

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis

## Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

---

Bachelor of Divinity

Concordia Seminary Scholarship

---

5-1-1927

### A Critique of Goodspeed's Translation of the Gospels

Arthur F. Fergin

Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, ir\_fergina@csl.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/bdiv>



Part of the [Religious Thought, Theology and Philosophy of Religion Commons](#)

---

#### Recommended Citation

Fergin, Arthur F., "A Critique of Goodspeed's Translation of the Gospels" (1927). *Bachelor of Divinity*. 735.  
<https://scholar.csl.edu/bdiv/735>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Concordia Seminary Scholarship at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Bachelor of Divinity by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact [seitzw@csl.edu](mailto:seitzw@csl.edu).

A  
CRITIQUE  
OF  
GOODSPEED'S TRANSLATION  
OF  
THE GOSPELS.

Arthur F. Fergin.

## A Critique of Goodspeed's Translation of the Gospels.

The translation of the New Testament by Dr. E. Goodspeed appeared in the early autumn of 1923. The title which was given the book is: "The New Testament, An American Translation." The aim of the translation, as stated by Goodspeed in the preface of his book, is "to present the meaning of the different books as faithfully as possible, without bias or prejudice, in English of the same kind as the Greek of the original, so that they may be continuously and understandingly read." He adds as a further justification of his translation that "for American readers especially, who have had to depend so long upon versions made in Great Britain, there is room for <sup>a</sup>New Testament free from the expressions which, however familiar in England and Scotland, are strange to the American ear."

The reception which was accorded the translation was phenomenal. It was heartily received, not only by scholars and students of the New Testament, but by the general public as well. Some newspapers even published the translation in serials. Others devoted considerable space to discussions on the translation, which at times were as destructive in their criticism as they were eloquent in their praise.

The distinctive merits of the book have been variously judged, according to the diversified nature of its readers. Among literary men it was welcomed by some as a book that possesses the charm and finish of a masterpiece. Others, however, spoke deprecatingly of the work. A critic who is widely recognized as an authority in the field of literature and in particular of the American language, H. L. Mencken,

denounced the translation in his characteristic style. ( Cf. New York "World", Aug. 15, 1926. ). Among New Testament scholars the views that have been expressed are no less conflicting. "A master stroke of genius" is the opinion of Sidney H. Babcock in the "Methodist Quarterly Review." While the Biblical scholars, in the main, have been generous in their praise of the translation, the conservative and profound J. G. Machen denounced it as "execrable", when asked for his opinion by a student of Concordia Seminary. In his recent book "What Is Faith" ( vide pg. 24, 162-163 ) his criticism is set forth in terms which are no less uncertain in their condemnation. A. T. Robertson in his "Studies of the Text of the New Testament" ( pg. 144-145 ) makes much of Goodspeed's qualification for preparing a translation, but that the work has not found wholehearted favor with him is evident from the remark that "one can find flaws in this as in all translations." It may be added that of all the recent un-official translations, critics as a rule do not hesitate to give Goodspeed's New Testament first place.

Since the translation of Goodspeed has arrested such wide-spread attention, and since the translator has received both glowing tributes and decided rebukes from a host of readers, it will be interesting and profitable to give a critique of the Gospels as they are rendered in this translation.

In the execution of this treatise the translation of Goodspeed will be studied on the basis of the original Greek text. The critique will thus seek to establish whether the translation is true to the original. Since no other translation has till now successfully supplanted the Authorized Version,

the later will be used in establishing the conclusions reached in this thesis. It is necessary to state at the outset, however, that such a procedure will not in all cases be fair to the translation of Goodspeed. Goodspeed has a better equipment in the way of an authoritative text and grammatical and lexical aids for his translation than did the translators of the King James Version. It will be well, therefore, to mention, in brief, the advantages enjoyed by Goodspeed in this respect before we discuss the comparative values of the translations.

When, in 1611, the Authorized Version was written, the four manuscripts which we now regard as the most ancient and authoritative were not used. The entire Greek text of that time was based on comparatively few modern manuscripts. The ancient versions had not been examined, and no careful investigation had been made into the testimony of the Fathers. Textual criticism was still in its infancy. The materials for the study had not been gathered, the principles of the science had not been studied, and the labors of Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Nestle, Westcott-Hort, to secure the purity of the text of the New Testament, were as yet unheard of. Goodspeed, with evident advantage over the translators of the Authorized Version, has come into full possession of what was recently produced in this field. With but a few exceptions, he adopts the text of Westcott-Hort, in which there are a number of variations from the Textus Receptus of the King James Version. It would be impossible and unnecessary to treat these variations in this thesis. The text of Westcott-Hort has not in the least affected any of the doctrines of faith. It has, however, in some cases, given us a truer readings of the original text which are of genuine value. Some of these instances will be pointed out.

The other advantage which Dr. Goodspeed has over the translators of the Authorized Version is the use of lexical and grammatical works which recent scholarship, in the light of papyri discoveries, has made possible. At the time in which the Authorized Version was prepared it was <sup>the</sup> a common consensus of scholars that the New Testament was written in classical Greek, and that it must be interpreted accordingly. The new and true view, however, is that the New Testament is written in the popular Koine, with sparing instances of the literary elements which are characteristic of the classical Greek, and that students of the New Testament must, therefore, go to this source for help in determining the meaning of the Greek text. The scholars who have particularly distinguished themselves in establishing this method of interpretation are Deissmann, Moulton, Milligan, and Robertson. Goodspeed, in the capacity of Professor of Biblical and Patristic Greek at the University of Chicago, is also credited with having contributed to the progress of this study. Since Goodspeed, then, is more thoroughly equipped on the linguistic side to give a translation than were the translators of the King James Version, we naturally find instances of departure from the Authorized Version which are commendable. Differences of this nature, however, are not numerous or radical. Just as variations due to textual criticism have not disturbed any doctrine of faith, so also changes introduced as a result of papyri discoveries have not altered the commonly accepted interpretation of the New Testament. Only occasionally do we find a more accurate rendering of individual words, some of which will be given.

With these differences in the equipment of the translators in mind, we may now turn to examine the instances in which Goodspeed departs from the King James Version. In this investigation the material that has been gathered is based almost exclusively upon the study of St. Mark's Gospel. Only the outstanding differences that have incidentally been noted with respect to the other Gospels will be given.

Before we discuss the happy translations of Goodspeed, which will constitute the first part of this treatise, we must give attention to the differences between the Authorized Version and the translation of Goodspeed in the matter of mechanical make-up. Goodspeed follows the practise of modern books and newspapers in giving a separate paragraph to each unit of conversation, however small it may be. The verse-division he gives on the margin instead of inserting it in the text. The object in adopting this change, as given by Goodspeed in his preface, is that the New Testament may be "continuously and understandingly read." While there are undoubtedly many Bible-students to whom the order of the Authorized Version will offer no obstacle to continuous and intelligible reading, and while to many the order will afford a means of ready and accurate reference, yet it cannot be denied that the argument advanced by Goodspeed for his method has much in its favor. The protest against the mechanical make-up of the King James Version is not of recent origin, for it has repeatedly been asserted before Goodspeed's translation appeared that the arrangement of the Authorized Version breaks up the coherence of the text, and offers less of an inducement, properly speaking, to lose oneself in the reading of the Bible. But it is an exaggeration to make this

feature an outstanding improvement over the Authorized version, for, after all, the mechanical make-up is only a minor point. Of a far greater importance is the translation proper, and of this we are now prepared to give a criticism.

We will treat, in the first part of the thesis, instances in Goodspeed's New Testament which we regard as happy translations. After these have been given under various subdivisions, we will take up instances of unhappy renderings. Under the happy translations we will give examples of commendable departures from the King James Version which are due;

- I. to the use of a better text and papyri discoveries;
- II. to the principle of adopting the English of our present-day speech;
- III. to a more accurate rendering of individual words and phrases;
- IV. to the principle of translating less literally when the sense of the text is better expressed;
- V. to a better knowledge of the grammar of the New Testament.

N.B. In the ensuing technical discussions the following abbreviations will be used:

G.---Goodspeed, New Testament.

A.V.-Authorized Version, New Testament.

M.---Moffatt, New Testament.

R.V.-Revised Version, New Testament.

T. R.-Textus Receptus.

Ex. Gk. N. T.--Expositor's Greek New Testament.

R.---A. T. Robertson, A Grammar of the Greek New Testament In the Light of Historical Research.

Other abbreviations are so standard as to be obvious.

## I.

As has been stated, only such instances will here be cited which clarify the sense of the original as given by the A.V. The following instances are representative of this

class of variations:

Mk. 1,10:  $\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$  - - -  $\tilde{\epsilon}\pi' \alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\omicron}\nu$ . Taking the reading  $\tilde{\epsilon}\tilde{\iota}\tilde{\varsigma}$  instead of  $\tilde{\epsilon}\tilde{\pi}'$ , and on good grounds, the translation of G. "to enter into him" (A.V.; "upon him") suggests the idea of a descent not merely upon him, but of an entering into him, according to his human nature, to take up its abode.

Mk. 1,23:  $\kappa\alpha\iota$  ( $\tilde{\epsilon}\tilde{\upsilon}\tilde{\theta}\tilde{\upsilon}\tilde{\varsigma}$  in N, B, L, 23 et alii). Accepting the variant, G. has: "just then!" A.V.: "and!" The sudden and sharp beginning of G. prepares for another surprise in addition to the one already experienced (Jesus speaking with authority).

Mk. 1,27:  $\tau\acute{\iota} \tilde{\epsilon}\tilde{\sigma}\tilde{\tau}\tilde{\iota}\nu$   $\tau\tilde{\omicron}\tilde{\upsilon}\tilde{\tau}\tilde{\omicron}$ ;  $\tilde{\iota}\tilde{\delta}\tilde{\alpha}\tilde{\chi}\tilde{\eta}$   $\tilde{\kappa}\tilde{\alpha}\tilde{\iota}\tilde{\nu}\tilde{\eta}$  ---. G.: "It is a new teaching! He gives orders with authority even to the foul spirits!" A.V.: "What new doctrine is this, for with authority commandeth he even the unclean spirits!" The former translation, on the basis of a purer reading, is more vivid and realistic. It arrests the attention to two causes of wonderment instead of one: 1) new teaching, 2) power over evil spirits.

Mk. 2:16: G.: "The scribes who were of the Pharisees' party!" A.V.: "The scribes and Pharisees!" Not two distinct parties are meant according to this variant.

Mk. 4,30: G: "or what figure can we use to describe it?" A.V.: "or with what comparison shall we compare it?" The improved text yields an intelligible translation.

Mk. 6,14: G.: "The people were saying that John the baptizer had risen from the dead!" A.V.: "He (Herod) said -----!" G's. translation is based upon the variant reading  $\tilde{\epsilon}\tilde{\lambda}\tilde{\epsilon}\tilde{\gamma}\tilde{\omicron}\nu$  (T.R.:  $\tilde{\epsilon}\tilde{\lambda}\tilde{\epsilon}\tilde{\gamma}\tilde{\omicron}\nu$ ) adopted on good grounds by Westcott-Hort. The context favors the translation of G. The Ex. Gk. N.T. says: "It appears to be the aim of the Evangelist first to report the opinion of

others and then to give the king's, emphatically endorsing one of these hypotheses!"

Mk.6,20: G.: "was very much disturbed!" A.V.: "did many things!" This is said of Herod. G's. translation upon the basis of the variant ἤπορει is well attested on both critical and psychological grounds. The ἐποίησεν of the T.R. is undoubtedly supported by good authorities, but on the other hand the supposition is easy and natural that a transcriber here met with an unfamiliar expression and changed it into one with which he was well acquainted.

The following are examples of improvements introduced because of papyri discoveries:

Mk.3,9: πλοῦν . G.: "boat"; A.V.: "small ship!" According to papyri evidence the diminutive in the Koine, in most cases, lost its original significance. ( vide R.pg.82)

Lk.2,2: ἀπογραφὴ does not mean "taxing" ( A.V.), but "taking census" (G.).(Cf., Coburn, The New Archeological Discoveries, pg. 46.)

Mt.2,16: πάντας τοὺς παῖδας . G.: "all the boys"; A.V.: "all the children!" The unspeakable cruelty of Herod in slaying the children out of fear of the advent of the Messiah does not acc. to G. extend to the indiscriminate murder of children.

Mt.6,16: ἀπέχουσιν τὸν μισθὸν αὐτῶν.  
G.: "That is all the reward they will get"; A.V.: "They have their reward!" In the papyri and ostraca the verb ἀπέχω is a technical term for granting a receipt. Applying this meaning to the present passage, Deissmann reads into the verse the more pungent and ironical meaning: "They can sign the receipt of their reward" ( Cf. Milligan, Here and There Among the

Papyri, pg. 69; Deissmann, Licht vom Osten, pg. 88ff.) .

## II.

Changes under this head are quite numerous. G. consistently follows the principle of rendering the Greek in the popular language of today. To give an exhaustive list of variations from the A.V. would, therefore, be impossible. We are concerned here only with the changes which can be regarded as distinct improvements over the Elizabethan English of the A.V. Such instances we have, e.g., in the passages where modern terms supplant archaic forms:

N.B. The first citation is from G.; the second from A.V.

"Immediately" for "straightly" (Mk.1,43); "crowd" for "press" (Mk.2,4); "came" for "resorted" (Mk.2,13); "toll-house" for "receipt of custom" (Mk.2,14); "was hungry" for "was an hungred" (Mk.2,25); "allowable" for "lawful" (Mk.3,4); "appointed" for "ordained" (Mk.3,14); "plunder" for "spoil" (Mk.3,27); "ate" for "devoured" (Mk.4,4); "afraid" for "fearful"; "hemorrhage" for "issue of blood" (Mk.5:25); "healing power" for "virtue" (Mk.5;32); "bag" for "script" (Mk.6,8); "protected" for "observed" (Mk.6,20); "leading men" for "estates" (Mk.6;21); "right away" for "by and by", "platter" for "charger" (Mk.6,25); "some" for "divers" (Mk.8,3); "know" for "whist", "cause to fall" for "offend" (Mk.9,42); "test" for "tempt" (Mk.10,2); "scattered" for "strawed". (Mk.11,8).

The expressions of the A. V. undeniably have a peculiar charm that is not found in the rendering of G. Invariably we feel that the archaic terms, to which we have become accustomed, are better fitted for the exalted purpose which they serve than the familiar expressions of G. When these

terms, however, obscure the sense of the original to the present-day reader, as is the case in a number of passages that have been listed, they must be regarded as inadequate. A clear rendering of the thought is the first essential of any translation; pleasing form must take a secondary place. Machen, in "What Is Faith" ( vide pg. 162), expresses a reaction to these changes which may be regarded as representative of the opinion held by many students of the Bible who have read Goodspeed's New Testament. He agrees that "the Bible and the modern man ought to be brought together", but he says this should be done by "bringing the modern man up to the level of the Bible , instead of bringing the Bible down to the level of the modern man." In other words, he holds that by changing the terms of the A.V. for present-day terms, we deprive the Bible of its uniqueness and dignity. While there is much to this argument, as will be pointed out later, yet we cannot help feel that one way of "bringing the modern man and the Bible together" is to remove real obstacles in the Bible, i.e., antiquated expressions which are not understood by the laymen of our day.

A striking example of the value of this method of translating we have in the rendering of terms denoting coins. G. give<sup>s</sup> the equivalent to the Greek terms for coins, as nearly as possible, in dollars and cents instead of repeating the English equivalent of the A.V., which are not intelligible to the average American reader and which often are erroneous. That the method is an improvement over the A.V. will readily be seen. For *λεπτός* , he has "little copper coins" (Mk.12,42), "cent" (Lk.12,59), "coppers" (Lk. 21,2). In this case, perhaps, it would have been well to retain the "mite" of the A.V., since

its meaning is quite generally known. The following changes, however, are distinct improvements: *κοῦράντης*: G.: "penny" (Mt. 5, 26), "cent" (Mk. 12, 42); A.V.: "fāthing". *δραχμίων*, though it has four times the value of the *κοῦράντης*, is translated "farthing" instead of "penny" in the A.V. G.: "cent" (Mt. 10, 29; Lk. 12, 6). *δρακμίον*: in only two passages does G. translate "a denarius", and that is when the name of the coin should be given (Mk. 12, 15; Lk. 20, 24). Otherwise, he gives the value in American money, according to the number of denarii: Mt. 18, 28: \$20.; A.V.: 100 pence. Mt. 20, 9: 20 cts; A.V.: "penny". Mk. 6, 37: \$40.; A.V.: 200 penny-worth. Mk. 14, 5: \$60.; A.V.: 300 pence. Besides being unintelligible to the average American reader, the figures of the A.V. are incorrect. The denarius, according to reliable authorities cited by Thayer, most closely corresponds to the French franc (19.3 cts.). G. accepts this view and gives us a more accurate rendering than the A.V.

The service rendered by giving American instead of English equivalents for coins stands out in several cases, where false impressions which are likely to be gained in reading the A.V. are obviated. This applies to the passages cited above, but it is true in a special sense of the two following passages: In Lk. 10, 35 the obvious sense of the context is that <sup>the</sup> Good Samaritan is giving a liberal amount to the innkeeper to provide for his needs. The sum of the A.V., however, is absurdly small. (A.V.: "two pence"; G.: "one dollar!") In Mt. 20, 2 the owner of the vineyard, whose liberality is contrasted with the niggardly, envious spirit of others, gives "a penny" (A. V.) to each man as a day's wage. The improvement of G's. rendering, "twenty cents", is obvious.

Among the happy translations under the second part we include also the passages which adopt ~~our~~ <sup>the</sup> system of reckoning time in preference to the Hebrew method of the A.V. The account of events on Good Friday, as far as the time is concerned, is at of events on Good Friday, as far as the time is concerned, is at

once clear to the modern reader, when he sees them given in G. .  
in this order: Crucifixion at "nine in the morning"; Darkness at  
"noon"; Death at "three in the afternoon!" (Mk.15,21-39)

### III.

The examples that make up this group of happy translations are comparatively few, when we consider the progress that has been made in lexicography since the time of the A.V. Outstanding passages in which this type of happy translations is found are the following:

Mk.2,4: *κρεβάτιος* . G.: "mat"; A.V.: "bed". The term is used of a mean bed holding one person. "Mat" is a good equivalent; "pallate" (M., R.V. ) would be still more accurate.

Mk.3,9: *σθίβωσιν* . G.: "crush"; A.V.: "throng!" The term is used of pressing grapes.

Mk.6,8: *χαλκόν* . G.: "small change"; A.V.: "money!"  
Literally: brass-money of insignificant value.

Mk.3,18: *Σίμων ὁ κανανίτης* . G.: "Simon, The Zealot"; A.V.: "Simon, the Canaanite!" The translation of the A.V. might suggest the idea that one of the apostles did not belong to the family of Abraham, but to the race of the Canaanites. This, however, is not the case. The cognomen applied to Simon is taken from the Aramaic. It is replaced by the Greek word meaning "Zealot" in Lk.6,15 and Acts 1,13. The meaning, therefore, is that Simon had, before he became a follower of Christ, belonged to the Jewish faction of Zealots. Accordingly, G. has properly translated "Zealot!"

Mk.6,54: *κρασπέδου* . G.: "tassel"; A.V.: "border!" N.T.:  
Hebr. *מִצְעָזָה* , a tassèl, tuft. Such appendages were attached to the mantels as a reminder of the law (Num.15,38). Edersheim,

Life and Times of Jesus: "Most likely the long Tbitsith of one of the corners of the Tallith!"

Mk.10,22: Of the rich young man to whom the mention of the cross of Christ proved a stumbling-stone this passage says:

*στυγνάσας* (referring to the face) and *αυτούμενος* (referring to the heart). The distinction is observed in G's. translation: "But his face fell at Jesus' words, and he went away much cast down!" A.V.: "sad-----grieved!"

Mk.11,17: *ληστής*, in all, is used twelve times in the Gospels, and is correctly translated with "robber" by G. The A.V. erroneously translates "thief" in all cases except at Jn,8,40 and at Jn.10,1.8., where we have the phrase *ικλέπτης και ληστής*. (Cf. Trench, Synonyms of the N.T., pg. 148)

Mt. 26,15: *οι δε εσέγασαν*. G.: "counted out"; A.V.: "covenanted!" The translation of the A.V. is not only incorrect, but it breaks the connection between this passage and Zech.11,12. In the O.T. prophecy we find the very same Greek verb in the LXX as occurs here in the Gospel. The O. T. rendering is: "they weighed for my price thirty pieces of silver!"

Mk.27,3: *μεταμενηθείς*, (said of Judas). G.: "in remorse"; A.V.: "repented himself!" Not a genuine repentance, involving a change of heart, is meant, but only remorse.

Jn.13,10: *ο θελούμενος* --- *νίψασθαι*. G.: "Anyone who has bathed only needs to have his feet washed!" A.V.: "He that is washed needeth not save to wash his feet!" G. distinguishes between the two verbs used, and the sense is at once clear, while in the A.V. it <sup>is</sup> almost completely obscured.

Mt.28,19.20.: *μαθητεύσατε* --- *διδάσκοντες*. G.: "make disciples-----and teach"; A.V.: "teach", for both verbs.

Other passages in which these verbs are confounded in the A.V.,

but correctly translated by G., are Mt.23,52; 27,57.

Mk.14,26: ὑμνήσατε . G.: "After singing the hymn!";  
A.V.: "an hymn!" In this passage the singing of a special hymn is  
meant, namely the paschal hymn, the 'great Hallel'.

τὸ ἱερόν and ἁ ἁγία : While the A.V. translated both terms  
with "temple", G. makes the proper distinction, and translated  
the former "temple", the latter "sanctuary!" This distinction is  
observed in the Bible. τὸ ἱερόν designates the whole compass of  
the sacred enclosure, embracing the entire aggregate of buildings,  
balconies, porticos, and courts (Mt.12,6; 24,1; Mk.13,3; Lk.21,5).  
ἁ ἁγία is used only of the sacred edifice itself, consisting  
of the Holy Place and the Holy of Holies. (Mt.23,16.35; Mk.14,58;  
15,29.) G. makes one exception, when he translates ἁγία with  
"temple" in Mt.27,5. It is no doubt done, because it seems unlikely  
to him that Judas entered the sanctuary before committing suicide.  
(Cf. Trench, Synonyms of the N.T., pg. 10.)

That G. is guided by the context in choosing the proper  
English equivalent to Greek words is born out by the various  
translations of ἐκπλησσω . At Mk.1,22 he has "amazed", which  
is stronger than "astonished" (A.V.). Context: Jesus has just been  
heard in the synagogue for the first time. In Mk.10,26 "perfectly  
astounded" (G.) is also more forceful than "astonished out of  
measure" (A.V.). Context: Surprise upon surprise has been heaped  
upon the disciples, and to cap the climax they are literally  
stunned with amazement (astounded) by the assertion of Jesus that  
it is easier for a camel to get thru the eye of a needle than  
for a rich man to get into heaven. (Cf. also Mk.7,37; 11,18)

Similarly mistakes concerning the meaning of  
Greek words are corrected in the following passages:

N.B. The first citation is the correction of G.; the second the translation of the A.V.

"choose" for "wilt" (Mk.1,40); "obstinacy" for "harshness" (Mk.3,5); "peck-measure" for "bushel" and "lamp" for "candle" (Mk.4,21); "left" for "sent away" (Mk.4,36); "district" for "coasts" (Mk.5,17); "girdle" for "purse" (Mk.6,8); "one of his guard" for "executioner" (Mk.6,27); "terrified" for "troubled" (Mk.6,50); "understood" for "considered" (Mk.6,52); "moored the boat" for "drew to shore" (Mk.6,53); "market-place" for "streets" (Mk. 6,56); "village" for "town" (Mk.8,23); "sufferings" for "sorrows" (Mk.8,8); "governors" for "rulers" (Mk.8,9); "kissed him affectionately" for "kissed him" ÷ compound verb with intensified meaning (Mk.14,45); "strained out" for "strained at" (Mt. 23,24); "writing tablet" for "writing table" (Lk.1:63).

#### IV.

To find free translations one need not read very much of G's. N.T. Among these are to be found a number that are admirably executed. Only those among the free translations do we consider happy, however, in which we have a better representation of the thought than would be possible by a verbal translation. Such instances we have in the following examples:

Mk.7,9: *κκλω, 2 2 2 2 2 2* . G.: "How skillful you are in nullifying"; A.V.: "Full well ye reject! The free translation of G. expresses well the irony contained in the words and indicated by the context.

Mk.7,11: "Corban" is defined. The A.V. is extremely literal, and as a result almost wholly unintelligible. G. departs from the order of the words in the Greek and gives us a translation that at once conveys the thought of the text: "But you say, 'If a

man says to his father and mother, "anything of mine that might have been of use to you is Korban," that is, consecrated to God, -----!"

Mk.9,49: *πᾶς γὰρ πυρὶ κλιεθήσεται*. G.: "Every-one must be seasoned with fire"; A.V.: "Every one shall be salted with fire!" What M. in a note says of his translation, which also departs from the literal rendering of the A.V., applies also to the translation of G.: "The Greek word literally means 'salted', the metaphor being taken from the custom of using salt in sacrifices, (Cf., e.g., Lev.2,13; Josephus, Antiq. 3,9.1.). 'There is fire to be encountered afterwards, if not now; how much better to face it now and by self-sacrifice insure against the future'. (Prof. Menzies)!" Rightly understood, a purifying fire is meant. This is well expressed by "seasoned!" Besides, the less literal rendering avoids the combination of salt and fire, whose functions are opposed.

Mk.10,30: *μετὰ διωγμῶν*. G.: "though not without persecution"; A.V.: "with persecution!" Negatively expressed in a concessive clause, persecution is made to stand out more prominently as a complement of the blessings which have been mentioned. The freer rendering emphasizes the thought which may otherwise be little noticed.

Lk.3,23: G.: "Jesus himself was about thirty years old"; A.V.: "Jesus began to be about thirty years old!"

For similiar renderings that are less literal but clearer cp. G. and A.V. at Mk.1,44.45; 2,19.21.; 4,15.30; Lk.24,25; Jn.9,17; Jn.11,20.

*Under*  
77

## V.

In translations where grammar is a deciding factor in properly rendering the sense of the text, G. follows certain definite principles which were apparently unknown when the A.V. was prepared:

The force of the Greek Aorist is observed throughout in the translation of G. He properly never considers the tense independent of the meaning of the verb. From the word itself he takes his clue, as to whether the beginning (ingressive Aorist), the end (effective Aorist), or the action itself as a whole is to be stressed (constative Aorist). R. (pg.832) shows that the shading of the verb should thus be the proper guide for correctly translating the Aorist, as well as other tenses. The examples which follow will suffice to show that G. is thoroughly in sympathy with this method which so admirably does justice to the Aorist tense:

Mt.9,18: *ἔτελευτήσεν* (with *ἔπειτα*), "My daughter has just died!" (effective idea)

Mt.12,28: *ἔφθασεν*, "has overtaken you!" (idem).

Mt.23,2: *ἔκαθίσταν*, "the scribes and Pharisees have taken Moses' seat!" (idem)

Jn.10,38: *γινώτετε* (Aorist) *καὶ γινώσκετε* (Present), "That you may realize and learn!" (ingressive idea in the rendering of the Aorist).

Jn.1,10: *οὐκ ἔγνω*, "did not recognize!" (idem)

Lk.15,32: *ἔγενσεν*, "has come to life!" (idem)

Another noteworthy achievement of G. is the delicacy with which he retains the various shadings of the

Greek Imperfect, e.g., Mt.3,14: The meaning is that John labored for a time to avoid what he thought unseemly (baptizing his superior); where we have "conative" action, he translates *οικειωσθευ*. "dissuaded him!" A.V.: "forbade!" A more accurate rendering would be "he was forbidding!" Again, Lk.8,23, he discriminates between the Aorist and the Imperfect by translating: "a squall of wind came (Aor.) upon the lake, and they were being swamped (Imperfect). A.V.: "were filled with water!" In other passages he beautifully brings out the inchoative force of the Imperfect, e.g., Lk.1,59: "they were going to name him Zechariah!" The translation should not be "they called <sup>him</sup> Zachariah!"(A.V.) --The interposition of his mother prevented this. So also Lk.5,6: "their nets began to break!" (A.V.: "brake"); Jn.7,14: "began to teach" (A.V.: "taught")

Other instances where it has been found that the sense of text has been better expressed by thus rendering the Imperfect according to the demands of the context and the shading of the verb will be noted here. In all these cases the A.V. misses the force of the tense: Mk.2,2; 3,2; 4,37; 5,8. 32; 8,16; 9,4.31;14,1; 15,1; 16,8.

In the translation of the articles improvements are also to be found in G's. New Testament. Where the A.V., sometimes injuriously, inserted the indefinite article it is omitted by G. In Mt. 1,20; 2,13; 28,2; Lk.2,9 G. has "an angel of the Lord"; the A.V.: "the angel of the Lord!" The latter is incorrect, not only because the article is lacking in the original, but because "the angel of the Lord" appears in Scripture as a manifestation of Jehovah. Furthermore, in

Mk.1,45, where again the original has no article, G. translates, "a city"; A.V.: "the city" G's. correction in this case has real value. It presents the true situation. Not only was Jesus unable to enter "the city" (Capernaum), but the report of his miraculous power had spread so far that he could not enter "a city", any populated place. Other instances in which the article is properly omitted will be found by comparing the A.V. and G. at Mt.15,9; 22,30; Mk.1,45; 15,22; Lk.2,12; 7,3; 22,17.

Similarly omissions of the article in the A.V. are corrected by G. (Cp. G. and A.V. at Mt.1,23; 4,5.21; 5,1; 8,32; 10,12) There are cases, however, when the English idiom will not tolerate the use of an article where it is found in the original, viz., before proper names and abstract nouns. This rule G. observes in translating, Jn.2,17, "zeal" for "the zeal" (A.V.). However, he intentionally ignores the rule, and properly so, in translating the term Christ, since the term is used as an official title and not as a proper name. The Gospels, with a few exceptions, have the article prefixed to the title "Christ", and while it is ignored by the A.V., it is translated with the proper effect by G.: "the Christ" in Mt.2,14; 11,2; 22,42 et alii.

This will conclude the array of instances which can, without qualification, be considered happy translations. We will proceed to treat the unhappy translations that have been found. In this part of the critique we will point out instances where G. fails to do justice to the Greek text because of his aim:

I. to render the thought in the language of the present day;

II. to interpret rather than to translate. (That the

classification is not rigid, nor the classes entirely exclusive of each other, is quite obvious.)

## I.

It will be impossible to establish definit<sup>e</sup>ly whether the objections urged against G's. translation under this head, in every case, are due to his aim of producing an "American translation" The explanation, however, is quite plausible. It is not unlikely that G. was anxious to offer something distinctly original as far as the language is concerned (a laudable aim, to be sure), and that, as a result, he was less inclined to repeat the words and phrases of the A.V., although these may be more accurate. Whatever the cause may be, the following examples of inaccurate renderings will suffice to show that G's. translation, in many respects, is unfortunate:

Mk. 1, 2: ἰδοὺ -----: G.: "Here I send my messenger"; A.V.: "Behold-----!" The Greek form is the exclamation of one pointing out something striking and unusual.

Mk. 1, 3: φωνὴ βοῶντος : G.: "Hark! Someone is shouting"; A.V.: "The voice of one crying!" "Someone" is misleading, when John is meant. The rendering is in direct conflict with the prophecy Is. 40, 3.

Mk. 1, 25: ἐπιτιμᾶσθαι: G.: "reproved"; A.V.: "rebuked!" The first meaning of the verb is to administer sharp and stern reproof. The context is in favor of "rebuke", as is indicated by G's. translation of the rebuke: "Silence! Get out of him!" Also in Mk. 8, 33 G's. "reproved" is too mild. That the answer was sharp and stern in the extremis is evident from the grievous offence of Peter and the Lord's unparalleled censure: "Get thee behind me, Satan!"

Mk.1,45: *κηρύσσειν*. G.: "talked about"; A.V.: "published!" G's. rendering is weak. The leper was more than talking about the startling incident ( his healing ); he was proclaiming it publicly.

Mk.2,8: *ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις*. G.: "in your minds"; A.V.: "in your hearts!" "Hearts" is the first meaning. It has in its favor Biblical usage in the sense of the seat of spiritual life. It is the correct translation, because the sin that Jesus here so sharply censures is the depravity of the heart.

Mk.2,15: *ἑμάρτωλοί*. G.: "irreligious"; A.V.: "sinners!" Literally the form means "devoted to sin!" Mere indifference to religion, as G's. translation suggests, is wrong. Rom. 7,13 *ἡμαρτία* itself is called *ἑμάρτωλός*.

Mk.2,17: *οὐκ ἦλθον καλεῖσαι*. G.: "I did not come to invite"; A.V.: "I came not to call!" The purpose of the calling was *εἰς μέτρον*, and the caller was Christ. It was, then, not mere inviting but authoritative and effective calling.

Mk.3,24: *ἑφ' ἑαυτὴν μερισθῆ*. G.: "disunited"; A.V.: "divided against itself!" G's. translation is obviously inadequate.

Mk.3,28: *τοῖς υἱοῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων*. G.: "men"; A.V.: "sons of men!" G. ignores the fact that in these words there is a literary connection with the Son of Man (context).

Mk.3,10: *μάστιγας*. G.: "ailments"; A.V.: "plagues!" "Ailments" is weak. It suggests mere indisposition. The word, however, is derived from *μάστιξ*, "scourge!" It is used figuratively in the LXX and in the N.T. for a providential scourge, a disease.

Mk. 4, 11: *μυστήριον-- τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ*  
 G.: "the secret of the reign of God"; A.V.: "the mystery of:  
 the kingdom of God" Thayer's definition: "The inscrutable  
 purposes relative to the kingdom of God" This meaning is  
 indicated by the context. These purposes the unconverted fail  
 to grasp, not because they are in themselves hidden or  
 concealed (secrets), but because they are spiritual and can  
 be understood only by the enlightenment of the Holy Spirit,  
 (mysteries).

Mk. 5, 2: *μνημείων* . G.: "burial places"; A.V.:  
 "tombs" G's. term is too general. In the next verse he  
 translates "tombs" It is certainly desirable to follow one  
 form in translating one and the same word, unless the sense  
 demands a change.

Mk. 5, 7: *ἐπιτίθω* . G.: "implore" (too weak);  
 A.V.: "adjure!"

Mk. 5, 19: *ὅσα* . G.: "Tell them all the Lord has done  
 for you"; A.V.: "how great things" "All" is possible  
 grammatically, but "how great things" will better fit into  
 the context. Not only was the demoniac freed from the power  
 of the devil, but he had come to know Jesus as the Savior  
 from still greater perils. He had found Jesus to be a Healer  
 of the soul as well as the body. This great and wonderful  
 gift in particular Christ undoubtedly wished to emphasize in  
 the *ὅσα* .

Mk. 5, 27: *τοῦ ἑματίου αὐτοῦ* . G.: "coat";  
 A.V.: "garment" Edersheim, Jesus the Messiah, on Mt. 9, 20:  
 " 'Touched the border of his garment', most probably the long  
 Tsitsith of one of the corners of the Tallith", which he  
 defines as "upper cloak" This cloak certainly bore no

resemblance to a coat of our day. In Mk.6,56 the same term is properly translated "cloak"

Mk.5,38: *ἄβουβον*. G.: "confusion"; A.V.: "tumult!"

The term denotes a confused din, in which sounds of weeping and howling without restraint are distinguishable.

Mk.6,2: *τίς ἢ σοφία ἢ ἰσχυρία αὐτοῦ*. G.: "How

does he come to have such wisdom?"; A.V.: "What wisdom is this which is given unto him?" The question does not concern the manner in which the wisdom was acquired, or its source. This is given in the preceding sentence (*πόθεν*). The point is rather: What is this wisdom?

Mk.6,51: *ἔξίσταστο*. G.: "were perfectly beside

themselves"; A.V.: "were amazed!" The former is too strong an expression (context). On this particular verb Thayer cites a number of passages in which the term is properly translated "to be amazed", while for the translation of G. he gives only two instances in the N.T., and adds that when the word is used in this sense *τοῦ φροεῖν* or *τῶν φροεῖν* is generally added.

Mk.7,7: *διδασκαλίας*. G.: "lessons"; A.V.:

"doctrines!" N.T. usage has many instances of the word in the latter sense. The context here demands this conception. The outward forms, so religiously insisted upon by the Pharisees, were taught not as lessons, but as doctrines in the strictest sense of the word.

Mk.7,15: *κοινῶσαι*. G.: "pollute"; A.V.: "defile!"

The translation of the A.V. is to be preferred, since the subject is ethical defilement.

Mk.8,12: *ἀναστενάξας τῷ πνεύματι*. G.: "he sighed"

deeply! "In his spirit" is omitted. τῷ πνεύματι gives the cause of the sigh, which is spiritual.

Mk.9,1: οἵτινες οὐ μὴ γεύσονται θανάτου. G.: "Will certainly live to see"; A.V.: "Will not taste of death!" The force of the passage is greatly reduced by the free rendering of G. There is only one fault with the translation of the A.V. The double negative is inadequately rendered "not!"

Mk.10,18: οὐδεὶς ἀγαθός, εἰ μὴ εἷς, ὁ θεός. G.: "No one is good but God himself"; A.V. (literal and more vigorous): "There is none good but one, that is God!"

Mk.10,38: πικρὸν ποτήριον ὃ ἐγὼ πίνω. G.: "Can you drink what I am drinking?"; A.V.: "Can you drink of the cup that I drink of?" ποτήριον is used figuratively in the N.T. for the bitter sufferings of Christ, as is borne out by the passages: Mt.26,39; Mk.14,36; Lk.22,42; Jn.18,11. In none of these passages does G. ignore the figure by omitting "cup", as he does in this passage, and again in Mt.20,23.

Mk.14,21: οὐαί. G.: "alas"; A.V.: "woe!" The term is an interjection of grief or denunciation, and hence is best translated by "alas" or by "woe!" "Alas" will suffice, where the context calls for an expression of grief, as at Mk.13,17, but it is too mild when, with the expression of grief, there is coupled such a scathing denunciation as is pronounced against the Pharisees in Mt.23,14. (So also Mk.14,21) G. indiscriminately translated the term "alas!"

Mk.15,3: Σὺ λέγεις. (Jesus' answer to Pilate's question: "Are you the king of the Jews?") G.: "Yes! There is, however, more than simple "yes" in the words. The expression is a most emphatic affirmative, and could well be rendered: "You are speaking 'the truth'", or less accurately: "Certainly" (mi.)

Mk.1,17: ποιήσω ὑμᾶς γενέσθαι ἀλιεῖς

G.: "I will make you fish for men"; A.V.: "I will make you become fishers of men" γενέσθαι is important, and should be translated. It suggests Christ's plan, namely that the disciples should go through a gradual process of training.

Unhappy also are those translations in which present-day terms are substituted for time-honored, technical terms of the Bible. The changes are not in themselves objectionable, since they do not necessarily mar the sense of the Greek text. They will not serve as adequate substitutes, however, because of the sacred associations which these technical terms contain and the precision which they lend to the thought expressed. Such instances we have, when G. substitutes "Presentation Loaves" for "shewbread" (Mk.2,26); "God bless him!" for "Hosanna" (Mk.11,9); "good news" for "Gospel" (Mk.1,14); "figure" for "parable" (Mk.3,23); "yeast" for "leaven" (Mk.8,15); "reign" for "kingdom" (Mk.1,15); "Master" for "Rabbi" (Mk.10,51). The changes are consistently carried out in the Gospels.

## II.

Instances in Goodspeed's N.T. which are representative of interpretations rather than translations can conveniently be arranged in three groups:

- A. Interpretations which do not injure the sense of the text;
- B. Interpretations which, in greater or less degree, harm the sense of the text;
- C. Interpretations which radically depart from the sense of the text.

All of these translations, however, come under the same condemnation. It is only a matter of degree in which they offend. The underlying principle which prompted them is the same in each of these groups, namely, to interpret rather than to translate. Each of these groups is evidence of a denial of the old and sound hermeneutical rule of permitting Scripture to be its own interpreter. And no motive, no matter how noble it may be, will excuse this transgression. Once a translator ipso facto assumes the role of interpreter, there is grave danger that the translation will become tinged with his own preconceived notions. But even if the translator does not interpose his own notions between the inspired writers and the reader, his work is not a translation in the true sense of the word, unless he adheres strictly to the thought of the original text. Slavish word-for-word translations are not required, but nowhere does a translator have the license to choose conceptions which, in particular instances, were not in the mind of the author. There is, for example, a difference between the idea of "perishing" and the idea of "sinking". Yet to Goodspeed the terms are evidently congruous. While St. Mark writes "perish", Goodspeed translates "sink". The example is one of the lesser offences. It indicates, however, that in Goodspeed's translation there is a breakdown of the cherished and reputable principle of permitting the inspired writers to speak for themselves. No matter how great the merits of a translation may be in other respects, if it does not discriminate between what the translators thought the writer expressed or what he wanted him to express, and what he actually did express, it is not a faithful and honest translation. That Goodspeed's translation must suffer this

indictment will be seen from the examples of interpretative renderings which will be pointed out under the divisions that have been stated.

## A.

In pointing out the translations which come under this head, the Greek, Goodspeed's rendering, and the correct rendering will be given. The cases which have been noted are: ἀγρῶν σου, "unshrunk", "unwrought" (Mk. 2, 21); πτερυγὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, "wild birds", "birds of the heaven"<sup>3</sup> (Mk. 4, 32); ἀπολλύμεθα, "sink", "perish" (Mk. 4, 38); ἀρῆσαι, "break his word", "reject" (Mk. 6, 26); αὐτῶν ἡ καρδία πεπωρωμένη, "their minds were blinded", "their hearts were hardened" (Mk. 6, 52); ἐν τῇ δόξῃ, "in your triumph", "in your glory" (Mk. 10, 37); γεωργοὺς, "tenants", "farmers" (Mk. 12, 1); τρίχας κάμηλου, "hair cloth", "camel's hair", and ἀκρίδας, "dried locusts", "locusts" (Mk. 1, 6); δοξάσει τὸν θεόν, "acknowledged the power of God", "glorified God" (Mk. 2, 12); ἄρον, "kill him!", "away (off) with him" (Jn. 19, 15).

By studying these translations in the light of the context it will be seen that Goodspeed unnecessarily explains the thought of the Evangelists.

## B.

The more serious consequences of interpreting rather than translating will be pointed out under this head. Exception must be taken to these instances, not because they inject un-Scriptural elements into the translation, but because they either misinterpret the inspired writings, or because they fall short of completely representing what the

writings express. The following instances will serve as examples of such deficiencies:

Mk.1,11:  $\hat{\omega}$  εὐδόκησα . G.: "You are my chosen!";  
 A.V.: "in whom I am well pleased!" The truth expressed by G. is evident from the context, and is merely implied in the words  $\hat{\omega}$  εὐδόκησα. The direct truth of the words is, as rendered by the A.V., that God is completely satisfied with the work of redemption which on this occasion is officially taken up by Christ.

Mk.8,33: οὐ φρονεῖς τὸν τὰ θεοῦ. G.: "You do not side with God, but with man!" There is nothing in these words about taking sides. The thought is implied, but the words express what the A.V. says: "Thou savourest not the things that be of God," i.e., you do not understand (φρονεῖν) the ways decreed by God concerning the redemption of man.

Mk.10,45: The portion of this passage which is translated by the A.V. "to give his life a ransom for many" is rendered by G. "to give his life to free many others!" Where in G's. translation is the thought, so beautifully expressed in the term "ransom" (λύτρον), that redemption was accomplished when our penalty became Christ's penalty, and that by the death of Christ we were freed from bondage? These thoughts are but poorly suggested in the free translation of G.

Mk.5,25: πολλὰ καὶ παροδοσα ὑπὸ πολλῶν ἰατρῶν.  
 G.: "had a great deal of treatment from various doctors";  
 A.V.: "And had suffered many things of many physicians!" That the unfortunate woman, who in this passage applies to Jesus for healing, suffered from physicians of the unscientific type is undoubtedly the sense of the Greek. Edersheim, Jesus the Messiah, says in support of this view, expressed by the

rendering of the A.V.: "On one leaf of the Talmud not less than eleven different remedies are proposed, of which only six can possibly be regarded as astringents or tonics, while the rest are merely the outcome of superstition, to which resort is had in the absence of knowledge!"

Mk.7,3: *πυγμῆ*. G.: "they washed their hands in a particular way!" Literally: "with the fist!" Edersheim, Jesus the Messiah, discusses the practise referred to in this passage and on good authority arrives at the following conclusions: "If the water remained short of the wrist, the hands were not clean. Accordingly, the words of St. Mark can only mean that the Pharisees eat not 'except they wash their hands to the wrist'!"

Mk.12,11: *καὶ ἔστι θαυμαστὴ ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς ἡμῶν*  
 (Part of a quotation of Jesus from Ps.118,22) G.: "And seems marvelous to us"; A.V.: "It is marvelous in our eyes!" That Christ who has been rejected by the builders, has become the cornerstone, is a positive marvel, and it is stated as such by *ἔστιν*. Goodspeed interprets the text as saying that it is a marvel only to the eyes, but not in reality, hence he omits *ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς ἡμῶν* and translated *ἔστιν* with "seems!"

## C.

The translations which will be cited under this head are not numerous, but they are open to the severest criticism. In the passages previously treated we have not unfrequently found Goodspeed speaking in the place of the Evangelists, and yet in a way which was not out of harmony with Scripture in its entirety. Not so in these passages.

Here Goodspeed makes full use of his license to interpret. What the words say in themselves and in analogy with clear Scripture passages is of no serious concern to him. At one time he is extremely literal, to the obvious injury of Scripture, as when he so scrupulously offers the first meaning of such words as *πέενα* and *προσκυνέω* (the former he translates "pit", the latter "bow down before"). At another time, when the method evidently better suits his purpose, we have anything but an exact rendering of the Greek (Passages speaking of the Lord's Supper and of Baptism). It will be shown, in treating these and other instances, that the translations cannot be endorsed, because they are grammatically incorrect, and chiefly because they are unquestionably in conflict with the analogy of faith.

On the passages refer<sup>y</sup>ing to the Baptism of John, Goodspeed gives the following translations:

Mk.1,4: "Preached repentance and baptism in order to obtain forgiveness of sins" (*εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν*).

Lk.3,3: a repetition of Mk.1,4.

Mt.3,11: "I am baptizing you in water in token of your repentance" (*εἰς μετάνοιαν*).

From the translation of Mt.3,11, it seems Goodspeed regards the baptism merely as an act symbolising repentance. Surely such is not the case. The baptism, acc. to the other two passages, clearly has as its aim and purpose (expressed with *εἰς*) the forgiveness of sins. So also in the third passage *εἰς* with *μετάνοιαν* has the same force: "for" or "unto repentance"; i. e., the repentance for the forgiveness of sins (Mk.1,4). That is the purpose of John's baptism. *εἰς* cannot be translated with "token", when it thus

conflicts with the evident sense of the parallel texts.

That Goodspeed regards the baptism of John as a mere form signifying repentance seems very likely from his translation of Mt. 3, 6: "They were baptized by him in the Jordan River, in acknowledgement of their sins!" Grammatically, "in acknowledgement" (Part. in Greek) is not wrong, and, rightly understood, it may be approved. It seems unavoidable, however, that the impression made upon the reader will be that baptism is a token by which sin is acknowledged. Since this view has above been shown to be untenable, the Greek participle must express accompanying circumstances and read in English: "confessing (acknowledging) their sins!"

Altho this error is noted with reference to the baptism of John, it will also effect the baptism instituted by Jesus, since in the point at issue the baptisms do not differ.

No less objectionable is the translation given of Mk. 1, 8: "I have baptized you in water, but he will baptize you in the holy Spirit!" The A.V. has "with" instead of "in!" The rendering of G. makes it appear as if immersion is the manner of baptizing adopted on this occasion. The passage, however, does not necessarily point to immersion as the form which was used. Grammatically,  $\bar{\epsilon}\nu$  may be used here in either the local (G.) or in the instrumental (A.V.) sense,---that is, the  $\bar{\epsilon}\nu$  with  $\bar{\upsilon}\bar{\nu}\alpha\tau\iota$ . The  $\bar{\epsilon}\nu$  with  $\bar{\pi}\nu\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\mu\alpha\tau\iota$ , however, is clearly instrumental. "Baptizing in the Holy Spirit" is foreign to Scripture. It is, then, very likely that also the  $\bar{\epsilon}\nu$  with  $\bar{\upsilon}\bar{\nu}\alpha\tau\iota$ , which is in a parallel relation to the  $\bar{\epsilon}\nu$  with  $\bar{\pi}\nu\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\mu\alpha\tau\iota$ , is instrumental. Furthermore, the instrumental usage of  $\bar{\epsilon}\nu$  has a wide application in the N.T., and its

origen is traced to the  $\gamma$  of the Hebrew. (R., pg. 589-590)

But this offence is mild in comparison to the damage done to the passages on the Lord's Supper. Mt. 26, 28 and Mk. 14, 24:  $\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\acute{\omicron}\ \epsilon\omicron\sigma\epsilon\iota\nu\ \tau\omicron\delta\ \kappa\acute{\omicron}\epsilon\iota\mu\acute{\omicron}\ \mu\omicron\upsilon\ \tau\omicron\delta\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \kappa\alpha\iota\nu\eta\varsigma\ \delta\iota\alpha\theta\eta\kappa\eta\varsigma$ . G.: "This is my blood which ratifies the agreement"; A.V.: "This is my blood of the new testament"; R.V. (more accurately): "-----of the new covenant!"

Scripture must determine the meaning and the interpretation of the words. The  $\kappa\alpha\iota\nu\eta\ \delta\iota\alpha\theta\eta\kappa\eta$ , from clear explanations of Scripture, is the forgiveness of sins. It is defined as the forgiveness of sins, in contrast to the old covenant, already in Jer. 31, 31-34. The definition is, furthermore, repeated by Paul (Rom. 11, 27). In the letter to the Hebrews it is defined in the same manner (Heb. 8, 8-12; 10, 16, 17). In the LXX the term is used throughout for the  $\gamma$  (covenant) of the O.T. Furthermore, "agreement" is vague and ambiguous. At once we ask: "Who made the agreement? With whom was it made?" Again, the term "agreement" implies reciprocal promises, which is radically opposed to the conception of "covenant." God alone, in his covenant, promises grace and forgiveness. Man had no part in making the covenant. Literally, then, and in the light of many clear Scripture passages there is only one correct translation: "This is my blood of the new covenant!"

The new covenant has taken the place of the old. There is forgiveness of sins instead of the imputation of sins. The blood, which is received in the Lord's Supper, is the blood of this new covenant. In the passages I k. 22, 20 and I Cor. 11, 25 it is clear and grammatically correct that in the words  $\epsilon\nu\ \tau\omega\ \epsilon\mu\omega\ \alpha\iota\mu\alpha\tau\iota$  we have the cause or the reason why the  $\kappa\alpha\iota\nu\eta$

*σιανήν* is the forgiveness of sins. The same applies to the *τοῦ αἵματος* of this passage. There is nothing in the passage to indicate that the blood "ratifies" the covenant. The translation of G. suggests that blood, in a figurative sense for the sufferings and death of Christ, presents the ratification of the "agreement (?)"! Otherwise, taken literally, there would be no need for the addition "ratifies!"

It is, of course, quite unnecessary to state the reason why such an error has crept into G's. translation.

The passages which remain to be discussed are, perhaps, improperly classified as instances of interpretative translations. It will be shown that the first meaning of particular words have been chosen in preference to the special meaning which they have in the N.T. The inevitable result, it will be seen, is that the N.T. has been exposed to interpretations which deny fundamental doctrines of the Church. That G., however, had such interpretations in mind when he made the translations cannot be proved. This we will have to keep in mind in making further criticism.

*κύριος*, referring to Christ, G. translates "Master" (Mk. 2, 28; 11, 3 et alii). The translation strongly suggests agreement with the liberal critic Bousset, who doubts whether the title of Lord, in the sense of being invested with divine authority, was assumed by Jesus, and whether it was applied to him in this sense by the primitive church. The view involves a radical denial of the Messianic consciousness of Jesus and of the divine honor given him by the early Christians. Against this theory of Bousset, Machen in his recent book, *The Origin of Paul's Religion* (Chap. VIII), presents a scholarly investigation of the term on the basis of

a penetrating study of the linguistic as well as the historical side of the question, and arrives at the following conclusion: (1) The term is distinctly a designation of divinity; (2) Its use in heathen cults to designate God is striking testimony for the accepted meaning of the word; (3) The term is used by the LXX to translate the "Jahweh" of the Hebrew text of the Old Testament.

When in such passages as Mt. 20, 8 and Mk. 12, 9 *Κύριος* is translated "owner" instead of "Lord" (A.V.), the translation cannot be criticised. In these passages the term is clearly used in this sense, and the LXX uses the term as the equivalent to *יָדָן* (owner) of the O.T. (I Kings 16, 24).

When applied to Christ, however, as in Mk. 2, 28, where it is distinctly stated that Christ has the rule over the Sabbath, the translation must be "Lord", since the passage attributes to Christ divine prerogatives.

At Mk. 12, 35-37, where Jesus quotes Ps. 110, 1, G. translates: "The Lord said to my lord!" The first *Κύριος*, referring to God, is capitalized; the second, referring to Christ, is written small. Why the inconsistency? Why did not G. translate "Master" as in the other case? It is obvious from the context and from the O.T., from which the quotation is taken, that Jesus here is represented as being far more than the term "Master" implies. He occupies such a lofty position that even the illustrious David called him "Lord!" Yet to G. he evidently does not quite measure up to the Lord God. If he does, it is difficult to explain why he should write the one with a capital letter and the other with a small letter.

But it may be a rash conclusion to take from these instances that G. is in sympathy with the negative critic Bousset. The reason for the change may be quite another. Machen, *The Origin of Paul's Religion*, gives another cause for such deviations from the use of the term "Lord", and he also ably shows that the grounds for the change are insufficient. On page 308 he says: "Sometimes the modern fashion (substitution of "Master" for "Lord") is adopted by devout men and women with the notion that the English word "Lord" has been worn down and the use of the word "Master" is a closer approach to the meaning of the Greek Testament. This notion is false. In translating the New Testament designation of Jesus, one should not desire to get back to the original meaning of the word "Kyrios". For the Greek word had already undergone a development, and as applied to Jesus in the New Testament it was clearly a religious term. It had exactly the religious associations which are now possessed by our English word "Lord." And for very much the same reason. The religious associations of the English word "Lord" are due to Bible usage; and the religious associations of the New Testament word "Kyrios" were also due to Bible usage---the usage of the Septuagint. ----- The uniform substitution of "the Master" for "the Lord" in speaking of Jesus has only a false appearance of freshness and originality. In reality it sometimes means a departure from the spirit of the New Testament usage! Although Machen is not referring to G., at least not by name, the explanation which he gives for choosing the term "Master" rather than "Lord" as the correct translation of *κύριος*, applies well to G. His aim is to give a fresh and original translation in American, and to achieve this end he forgets

that the term "Lord" had a peculiar religious association which will not be conveyed by another word such as "Master"

Of a similar nature is the objection which must be raised against the translation which is made wherever the term *προσκυνέω* occurs. Unless referring to God, G., in the Gospels, translates the term "bow down before", "make obeisance", "do homage", --- never "worship"(A.V.). He consistently adopts the first meaning of the word. In a few instances his changes may be accepted, namely when the word is used in the sense of giving reverence to a creature ( Mt. 18,26; Mk.15,19). When, the text bears out, however, that Christ is the Son of God, worthy of equal honor with the Father, the translation is inadequate. In these instances special, divine homage, as it is accorded to God and the ascended Christ (Jn.4,20; Rev.4,10) is meant. Such an instance we have, e.g. in Mk.14,32: after Jesus had stilled the storm, the disciples, we read, *προσεκύνησαν αὐτῷ* and said: "You are certainly the Son of God" Jn.9,38: In answer to the anxious questions, concerning salvation, of one whom Jesus had healed of blindness, Jesus points to himself as an object of faith and declares himself to be the Son of Man. The man professes his faith in Christ, and according to the text *προσεκύνησεν αὐτῷ*. Such examples could be multiplied. Other outstanding passages in which the term *προσκυνέω* will be found to have the meaning of "worship" are Mt.29,9 and Mt.2,2.

*Γέεννα* is translated "pit" by G. The A.V. has "hell." The first meaning is "Gehenna", a valley southeast <sup>west</sup> of Jerusalem where the refuse of the city was burned. The second meaning is the place where the wicked after death

suffer punishment. The latter is, without a doubt, the sense of the term in the ten passages of the Gospels in which it appears. G. translates them all "pit", with the exception of Mt.5,22 and 10,28, where he translates "fiery pit!" The sense, especially in the light of such clear passages as Mt.10,28: "rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell"(A.V.), demands the rendering "hell!" Strange to say, in Jas. 3,6 G. translates the term "hell!" The same objections must be urged against the rendering  $\xi\sqrt{\eta}\varsigma$ , which occurs four times in the Gospels in the sense of "hell", and yet is never rendered "hell" in G's. translation (Mt.11,23; 16,28; Lk.10,15; 16,23).

Jn.1,1:  $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma\ \eta\upsilon\ \delta\ \lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ . G.: "And the Word was divine"; A.V.: "And the Word was God!" Like the passages in which  $\kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$  and  $\eta\pi\alpha\kappa\upsilon\upsilon\epsilon\omega$  are translated in a manner in which it seems the Son is denied the place of equal honor and authority with the Father, so also this translation leaves room for the same un-Scriptural interpretation. The translation is impossible. The A.V. is correct, because:

1)  $\theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$  is the usus loquendi in the classical and Koine Greek for "God!" (If "divine" is the sense, why was not  $\theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$  used?)

2) The word  $\theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$ , like a proper name, is freely used with and without the article, as subject  $\delta\ \theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$ , but as predicate  $\theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$ . (R., pg. 795)

3) The immediate context demands the translation "God!" The words that precede are: " $\delta\ \lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma\ \eta\upsilon\ \pi\rho\acute{o}\varsigma\ \tau\acute{o}\nu\ \theta\epsilon\acute{o}\nu$ ". The meaning of  $\pi\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$  is significant. R. (pg.623) explains it to mean "facing!" The Ex. Gk. N.T.: It "implies not merely existence alongside of but personal intercourse!" With this

established, it is evident that "divine" is inadequate.

4) Luther treats the history of the passage and shows that his translation, with which the A.V. agrees, is correct. He says: "The Word was God" is against Arius; "The Word was with God" against Sabellius. (Ex. Gk. N.T.)

5) The N.T. time and again calls Christ God, and shows him, in his life and in his speech to be "very God of very God" so that there is no justification for shrinking from translating *θεός* with "God" in this passage. (Mt. 3,17; Jn. 1,18 3,13; 10,30; Col. 2,9; Phil. 2,6-18)

One more example will be given in which G's translation minimizes the testimony to the divinity of Jesus. In Mk. 15,38 (and parallels) the words of the centurion at the cross are translated: "This man was certainly a son of God!" The definite article is not given in the original, hence G's translation, according to which the centurion appears to be astonished at Christ as the son of God (in the sense "of child of God") is grammatically not impossible. R. (pg. 780) says of such a construction as we have here, where the article is absent from both nouns (*υἱός θεού*), that the phrase may still be definite. He adds that the context must decide. And the context, in this case, is strongly in favor of the definite phrase. Although G. does not accept the possibility of a definite phrase, there is no serious harm done to Scripture. Christ's divinity is sufficiently attested in the N. T. without using this passage to indicate that the centurion came to believe in him as the Son of God. It is strange, however, that in two other instances in which we have a similar phrase G. considered the form to be definite. In Mt. 16,18 he translated *πύλας θανάτου*, "the powers of death", and in

Rom. 4, 11, *σημεῖον περιτομῆς* , "the mark of circumcision!"

This may well suffice as a review of the varied impressions that have been gained from the study of Goodspeed's translation. In conclusion, it will be well to sum up the objectionable and the happy features of the work.

There is no doubt that Goodspeed has rendered a real service by giving clear present-day terms for the archaic terms of the Authorized Version, and that likewise, in allowing himself greater freedom in rendering the Greek, he has occasionally cast a ray of light upon passages of the Authorized Version. But the aim of giving a modern translation has led to serious faults which will outweigh these merits. Not infrequently Goodspeed's modern rendering has been found to slight the sense of the Greek. Time and again, it has been found that, in an effort to make the New Testament intelligible to the reader of the present day, he abused his privilege as translator. Many are the passages which bear the marks of an interpretation rather than a translation. And the result of thus interpreting the New Testament, it has been found, is that passages which contain fundamental truths of the Bible have been weakened, mutilated, and at times destroyed.

When these objectionable features have been sifted, however, there remains much in the translation that can profitably be used by the student of the Greek New Testament. We refer to the improvements over the Authorized Version which have been made along textual, lexical, and grammatical lines. For the student of the Greek New Testament Goodspeed's translation may, in this respect, serve as a valuable supplement to the Authorized Version.

The conclusion, then, is obvious. The translation of the New Testament by Dr. Goodspeed, on the whole, is sorely inadequate as a substitute for the Authorized Version, but admirable as a supplement. Advisedly we have said, however, that it will be of genuine service only to the student of the Greek New Testament. Only the student and scholar, who have a knowledge of the Greek New Testament, can appreciate the improvements embodied in Goodspeed's translation and exercise the proper discretion as to the deficiencies and errors.

## B I B L I O G R A P H Y.

Nestle, E., Novum Testamentum Graece.

Goodspeed, E. J., The New Testament, An American Translation.

Moffatt, J., The New Testament, A New Translation.

Authorized Version, The Holy Bible. (Concordia Bilingual  
Edition).

American Revised Version, The Holy Bible.

The Expositor's Greek New Testament.

Thayer, Greek-English Lexicon.

Preuschen, E., Griechisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften  
des Neuen Testaments.

Trench, Synonyms of the New Testament.

Robertson, A. T., A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the  
Light of Historical Research.

Robertson, A. T., A Short Grammar of the Greek New Testament.

Robertson, A. T., Studies in the Text of the New Testament.

Robertson, A. T., An Introduction to the Textual Criticism  
of the New Testament.

Milligan, G., Here and There Among the Papyri.

Coburn, C. M., The New Archaeological Discoveries and their  
Bearing upon the New Testament.

Deissman, A., Licht vom Osten.

Edersheim, Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah.

Davis, J.G., A Dictionary of the Bible.

Smith, W. W., The Student's Historical Geography of the  
Holy Land.

Fuerbringer, L., Theologische Hermeneutik.

Terry, Biblical Hermeneutics.