

prepare a final copy for the Bible Union. The work, as a whole, is then to be examined by a convention of competent scholars, and, if approved, submitted to the Board and the Union for their adoption; and, if adopted by the Union, it will be stereotyped under the editorial supervision of a competent scholar, in order to secure the greatest possible accuracy, both in the translation and typography of the work.

I think it is not too much to expect, that a work made by good and learned men on such principles, and with such pains, will be worthy of the respect and patronage of all who read the English language or love the truth of God. And for the credit of the nation, rightly claiming a high degree of intelligence and candor, I cannot believe that the people of Great Britain and America will, for any considerable time, prefer from mere prejudice, or superstition, or the attachment of association, a faulty version of the Divine Word to one which is comparatively pure. If the Bible Union bring forth a corrected version, which is, as a whole, much superior to that of King James, I believe it will come into general use despite all opposition. But, however this may be, it is not for us to inquire. The work is evidently needed and demanded, and the time has come in Divine Providence for its accomplishment.

It is therefore our part to do the work and leave the consequences with God, who maketh even the wrath of man to praise him. Christians have nothing to fear in the path of duty. To do right and publish the truth, is always safe, and cannot but be followed with the best results. When the revision of our English version shall have been finished, the Bible Union will then turn their attention more to other languages, applying the same principle in the translation or revision of other versions; aiming to conform the translations of all lands to the divine original, to the extent of their means and opportunity; that the word of God may speak one voice to all nations.

Such translations of the Scriptures will prove the greatest blessing to the world. The ungodly will understand most distinctly, the doctrine of salvation when every word is addressed to them in their own tongue, with the greatest plainness and precision. And Christians will be most perfectly harmonized when all the precepts of the Bible are expressed in their own language without obscurity or ambiguity. Nothing has contributed more to introduce and foster the sectarian divisions which arise among the people of God from different views of Christian faith and practice, than unfaithful translations of the word of God. The Bible, as God gave it, is a bond of union, and a ground on which all true believers can meet and harmonize in their faith and practice. But the Bible, as men have made it, in some of their translations where obscurities and ambiguities, caused by unnecessary transfers, or erroneous translations, gives occasion for various and conflicting explanations to sustain their respective pre-conceived opinions.

The Bible, in such versions, prevents and destroys the union of the Christian church, and ministers rather to uphold and perpetuate these unholy dissensions. Let true believers take the Bible, fully and faithfully translated, as the only and all sufficient rule of their faith and practice, and many of the divisions which now exist would disappear forever; numerous sects and societies, which now conflict and war with each other, would unite in one bond of brotherhood to prosecute with one heart and one mind the same glorious work. It is a great mistake to suppose that any effort made in the love of the truth and of God, to render all the translations of the Bible uniform and pure, tend on the whole to strife and division. For truth in its purity is the only ground of permanent peace and perfect union.

It is then in view of the blessings which the Bible brings from God to man, that I feel so anxious to have it faithfully translated into every living language under heaven, and scattered broadcast over the face of the whole earth. It is for the salvation of the soul, the peace and purity of the church, and the honor of God, that I so much desire the correction, as far as possible, of every human addition, diminution, or concealment, which now mar the translations of God's holy word in many languages. It is because I solemnly believe that no other version of the sacred scriptures occupies so important a position in relation to

the church and the world, and no other is destined to exert so extensive, so permanent, and so mighty an influence, as the English version, that I cannot rest till I see its known and acknowledged errors corrected, or at least have done, what I can to promote this great work. Let me direct your thoughts to the circumstances under which and by reason of which, some of these errors were introduced into this version, and afterwards to the false views, in reference to matters of the most vital interest to the purity of the church, which have been thereby perpetuated.

INFLUENCE OF KING JAMES AND HIS BISHOPS UPON OUR VERSION.

The argument in favor of the Bible Union, arising from the consideration that those who are engaged in the work of preparing a faithful version of the Scriptures in our language under its auspices are, happily exempt from royal or ecclesiastical authority, has been often stated and its force acknowledged.

The honest enquirer after truth is insensibly led to contrast the present period with that in which our authorized translation was made. Having done so, when he is told that our English version cannot be called "in strict speech" King James' version, he can well understand how far the statement is true, and how far it is adapted to mislead an uninformed hearer by the erroneous inference which it suggests. He may have more difficulty in reconciling, with the obligations of truth and the facts of history the bold denial of the alleged influence of that monarch, both in the progress of the work, and in the measures taken to secure its currency when finally executed.

Without the indirect proof of that interference, visible in the rendering of so many important passages of our present translation, what stronger evidence can be required or furnished than is to be found in the letter of the King—July 22, 1604, addressed to Bancroft, Bishop of London, stating his appointment of the translators and enjoining upon him and the Bishops that whenever a living became vacant, "they should inform his majesty of it, that he might commend to the Patron, one of the said translators, as a fitting person to hold it as a reward for his service in the translation." We know that in accordance with the injunction contained in this letter, twelve of the translators obtained livings, shortly after the translation was completed.

Anderson in his "Annals of the English Bible," has a remark in this connection, which illustrates both the noticeable bias of that author whenever the part which the King bore in our translation is referred to, and also how even a good man may fail to see the truth, who looks at facts through the discolored medium of a theory.

In the early part of my life, I was a fellow student with him in the University of Edinburgh. When I revisited that city in 1839, he read to me some of his works, then in manuscript, with the view of proving to me that King James and his Bishops had very little to do in giving to the world our present English version of the Scriptures. In all that part of the work which treats of this version, this opinion is more conspicuous than any fairness in drawing inferences from the facts recorded. Many illustrations might be given, but the one we were about to cite concerning his statement of the appointment of the translators to the livings, as directed by the King, may suffice.

He says, "these appointments however it will be obvious, had occasioned no personal expense to his majesty, as they were simple casualties arising from death or otherwise which required to be filled up at all events."

Imagine a President of the United States, who had signified in writing to some subordinate officer a desire that whenever a place in his gift became vacant, certain persons might be appointed to fill it, as a reward for some service which moved the gratitude of the Executive. Imagine further that such places became vacant and that such persons were appointed to fill them; would we be satisfied with the reasoning, or hesitate to pronounce it inconclusive which should assure us that the President took no interest in the work performed by the individuals thus rewarded because the appointment thus conferred upon them "occasioned him no personal expense and required to be filled up at all events."

On the last day of the same month, Bancroft sent to Cambridge a copy of this communication together with a letter of instructions, presenting in detail the mode in

which the undertaking was to be conducted, and restricting the translators as to the translation of portions of God's Word from the exercise of all due fidelity, and so far forth, rendering nugatory the judgment and learning which it is claimed they brought to their task, whatever these may have been.

The following are the 3rd and 4th articles of these instructions.

"3rd. The old ecclesiastical words to be kept, as the word 'Church,' not to be translated, Congregation."

"4th. When any word hath divers significations, that to be kept which hath been most commonly used by the most eminent fathers, being agreeable to the propriety of the place, and the analogie of faith."

When some difference of opinion arose among the translators as to the manner of observing these instructions, Bancroft again wrote to them stating "that it was the royal wish that there should be three or four Divines of the University appointed as overseers of the translation, especially with the view of carrying out the 3rd and 4th Rules."

The reign of King James was not one in which a "royal wish" in any matter, civil or ecclesiastical, was lightly regarded.

What other despots have thought in their hearts or expressed in their acts, James embodied in language which stands an enduring memorial of the impious pretensions of the monarch by whom it was uttered, and of the servility of the hierarchy by which it was approved.

At the commencement of his reign, when journeying towards London, a pickpocket was taken in the crowd assembled in Newark to see his entrance, the King caused him to be hung without either trial or ceremony; and when it was intimated to him that such acts were contrary to the laws, he exclaimed to the Lords of his Council—"Do I make the Judges? Do I make the Bishops? Then by God's wounds I make what I like me, Law and Gospel."

On another occasion when giving vent to some similar outbreak of despotism, Bancroft declared "that his majesty spoke by the inspiration of God." Bancroft, let it be remembered was without much doubt the person indicated in the preface prefixed to our version as "the chief overseer and taskmaster of his majesty, to whom not only the translators, but the whole church was much bound." The confidential relation in which he stood to the King, as his organ of communication with the translators in the very outset of their task, and the important post he occupied as "chief overseer" during its progress, and at its completion he owed to his exalted notions of the King's prerogative and the extended authority, which he claimed for the dominant church in matters of conscience.

In his biographical History of England, Granger says, "Bancroft had the highest notions of church power that ever were entertained by any Protestant bishop, except Laud, and was a strenuous friend of the royal prerogative, in which he followed the dictates of his own conscience and the genius of the times. At the Conference held before the King, at Hampton Court, he delivered an oration full of the most abject flattery, comparing King James I. to Solomon for wisdom, Paul for learning, and Hezekiah for piety. He strove hard to establish Episcopacy in Scotland, and it may be said of this prelate, that he laid the foundation on which archbishop Laud raised a superstructure."

At the Hampton Court Conference, when Dr. Reynolds had made some remarks rather derogatory to the dominant power of Episcopacy, Bancroft appealed to the King, presiding, to silence the presumptuous Puritan. "May your majesty be pleased," said he, "that the ancient canon may be remembered, 'Schismatici contra episcopos non sunt audiendi.' [Schismatics are not to be heard against bishops.] And there is another decree of a very ancient council, that no man should be admitted to speak against that whereunto he hath formerly subscribed. And as for you, Dr. Reynolds, and your associates, how much are ye bound to his majesty's clemency, permitting you, contrary to the statute *primo Elizabethae*, so freely to speak against the liturgy and discipline established?"

Dr. Lillie when referring to Bancroft, says "James' overseer was Bancroft, Archbishop of Canterbury; and verily, like master like man. This man told the most learned of James' subjects, who had incurred the displeasure of the king and his bishops, by writing (not publishing) a few Latin verses, on the Popish practices of the Church of England, that he had committed a high misdemeanor and was even guilty of high treason; and it is history that this honor of his country was first sent to the Tower, and finally banished for life."

Aside from the special instructions by which they were fettered, our translators were not ignorant of the authority claimed by the King in matters of conscience. In his Basilicon Doran when speaking of the kingly function, he had declared that a principal part of it "consists in ruling the church, it belongs to him to judge when preachers wander from their text, and such as refuse to submit to his judgment in such cases ought to be capitally punished."

The works of James the First, published in 1616, a rare book, a copy of which is in one of our libraries in the city of New York, furnishes the most ample evidence of these pretensions.

Before leaving this branch of our subject, let the attention of the candid enquirer be given to a statement alluded to by Anderson in his work already mentioned. He says that the "learned Henry Jessey, being engaged for many years in critical enquiries, drew up an essay for the amendment of the last revision of the Bible, in connection with Mr. John Row, Professor of Hebrew and the Principal of the King's College, Aberdeen." In this essay, we are told, that one Dr. Hill declared in open assembly, that Bancroft "would needs have the version speak the prelatial language, and to that end altered it in fourteen different places, and that Dr. Miles Smith, one of the translators, complained of the Bishop's alterations, but said, 'he is so potent, there is no contradicting him.'"

PUBLICATION OF THE VERSION.

That King James' version was the only one allowed by royal authority to be publicly read in any congregation of the Established Church, does not admit of a reasonable doubt. It is true, that, Anderson, ventures the bold assertion, that, this version came into use in the Church, as well as among the people, on its own merits, without any interposition of the King. But this statement is disproved by the irrefragable facts of history. Dr. Reynolds first requested of the King, in the Hampton Court Conference, that a new translation of the Bible might be undertaken. (See Lewis's History, pp. 78, 79; also Fuller Book, X, p. 14.) "The King answered Dr. Reynolds, that he had never yet seen a Bible well translated into English; though he considered the Geneva translation the worst. He therefore wished that the most learned men in both the Universities would undertake the work; which when reviewed by the bishops might be presented to the Privy Council, and there receive the sanction of his authority; that so the whole national church might be bound to that translation, and not use any other." (See Archbishop Newcome's History, p. 92; also Bagster's Hexapla, p. 149.)

Here the King expresses his will, in regard to the new translation, without ambiguity. "The whole national church" was to be "bound to that translation." It was to be prohibited from using any other. Accordingly we find that when the version was first published, 1611, by Robert Barker, printer to the King, the title page bore these expressions: "revised by his Majesty's special commandment"—"appointed to be read in churches."

There could not be a more direct interposition of royal authority than the King's sanction of such a publication. For the King was the Head of the church, and no new version could be "appointed to be read in churches" without his authority, and he could not so authorize any version without excluding from the churches every other; as it was necessary that all the churches should use the same.

All this is placed beyond a reasonable doubt by the following well-known facts: 1. No version but that of King James was allowed to be printed in the British Realm, or imported from any foreign country, after the publication of the authorized version of 1611; so that the adoption of that version within a few years was not a question of merit and demerit, but a matter of necessity, with but a single alternative. It must be that or none. 2. Immediately after King James' version was published, the Bishops' Bible was laid aside, and the new one took

its place in the churches, which proves positively that the adoption of the new one so suddenly, was not the result of a favorable judgment upon its merits, or of necessity from the wearing out of the old Bibles, but of the authoritative appointment of King James.

On the whole, I am persuaded that, the man who undertakes to show, that, King James' version came into use in the Church of England gradually, by the independent force of its own merits, must be blinded to the most obvious facts of history, and regardless of the best established rules of reasoning.

Whatever may be said as to the extent of King James' patronage to the translators, it is an historical fact that on this account the monopoly of printing the version which came from their hands was long claimed as the exclusive prerogative of the crown. This monopoly by which Great Britain prohibited the printing of a Bible in her American colonies, still exists in the Universities of Cambridge and Oxford, and the Royal Printer in London.

FALSE VIEWS OF THE MINISTRY PERPETUATED BY ERRORS OF TRANSLATION.

THE restrictive rules under which the work was accomplished, have necessarily perpetuated certain errors of translation, that have greatly impeded the development of true ideas in relation to the church and the ministry.

Thus, for instance, the original Greek *diakonia*, properly denotes any service of the saints to the Lord and his church. Thus it is rendered in the following passages: "Martha was cumbered about much serving." "There was a murmuring, &c., because their widows were neglected in the daily ministrations."

"The disciples determined to send relief unto the brethren which dwelt in Judea."

"Touching the ministering to the saints it is superfluous for me to write you."

"I know thy works, and charity, and service."

In all these instances the Greek *diakonia* has no such meaning as that with which we technically invest the word "ministry;" but in the following instances, owing to confused notions, and the force of preconceived opinions, very many readers attach the technical, or clerical, idea to the original, which is still the same *diakonia*, from the root of which comes our English *deacon*.

"Shew whither of these two thou hast chosen that he may take part of this ministry and apostleship." That is of this service—service to God and his church. Again, "Say to Archippas take heed to the ministry which thou hast received in the Lord to fulfil it."

Had *diakonia* been translated service, it would far more faithfully have expressed the meaning of the original.

Archippas was known as one who was in some kind of service to the Lord, and to his people, but there is no evidence that service was preaching the gospel or the exercise of the pastoral office.

The fact is, any service and all service is ministry in the New Testament. There is not one indubitable instance in which it was a clearly clerical import.

The translators of the English Bible had a double task to perform—not only to give a version of the sacred Scriptures, but so to manage that version as not to disturb the ecclesiastical order of their own communion.

That this caution was part of their task, we know by historical record, for King James, as we have seen, "expressly commanded them not to change the old ecclesiastical words;" and in their preface attached to the larger Bible, they thus express themselves: "We have avoided the scrupulosity of the Puritans, who leave (abandon) the old ecclesiastical words and betake themselves to others."

The effect of this caution is most conspicuous in their management of the words "Bishop, Overseer, Deacon, Minister, &c.," in regard to which it would be easy to show that their retention was purely a matter of ecclesiastical polity, as the king, or rather the clergy, from whom he took his suggestions, saw clearly, that to preserve their church system intact, it was indispensable to preserve inviolate the technical terms on which the whole was founded.

They had too much sagacity not to perceive that the foundation of their church edifice would be terribly shaken, were the mass of Christian people to be left to suppose that the true scriptural Bishop was