

An Introduction to the Grammatical Studies of *The New English Bible*

Hiromi Itofuji

(I)

According to C. L. Wrenn, one of the recent linguistic trends is “the increased seeking after ‘correctness’ in English and the looking after a ‘received standard.’”⁽¹⁾ True enough, but this would be more aptly applied to the foreign students of English than to the native English speakers he has in mind. Consciously or unconsciously, we are facing the problem of ‘correct’ or ‘standard’ English every time we open our mouth or take up a pen to express ourselves in this idiomatic language of divergent usage. Of course, there is an enormous body of dictionaries and various books published for our reference. But, in the absence of such literary authority as is embodied in the *Académie française*, we are sometimes at a loss to find out a ‘received standard’ when Doctors disagree.⁽²⁾ Usage by the first-rate authors is supposed to be a good criterion, but, again to our annoyance, “English writers have never ceased to play the revolutionary with language.”⁽³⁾

(1) C. L. Wrenn, *The English Language*, p. 167.

(2) Apart from the scientific discussion on the nature of language, the following would be an honest reflection of the popular notion among the English speaking people themselves: “Why has England no authoritative linguistic academy, like the Italian *Accademia della Crusca* (1582) or the *Académie française* (1635), which might give clear and definite rulings on such vexatious questions as the split infinitive, the fused participle, the final preposition, double comparison and accumulation of negatives; and which might state unequivocally whether such oft-repeated expressions as ‘Go slow’, ‘the three alternatives’, ‘between four walls’, ‘It’s no use complaining’, ‘I didn’t use to go’, ‘Who do you mean?’ and ‘It’s me’, are acceptable English or not? After all, general counsels—‘Remember that good English follows clear thinking’, or ‘Have something to say and try hard to say it’—are not particularly helpful when we are halting between two expressions and are in need of guidance.” (Simeon Potter, *Our Language*, p. 117.)

(3) J. M. Murry, *The Problem of Style*, p. 138.

Such being the case, it is natural that we should be induced to study the materials, literary or otherwise, which might help us in this subtle linguistic problem. And it is in this sense that we are going to examine the language employed in *The New English Bible*.⁽⁴⁾

The Joint Committee on the New Translation of the Bible, who sponsored the project of *NEB*, instructed the translators to carry through the principle "consistently to use the idiom of contemporary English."⁽⁵⁾ And, in the use of present-day English, the aim of the Committee is not confined within the narrow range of "the natural vocabulary, constructions and rhythms of contemporary speech,"⁽⁶⁾ for we are told of their scrupulous care for the matter of style: "Since sound scholarship does not always carry with it a delicate sense of style, the Committee appointed a panel of literary advisers, to whom all the work of the translating panel has been submitted."⁽⁷⁾

Not to mention the social and cultural importance of this sort of work in the English speaking nations, these linguistic considerations alone would make *NEB* a resourceful material no student of English should overlook. And some more significance would be added to its usage of English by the fact of it being a group work based on their "collective responsibility,"⁽⁸⁾ if we think of the criticism to H. W. Fowler's *A Dictionary of Modern English Usage*: "it is a collection of linguistic prejudices persuasively presented by a clever advocate."⁽⁹⁾ We could, then, admitting an exaggeration, assume that the *NEB* translators and their literary advisers together worked, as it were, as an unconscious or unintended '*Académie*' concerning the present-day usage of English at least on the "Choice Written" or "Choice Spoken" level,⁽¹⁰⁾ since they must have been *par excellence* "under condition which naturally caused the writers to try to write what they thought to be correct English."⁽¹¹⁾ Their choice of idioms and construction of sentences, therefore, might serve for a proper norm

(4) Undertaken in 1947, the New Testament part was completed and published in two editions, library and popular, in 1961. The former and fuller edition is used in this present study, and, for convenience sake, the title is abbreviated to *NEB*. Work upon the Old Testament and the Apocrypha is reported to be actively going forward.

(5) 'Introduction' to *NEB*, pp. viii-ix.

(6) (7) & (8) *Ibid.*, p. x.

(9) Potter, *op. cit.*, p. 129.

(10) Two of the five levels of speech according to Paul Roberts' classification. (v. his *Understanding Grammar*, pp. 14-15.)

(11) H. L. Mencken, *The American Language*, p. 419.

to foreign students who have to learn to express themselves, first of all, in 'correct' or 'standard' English, on which the linguistic societies in Britain, being generally "reluctant to assume responsibility for the control of 'good usage,'"⁽¹²⁾ will not pass their judgement in a decisive way.

Being an epoch-making work in itself, *NEB* has quickly arrested the eyes of critics. But most of them seem to have focused their attention upon the success or failure of *NEB* as a religious document, and that with good reason. We are, however, going to treat it primarily as a linguistic material with which to study the structure of "current speech of our own time"⁽¹³⁾ in Britain.

(II)

This *NEB*, however, is not the only modern version of the Bible. In this century, various attempts have been made to render the Bible in the present-day English and we are, more or less, familiar with such respectable works as were accomplished by R. F. Weymouth (1902) in Britain, or by James Moffatt (1913) in the United States. And, as the most recent individual translators, we could name R. A. Knox (1945) and J. B. Phillips (1947). These are, however, private attempts in their relation to the churches or general public, while the case is quite different with *The Revised Standard Version*⁽¹⁴⁾ of America and the British *NEB*. Both of these latter renderings are, so to speak, the new 'authorized' versions,⁽¹⁵⁾ because they were sponsored and brought forth by the cooperative efforts of almost all the protestant denominations on each side of the Atlantic. The project, of course, was whole-heartedly participated by the respective eminent scholars; Dr. Moffatt himself, for instance, contributed in *RSV* until his death in 1944 as Executive Secretary of the American Standard Bible

(12) Potter, *op. cit.*, p. 120.

(13) 'Introduction' to *NEB*, p. vii.

(14) This is abbreviated to *RSV*, whose New Testament and Old Testament were completed respectively in 1946 and in 1952.

(15) The *RSV* revisers self-confidently admit it: "The Revised Standard Version of the New Testament published in February, 1946, is an *authorized* revision of the American Standard Version, published in 1901, which was a revision of the King James Version, published in 1611." (The italics are mine.) (L. A. Weigle *et al.*, *An Introduction to the Revised Standard Version of the New Testament*, p. 9. This book will be referred to as *Introduction to RSV*.)

Committee.

Between these two 'authorized' versions of our day, however, there is again a vast difference. *RSV* is, after all, a revision of a revision of the Authorized Version,⁽¹⁶⁾ whereas *NEB* is "not another revision of the Authorized Version but a genuinely new translation."⁽¹⁷⁾ The significance carried by the latter is justly recognized by *The Times Literary Supplement* when it remarks that "the position of the Authorized Version has been definitely challenged."⁽¹⁸⁾ And it continues: "It is true that the translators of the new version expressly disclaim any intention of 'replacing' the Authorized Version...but what they have done, although they do not say so in so many words, is to offer an alternative."⁽¹⁹⁾

Judging from the rôle played by *AV* on the mind and speech of the English speaking peoples for more than three centuries, this is really "an event of no small importance."⁽²⁰⁾ Although we admit that, with the fall of religion from its former pinnacle, no translation of the Bible could possibly wield such a mighty influence as was exerted by *AV*, it is quite proper that critical examinations should be made on this 20th century's "its own Bible"⁽²¹⁾ from every cultural viewpoint. To the students of English also, this is indeed a challenging subject to study.

Once in studying *RSV* from a similar motive,⁽²²⁾ I kept in mind a double qualification for making use of materials of this sort. First, being a translation and revision, *RSV* cannot avoid restrictions from the original text as well as from the foregoing standard versions particularly because it asserts itself proudly "to stand in the great tradition of Tyndale and the King James Version;"⁽²³⁾ and second, the contents of the Bible itself being too much limited or estranged to

(16) This version is traditionally abbreviated to *AV*, though Americans prefer to make it *KJ* which comes from 'King James Version.'

(17) 'Introduction' to *NEB*, p. viii. There might have existed a rivalry between them, for it was in 1946, the very same year of the *RSV* (N.T.) publication that the delegates of the various churches in Britain recommended "that a completely new translation should be made, *rather than a revision, once previously contemplated*, of any earlier version." (The italics are mine. 'Preface' to *NEB*, p.v.)

(18), (19) & (20) *The Times Literary Supplement*, No. 3,082 (Friday, March 24, 1961), p. 177. This issue will be referred to simply as *TLS*, which contains two fairly long articles concerning *NEB*: 'The New English Bible: Text and Meaning' and 'Language in the New Bible.'

(21) "Every language, and sometimes every age, produces its own Bible." (David Daiches, *Literary Essays*, p. 193.)

(22) 'A Grammatical Survey of *RSV*,' *Kyushu American Literature*, No. 3, part of which is, of necessity, repeated in this present study.

(23) *Introduction to RSV*, p. 58.

cover the bewildering variety of phenomena in the modern world, *RSV* cannot represent by itself all the species of the present-day English even on its 'Choice Written' or 'Choice Spoken' level.

As far as the second one of these qualifications is concerned, *NEB* cannot be exempted from it, either. We are reminded of what J. M. Murry exaggeratedly says of *AV*, though he is discussing primarily on vocabulary: "I can conceive no modern emotion or thought—except perhaps some of the more Hegelian metaphysics—that could not be adequately and superabundantly expressed in Shakespeare's vocabulary: there are very few what would not be mutilated out of all recognition if they had to pass through the language of the Bible."⁽²⁴⁾ This will be applied, more or less, to both of these modern 'authorized' versions in spite of the expansion of vocabulary in *NEB*.⁽²⁵⁾

In the case of *NEB*, however, it goes without saying that the first of the above qualifications are completely removed. *NEB* is quite independent of the words, phrases or syntax of *AV*, even though some of them are time-honoured treasure of the English literature. This is, of course, a factor of advantage for our present purpose, but, naturally, it is lamented by most of the critics who review *NEB* from another angle. In addition to such divorce from *AV*, *TLS* testifies, through a detailed comparison with the original Greek text, that the *NEB* translators have successfully accomplished their initial aim to emancipate themselves from the older translators' misguided principle that "fidelity to the original demanded that they should reproduce, as far as possible, characteristic features of the language in which it was written, such as the syntactical order of words, the structure and division of sentences, and even such irregularities of grammar as were indeed natural enough to authors writing in the easy idiom of popular Hellenistic Greek, but less natural when turned into English."⁽²⁶⁾ This is a vast stride forward from the Revised Version (1881) or its variant, the American Standard Version (1901), the immediate predecessor of *RSV*, since their characteristic in general is "strong in Greek, weak in English" as is tersely criticized by C. H. Spurgeon.⁽²⁷⁾

That familiar formula in *AV* "and it came to pass" and other

(24) Murry, *op. cit.*, pp. 134-135.

(25) v. Makoto Kuranaga, 'Saishinkan no THE NEW ENGLISH BIBLE' (On the Recently Published *NEB*), *Eigokyoiku* (The English Teachers' Magazine), Vol. X, No. 3 (June, 1961). p. 19. The *NEB* translators thought that they should be "free to exploit a wide range of English words..." ('Introduction' to *NEB*, p. ix.)

(26) 'Introduction' to *NEB*, p. ix.

(27) v. *Introduction to RSV*, pp. 11-12.

Biblical phrases of Semitic colouring⁽²⁸⁾ are clearly erased in *NEB*, and so are their remnants in *RSV*.⁽²⁹⁾

On the whole, *TLS* is quite skeptical of the success of *NEB* as a Holy Scripture. But, in regard to the translators' endeavour "to replace Greek constructions and idioms by those of contemporary English,"⁽³⁰⁾ it has no hesitation in recognizing the faithful fulfilment of their aim: "they have certainly done so—and with no mean success,"⁽³¹⁾ to which, of course, not a little must have been contributed by the panel of literary advisers.

Speaking of *TLS*, however, we cannot but find it deplore the "losses which include the substitution of a colourless phrase for a vivid one."⁽³²⁾ Does it mean that the participation of the literary advisers proves to be futile in an essential point? Though we are not concerned with the problems of religious or aesthetic connotation, it is indispensable to grasp the general characteristics of *NEB* before dealing with details. In this sense, by way of casting a glance over the general background against which the individual grammatical features are placed, we shall proceed to examine some phases which might touch upon the religious or aesthetic qualities of *NEB*. And it will be most conveniently and effectively done through comparisons with *AV* or *RSV*.

(III)

The disciples had gone away to the town to buy food. Meanwhile a Samaritan woman came to draw water. Jesus said to her, 'Give me a drink.' The Samaritan woman said, '*What! You, a Jew, ask a drink of me, a Samaritan woman?*' (Jews and Samaritans, it should be noted, do not use vessels in common.) (John, 4.7-9)...①⁽³³⁾

AV: There cometh a woman of Samaria to draw water: Jesus saith unto her, Give me to drink. (For his disciples were gone away unto the city to buy meat.) Then saith the woman of Samaria unto him, How is it that thou, being a Jew, askest drink of me, which am a woman of Samaria? for the Jews have no dealings with the Samaritans.

(28) v. *Introduction to RSV*, p. 28.

(29) v. 'A Grammatical Survey of *RSV*'. cf. Quotations ③①, ④④ & ④⑤.

(30) 'Introduction' to *NEB*, p. ix.

(31) *TLS*, p. 178.

(32) *TLS*, p. 184.

(33) Unless otherwise specified, the Biblical quotations are from *NEB* and these are numbered consecutively for the convenience of cross reference. The italics in them are mine.

RSV: There came a woman of Samaria to draw water. Jesus said to her, "Give me a drink." For his disciples had gone away into the city to buy food. The Samaritan woman said to him, "How is it that you, a Jew, ask a drink of me, a woman of Samaria?" For Jews have no dealings with Samaritans.

How stubborn you are, heathen still at heart and deaf to the truth! You always fight against the Holy Spirit. *Like fathers, like sons*. Was there ever a prophet whom your fathers did not persecute?

(Acts, 7.51-52)...②

AV: Ye stiffnecked and uncircumcised in heart and ears, ye do always resist the Holy Ghost: as your fathers did, so do ye. Which of the prophets have not your fathers persecuted?

RSV: You stiff-necked people, uncircumcised in heart and ears, you always resist the Holy Spirit. As your fathers did, so do you. Which of the prophets did not your fathers persecute?

Who makes you, my friend, so important? What do you possess that was not given you? If then you really received it all as a gift, *why take the credit to yourself?*

(1 Cor., 4.7)...③

AV: For who maketh thee to differ from another? and what hast thou that thou didst not receive? now if thou didst receive it, why dost thou glory, as if thou hadst not received it?

RSV: For who sees anything different in you? What have you that you did not receive? If then you received it, why do you boast as if it were not a gift?

At this I fell at his feet to worship him. But he said to me, '*No, not that!* I am but a fellow-servant with you and your brothers who bear their testimony to Jesus. *It is God you must worship*. Those who bear testimony to Jesus are inspired like the prophets.'

(Rev., 19.10)...④

AV: And I fell at his feet to worship him. And he said unto me, See thou do it not: I am thy fellowservant, and of thy brethren that have the testimony of Jesus: worship God: for the testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy.

RSV: Then I fell down at his feet to worship him, but he said to me, "You must not do that! I am a fellow servant with you and your brethren who hold the testimony of Jesus. Worship God." For the testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy.

These are taken from each of the four parts into which *NEB* is divided,⁽³⁴⁾ namely, 'The Gospel' (the four gospels), 'Acts of the Apostles',

(34) In order to have a general view, these specimens are taken from each of the four parts, but actually the difference between them is small as is pointed out by *TLS*: "they [*NEB* translators] have largely 'ironed out' what is distinctive as between one part of the New Testament and another." (*TLS*, p. 178.)

'Letters' (the twenty-one 'epistles' of the apostles), and 'The Revelation of John.' Let us have our attention focussed on the italicized parts, for, there seems to be afforded a clue to one of the features of *NEB*. Apart from the modernization in vocabulary, what we shall immediately notice there would be the colloquial tone which has a direct appeal to the present-day reader. Take for instance, "What! You, a Jew, ask a drink of me, a Samaritan woman?" side by side with "How is it that thou, being a Jew, askest drink of me, which am a woman of Samaria?" (Quotation ①) As is widely known, one of the distinguished qualities of *AV* is its dignified simplicity. But, as far as this passage is concerned, is it not rather literary and verbose, and out of harmony with the situation described? (In this kind of discussion, we have to be relieved of "the superstitious reverence for the style of the Authorized Version."⁽³⁵⁾) On the contrary, *NEB* here presents, in a lively way, the Samaritan woman's doubt and surprise by the free use of colloquialism of everyday speech. At least, we know that not everywhere does *NEB* commit the crime of "substitution of a colourless phrase for a vivid one."⁽³⁶⁾ So is the case with "No, not that!" vs. "See thou do it not." (Quotation ④)

Of course, this is the kind of passage where the dignity or grace of the language is fairly out of the question, which fact unquestionably favours the policy of *NEB*. In other words, when the situation is different, no objection will be raised to the criticism of *TLS*: "if we search the new Bible for the words we all now use in times of need, almost always we find a sad weakening, a loss of profundity and beauty."⁽³⁷⁾ It will be enough to quote just one sentence in this connection:

*How blest are those who know that they are poor ; the kingdom of of
Heaven is theirs.* (Matt., 5.3)...⑤

AV : Blessed are the poor in spirit : for theirs is the kingdom of heaven.

RSV : Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven.

Gk : Μάκαριοι οἱ πτωχοὶ τῷ πνεύματι ὅτι αὐτῶν ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν.⁽³⁸⁾

(35) Murry, *op. cit.*, p. 135.

(36) *TLS*, p.184, where these words here are applied not only to words and phrases but also to "an expanded form," which includes a group of sentences.

(37) *TLS*, p. 184.

(38) From time to time, when it seems to be of help, the 'Received Greek Text' is added. But I am far from imagining that it is identical with the original used by the *NEB* translators or the *RSV* revisers. This is a subject involving the delicate and difficult problem of textual criticism and we should refrain from easy credulity. Nevertheless, it is quite possible that we should obtain a general idea on the manner of the respective renderings.

This is, however, at once a demerit and a merit of *NEB*, for it is, in a sense, an endorsement as to how far *NEB*, thoroughgoing in the use of "language of the present day,"⁽³⁹⁾ is independent of the influence of *AV*.

On the whole, *RSV* retains the literary tone of *AV*, reflecting the revisers' belief that "it [the language of the English Bible] must not be colloquial or trivial."⁽⁴⁰⁾ As the legitimate heir to *AV*, it tries to be in the direction of "classic English style of the King James Version"⁽⁴¹⁾ with all their consciousness that "the New Testament...calls for a direct, familiar style in translation."⁽⁴²⁾ And this is also a demerit and a merit of *RSV*, for "The Revised Standard Version, which is a revision of a revision of the Authorized Version, retains some of its magic,"⁽⁴³⁾ i.e., those recognized qualities which we should, after all, admit in *AV*.

Another example of the vivid colloquialism of *NEB* is found in the oft-quoted passage concerning the prodigal son. Quite directly and plainly does *NEB* presents the joy of the father when his strayed son returned to him:

Quick! fetch a robe, my best one, and put it on him...(Luke, 15.22)...⑥

AV: Bring forth the best robe, and put it on him...

RSV: Bring quickly the best robe, and put it on him...

Gk: 'Εξενέγκατε τὴν στολὴν τὴν πρώτην, καὶ ἐνδύσατε αὐτόν...

The graded difference between them each other will be clear enough and you will also see how "free"⁽⁴⁴⁾ *NEB* is in its way of rendering the original, which we shall discuss a little more in the subsequent pages. (cf. Quotations ⑤ & ⑦)

This sort of comparison is itself an interesting subject, but now we must proceed to examine the other specimens quoted above, because we are not here concerned with the comparative merits of these versions as translation. Before proceeding to the next, however, one thing is to be mentioned by the way, for it also reflects the basic attitude of the *NEB* translators; there are in *NEB* such changes in the order of verses as you see in Quotation ①. This is, in practice, not without precursors; Dr. Moffatt, for instance, rather freely resorted to this

(39) 'Preface' to *NEB*, p.v.

(40) *Introduction to RSV*, p. 58.

(41) *Ibid.*, p. 11.

(42) *Ibid.*, p. 33.

(43) Daiches, *op. cit.*, p. 204.

(44) According to the translators, "taken as a whole, our version claims to be a translation, free, it may be rather than literal." ('Preface' to *NEB*, p.x.) Although they assert it to be "a faithful translation nevertheless," (*ibid.*, p.x.) this is adversely criticised in either of the two articles of *TLS*. My own view on this matter will be presented by degrees in the following pages.

measure in his translation of the Old and the New Testaments. In the case of *NEB*, however, the attempt is characteristically associated with the intention "to convey the meaning in continuous natural English rather than to correspond sentence by sentence with the Greek."⁽⁴⁵⁾

With the second group of quotations also, analysis will be made fundamentally in the same direction. In contrast to "Like fathers, like sons" (*NEB*), which is a condensed noun-cored phrase, "As your fathers did, so do you" (*AV*) gives us nothing but a flat, explanatory, prosaic description of the fact. This is not the kind of speech which moves our emotion directly, whereas that concise diction of *NEB*, echoing a familiar proverb, draws us nearer to the apostle Stephen addressing face to face the audience, to make us feel as if we were ourselves among them. Here is a living apostle, full of rage, reproving the obstinate infidel.

Another example of this category is found in 'Acts,' 7.22:

So Moses was trained in all the wisdom of the Egyptians, *a powerful speaker and a man of action.* (Acts, 7.22)...⁽⁷⁾

AV: And Moses was learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians, and was mighty in words and deeds.

RSV: And Moses was instructed in all the wisdom of the Egyptians, and he was mighty in his words and deeds.

Gk: Καὶ ἐπαίδεύθη Μωσῆς πάσῃ σοφίᾳ Αἰγυπτίων· ἦν δὲ δυνατὸς ἐν λόγοις καὶ ἐν ἔργοις.

Comparison with the Greek, however, will suggest that *NEB* here tends to go beyond, if "free," a translation to a paraphrase. This is indeed one of its disputable points, which will be examined later at some length.

Not radically different is the case with the rest of specimens, in which idiomatic constructions, elliptical in one way or another, are observed to work to some effect. One would point out, however, that all of these quotations are taken not from the descriptive but from the speech part of the text and he might attribute this specific quality of *NEB* to the nature of the material itself.

Certainly it is to the point, for distinctions between the different aspects of speech should not be overlooked. The panel of literary advisers is reported to have taken pains "to secure the tone and level of language appropriate to the different kinds of writing to be found in the New Testament, whether narrative, familiar discourse, argument, rhetoric, or poetry."⁽⁴⁶⁾ And yet my choice of material will not

(45) Note on 'Marginal Numbers,' *NEB*, p. xiv.

(46) 'Introduction' to *NEB*, p. x. Of course, we cannot accept the whole of these words at face value without critical examination. But, when references are made to style or usage, these words are always kept in mind throughout this present study. cf. (34).

disqualify the above quoted passages as a clue to the stylistic features of *NEB*. It will be enough for us to recall the basic principle of the translators: "consistently to use the idioms of contemporary English." Throughout the whole pages of *NEB*, this spirit is pervaded, but nowhere else is it so typically revealed as in the speech part of the text.

After all, literary style is built upon the spoken language⁽⁴⁷⁾ and ours is the age linguistically noted for the proximity of the one to the other. And this will be applied, with particular significance, to the English employed in *NEB*, for, in spite of the above quoted consideration for the use of style to match the different aspects of the language, "always the overriding aims were accuracy and clarity"⁽⁴⁸⁾ and that from the viewpoint of present-day English, that is, "the natural vocabulary, constructions, and rhythms of contemporary speech."⁽⁴⁹⁾ It is small wonder that the *NEB* translators should "have largely 'ironed out' what is distinctive as between one part of the New Testament and another."⁽⁵⁰⁾ It may be partly due to their arbitrariness, but it is largely ascribable to the very nature of the language to be used. In this sense, we could admit that, though free, *NEB* is "a faithful translation nevertheless, so far as we [the translators] could compass it."⁽⁵¹⁾

Owing to such predominance of colloquialism, there are varieties of simplified wordings observed in *NEB*. The following is their general classification with the counterparts in *AV* and *RSV* added for comparison.

1. Omission⁽⁵²⁾ of the subject.

* Better be married than burn with vain desire. (1 Cor. 7.9)...⑧

AV: ...for it is better to marry than to burn.

RSV: For it is better to marry than to be aflame with passion.

Why not rather * suffer injury?⁽⁵³⁾ (1 Cor. 6.7)...⑨

AV: Why do ye not rather take wrong?

RSV: Why not rather suffer wrong?

(47) v. Fumio Nakashima, *Kindai Eigo to Sono Buntai* (Modern English and its Style), p. 261.

(48) 'Introduction' to *NEB*, pp. x-xi.

(49) *Ibid.*, p. x.

(50) *TLS*, p. 178. cf. (38).

(51) 'Introduction' to *NEB*, p. x.

(52) 'Omission' is linguistically an inaccurate term, but here it is used conventionally for convenience sake. In the quotations, asterisk indicates something 'omitted' there.

(53) cf. Quotation ③. This quotation here shows its negative form and also the existence in *RSV* of the similar elliptical construction, though with far less frequency than in *NEB*. The verb here is considered to be 'bare infinitive,' so that, strictly speaking, it is not the subject part alone that is omitted. (v. O. Jespersen, *A Modern English Grammar*, Pt. V, 20.22) There are some other related forms in *NEB*, e.g.: "Why this crying and commotion?" (Mark, 5.39), "Why all these tears?" (Acts, 21.13) or "But what matter, I or they?" (1 Cor., 15.11)

2. Verb-less sentence.⁽⁵⁴⁾

Happy * they if he find them alert. (Luke, 12.38)...^⑩

AV: And if he shall...find them so, blessed are those servants.

RSV: If he...finds them so, blessed are those servants.

But *courage*! The victory is mine; I have conquered the world.

(John, 16.33)...^⑪

AV:...but be of good cheer; I have overcome the world.

RSV:...but be of good cheer; I have overcome the world.

Out of my sight, all of you, you and your wicked ways!

(Luke, 13.27)...^⑫

AV:...depart from me, all ye workers of iniquity.

RSV:...depart from me, all you workers of iniquity!

You, Lord, *washing* my feet?

(John, 13.6)...^⑬

AV: Lord, dost thou wash my feet?

RSV: Lord, do you wash my feet?

3. Omission of the other elements of the sentence.

Who made you * ruler and * judge? (Acts, 7.35)...^⑭

AV: Who made thee a ruler and a judge?

RSV: Who made you a ruler and a judge?

Start out and go *south* to the road...

(Acts, 8.26)...^⑮

AV: Arise, and go toward the south unto the way...

RSV: Rise and go toward the south to the road...

What is it * you have to report?⁽⁵⁵⁾

(Acts, 23.19)...^⑯

AV: What is it that thou hast to tell me?

RSV: What is it that you have to tell me?

4. Contraction of clauses into phrases, or phrases into words.⁽⁵⁶⁾

At the sight of the star they were *overjoyed*. (Matt., 2.10)...^⑰

AV: When they saw the star, they rejoiced with exceeding great joy.

RSV: When they saw the star, they rejoiced exceedingly with great joy.

(54) cf. Quotations ②, ④ & ⑦. Of course, there are some instances of this type even in *AV*, e.g.: "*Away* with such a fellow from the earth." (Acts, 22.22) Some of the quotations of this type are related to the free interchange of the function of conventional parts of speech, and others to the contraction of clauses into phrases, so that this classification is just a tentative one.

(55) cf. Quotation ④. This is an instance of what Jespersen calls 'contact-clause,' to which a detailed discussion will be given later.

(56) Later on this will be reviewed from a different angle. (cf. Quotations ⑤⑩, ⑤⑪ & ⑤⑫)

(IV)

In following this line of *NEB* features, however, we should not be misled to the idea that this new Bible would be a greater economizer of words than any other versions. Indeed, when a remark is made regarding a tendency in *NEB* to "condense" words and phrases,⁽⁵⁷⁾ part of the above indicated aspect is noticed by the critic. But this is only one side of the shield, for there are numerous "expansions" in *NEB*, which are criticized in *TLS*.⁽⁵⁸⁾ Whence, then, comes this seeming contradiction between condensation and expansion? In order to see the problem in concrete terms, we had better make use of the statistics presented by Prof. Weigle,⁽⁵⁹⁾ though this is originally intended to prove the terseness of the style of *RSV*.

	<i>KJ</i> [<i>AV</i>]	<i>ASV</i>	<i>RSV</i>	<i>NEB</i> ⁽⁶⁰⁾
Matthew 5	1081	1056	1002	1068
Mark 1-2	1654	1618	1534	1523
Luke 8	1431	1431	1367	1327
John 4	1096	1085	1038	1076
Acts 10	1108	1128	1022	1078
Romans 8	904	898	898	988
1 Cor. 15	1165	1169	1151	1209
Ephesians 3	410	418	405	437
Philippians 1	632	653	639	695
Colossians 2	503	515	502	569

Prof. Weigle would be right in judging that "it [*RSV*] probably contains fewer words than the former authorized versions, and certainly fewer than other modern versions such as those of Weymouth, Moffatt and Goodspeed."⁽⁶¹⁾ Consulting the figures obtained from *NEB*, we could extend his judgement to include this newest 'authorized' version, too. In other words, in spite of the free use of elliptical expressions, total number of words used in *NEB* is not, on the whole, reduced as compared with *RSV*, the other 'authorized' version of the 20th century. And again we could ascribe the cause to the stylistic difference between the two—between the latter's literary inheritance of *AV* and the predominance of colloquialism in the former, which necessarily involves the periphrastic tendency of the present-day's

(57) v. Mamoru Shimizu, 'New English Bible no Eigo' (The English Language of *NEB*), *Eigoseinen* (The Rising Generation), Vol. CVII, No.9 (September, 1961), p. 15.

(58) *TLS*, p. 178.

(59) *Introduction to RSV*, p. 57.

(60) The figures show the number of words used in each segment of the New Testament. Those in the *NEB* column are mine. *ASV* stands for the American Standard Version (1901), which is the American variant of the Revised Version (1881). cf. (15).

(61) *Introduction to RSV*, pp. 56-57.

spoken English.⁽⁶²⁾

But this is not the sole cause for this interesting phenomenon, for whether it is to be approved as a translation or not, there are not a few paraphrases in *NEB* despite of the translators' words that their "intention has been to offer a translation in the strict sense and not a paraphrase."⁽⁶³⁾ When they assert that they "have taken this liberty [of introducing into a passage something which is not there] only with extreme caution, and in a very few passages,"⁽⁶⁴⁾ we have to beg to differ with the reviewer of *TLS*.⁽⁶⁵⁾ But this is apparently only remotely connected with our main theme here, i. e., the stylistic or grammatical problem, so that it will be enough to introduce few specimens of the kind in order to get a general idea of it. In fact, there are quite a number of them, but the following are the notable ones found in those chapters which are taken up in the above numerical table. (cf. Quotations ⑤, ⑫, ②⑥-③② & ③⑨-④⑨)

If someone sues you, come to terms with him promptly...

(Matt., 5.25)...⑮

RSV: Make friends quickly with your accuser...⁽⁶⁶⁾

AV: Agree with thine adversary quickly...

Gk: Ἰσθι ἐὺνοῶν τῷ ἀντιδίκῳ σου ταχὺ...

The conclusion of the matter is this: there is no condemnation for those who are united with Christ Jesus... (Rom., 8.1)...⑰

RSV: There is therefore now no condemnation for those who are in Christ Jesus.

AV: There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus...

Gk: Οὐδὲν ἄρα νῦν κατάκριμα τοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ...

...and you are still *in your old state of sin*.

(1 Cor., 15.17)...⑱

RSV: ...you are still in your sins.

AV: ...ye are yet in your sins.

Gk: ...ἔτι ἐστὲ ἐν ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις ὑμῶν.

As for the other factor, i. e., a periphrastic tendency in the present-day English, it is one of the very features of our first concern, so that a detailed analysis will be given to it in the subsequent pages.

(62) v. Masaki Harasawa, *Gendai Kogo Bumpo* (A Grammar of Modern Colloquial English), pp. 3-4.

(63) 'Introduction' to *NEB*, p. x. In discussing this matter, of course, we admit "that every intelligent translation is in a sense a paraphrase," yet there exists the problem of its limit, though it is out of our present question. (*ibid.*, p. x.)

(64) *Ibid.*, p. x.

(65) v. *TLS*, p. 178.

(66) We are now more interested in the difference between *NEB* and *RSV*, so that, from now on, the Biblical quotations will be presented in the order of *NEB*, *RSV*, *AV* and, when necessary, *Gk*.

Admitting both of these factors, we could suggest that the above hinted seeming contradiction between condensation and expansion in the wording of *NEB* would be, in a sense, inherent in the very nature of "current speech of our own time"⁽⁶⁷⁾ to which the translators maintain to have resorted consistently in this modern version of the Bible. And the contradiction might constitute, as it were, a dialectical tension, and on this vital undercurrent there are displayed those "idioms and constructions of contemporary English,"⁽⁶⁸⁾ with which the translators are said to have replaced those of the Greek original "with no mean success."⁽⁶⁹⁾ But this might be a hasty conclusion. To say anything of certainty, we have to attempt a little more detailed analysis of those periphrastic expressions in *NEB*.

(V)

Periphrasis in *NEB* is no exception to those general tendencies of present-day English, especially in its colloquial aspect, which are classified into ten categories by Prof. Harasawa.⁽⁷⁰⁾ According to him, in the modern colloquial English, it is frequent that, instead of "I want it" or "I want a car," "That's what I want" or "It's a car I want" is respectively preferred.⁽⁷¹⁾ The frequency of the use of these latter forms in *NEB* will be guessed by their occurrence in close succession, e. g., in '1 Cor.,' 15.11-21, where there are no such forms observable in *RSV*, let alone in *AV*.

But what matter, I or they? *This is what we all proclaim*, and *this is what you believed*. Now if *this is what we proclaim*, that Christ was raised from the dead, how can some of you say there is no resurrection of the dead?...If *it is for this life only that Christ has given us hope*, we of all men are most to be pitied. But the truth is, Christ was raised to life—the firstfruits of the harvest of the dead. For since *it was a man who brought death into the world*, a man also brought resurrection of the dead. (1 Cor., 15.11-21)...⁽²¹⁾

RSV: Whether then it was I or they, so we preach and so you believed. Now if Christ is preached as raised from the dead, how can some of you say that there is no resurrection of the dead?... If in this life we who are in Christ have only hope, we are of all men most to be pitied. But in fact Christ has been raised from the dead, the first fruits of those who have fallen asleep.

(67) 'Introduction' to *NEB*, p. vii.

(68) & (69) v. *TLS*, p. 178.

(70) v. Harasawa, *op. cit.*, pp. 2-26.

(71) v. *Ibid.*, pp. 14-15. In his classification, these are considered "emphatic forms" on reasonable ground. Here, however, attention is paid to its periphrastic nature.

For as by a man came death, by a man has come also the resurrection of the dead.

AV: Therefore whether it were I or they, so we preach, and so ye believed. Now if Christ be preached that he rose from the dead, how say some among you that there is no resurrection of the dead? ...If in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable. But now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the firstfruits of them that slept. For since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead.

This, however, does not imply the nonexistence of these forms in *RSV* or in *AV*. To see the matter more realistically we had better resort to a statistical observation; the following is the number of each of these forms in 'The Gospel according to John.'

	This is what I want. (Type A)	It is a car [that] I want. ⁽⁷²⁾ (Type B)
<i>NEB</i>	11	37
<i>RSV</i>	9	24
<i>AV</i>	3	10

This statistical order of *NEB* > *RSV* > *AV* furnishes us with a clue by which to conjecture the way of development of the English language. Even in *RSV*, which tries faithfully to follow the tradition of *AV*, the number is largely increased in comparison with its predecessor. This is, however, the number of genuine instances of both types. If we include the types *similar* to these, the difference will be still larger. Here are some of such close relatives of Type A found in 'John.'

That is what the soldiers did. (John, 19.25)...^{②②}

RSV: So the soldiers did this.

AV: These things therefore the soldiers did.

This is why I told you... (John, 6.65)...^{②③}

RSV: *This is why* I told you...

AV: Therefore said I unto you...

That is why the parents said... (John, 9.23)...^{②④}

RSV: Therefore his parents said...

AV: Therefore said his parents...

That is how the saying comes true... (John, 4.37)...^{②⑤}

RSV: For here the saying holds true...

AV: And herein is that saying true...

(72) cf. (55).

If we expand the range a little farther, we could include "the truth is,..." in Quotation ②① and its kindred. And again this will make more marked the predominance of *NEB* over the others in the use of these periphrastic expressions. The following are the examples adopted from this broader viewpoint.

The truth is that I am honouring my Father. (John, 8.49)...②⑥

RSV: I honor my Father...

AV: ...but I honour my Father...

Gk: ...ἀλλὰ τιμῶ τὸν πατέρα μου...

Such are the worshippers whom the Father wants. (John, 4.23)...②⑦

RSV: Such the Father seeks to worship him.

AV: ...for the Father seeketh such to worship him.

Gk: ...καὶ γὰρ ὁ πατὴρ τοιούτους ζητεῖ τοὺς προσκυνοῦντας αὐτόν.

Here is a man who has opened my eyes. (John, 9.30)...②⑧

RSV: And yet he opened my eyes.

AV: ...and yet he hath opened mine eyes.

Gk: ...καὶ ἀνέφξε μου τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς.

This is my commandment: love one another. (John, 15.12)...②⑨

RSV: This I command you to love one another.

AV: These things I command you, that ye love one another.

Gk: Ταῦτα ἐντέλλομαι ὑμῖν, ἵνα ἀγαπᾶτε ἀλλήλους.

In connection with the above numerical statement, the source of these quotations is limited to 'John.' But it goes without saying that the sentences of this type will amount to a vast number if we count them up scrupulously from page to page throughout the whole of *NEB*, and this is simply due to the colloquial nature of the English employed in this new Bible.

Thus, taken in a broader perspective, these patterns seem to be more appropriately classified as periphrasis than as mere emphatic form, although Type A and Type B are both of them emphatic in their genuine status. And, making our perspective still broader, we shall find the sphere of periphrasis delicately entangled with that of paraphrase. Through a comparison with the Greek, it will be understood that those specimens quoted above testify to it. And here is an instance which is particularly interesting because of its connection with the well-known *AV* formula, "Verily, verily, I say unto you...."

Jesus answered, '*I tell you this: the truth is...*' (John, 6.32)...③⑩

RSV: Jesus then said to them, "Truly, truly, I say to you..."

AV: Then Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you...

Gk: Εἶπεν οὖν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Ἀμὲν ἀμὲν λέγω ὑμῖν...

After all, we could again suggest that, in considering the paraphrases in *NEB*, the translators' basic principle—"constantly to use the idioms of contemporary English"—should be fully taken into account side by side with their "aim of making the meaning as clear as it could be made."⁽⁷³⁾

We have been so far dealing with Type A and its related forms but *mutatis mutandis* similar things will be said of Type B. In its core, there exists a tone of emphasis, but, from another viewpoint, the latter is also a means of colloquial periphrasis and also paraphrase particularly because the *NEB* translators tend to resort to this pattern upon their own interpretation of the original even when there is no emphasizing element in it. We could refer to Quotation ④ or ②¹ but here are a couple of examples of Type B taken from the gospels other than 'John.'

It is a wicked generation that asks for a sign. (Matt. 16.4)...③¹

RSV: An evil and adulterous generation seeks for a sign.

AV: A wicked and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign.

Gk: Γενεὰ πονηρὰ καὶ μοιχαλὶς σημεῖον ἐπιζητεῖ.

It is not the healthy that need a doctor. (Mark, 2.17)...③²

RSV: Those who are well have no need of a physician.

AV: They that are whole have no need of the physician.

Gk: Οὗ χρείαν ἔχουσιν οἱ ἰσχύοντες ἰατροῦ.

But, in so discussing, we are far from suggesting the nonexistence of this type in *AV* or in *RSV*. The point is the difference in the frequency of its occurrence as is suggested in the above numerical statement. And here it will be enough to show an example in which each of these versions alike uses this form.

...for *it is not you who* will be speaking... (Matt. 10.20)...③³

RSV: ...for *it is not you who* speak...

AV: For *it is not ye that* speak...

Gk: ...οὐ γὰρ ὑμεῖς ἐστέ οἱ λαλοῦντες...

In connection with Type B, however, we should not neglect to mention one conspicuous fact, i. e., the frequent use of 'contact-clauses' in *NEB* and the very reverse in *AV* and *RSV*, and this is again due to the difference of the language used in the respective versions—colloquialism in the former and the literary style of the latter. (cf. Quotation ④) Jespersen, advocate of the term 'contact-clause,' points out the colloquial nature of this connective-less construction and

(73) 'Introduction' to *NEB*, p. x.

ascribes its scarcity in *AV* to this specific quality.⁽⁷⁴⁾ Moreover, to quote him, "in translations contact-clauses are very rare indeed," and, as he indicates, this is the case with *AV*.⁽⁷⁵⁾ Further, the nature of this construction is accusingly testified by Samuel Johnson as "a *colloquial* barbarism."⁽⁷⁶⁾ The omission of a conjunction 'that' after "the truth is" (Quotations ②① & ③① vs. ②⑥) is also related to contact-clause because of its colloquial tone. We have seen a typical instance of Type B as a contact-clause in Quotation ④ but here are some notable examples taken from among the almost countless uses in *NEB*, including a very rare and interesteng case of its use in *AV* and *RSV*.

Who is it * you are looking for? (John, 20.15)...③④

RSV: Whom do you seek?

AV: Whom seekest thou?

It is these * you should have practised... (Luke, 11.42)...③⑤

RSV: These you ought to have done...

AV: These ought ye to have done...

For it seems to me * God has made us apostles the most abject of mankind. (1 Cor., 4.9)...③⑥

RSV: For I think that God has exhibited us apostles as last of all.

AV: For I think that God hath set forth us the apostles last.

Perhaps they will respect him. (Luke, 20.13)...③⑦

RSV: It may be * they will respect him.

AV: It may be * they will reverence him.

cf. It may be *that* some person...has been invited. (Luke, 14.8)...③⑧

We are here primarily concerned with the periphrases in the English employed in *NEB*, that is, concerned with the problem of "expasion" in *NEB*. But, being an elliptical expression, contact-clauses are considered to be in the direction of "condensation." To put

(74) v. Jespersen, *op. cit.*, Pt. III, Ch. VII. In Jespersen's terminology, contact-clause covers far broader field than is the case at hand, including the so-called "omission of relative pronouns" in general. And, in this connection, it will be worthy to report that *NEB* seems to have a tendency to reduce the use of (attributive) relative pronouns, although it is quite far from my intention to ascribe the cause simply to the frequent use of contact-clasuses in *NEB*. (cf. Quotation ⑤①)

	who	which	that	(what)
<i>NEB</i>	140	29	37	(36)
<i>RSV</i>	248	42	45	(30) (counted in 'Luke.')

(75) & (76) *Ibid.*, pp. 135-136. (The italics are mine.)

it figuratively, forces in *minus* direction are working within the *plus* movement itself. And this is what the *NEB* translators have produced unconsciously through their effort constantly to use the idioms and constructions of the current speech of present day. Figures are presented above concerning the number of words used in *NEB*, but, in this sense, we have to interpret them not as static statistics but as kinetic figures and, through the poker face mask of those numbers we should penetrate into the dynamic reality of the living English language. And this is why the use of the term "dialectic tension between condensation and expansion" seems preferable to calling it, for instance, a mere coexistence of two contrary tendencies.

So far we have been dealing with Type A and Type B, but it goes without saying that these are not the only factors of expansion. And now we have to raise some other notable varieties.⁽⁷⁷⁾

1. Preference of phrases to single words, esp. in verbs and prepositions.

...[he] *had no intercourse with* her until her son was born. (Matt., 1.25)...^{③⑨}

RSV: ...[he] knew her not until she had borne a son.

AV: ...[he] knew her not till she had brought forth her first-born son.

Go and *make a careful inquiry for* the child. (Matt., 2.8)...^{④⑩}

RSV: Go and search diligently for the child.

AV: Go and search diligently for the young child.

...do not *turn your back on* a man who wants to borrow.

(Matt., 5.42)...^{④①}

RSV: ...do not refuse him who would borrow from you.

AV: ...from him that would borrow of thee turn not thou away.

The man who enters by the door is the shepherd *in charge of* the sheep.

(cf. Quotation ②⑩) (John, 10.2)...^{④②}

RSV: ...but he who enters by the door is the shepherd of the sheep.

AV: But he that entereth in by the door is the shepherd of the sheep.

You heard my teaching *in the presence of* many witnesses...

(2 Tim., 2.2)...^{④③}

RSV: ...and what you have heard from me before many witnesses...

AV: And the things that thou hast heard of me among many witnesses...

(77) It is to be noticed that some of these examples are again related to the *NEB* tendency to paraphrase the original.

2. Replacement of participial constructions by clauses and other means of expression, esp. in the case of "...saying" which is one of the favourite formulae in *AV*.⁽⁷⁸⁾

...he began to address them. And *this is the teaching he gave* : 'How blest are those who...!' " (Matt., 5.2)...⁽⁴⁴⁾

RSV : And he opened his mouth and taught them, saying: "Blessed are the poor..."

AV : And he opened his mouth and taught them, saying, Blessed are the poor..."

But Peter raised him to his feet *and said*, 'Stand up...' (Acts, 10.26)...⁽⁴⁵⁾

RSV : But Peter lifted him up, saying, "Stand up..."

AV : But Peter took him up, saying, Stand up...

He taught in their synagogues *and all men sang his praises*.

(Luke, 4.15)...⁽⁴⁶⁾

RSV : And he taught in their synagogues, being glorified by all.

AV : And he taught in their synagogues, being glorified of all.

3. Increase in the use of progressive form or expanded tense.

(For examples v. Quotations ②⑥, ③③, ③④ & ④⑦.)

The following figures are obtained from 'Mark' to see the validity of Jespersen's dictum: "In the Gospel of St Mark the Authorized Version has only twenty-nine expanded tenses, but has seventy-eight simple tenses where now expanded tenses would be *naturally* used."⁽⁷⁹⁾

<i>AV</i>	<i>RSV</i>	<i>NEB</i>	Weymouth ⁽⁸⁰⁾
29	46	65	54

4. Expansion of phrases into clauses. (cf. 2.)

Master, *when you say things like this* you are insulting us too.

(Luke, 11.45)...⁽⁴⁷⁾

(78) For the italicized parts in Quotations ④④ & ④⑤, the original uses the present participle active λέγων, which is equivalent to the English "saying."

(79) Jespersen, *Essentials of English Grammar*, p. 263. (The italics are mine.)

(80) Figures from Weymouth's version are added because it claims to be "an idiomatic translation into everyday English."

Though pretty close to Jespersen's expectation, *NEB* figures are still short of it, partly because it is not a literal renovation of *AV* and expression is made by some other means, e.g.:

On their way down the mountain, he enjoined them... (Mark, 9.9)

RSV : And as they *were coming* down the mountain, he charged them...

AV : And as they *came* down from the mountain, he charged them...

During the supper, he took bread...(Mark, 14.22)

RSV : And as they *were eating*, he took bread...

AV : And as they did *eat*, Jesus took bread...

RSV: Teacher, in saying this you reproach us also.

AV: Master, thus saying thou reproachest us also.

Gk: Διδάσκαλε, ταῦτα λέγων καὶ ἡμᾶς ὑβρίζεις.

They curse us, and we bless; they persecute us, and we submit to it.

(1 Cor., 4.12)...⁽⁴⁸⁾

RSV: When reviled, we bless; when persecuted, we endure.

AV: ...being reviled, we bless; being persecuted, we suffer it.

Gk: ...λοιδορούμενοι, εὐλοτοῦμεν· διωκόμενοι, ἀνεχόμεθα.

If we are in union with Christ Jesus circumcision makes no difference at all, nor does the want of it. (Gal., 5.6)...⁽⁴⁹⁾

RSV: For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision nor uncircumcision is of any avail.

AV: For in Jesus Christ neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision.

Gk: Ἐν τᾷ Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ οὔτε περιτομή τι ἰσχύει, οὔτε ἀκροβυστία...

This last syntactical aspect, however, is another typical field where the concurrence of two antagonistic tendencies, expansion and condensation, is evidently observed and we find not a few instances in the opposite direction besides Quotation ⁽¹⁷⁾.⁽⁸¹⁾

Our Father *in heaven*, Thy name be hallowed... (Matt., 6.9)...⁽⁵⁰⁾

RSV: Our Father who art in heaven, Hallowed be thy name.

AV: Our Father which art in heaven, Hallowed be thy name.

Gk: Πατήρ ἡμῶν ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, ἁγιασθήτω τὸ ὄνομα σου.

With the crowds swarming round him he went on to say...(Luke, 11.29)...⁽⁵¹⁾

RSV: When the crowds were increasing, he began to say...

AV: And when the people were gathered thick together, he began to say...

Gk: Τῶν δὲ ὄχλων ἐπαθροισμένων ἤρξατο λέγειν...

...*penniless*, we own the world. (2 Cor., 6.10)...⁽⁵²⁾

RSV: ...as having nothing, and yet possessing everything.

AV: ...as having nothing, and yet possessing all things.

Gk: ...ὥς μηδὲν ἔχοντες, καὶ πάντα κατέχοντες.

In some of these instances, the *NEB* rendering is in effect rather close to the Greek construction, but of course it is "free" and independent of the original.

(81) *TLS* is inclined to attribute these to *NEB* translators' "predilection for variety." On the whole, however, it is reasonable to regard them as the outcome of the linguistic nature of *NEB*, even though the blame is not off the point considering such an extreme case as the 'Prologue to John': "The two phrases 'when all things began' and 'at the beginning' represent only one Greek phrase (ἐν ἀρχῇ) repeated; yet the translators have no hesitation in rendering it differently in adjacent verses." (*TLS*, p. 178.)

(VI)

It is far from my intention to assert that what has been discussed is the only prominent characteristic of the English employed in *NEB*. We observe, for instance, its frequent or favorite use of 'extrapositions' or the interchange of the conventional function of parts of speech, which is again attributable to the qualities of the colloquial English of today. Basically, however, it will be quite fair to set the above discussed tension between the two polarities as the general background of the individual grammatical features of *NEB*, because it typically represents the living phase of the present-day English, having something in common with the fundamental problem of the language—synthesis *or* analysis.

Thus we are now on the stage to proceed to the studies of the grammatical features of *NEB* as a representative judgement on the divergent usage in "the current speech of our own time." But, having spent too much space for this introduction, we had better leave it to another occasion, for it will be more properly done when we deal with the entire body of *NEB* after the forthcoming completion of its remaining parts, i. e., the Old Testament and the Apocrypha. And a full discussion on these matters will require sufficient pages to be spared to make references to the usage by the standard authors of the present century, so that, as a kind of interim report, we shall here only record at random some of the noteworthy points of *NEB* without due comments.⁽⁸²⁾

- a. My dear friend, you show a fine loyalty in everything that you do for *these our fellow-Christians*, strangers though they are to you. (3 John, 5)
cf. ...*this son of mine* was dead and has come back to life. (*RSV*: ...
this my son was dead, and is alive again.) (Luke, 15.24)
Your brother here was dead and has come back to life... (*RSV*: ...
this your brother was dead, and is alive...) (Luke, 15.32)

v. H. Sweet, *A New English Grammar*, II, p. 75.

- b. Men swear by *a greater* than themselves... (Heb., 6.16)
cf. ...what is here is greater than Solomon. (*RSV*: ...something greater
than Solomon is here.; *AV*: ...*a greater* than Solomon is here.) (Matt.,
12.42 & Luke, 11.31)

(82) Casual suggestion for reference books is added.

- ...beyond all dispute the lesser is always blessed by *the greater*.
(Heb., 7.7)
- v. S. Ichikawa, *Seisho no Eigo* (Grammatical Studies of the English Bible), p. 41.
- c. What shall I compare it *with*? (Luke, 13.18); What shall I compare the kingdom of God *with*? (Luke, 13.20)
- cf. *RSV*: And *to* what shall I compare it? (Luke, 13.18); *To* what shall I compare the kingdom of God? (Luke, 13.20)
...if the salt loses its saltiness, what will you season it *with*? (Mark, 9.50)
Where does he get it *from*? (Mark, 6.2); Where have you come *from*? (Mark, 19.9)
- d. Who is the liar? Who but *he* that denies that Jesus is the Christ? (1 John, 2.22)
- cf. ...on the stone will be written a new name, known to none but *him* that receives it. (Rev., 2.17)
- v. I. Hosoe, *Eibumpo Hanron* (An Outline of English Syntax), pp. 339-342.
- e. It is *I*; do not be afraid. (Matt., 15.27, Mark, 6.50 & John, 6.20); It is *I* myself. (Luke, 24.39)
Not *I*, surely? (Mark, 14.19); ...not *I*, indeed, but the grace of God working with me. (1 Cor., 15.10)
- cf. ...*he* it is who loves me. (John, 14.21); I am *he*. (John, 18.5, 6 & 8)
- v. O. Jespersen, *Essentials*, p. 176 & *MEG*, Pt. VII, p. 255.
- f. But *this much* I will admit. (Acts, 24.14)
- v. G. O. Curme, *Syntax*, p. 146.
- g. Why, as I have told you before, the place you have in our heart is such that, *come death, come life*, we meet it together. (2 Cor., 7.3)
- cf. *RSV*: ...for I said before that you are in our hearts, to die together and to live together.
- h. He moved that the men *be* put outside for a while. (Acts, 5.34)
- cf. *RSV*: ...[he] ordered the men to be put outside for a while.
- v. S. Potter, *Our Language*, p. 170.
- i. Come out of her, my people, *lest* you *take* part in her sins... (Rev., 18.4); Beware, then, *lest* you *bring* down upon yourselves the doom... (Acts, 13.40)
- cf. Fathers, do not exasperate your children, *for fear* they *grow* disheartened. (Coloss., 3.21); The soldiers thought they had better kill the prisoners *for fear that* any *should* swim away and escape. (Acts, 27.42); ...cruelty forced our ancestors to expose their children *so* that they *should not* survive. (Acts, 7.19); Go on your way while you

- have the light..., *so that* darkness *may not* overtake you. (John, 12.35)
- v. O. Jespersen, *Essentials*, p. 263.
- i. I *should* rather *like to* hear the man myself. (Acts, 25.22); We *should like to* hear from you what your views are... (Acts, 28.22); In saying this, we *should like* you to know, dear friends, how serious was the trouble... (2 Cor., 1.8)
- cf. Always treat others as you *would like* them to treat you... (Matt., 7.12); Which *would* you *like me to* release to you—Jesus Bar-Abbas, or Jesus called Messiah? (Matt., 27.17)
- v. O. Jespersen, *Essentials*, p. 284.
- k. Which is *the* more important, the gold, or the sanctuary...? (Matt., 23.17); Which is *the* more important, the offering, or the altar which sanctifies it? (Matt., 23.19)
- cf. *RSV*: For which is greater, the gold or the temple that has made the gold sacred? (Matt., 23.17); For which is greater, the gift or the altar that makes the gift sacred? (Matt., 23.19)
- Mercy, peace, and love be yours in * fullest measure. (Jude, 2); ...the place for ever reserved for them is * blackest darkness. (Jude, 13)
- l. 'Two men were in debt to a money-lender: one owed him five hundred silver pieces, the other fifty. As neither had anything to pay with he let them both off. Now, which will love him *most*?' Simon replied, 'I should think the one that was let off *most*.' (Luke, 7.41-43)
- cf. *RSV*: "A certain creditor had two debtors; one owed five hundred denarii, and the other fifty. When they could not pay, he forgave them both. Now which of them will love him *more*?" Simon answered, "The one, I suppose, to whom he forgave *more*."
- v. H. Saito, *Practical English Grammar*, p. 117.
- m. My father, if it is not possible for this cup to pass me by without *my drinking it*, thy will be done. (Matt., 26.42); 'Look,' said the eunuch, 'here is *water*: what is there to prevent *my* being baptized?' (Acts, 8.38); And she insisted on *our* going. (Acts, 16.15)
- v. O. Jespersen, *Essentials*, pp. 324-327.
- n. You know the commandments: "*Do not* commit adultery; *do not* murder; *do not* steal; *do not* give false evidence; honour your father and mother." (Luke, 18.20 cf. Matt., 19.18 & Mark, 10.19); For the commandments, 'Thou *shalt not* commit adultery, thou *shalt not* kill, thou *shalt not* covet'... (Rom., 13.9)
- o. Then he took a cup...and he *gave it to them*. (Mark, 14.23); Jesus now came up, took the bread, and *gave it to them*... (John, 21.13)
- cf. ...if you ask the Father for anything in my name, he will *give it to you*. (*RSV*: ...if you ask anything of the Father, he will *give it to*

you.; *AV*: Whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in my name, he will *give it you.*) (John, 16.23); I did not take it over from any man; no man *taught it me...* (Gal., 1.12)

v. Y. Inoue, *Eibeigo Yoho Jiten* (A Dictionary of English and American Usage), pp. 442-446.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

a. Texts

The New English Bible : New Testament (Library Edition). Cambridge University Press, 1961.

The New English Bible : New Testament (Popular Edition). Oxford University Press, 1961.

Revised Standard Version of the New Testament. New York, Thomas Nelson, 1946.

The New Testamant (The Received Greek Text together with the English Authorized Version). Cambridge University Press, 1929.

The New Testament in Modern Speech (tr. by R. F. Weymouth). London, James Clarke, c1960.

The Moffatt Translation of the Bible (tr. by James Moffatt). London, Hodder & Stoughton, 1957.

b. Reference Books

Curme, G. O. *Syntax*. Boston, D. C. Heath. 1931.

Daiches, David. *Literary Essays*. Edinburgh, Oliver & Boyd, 1956.

Fowler, H. W. *A Dictionary of Modern English Usage*. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1927.

Harasawa, Masaki. *Gendai Kogo Bumpo* (A Grammar of Modern Colloquial English). Tokyo, Kenkyusha, 1959.

Ichikawa, Sanki. *Seisho no Eigo* (Grammatical Studies of the English Bible). Tokyo, Kenkyusha, 1949.

Inoue, Yoshimasa. *Eibeigo Yoho Jiten* (A Dictionary of English and American Usage). Tokyo, Kaitakusha, 1960.

Jespersen, Otto. *A Modern English Grammar*, 7 vols. Copenhagen, Ejnar Munksgaard, 1949.

" *Essentials of English Grammar*. London, Allen & Unwin, 1959.

Kuranaga, Makoto. *Seisho to Eigo* (An Introduction to the Study of the English Bible). Tokyo, Taibundo, 1954.

Members of the Revision Committee (Weigle, Luther A., Chairman). *An Introduction to the Revised Standard Version of the New Testament*. New York, Thomas Nelson, 1946.

- Mencken, H. L. *The American Language*. New York, A. Knopf, 1938.
- Murry, J. M. *The Problem of Style*. Oxford University Press, 1952.
- Nakashima, Fumio. *Kindai Eigo to Sono Buntai* (Modern English and its Style). Tokyo, Kenkyusha, 1951.
- Nunn, H. P. V. *The Elements of the New Testament Greek*. Cambridge University Press, 1952.
- Otsuka, Takanobu, et. al. *The Kenkyusha English Grammar Series*, 3 vols. Tokyo, Kenkyusha, 1959.
- Palmer, Harold E. *A Grammar of Spoken English*. Cambridge, Heffer & Sons, 1955.
- Potter, Simeon. *Our Language*. Penguin Books, 1959.
- Read, Herbert. *English Prose Style*. London, G. Bell & Sons, 1956.
- Roberts, Paul. *Understanding Grammar*. New York, Harper & Brothers, 1954.
- Saito, Hidesaburo. *Practical English Grammar*. Tokyo, Kairyudo. 1951.
- Sweet, Henry. *A New English Grammar*, 2 vols. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1955.
- Wrenn, C. L. *The English Language*. Tokyo, Kenkyusha, 1954.

‘The New English Bible: Text and Meaning’ & ‘Language in the New Bible’,
The Times Literary Supplement, No. 3,082 (Friday, March 24, 1961).

Kuranaga, Makoto. ‘Saishinkan no THE NEW ENGLISH BIBLE’ (On the Recently Published *NEB*). *Eigokyoiku* (The English Teachers’ Magazine), Vol. X, No. 3 (June, 1961).

Shimizu, Mamoru. ‘New English Bible no Eigo’ (The English Language of *NEB*), *Eigoseinen* (The Rising Generation), Vol. CVII, No. 9 (September, 1961).

(Jan. 10, 1962)