implies that the object of parables is to conceal the truth, which, to say the least, is a hard saying. Various attempts have been made to evade it by postulating a mistranslation of an Aramaic particle, which allows us to soften the saying by rendering 'who' or 'because' instead of 'in order that'. This may be the answer, but it is significant that both Dr. Matthew Black and Dr. Vincent Taylor[13] hold that St. Mark meant 'in order that'. For my own part I think that there is hope in the following rendering: "To those

[9] Cf. A. M. Hunter, *The Unity of the New Testament* (London: Student Christian Movement Press, 1954), pp. 66-67, and A. R. George, *Communion with God in the New Testament* (London: The Epworth Press, 1953), p. 180 and Chap. 7 as a whole.

[10] *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism* (London: Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge, 1944), pp. 149, 172.

[11] Mozley, *op. cit.*, p. 229.

[12] Moule, *Idiom Book of New Testament Greek* (Cambridge: University Press, 1953), p. 186. Cf. R. Heard, *Introduction to the New Testament* (London: A. and C. Black, 1950), p. 51n., and A. M. Hunter, *Interpreting the New Testament* (London: Student Christian Movement Press, 1951), pp. 32f.

[13] *The Gospel According to St. Mark* (London: Macmillan and Co., 1953), p. 257.

outsiders (dative of reference — 'denoting persons to whose case the statement is limited') [14] everything happens *(ginetai)* in riddles (a way of saying that they misunderstand, immorally, perhaps wilfully), their purpose being that seeing they may see and not perceive . . . lest at any time they should turn and it should be forgiven them". There are hardened sinners whom this description fits like a glove. Must we always interpret the Gospels by academic canons to the neglect of spiritual insight?[15]

Problems within the field of textual criticism continue to beset the translator. Consider the phrase *to mê huper ha gegraptai* in I Corinthians 4 : 6, rendered in the Authorized Version "not to think [of men] above that which is written" and in the Revised Version "not [to go] beyond the things which are written". There may be an allusion to a catchword at Corinth. "Not above what is written" could well be the cry of a 'Protestant' or biblical enthusiast. But if we disregard accents and breathings we can translate "the *mê* has been written over the *alpha* [of the hina]", which is thus reduced to a marginal comment by a scribe which has some time been incorporated in the text. Which choice is the translator to make?

Such examples could be continued, and it would seem that there are only two possible courses open to us: either we must decline the task of translation altogether, or we must take the risks and do our best, always remembering that our work is subject to improvement. The refusal to translate on the grounds that all translation loses something was characteristic of the mediæval church, and early in the fifteenth century (1408), the first decree in English Church Law concerned with Bible reading contains the following:[16] "Since it is dangerous, as St. Jerome witnesses, to translate the text of Holy Scripture from one language into another, because in such translations the same meaning is not easily retained in all particulars . . . therefore we decree and ordain[17] that no one shall reprint or translate on his own authority any text of Holy Scripture into the English tongue or into any other tongue, by way of book, booklet, or treatise". The Founders of the Bible Society, on the other hand, true to the principles of the Reformation and refreshed by the memory of the Evangelical Revival and the place in it of Holy Scripture, were eager to take the risk, and to make available to all who could read, that element of the written Word which could survive a translation. Nor can we criticize them for their decision or blame them for failure. For when all the baffling problems of translation have been allowed for, there remains in the versions of the Bible such a substantial core of the truth of God, of that record of his mighty acts in his dealings with his people and of the apostolic testimony to "that one, far-off, divine Event, to which the whole creation" moved (not 'moves'), with its salvation achieved, and offered,

[14] Goodwin, *Grammar*, paragraph 1172.
[15] Cf. W. L. Knox, *Some Hellenistic Elements in Primitive Christianity* (London: H. Milford, 1944), p. 43, and V. Taylor, *The Names of Jesus* (London: Macmillan and Co., 1953), p. 171.
[16] See M. Deanesly, *The Lollard Bible* (Cambridge: The University Press, 1920), p. 296.
[17] The Latin of the rest of Art. VII of the Constitutiones Thomae Arundel is given in T. M. Lindsay: *History of the Reformation* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1922), Vol. I, p. 148.

that the seeker may find in them the way of salvation. We salute therefore those courageous literary evangelists who have left behind them a permanent record of what otherwise might have been a preached and because only spoken, an evanescent Word.

It is not my purpose to speak here of the dissemination of the Scriptures or to count the number of versions in which they have been offered to the world. These facts are well known. We recognize them, and give thanks to God for his goodness. The church, fulfilling Charles Wesley's aspirations, can now sing: O *with* a thousand tongues *we* sing our dear Redeemer's praise! Our task is rather to ask what is implied by the fact of translation. Has it any meaning for us today?

It would seem that a version of Holy Scripture is a kind of commentary on the original, suggesting to us an irreducible minimum of what it means. Much may have been left behind in translation, as we have seen, but there is enough here to nourish the soul of the reader, to convey, as a means of grace, to him who believes as he reads, the knowledge of a Saviour. The Bible Society is to be commended "for the wider distribution of the Scriptures without note or comment". But its Founders cannot have had in mind solely the individual reader, conning the pages of the Book in solitude, when the very message of the Bible is the rich fellowship of the redeemed community. It is meant to be read also in the corporate setting of the people of God, and it needs not only to be read but to be expounded, and that not only to those who are ignorant of its message but also to those familiar with it. Where the people of God are gathered together there is the Living Christ by his Spirit, to charge the spiritual atmosphere and to reveal afresh the Face of Christ. What preacher is there who has not found, even as he read the lessons, that some new aspect of the truth, some new light, has flashed across his mind which never came to him in the study? I forbear to mention matters of theological truth, wherein the scriptural content is hammered into its form. But it is surely implied that we cannot merely praise the Society — which we gladly do — and then sit back and leave the work of God to the seller of the Scriptures. We need preachers, and the church must continue to produce them. And further: if translation involves some loss it must be made up by the preacher, not indeed revealing his technique by quoting Greek and Hebrew in the pulpit but by so studying these languages in his preparation of his sermon that he is able to give the deepest meaning of his text. This ultimately has implications for the training of the ministry, but the times are hard and the need of preachers is great, and it may not always be possible. The Word of God is not bound — even by a translation; and his call is not limited to Hebrew and classical scholars.

It is instructive to consider the meanings of various texts which they had for the translators of different versions from all ages. In this we shall be gathering up some of the fragments which otherwise might have been lost. We shall quote the texts first in the Authorized or King James Version, and then in the one to which attention is to be drawn.

Think first of St. John 20 : 22, "And when he had said this, he breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost". The Wiclif Version reads, "he blewe on hem and seide, take ye the holi goost". He

blew on them! It is a word appropriate to the flute-player, and we may infer that from those who receive the Holy Ghost we should expect to hear melody, nor harsh cacophony. This may explain why St. Paul was impressed with the tragedy of spoilt music: "Though I speak with the tongues of men and of angels, and have not charity, I am become as sounding brass, or a tinkling cymbal" (I Cor. 13 : 1). He looked for the music of the Spirit (Gal. 5 : 22) and found only a clang. Our Lord compared the men of his day to fractious children whom nothing would please: we played the flute to you and you did not dance, we mourned and you did not lament (Matt. 11 : 17, Luke 7 : 32). You won't play at weddings and you won't play at funerals! But, now his disciples are not merely to listen to the Divine music in him; they are the very flute itself. Therefore, in order that the sweet melody may be produced, not merely "receive" but "take the Holy Breath". The original *pneuma,* from which we get our words 'pneumatic', and 'pneumonia', meant 'wind'.[18] We might therefore give as an alternative, "Take the Holy Wind" (Cf. John 3 : 18, 6 : 18), and it is not difficult to bring this into harmony with the thought of music. Is there not such an instrument as an Eolian lyre or harp, which sounds by the air sweeping across its strings? And when the wind is up, then

> . . . mind and soul, according well,
> May make one music as before,
> But vaster: . . .[19]

Or think of St. Luke 2 : 9-13. The Authorized Version reads:

> And, lo, the angel of the Lord came upon them, and the glory of the Lord shone round about them: and they were sore afraid. And the angel said unto them, Fear not: for, behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people . . . And suddenly there was with the angel a multitude of the heavenly host praising God . . .

There are some interesting variations on this lovely theme. The Wiclif Version, for example, gives us "the cleernesse of god schyned aboute hem" *(claritas Dei).*[20] Clouds and darkness are about him — until he reveals himself. Wiclif continues, "I preche to you, a greet ioie" *(euangelizo uobis gaudium magnum).* It was Tyndale who rendered "I bringe you tydinges of greate ioye", but Wiclif's word is timely. When preaching is discountenanced by a hesitant church it is well to remember that it is a work which even angels are not too proud to do and which is the true bringer of Joy. And we recall the sublimity of the preaching office as suggested by Judges 6 : 7-8: "And it came to pass, when the children of Israel cried unto the Lord because of Midian, that the Lord sent a prophet unto the children of Israel". There are some national disasters which can only be dealt with by the preacher. But perhaps the most romantic is Wiclif's "a multitude of the heuenli knyghthod". He is speaking to his own times here, and if

---

[18] For some illuminating remarks on the Hebrew *ruach* and the Greek *pneuma* see H. Wheeler Robinson, *The Christian Experience of the Holy Spirit* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1928), p. 8, and *Inspiration and Revelation in the Old Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1946), p. 75, and *The Christian Doctrine of Man* (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1926), p. 17. See also A. R. Johnson, *The Vitality of the Individual in the Thought of Ancient Israel* (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1949), p. 26. There is a useful summary of Old Testament psychology in D. Cairns, *The Image of God in Man* (London: Student Christian Movement Press, 1953), pp. 26f.

[19] Alfred, Lord Tennyson, *Book of Common Praise,* No. 532.

[20] The Latin is throughout taken from Wordsworth and White's text of the Vulgate.

chivalry is "the union of the Christian and military ideals",[21] then in the living God we have the perfect union and final reconciliation of love and power. Tyndale is even blunter: "a multitude of hevenly sowdiers"; and is followed by the Great Bible ("sowdyers") and the Genevan ("souldiers"). The Rheims Version gives "the heauenly armie". It is worth reflecting today when the tramp of the barrack square gives its rhythmic accompaniment to the staccato crash of atomic explosions, that there is another army, a heavenly *(plethos stratias ouraniou: multitudo militiae caeletis),* praising God and working for "peace on earth".

We are all familiar with the moving words of Revelation 7 : 17:

> For the lamb which is in the midst of the throne shall feed them, and shall lead them unto living fountains of waters: and God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes. (Authorized Version)

Tyndale seems to have set the fashion for "all tears". But the Greek is "each tear" *(pan dakruon),* and Wiclif must have noted it in his copy of the Vulgate *(absterget Deus Omnem lacrimam ex oculis eorum),* for he translates "god schal wipe awey ech teer . . ." The fashion has changed again: at any rate both the Revised Version and Moffatt rendered "every tear". But there is a sound instinct in Wiclif's "ech", for it makes us think of each individual tear. Blass, it is true, states that *pas* before a noun without the article means "not every individual like *ekastos,* but any you please",[22] and strangely enough includes Matthew 3 : 10, "every tree not producing good fruit is cut down and cast into the fire". This seems, in this context, too subtle a refinement, and we may rest content with the statement of A. T. Robertson[23] that "in the singular *pas* may be used without the article in the sense of 'every' ".[24] Is this, then, a mere academic discussion, of interest only to scholars? No; it makes plain to us what we may have known already, as indeed all Bible reading does to some extent, but what we need to remember always. God is the living God, and his good hand is upon the whole church. In particular, he is with his people in their trials. Further, our text discloses something of the very character of God. Is there a company of Christians in dire extremity? He marks their distress. Is there some Christian individual, in some lone outpost of the faith, like Canon James away up in the Arctic at Baker Lake, in lonely fortitude manifesting the staying-power *(hupomonê)* of which the New Testament speaks? Our God is with him. Is there, not only a lonely Christian, but some one experience which comes to him, shattering his life, pulling down the structure so laboriously built over twenty years or more? Our own God sees it, marks it, stands by him in the hour of his sorrow. That, in itself, is a gospel. But we have more. So closely does he guard his own that not a single tear escapes him. There is not a single grain of sand on the shore of the remotest island in the Pacific but Omniscience can give a precise reason why it should be exactly there and not elsewhere; and there is not a single tear which wells up in some

[21] L. H. Marshall, *The Challenge of New Testament Ethics* (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1947), p. 96.
[22] *Grammar of New Testament Greek,* p. 161.
[23] *Grammar,* p. 771.
[24] For a recent discussion see C. F. D. Moule, *op. cit., pp.* 93-95.

sorrowing eye but Eternal Love is moved to put it away. He is the all-attentive God of the whole church throughout all the world, yesterday, today, and forever; the God of the smaller group within his people; the God of the individual; the God of the separate experience, and the God of each separate falling tear. Our God is not the mere First Cause of a philosopher's universe. He is the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, living, noting, hearing each sob and removing the tear which makes its grimy way down the battle-stained face of the humblest private soldier in the army of the church militant. I grant you, with Dr. Dodd,[25] that Jewish apocalyptic from a psychological point of view must be described as a form of compensation in fantasy for the sense of futility and defeat. But I refuse to believe that this picture of God in a Christian apocalyptic is no more than a compensation in fantasy.

There are some lovely renderings in the Epistle to the Philippians, with a freshness and even a modernity about them despite their age. "For to me to live is Christ, and to die is gain" (1 : 21), says the Authorized Version. Wiclif has "to die is wynnynge" (*mori lucrum*). The Greek *kerdos* means 'gain', 'profit'. Well, men speak of a gambler's 'winnings', when he gains what he did not earn, perhaps out of all proportion to his original risk. In Churchillian style we may add that "never was so much won in return for so little, for so many by so few — our Lord".

We are familiar with the doctrine of the 'Exaltation' of Christ. Wiclif speaks in the classical passage (Phil. 2 : 5-11) of the cross of Christ, "for which thing god enhauncid him" *(propter quod et Deus illum exaltauit)*. We miss the 'super-exalted him' *(huperupsôse)*, but surely the fresh "enhauncid" is ample reward. Wiclif uses this word in John 12 : 32, "and if I schal be enhauncid fro the erthe, I schal drawe alle thingis to my silf" *(Et ego si exaltatus fuero a terra, omnia traham ad me ipsum)*. He who was once enhanced on an earthly cross is now enhanced on a heavenly throne. In that fair Name "eche kne be bowid" and "ech tunge knowleche: that the lord ihesus crist, is in the glorie of god the fadir" *(ut . . . omne genu flectatur . . . et omnis lingua confiteatur quia Dominus Iesus Christus in gloria est Dei Patris)*. The love that notes each tear is worthy of the adoration of each knee, the confession of each tongue. As Tyndale said, "He must increace: I must decreace" (John 3 : 30).

In view of all this, we should gladly "do all things without murmurings and disputings" (Phil. 2 : 14, Authorized Version). Now the Greek for "murmurings" is *gongusmos*, a good example of onomatopoeia, combining the thundering roll and sibilant whispers of mass complaint. (Compare *lailaps* for a storm in Mark 4 : 37: you can hear the wash of the waves on the boat). I wonder if Wiclif felt this in his Vulgate, *"sine murmurationibus et haesitationibus"*. At any rate he translates "without gruchingis and doutingis". We ought to rescue "grucchingis" for modern use! Can you not hear in it the splutter of the grumbler? The second word is rendered in the Genevan version by "reasoning", fairly enough, and Wiclif and Tyndale give us aspects of this. A grumbler's reasonings may arise because of his "doutingis" and express themselves in "disputynge". But why did the Rheims Version say "without murmurings and stagger-

[25] *New Testament Studies* (Manchester: University Press, 1953), p. 126.

ings"? The Authorized Version goes on "that ye may be blameless and harmless, the Sons of God", with "sincere" as an alternative for "harmless". Wiclif has "symple as the sones of god" *(simplices filii Dei)*, and the Great Bible has "unfayned sonnes of God". The Rheims Version comes back to Wiclif with "the simple children of God". Now "simple" really means 'one-fold', as opposed to 'double' or 'treble', 'two-fold' and 'three-fold', and so on. The Greek word, however, really is 'unmixed' and so 'pure'. That is, it is one-fold in its constituent. It is made of one thing, so to speak, and of one thing only, with no admixture. It would be a good spiritual exercise to try to find what this one thing is, which makes up the Christian. Is it love to God, faith, or what? In the meantime we note Souter's "unsophisticated", an admirable rendering. But has it the loveliness, the natural charm, the wholesome freshness, of "the simple sons of God"?

There is a modernity, or shall we say a Canadian flavour, about Wiclif's "I gessid it nedeful: to sende to you epafrodite my brother and euene worcher" (Philippians 2 : 25), *(fratrem et cooperatorem)*. But he should have rendered the epistolary aorist by 'I guess'. Tyndale calls him "my companion in laboure" and thus starts a fashion, but the Rheims frankly calls him "coadiutor", recalling several passages[26] where 'officials' bear this name; and one other, III John 8, which speaks of "coadiutors of the truth" — a fine title. Tyndale also styles him "felowe soudier", again setting a fashion, but Wiclif calls him "myn euene knyght" *(commilitonem meum)* or my fellow-knight, which adds a romantic touch: the order of knighthood of Christian workers!

In our desire to be up to date, and, quite properly, to let the Bible speak in the language of our day, we may lose something which ought to be retained. The emphasis today is on 'toughness', and the military metaphors which St. Paul uses are in keeping with this. But there is another side to the question, and it is Tyndale who surprises us. Our Authorized Version gives us "Let your moderation be known unto all men" (Phil. 4 : 5). The variations on "moderation" are well known, and are attractive: "let your winsomeness, let your sweet reasonableness, be known . . ." But Tyndale, followed by the Great Bible, uninhibited by our modern cult of physical fitness boldly says "Let youre softenes be knowen unto all men". Can this be justified? I think it can. The Greek word behind this is used by Aristotle[27] in an interesting discussion of justice and equity. The law may lay down a general principle, and in a certain instance obedience to it would involve hardship and indeed an injustice such as the legislative authority had not envisaged, and would have allowed for, had attention been drawn to it when the law was made. At this stage equity steps in. Equity is just, but not justice according to the law; it is a correction of the law, and is thus nearer to absolute justice, absolute morality. Thus law in expansive mood, law without its rigidity, law with a measure of elasticity, is equity. The equitable man is then the man who is not a 'stickler' for his rights. He knows when to give way. He is not as hard as rock, but can yield. "Let your softness be

[26] Rom. 16 : 21, 1 Cor. 3 : 9, II Cor. 8 : 23, Phil. 4 : 3, Col. 4 : 11, Philemon 1 and 24.
[27] In the *Nicomachean Ethics*, V. x.

known unto all men". This, let it be said, is not the mark of weakness but of strength. It is significant that in II Corinthians 10 : 1 St. Paul associates such an attitude *(epieikeias)* with gentleness *(praütetos)*: I beseech you through the gentleness and (dare we say it?) the elasticity of Christ. Gentleness is not weakness but restrained strength. We do not speak of a gentle jelly fish. In the Corinthian passage Wiclif speaks of "the myldenesse and softnesse of crist" *(per mansuetudinem et modestiam Christi)*, and Tyndale, the Great Bible, and the Genevan Version all use the expression "the meekness and softness of Christ". Softness: the refusal to insist on one's rights; is not this the very way in which Christ treats his people? That is why we live, not in this year of law, but in this year of grace. There is a sermon lurking here, or the materials for one. The hardness of Christ: "He steadfastly set his face to go to Jerusalem" (Luke 9 : 51). "The Son of Man must suffer many things" (Mark 8 : 31). The softness of Christ:

> He hath not dealt with us after our sins
> Nor rewarded us after our iniquities. (Psalm 103 : 10)

The one shows a fixedness of purpose: the other the elasticity of grace.

In this connexion it is well to recall S. R. Driver's exposition of the Hebrew term *hesedh*. Wider and more comprehensive than 'mercy', "it is the kindliness of feeling, consideration, and courtesy, which adds a grace and *softness* to the relations subsisting between members of the same society . . . The force of *hesedh* is most adequately represented by *kindness*, or when applied to God — for the term is too strong to be used generally of men — lovingkindness".[28] This will serve as a link: the "softness" of Christ is but an aspect of the divine lovingkindness, of the grace of God.[29] "Long and loyal love" shall we say?

There is a simplicity about some of Wiclif's renderings which we might well ponder. "Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel: not with wisdom of words". This is the Authorized Version. Wiclif goes on: "that the cros of crist be not voidid awei" (I Cor. 1 : 17). Now the cross of Christ does not mean here something made of wood, but that whole truth which is summed up in the sentence "Christ died for our sins". Preach that in wisdom of speech, and, as St. Paul sees it, you say nothing about the cross: you have emptied it of meaning. It has become a hollow shell — voidid awei, as Wiclif says; not merely "of none effect". It is possible to argue that what is of none effect is still intact; but if we are so ashamed of the cross that human wisdom has to be our theme, then by implication "there is nothing in it" — which is after all the meaning of "empty", "made void" (Rheims). Wiclif continues: "for the word of the cros is foli to hem that perischen, but to hem that ben made saaf,

[28] *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Deuteronomy* (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 3rd edition, 1951), p. 102.

[29] See also Brigg's note, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Psalms* (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 3rd edition, 1951), Vol. I, pp. 33f.; Oesterley and Robinson, *Hebrew Religion* (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1930) — *hesedh* is "quite untranslatable" in English; and Norman H. Snaith in *A Theological Word Book of the Bible*, edited by Alan Richardson (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1950), pp. 100-103, 136-137, and *The Distinctive Ideas of the Old Testament* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1946), pp. 94-130.

that is to seie to us, it is the vertu of god . . ." "Vertu", of course, comes straight from the Latin *(. . . ut non euacuetur crux Christi . . . his autem, qui salui fiunt, id est nobis, uirtus Dei est)*. When we are told time and time again to "put the gospel into modern terms" and "avoid theological technicalities", there is surely room for a study of salvation in the simplicity of "being made safe". Men of today ought to understand that language. There is enough talk of social security and the welfare state and of world peace: is that not "being made safe"? Wiclif may yet lead our theological thinking about him who "schal make his puple saaf fro her synnes" (Matt. 1 : 21). But why does Goodspeed think that *ina mê* should be rendered ". . . or the cross of Christ might seem an empty thing"? He has left out Christ's purpose behind the apostle's commission.

Here, then, are some of the treasures worthy to be rescued, and we might add to their number. At the Transfiguration (Luke 9 : 35) the voice said, according to Wiclif, "this is my dereworthe sone". *(Hic est Filius meus dilectus)*.[30] "I have been crucified with Christ" (Gal. 2 : 20) is rendered by Wiclif "I am ficchid to the cros", through the Latin *(? Christo confixus sum cruci)*. It is arguable, grammatically on the ground that the Greek perfect tense expresses the abiding result of a past act. But it is better interpreted spiritually, as the New Testament does not leave the Christian on the cross. "If ye han rise to gidre with crist: seke ye tho thingis that ben aboue, where crist is sittynge in the right-half of god, sauer ye tho thingis that ben aboue: not tho that ben on the erthe . . . for ye ben deed: and youre liif is hidde with crist in god" (Col. 3 : 1-3). (*phroneite-sapite: apethanete-mortui estis*). Savour ye! There is a modernity about "charite fallith neuer doun" (I Cor. 13 : 8). We speak today of men "falling down on the job"; love never does. We speak of the law as "binding". Our Lord said "nyle ye deme that I cam to undo the lawe or the profetis" (Matt. 5 : 17, *katalusaisoluere*). Perhaps Wiclif was influenced here by remembering that *"religio"* implies that which is binding — in heathen times, scruple. We speak of a man being "in the toils", "in the grip" of something. But the Son of God was manifested "that he undo the werkis of the deuel" (I John 3 : 8, *ina lusei-ut dissoluat)*. There is a quaint realism in Tyndale's description of the unjust judge (Luke 18 : 5): "because this wedowe troubleth me, I will avenge her lest at the laste she come and hagge on me". And in Hebrews 10 : 23, with its elusive *akline*, Wiclif "translates finely", as James Moffatt recognizes,[31] "holde we *(teneamus)* the confessioun of oure hope bowinge to no side" *(indeclinabilem)*.

Such, then, are some of the treasures of our earlier translators, and they have left behind much more. What shall we say of these men and of their work? It would seem that their labours grew out of their experience of the living God. They were not merely literary pioneers, trying to start a new fashion in men's reading, or scholars with a passion for academic advertisement. God spoke to them as surely as he had spoken to men of old.

---

[30] But is his text right? Cf. Matt. 17 : 5, Mark 9 : 7, and see H. E. W. Turner, *Jesus, Master and Lord* (London: A. R. Mowbray and Co., Ltd., 1953), p. 216, for summary of evidence of *agapetos* (unique).

[31] *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews* (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 2nd edition, 1948).

"One of F. C. Baur's friends and admirers wrote after his death, in words which were meant to be laudatory: 'His was a completely objective nature. No trace of personal needs or struggles is discoverable in connection with his investigations of Christianity . . .'" Sir William Robertson Nicoll goes on to comment that "Baur was a stranger to the requirements of his own soul, and his need of a Saviour".[32] I suggest that this is the very opposite of our verdict on the translators.

Thus they felt that they had something to give. It must be confessed, alas, that we do not always gain this impression as we read books about the Bible. Men have analyzed it, criticized it, cut it up, joined it together again, set it against its historical background, even written deadly dull books about it, perhaps the gravest of all heresies. But like its Lord, it has risen from the dead, and thanks to the faithful endeavour of earlier scholars, "others have laboured and we have entered into their labours". They wanted to be helpers of our joy, to share with us what they had found. Their work is thus an example of true fellowship. We cannot bring against them the serious charge laid by Professor T. W. Manson in his essay: "The Failure of Liberalism to Interpret the Bible as the Word of God".[33]

They felt further that what they had to give could be safely offered. They believed that the common man would profit if he had the written Word in his hand and the love of God in his heart; indeed, there are not unknown cases of men being converted through the Holy Scriptures. By instinct and experience they anticipated the words of James Moffatt in his valuable chapter on the limitations of the historical method: "The practical use of the New Testament is an indispensable clue to its inner meaning".[34] "The New Testament is the medium of intercourse between God and the human soul . . . a direct gift and communication of God to man".[35] ". . . in its moments of anguish or of ardour, perplexed, dominated, struggling with the demands of God and the duties of life, facing tragic facts of sin and guilt and death, the soul understands the New Testament as it was meant to be understood and as it always has been understood by some on earth".[36] As Luther said, "The Words of our Saviour Christ are exceeding powerful; they have hands and feet".[37]

It may be freely admitted that uninstructed men may have wrought havoc through sectarian interpretations and through the follies of private judgement. But "the right of private judgement is not the right of private fancy, the right to think as we please; it is the right to listen when God speaks to us . . ."[38] "No prophecy of Scripture is a prophecy with its own interpretation" (II Peter 1 : 20), that is, it is not self-evident.[39] What if

---

[32] *The Church's One Foundation* (New York: Geo. H. Doran Co.), p. 120.
[33] C. W. Dugmore (Ed.), *The Interpretation of the Bible* (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1946), pp. 92-107.
[34] *The Approach to the New Testament*, p. 205.
[35] *Ibid.*, p. 231.
[36] *Ibid.*, p. 234.
[37] Quoted by Rawlinson: *Christ in the Gospels* (London: Oxford University Press, 1944), p. 110.
[38] A. Peel, in *The Interpretation of the Bible op. cit.*, p. 74.
[39] Cf. R. V. G. Tasker, *The Old Testament in the New Testament* (London: Student Christian Movement Press, 1944), p. 134.

there are men who mishandle the Word of God? There are those who would turn a theorem of Euclid into a cooking recipe. We might just as well screen our congregations, simply because some people go away from a service without a personal faith in Christ. The preached Word of God is open to all, just as the written Word is, and our translators no less than our preachers, if we are faithful, rely on the Holy Ghost to make it plain.

Here, then, through the efforts of those whom we salute today, is the Voice of God to inspire the private worshipper, to instruct the public congregation; here is the startingpoint of the public teacher and preacher, to be read and pondered, with Scripture compared with Scripture.[40] Here is evidence that the translators were willing, in so far as they themselves were preachers, for their preached message to be tested by the Word of God, known to the congregation. Here is a challenge to all of us engaged in the task of training men for the ministry: when we have had our fill of criticism and of introduction, of biblical history and of biblical background, and have given the same to our students; then it is high time to let religion itself come into our classrooms, for the lecturer to give not only what scholars have conveyed to him but also what he has learnt from the living God himself. The truth of God must not descend to a mere examination paper, and the Son of God to a pass mark. When we thus use the Bible we shall find, with Dr. Vincent Taylor, that the New Testament names of Jesus are the only ones with a foreseeable future, and that "this fact is one of the neglected arguments for the plenary inspiration of Holy Scripture".[41] *"Le commentaire peut errer: le texte subsiste"*. And now this Book has been given to us, for "all things are yours, and you are Christ's and Christ is God's" (I Cor. 3 : 21-23).[42]

---

# Book Review

*The Gospel of St. Mark — A New Translation in Simple English*, by Edward Vernon. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 3/6.

It has been confidently stated on many occasions in recent years that English has now become the most important missionary language in the world today. Substantial evidence in support of this claim is the fact that though the Scriptures in part or whole have been translated into many hundreds of languages and dialects, in by far the larger number of seminaries, theological colleges and training centres, in Africa, India and S. E. Asia, English remains the essential key to the libraries of Christian theology and doctrine. In the nature of things, it will be a very long time before the major languages of India and Africa have their own vernacular libraries. This being so, all new translations of the Scriptures into modern

[40] Cf. O. Cullmann, *Peter* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1953), pp. 213f. and n.
[41] *The Names of Jesus*, pp. 174f.
[42] Cf. also Lindsay: *History of the Reformation*, Vol. I, pp. 453-467; G. W. Bromiley, "The Authority of Scripture", and D. Lamont, "Revelation and Inspiration", on pp. 15-23 and 24-30 of the *New Bible Commentary*, edited by F. Davidson (London: The Intervarsity Fellowship, 1953).