

imperfectly in the Epistles. In the Psalms, therefore, a translation from the Vulgate presents the original at fourth hand, so to speak, the Hebrew having passed into a Greek version (often of very inferior quality), the Greek into a Latin, before the translation into English commenced. On the other hand, Jerome's own work is of great excellence. We may expect, therefore, that any correct reproduction of the Vulgate in English will be very faulty and imperfect in the Book of Psalms, but usually good and true in the greater part of the Old Testament. In the New Testament the case is more complicated. The Latin translation, being derived from manuscripts more ancient than any we now possess, is frequently a witness of the highest due in regard to the Greek text which was current in the earliest times and (as was remarked in an earlier chapter) its testimony is in many cases confirmed by Greek manuscripts which have been discovered or examined since the sixteenth century. Hence we may expect to find that the Rhemish New Testament frequently anticipates the judgment of later scholars as to the presence or absence of certain words, clauses, or even verses. Thus in Acts xvi. 7, there is now overwhelming evidence for reading "the Spirit of Jesus suffered them not;" in Matt. v. 44, the words "bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you," and the words "which despitefully use you and," should be omitted from the text, having found their way into later manuscripts from St. Luke's Gospel; and in 1 Peter iii. 15 we must read "Lord Christ" instead of "Lord God." In these and many other instances the Rhemish Testament agrees with the best critical editions of the present day. There are, no doubt, many examples of a different kind, such as the reading "*by good works* make your calling and election sure" (2 Peter i. 10); but, on the whole, the influence of the use of the Vulgate would in the New Testament be more frequently for good than for harm in respect of *text*. As a translation the Vulgate is, as a rule, literal and faithful, but often obscure: a correct reproduction of the Vulgate will reflect these qualities, and this the Rhemish Testament certainly does. If, however, we allow that this version faithfully represents the Latin, it must be understood that it is the Latin as current in the time of the translators. Even then it was acknowledged that the common copies of the Vulgate differed widely from Jerome's text, and the need of a new examination of manuscripts was felt as early as the Council of Trent. It was not until 1587 and 1592 that the authorised editions of the Vulgate appeared, and these were very far from supplying the want.

We now come to the consideration of the principles of action adopted by the translators. Having the Latin text before them, how did they deal with it? The answer may be given in a few words: the translation is literal and (as a rule, if not always) scrupulously faithful and exact, but disfigured by a profusion of unfamiliar and Latinised words which convey no meaning whatever to the ordinary English reader. The last peculiarity strikes the eye at the first opening of the volume. The translators argue skillfully in defence of their practice. If (they ask) such words as *Raca*, *Hosanna*, and *Belial* be retained, why not *Corbana* (for treasury, Matt. xxvii. 6)? If Sabbath is kept for the seventh day, why not *Parascene* for the Sabbath-eve? If Pentecost is a proper word, what objection is there to *Pascha* for Passover, *Azymes* for sweet (i. e., unleavened) bread, bread of proposition for shew-bread. If proselyte and phylacteries be allowed, why not *neophyte* and *didragmes*? It is not possible, they maintain, to avoid the word *evangelise*, for no word can convey its meaning; and for the same reason they use "*depositum*" in 1 Tim. vi. 20; he "*exinanited himself*" in Phil ii. 7; "to exhaust the sins of many" in Heb. ix. 28. On the other hand, the translator's care strictly to follow the text before him often led to happy results, the preservation of a significant phrase of the original or of an impressive arrangement of words. Thus every translator would now agree with this version in the words, "liberty of the glory of the children of God" (Rom. viii. 21); "holiness of the truth" (Eph. iv. 24); "by their fruits you shall know them" (Matt. vii. 16); If we turn to any chapter of the Gospels we shall find examples of excellent