

conclusions. In short, his approach to translation is that of an inspired amateur with a good knowledge of linguistics. Not that this makes his contribution to the body of doctrine on translation any less valuable.

His contribution is underlining the teaching validity of translation and its relevance to the Christian message. He is, in this regard, a useful foil to St. Jerome for whom the operational priorities were reversed. Though he was limited by his aim of explaining to his congregation the ways of translators, and showing his fellow exegetes how to cope with their vagaries, he marks an important step forward in understanding the nature of the translator's work.

SAMUEL HORNSBY

PUNCTUATION IN THE AUTHORIZED VERSION OF THE BIBLE

The author is Assistant Professor of English at LaGrange College, Georgia, U.S.A. His article is to appear in a modified form in the review *English Studies*.

English punctuation practices in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries remain a puzzle. We have, for example, a statement from the introduction to Hebel and Hudson's *Poetry of the English Renaissance* (New York, 1929), p. iv: "Frequently the original punctuation has left the meaning ambiguous; we have been forced to settle upon the interpretation which seemed to us closest to the author's meaning." This, of course, was written before William Empson published his study of ambiguity in Shakespeare's sonnets.¹

In the last decade other students have followed Empson's lead, especially in the study of Milton's poetry. Several of these students have pointed to passages in *Paradise Lost* where it appears certain that Milton deliberately cultivated ambiguity with punctuation.² Still, the work has not swept away the belief that punctuation in the Renaissance was either haphazard or designed solely to guide the public speaker.

One neglected source for good clues to Renaissance punctuation practices is the Authorized Version of the English Bible (1611).³ The lately discovered notes of John Bois, one of the translators who kept records during the final preparation of the 1611 Bible, make the point that the translators were not only aware of ambiguity but used it to good advantage in their work.⁴ Moreover, the translators from time to time seemingly achieved their ends

¹ William Empson, *Seven Types of Ambiguity* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1930).

² Good comments on Milton's punctuation are found in John Carey and Alastair Fowler, *The Poems of John Milton* (London: Longmans, 1968), pp. 427-428; Christopher Ricks, *Milton's Grand Style* (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 1963); and Mindele Treip, *Milton's Punctuation* (London: Methuen, 1970).

³ It is worth noting that F. F. Bruce in *The English Bible* (London: Lutterworth, 1970) has said (p. 108) that Renaissance punctuation, at least in the A. V. Bible, was designed solely to guide the public speaker in church "to enunciate properly and to place emphasis in the right places".

⁴ John Bois's notes have been translated and edited by Ward Allen in *Translating for King James* (Nashville: Vanderbilt Univ. Press, 1969). Allen's introduction discusses in detail the evidence for ambiguity in the A.V.

with punctuation. Bois cites at least two places, Rom. 11:31 and Heb. 10:12, where the punctuation is significant.⁵ This 1611 punctuation, altered slightly in subsequent editions, remained substantially unchanged until the eighteenth century.

To the eighteenth century editors of the Bible, the 1611 punctuation was a problem and a matter for fretting. Dr. Benjamin Blayney, whose 1769 edition of the Bible along with the 1762 edition of Dr. Thomas Paris is the basis for our modern King James,⁶ told the Clarendon Press that one of his jobs was the logical ordering of the punctuation.⁷ A look at the Bibles of Dr. Paris and Dr. Blayney shows that their punctuation changes made differences. I offer one passage, Rom. 3:25, as an illustration:⁸

Authorized Version (1611):

Whom God hath set forth to bee a propitiation,
through faith in his blood, to declare his
righteousnesse for the remission of sinnes,
that are past, through the forbearance of
God.

Dr. Paris (1762):

Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation,
through faith in his blood, to declare his
righteousness for the remission of sins
that are past, through the forbearance of
God;

Dr. Blayney (1769):

Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation
through faith in his blood, to declare
righteousness for the remission of sins
that are past, through the forbearance of
God;

Our attention focuses on *that are past*. What meaning did the 1611 intend? Is the idea *remission of sins that are past* or *remission of sins that are past through the forbearance of God*? Though the difference is not one of life and death, it is a matter to ponder. Dr. Paris and Dr. Blayney permit one reading, but we know from Bois's notes (Allen, p. 39) that the translators found the passage troublesome and were not completely at ease about its meaning.

Is it not possible, then, that the translators deliberately punctuated the passage to permit more than one reading? Do we not have here another bit of

⁵ Allen, pp. 41, 81.

⁶ C. C. Butterworth, *The Literary Lineage of the King James Bible, 1340-1611* (New York: Octagon, 1971), p. 10; Geddes MacGregor, *A Literary History of the Bible* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1968), p. 214.

⁷ Blayney's report is reprinted in F. H. A. Scrivener, *The Authorized Edition of the English Bible (1611), Its Subsequent Reprints and Modern Representatives* (Cambridge: at the University Press, 1884). See p. 238.

⁸ The texts are from the following editions: The Holy Bible, the facsimile of the first impression of the original 1611 produced for World Publishing Company by George Rainbird, Ltd. (London, n.d.); The Holy Bible, Cambridge, Printed by Joseph Bentham . . . 1762; The Holy Bible, Oxford, Printed by T. Wright and W. Gill . . . 1769.

evidence to support the belief that Renaissance punctuation was not haphazard? And does not the punctuation here do more than tell the public reader when to breathe? Are not, in short, rhetorical punctuation and grammatical punctuation working hand in hand?

I suggest that the 1611 Bible placed beside its eighteenth century editions gives us added assurance to believe that Renaissance punctuation was designed to allow minds—minds trained to make subtle discriminations—the freedom to manoeuvre.

REPORT ON THE GREEK NEW TESTAMENT WORDBOOK FOR TRANSLATORS

Readers' comments are requested on the following report, which is closely related to Dr. Louw's article on pages 101-18.

On the basis of principles and procedures approved by the UBS Committee on Helps for Translators, the Editorial Committee for the Greek New Testament Wordbook (Professor Johannes P. Louw, Dr. Eugene A. Nida, and Professor Rondal B. Smith) met in Gstaad, Switzerland, last summer in order to determine the basic semantic domains of New Testament vocabulary and to work out a more detailed statement of principles and procedures to govern the development of the project. The Committee was able to classify an estimated 15,000 different meanings into some 700 basic domains. In addition, an analysis was made of the principal diagnostic components involved in the meanings of objects and of several domains of events. The detailed description of these meanings will be carried out during this next academic year.

Principles

The following principles represent an amplification of an earlier statement submitted to the Committee on Helps for Translators and discussed during the 1972 Translations Workshop:

1. The related meanings of different words, rather than the different meanings of the same word, constitute the basis for classification and description of meanings, since the related meanings of different terms (that is, those meanings which belong to the same semantic domain) are much closer in "semantic space" than are the different meanings of the same terms. This provides a more efficient basis for diagnostic distinctions in contiguous, included, overlapping, or complementary sets of meanings.
2. The order of related meanings is central, peripheral, derivative, and figurative, treated in terms of "semantic extensions" involving primarily the addition of components. Idioms are treated in the semantic domains to which the total complex belongs, though key words will be cross-referenced, both in the indices and in the descriptive accounts.
3. The meanings are described primarily by means of definitions, rather than by listing translational equivalents. This will make possible the identification of the diagnostic components by numbers in parentheses immediately preceding the relevant portions of the definitions. For