

STRICTURES

ON THE REMARKS CONTAINED IN

"Papers relating to the Shanghae revision of the Chinese Scriptures."

A paper with the above title, dated "Shanghae, November 10th, 1851," has come into our hands. It has no signature, but we have reason to believe, that it is from the pen of the Rev. M. S. Culbertson. It is divided into two parts, the first containing "Notes on the translation of Genesis and Exodus," and the second, "Notes on the translation of Ephesians i. 3—23."

PART I.

"Notes on the translation of Genesis and Exodus."

Our names (Medhurst, Stronach, and Milne) are, in the paper alluded to, introduced as the authors of the said translation. It will be necessary, however, to note an inaccuracy into which the writer has fallen, in ascribing the translation to us only. The copy of the translation of Genesis and Exodus, which the writer has commented on, belonged to "the Committee of Delegates for the Revision of the Old Testament;" the names of those present at the preparation of it were Medhurst, Stronach, Milne, Bridgman, Shuck, and occasionally Culbertson. These Delegates met in August, 1850, and laboured on the revision until February 19th, 1851: during this time, they went through the Pentateuch as far as Deuteronomy, ch. ix. At this point, the Committee was broken up by the withdrawal of the three first named. On the dissolution of that Committee, it was distinctly stated that the translations executed together were not to be considered as the property of either party alone, but that each party might make what use of them they pleased in their separate efforts to translate the Scriptures. The two parties into which the Committee separated then resolved to go on alone, and severally proceeded to revise what had been prepared. Thus it appears, that the translations, in existence at the separation, were sanctioned by neither party; and Messrs. Bridgman, Shuck and Culbertson, as forming part of the Committee previous to the separation, might as well be charged with any improprieties found in those papers as Messrs. Medhurst, Stronach, and Milne. The papers belonged to nobody, and nobody was responsible for them, unless subsequently adopted. Mr. Culbertson, as a member of the Committee of Delegates, though attending but a short time, had a right to use the papers, but not for the purpose of condemning a portion of the Committee for anything contained in them. If

he intended to criticize the translations publicly, and, by so doing, to reflect on Messrs. Medhurst, Stronach, and Milne, it was his duty to ask them, if they sanctioned the papers to be commented on, as their own. He did not do this, and has thus been rash enough to condemn men for that, for which they are not responsible ; and (as will appear in the sequel) to find fault, where no fault is to be found. As before observed, both parties immediately after the separation proceeded to revise, and alter what had been previously done ; and it so happens, that, out of the numerous passages commented on in the notes before us, about one half have been altered a year ago ; while the criticisms on the other half will appear, on examination, to have been for the most part frivolous and ill-founded.

Here it may be remarked, that, of all the members of the Committee of Delegates, Mr. Culbertson ought to have been *the last* to come forward in criticizing what had been done by the others. He had been in attendance scarcely one month out of the six, during which the Committee sat, and therefore could not have been aware of the objections made by the assembled Chinese teachers to the rendering of certain passages, of the difficulties which the Committee felt in their work, or of the reasons which ultimately led them to the adoption of particular renderings. He was also the youngest student of Chinese amongst the number, and had had no experience whatever in the work of translation. But, whatever may be thought of his qualifications, he has thrown down the gauntlet, and it remains for us to see how he will acquit himself in the contest. Reserving what we have to say on Mr. Culbertson's attack on the translation of the New Testament, until we come to the second part, we shall begin with his "notes on the translation of Genesis and Exodus."

Under this head, he comments on some of the principles of translation, which appear to him to have been acted on in the translation of the above-named books. Some misgivings seem to have crossed his mind, however, in his statement of the principles adopted by the translators, for he says, "all these principles are not absolutely inadmissible ;" implying that some of them *are* admissible, though, in his estimation, they have been applied to too great an extent. The principles in question, he adduces from the practice of the translators, one of which he says, is—

1. "The pronoun is frequently substituted for the noun."

At the original meeting of the Protestant Missionaries in Hongkong, in 1843, (a year before Mr. Culbertson came to China,) it was resolved, "that the interchange of the noun and pronoun be allowed, when deemed necessary by the translators." This resolution was unanimously agreed to, and sanctioned by the Bible Society.

Under this head, the objector remarks "that the substitution of the pronoun for the noun generally consists, in the style of these translators, in leaving it to be supplied by the reader : e. g. in Genesis ii. 4, 5, the proper name of Jehovah is left out in two instances." Here we may observe that, in the rough draught left unfinished by the Committee of Delegates, the word Jehovah was omitted ; but, had the

objector waited until he had seen our revision, executed last March, he would have found the proper name supplied in both the above instances. Another practice ascribed by him to the translators, is—

2. "That where figures of speech occur, which are foreign to the Chinese habits of thought, they are sometimes dropped altogether, and sometimes others are substituted in their room."

We may observe, that the license here adverted to, is allowed to all translators, and without it, no translation could be rendered intelligible. The authors of the English version have availed themselves of it in innumerable instances. See a notable one in Isaiah 5 : 1. Also Genesis 1 : 20, where "open firmament" is put for "face of the firmament ;" 7 : 11, where "windows" is put for "floodgates ;" 8 : 3, where "continually" is put for "going and returning ;" 16 : 2, where "obtain children by her" is put for being "builded by her ;" 16 : 6, where "pleaseth thee" is put for "is good in thine eyes ;" 17 : 12, where "eight days old" is put for "a son of eight days ;" 19 : 21, where "thee" is put for "thy face ;" 22 : 17, where "shore" is put for "lip ;" 29 : 1, where "went" is put for "lifted up his feet ;" 30 : 30, where "since my coming" is put for "at my foot ;" 31 : 20, where "unawares to" is put for "the heart of ;" 34 : 26, where "edge" is put for "mouth." 43 : 7, where "tenor" is put for "mouth ;" 48 : 16, where "let them grow into a multitude" is put for "let them grow as fishes do increase ;" Exodus 10 : 5, where "face" is put for "eye." The instances adduced by the objector, viz. Genesis 49 : 10, Exodus 7 : 1, Genesis 50 : 19, will be afterwards alluded to, when we come to that part of his paper, in which he has noticed them more fully.

He himself allows that "the practice *may* be sometimes admissible, but it should be the exception, not the rule, and the principle should be applied with reserve and caution." So then it *may* be done, only we must be careful not to do it too frequently and incautiously. Does the objector lay claim to all the caution which exists in the world ? can he not allow others to have a little of it ? The simple state of the case is, it should be done where it is necessary, but who is to be the judge of that necessity,—those who are more, or those who are less, experienced in the work of translation into Chinese ?

3. Another practice, ascribed by him to the translators, is that "plain and simple expressions are sometimes amplified, and qualifications added, where there are none in the text ; if the Chinese sentence can thus be improved." It is difficult to judge of the propriety of this practice without having the instances before us ; the references to which the objector alludes, as illustrating this head, are Genesis 43 : 31, and Exodus 18 : 9, which we shall comment upon in due course.

4. In commenting further upon the practice of the translators, he says that "the anthropomorphism employed when speaking of God, is in some cases laid aside, and an explanation put in its place." The objector says, "this is done in some cases by the Chinese translators," and so we may add, it is done in *some* cases by every trans-

lator, the authors of the authorized English version not excepted. Genesis 38: 10, "It displeased the Lord," is put for "it was evil in the eyes of the Lord." Exodus 6: 8, "I did swear" is put for "I did lift up my hand," alluding to Jehovah; 9: 28, "mighty thunderings" is put for "voices of God;" 17: 16, "the Lord hath sworn" is put for "the hand upon the throne of the Lord." The degree to which it ought to be done, must be judged of by the necessities of the place, and the genius of the language into which the translation is made. When the passages adduced by the objector, come to be considered, viz. Exodus 20: 5. 24: 11, we shall see how far the anthropomorphism is laid aside.

5. Among the practices of the translators, he specifies that "when expressions are represented as having been employed in conversation, between superiors and inferiors, which the Chinese would not regard as respectful, others are substituted more in accordance with Chinese usage." This has very rarely been done by the translators. An instance of it is found in Genesis 41: 16, where Joseph, having been just taken out of prison, and appearing for the first time before Pharaoh, is represented as using "your servant" instead of "I." This however was not done "in order to represent the scriptural custom as the same with those of the Chinese," as the objector suggests; for it was a very common practice among the Hebrews, to employ this mode of speech. Gesenius says that, in addressing superiors, the Hebrews from modesty or humility were accustomed to call themselves servants, see Genesis 18: 3. 19: 19, &c.

The other passage, adduced by the objector, as illustrative of this practice, viz. Exodus 8: 9, where "the king is said to be used instead of "thou," is taken from the rough draught made by "the Committee of Delegates," but it has been already altered in our revision made a year ago.

6. Another practice ascribed to the translators, is, "where two clauses occur in juxtaposition, which express the same, or nearly the same idea, one of them is omitted." The passages adduced by the objector, Genesis 2: 1, 3, and 7: 15, 16, as illustrative of this practice, will be commented on in due course. We may remark, however, in passing, that it is by no means uncommon for translators to omit portions of the text, where they do not add to the sense, or would encumber the style in the translation. The authors of the authorized English version have done it in the following instances: Genesis 1: 4, the word "between" is twice omitted; 7: 22, "the breath of life" is in the Hebrew, "the breath of the spirit of life;" 13: 8, the word "men" is omitted before "brethren;" 25: 30, the word "red" occurs twice in the original and only once in the version; 27: 33, the word "tremble" occurs twice in the original, and only once in the version; 29: 14, "a month of days" in Hebrew is rendered "the space of a month" in English; 31: 2, "as yesterday and the day before" is cut down to "as before" in the English version; 43: 16, "kill a killing" is simply "slay" in English; 45: 5, "neither let there be anger in your eyes," is rendered "be not angry with your-

selves ;" 47 : 8, "how many are the days of the years of thy life ?" is in English "how old art thou ?" Exodus 4 : 9, "shall be" is repeated in the Hebrew and not in the English ; 10 : 8, "who" occurs twice in the Hebrew, and only once in English ; 12 : 6, "between the two evenings," is simply "in the evening" in our English version. We are aware that an objection lies against these quotations, that they only refer to the omission of words and not of clauses ; but we may reply that the principle is the same, and the genius of languages differs so much, that translators into one may require a greater license than those translating into another. Only let care be taken that the sense be fully given, without the omission of a single idea, and the translator has in this respect fulfilled his duty.

7. Among the practices of the translators, the objector enumerates "where the text alone, literally rendered, might not be plain to the Chinese, an explanatory clause is introduced." The first instance of this kind adduced by the objector, Genesis 38 : 23, will be commented on in its place. In the second, Genesis 50 : 6, 7, the objector has only had the rough draught before him, which has been altered in our revision a year ago. The principle of adding to the text for the sake of making a passage plain to the reader in a translation, is one of very common application. Take, the following, for instance, out of many from the English version : Genesis 1 : 30, "I have given" is added ; 17 : 16, "a mother" is added ; 24 : 46, "a shoulder" is added ; 25 : 8, "of years" is added ; 25 : 30, "pottage" is supplied.

8. Among the practices of the translators, the objector enumerates "where a passage is obscure, involved, or overloaded, a new sentence is sometimes constructed, briefly embodying the same general idea." The passages adduced by the objector will be considered below. The licence is, however, one which must be allowed to translators. It has been assumed by the authors of the English version. See Genesis 33 : 14, where the passage "I will lead on softly according to the foot of the work which is before me, and according to the foot of the children ;" is changed into English, "I will lead on softly according as the cattle that goeth before me, and the children be able to endure."

We shall now take the remarks of the objector, and answer them, in the order in which he has placed them.

I. Alleged "instances in which some word, or words, of the original are unjustifiably *omitted* in the translation."

1. Genesis ii. 1, 3. The objector says, that the second clause of verse 2, "and he rested on the seventh day from all his work which he had made," with the exception of the word "rested" is omitted. The two clauses of the second verse, when taken together, convey the idea that God finished his work, that he rested, and that he did this on the seventh day. "His work which he had made," is a Hebraism for "his work ;" this phrase occurs twice in the text, but the idea conveyed thereby is the same ; there is nothing intensive in the repetition, and, were it repeated in the translation, no clearer idea would be given of the writer's meaning, than would be afforded by a

single statement. The repetition in Chinese would in fact obscure the sense, which, to Chinese readers, is made exceedingly clear by the statement, "on the seventh day, God finished his work, and rested."

In the 3rd verse, the objector complains that the words "which God created and made," are not added to the words "his work." They were not added, as not tending to clearness in Chinese, but *the contrary*. In English, they appear to be pleonastic.

2. Genesis vii. 15, 16. The objector complains, that the first half of verse 16, is dropped as useless. To this it may be replied, that the idea is fully expressed in verse 15. The two verses have been put together in the translation, and the meaning of the two is fully expressed, without the omission of a single idea. This has been done to avoid the repetition of merely synonymous words, which in Chinese only burthen the sentence and obscure the sense; after having said that "all flesh male and female entered in," would it have added to the sense, to say "and they that went in, went in male and female of all flesh?"

3. Genesis xxiii. 5, 6. "And the children of Heth answered Abraham, saying," the objector says, is compressed into three words, "the Hittites said." This we cannot help regarding as mere trifling.

He complains that the last clause of the 6th verse is omitted. It had been already said, "no man will forbid you to bury in the best of our burial grounds;" what further idea could have been conveyed, by saying "Thou mayest bury thy dead in our sepulchres?" He further observes that the word "withhold" is rendered by us "forbid." To which we reply that the word "withhold" in our English version is rendered by Gesenius "prohibit;" so also by Dathe.

4. Genesis xxvii. 34. The objector complains that the words "of his father" and "unto his father" are omitted. To which it may be replied that the sentence, as it stands in our translation, "Esau having heard these words," means the "words of his father;" the pronoun being used instead of the noun. The word "said," further on, means of course, "said to his father." This is perfectly intelligible to the Chinese, and the objector ought to have known it. The objector also complains that the pronoun "me" is not repeated. But the repetition of the pronoun "me" would not have rendered the sentence more emphatic in Chinese: indeed it could not have been inserted twice, without repeating the verb, for which, upon the principles of the objector, there is no authority. Our English translators have been obliged to insert the word "even," in order to get the pronoun in twice.

5. Genesis xxx. 25. The objector complains that the word "return" is all that we have for the clause, "that I may go unto my own place and to my country." To which we may reply that the word "to return," in Chinese, means "to return to one's place." In the first draught of the version executed by the combined Committee of Delegates, the words "and to my country" were not expressed; on revising the translation, a year ago, we added the words in question. Had the objector waited until our work was

given out, he would have found his objection obviated. But his haste to pounce upon something to find fault with, has led him into the mistake of attacking a shadow.

6. Genesis xxxix. 19. The objector complains of the omission of the words "which she spake unto him, saying, After this manner did thy servant to me." On the revision of this passage a year ago, this omission was supplied. Had the objector not been so precipitate, he would have found his objection obviated without any need of complaint. We may observe, however, that, if the words in question had not been added, the sense would have been fully expressed. (See Dathe)

The objector says, when speaking of this passage, "Here again, Moses writing by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, is accused of inserting a useless clause, and it accordingly disappears in the translation." This is a style of language unbecoming a sober writer. Let it be applied to our English translators, in every word and clause which they have not thought it conducive to perspicuity to express, and what a host of accusations might they not be said to have brought against inspired writers of inserting useless clauses!

7. Genesis xlix. 26. The objector complains that the phrase "crown of the head" is omitted: to which we may reply, that "the crown of the head" is merely a poetical phrase for "the head," and may be expressed by the repetition of the word "head," or omitted, if required by the idiom of the language, without injury to the sense.

He objects further, that the descriptive designation of Joseph, "was separated from his brethren," has been turned into a cold historical statement that "Joseph went far from his brethren." We cannot help regarding this as sheer trifling. What is the difference between "Joseph's being removed from his brethren" (which is the sense of the Chinese version rendered into English,) and "Joseph's being separated from his brethren"?

8. Exodus xvii. 16. The objector says that this verse is rendered in our version, "for he said, because the hand of Amalek has been against Jehovah, therefore He will war with him through endless generations," and complains that the translators have cut the Gordian knot, by omitting the word, by some rendered "throne" and by others "banner," which he calls "*an apax legomena*!" Our English version, which he says he quotes as sufficient for his present purpose in pointing out the variations from the original, has also cut the Gordian knot, by translating the phrase in question "hath sworn."

II. We come to alleged "instances of unwarrantable additions to the text."

1. Genesis xxix. 11. The objector complains that we have rendered this verse "was to the utmost degree rejoiced and shed tears." On which we may observe, that the Chinese phrase, translated "was to the utmost degree rejoiced and shed tears," should have been rendered in English "he rejoiced to that degree, that he

shed tears." The tears shed on this occasion are said by the translators to have been tears of joy, which no doubt they were. The idea of *joy* was expressed in the Chinese version, because, were it omitted, the Chinese reader would have got the impression that the tears shed were those of *sorrow*, and thus have mistaken the inspired writer's meaning. The addition is so exceedingly unimportant, that we cannot help wondering at any remark being made upon it.

He complains further, that we have omitted the phrase "he lifted up his voice," and conveyed the idea of *silent* instead of *loud* weeping. To which we may reply, that the phrase, "lifting up the voice," is said by Gesenius to be pleonastic. The Hebrew phrase, "to weep," is derived from one which signifies to distil, and thus means to shed tears.

2. Genesis xxxviii. 23. The objector complains that the words, "*seek her in all directions*," have been added. The words were added to prevent a misconception. Without them, the Chinese reader would have thought that the woman's taking away the pledge would have added to their shame; whereas it was the making inquiries after the supposed harlot, that would have added to their shame.

The objector does not deny that the addition might have been helpful to Chinese readers. An English translator (thinking it needful to supply such a clause,) would have put it in italics; but we have no italics in Chinese.

His remarks, about "its being exceedingly difficult to prove that Judah ever used the language ascribed to him," are frivolous in the extreme. One might also say, that it would be exceedingly difficult to prove that Laban ever used the word "tarry," in his speech to Jacob, in Genesis xxx. 27. But such trifling objections are almost beneath notice. The next phrase said to be added, "what shall we then do?" which did appear in the rough copy executed by the combined Committee of Delegates, has been already omitted in our revision completed a year ago.

3. Genesis xliii. 31. "Set on bread," the objector says is a single Hebrew word in the original: it is however two, which Gesenius renders "set on food;" or, in other words, "lay the table." The phrase employed in the translation is its equivalent in Chinese. For the rendering, "spread out the carpet and arrange the entertainment," the objector has quoted Mr. Medhurst's translation of the "1,000 character classic." In that work, which was made nearly twenty years ago, and designed as a sort of vocabulary, to illustrate the correspondence between certain words in the Chinese and Korean languages, it was necessary to give every word literally. Morrison says, that the word rendered "carpet" means originally "mat," and hence feast, &c. The meaning would thus be "spread the feast and arrange the entertainment."

4. Genesis xlix. 4. "Your numerous lusts were like the bubbling up of water." The objector, commenting upon this rendering of ours, observes that this may be the correct sense of the passage; but he says, there is nothing in the text for "numerous

lusts." We give the words of Gesenius. "Reuben! a boiling up of water art thou: i. e. thou didst boil up like water, with lust and passion: referring to his incest." The objector complains that the Chinese translation has cut off all other interpretations. Why? because it has assigned a *definite* meaning to the phrase? So, we may add, does the English version.

The last clause "he went up to my couch," which the objector says is omitted, is sufficiently expressed by the previous phrase "went up to his father's couch."

The objector complains that a Chinese commentator on the version under consideration, would think the passage a very plain one. We think this a high commendation, and only wish that, when the objector undertakes to write in Chinese, he may succeed as well.

5. Exodus iv. 24, 25. The objector renders our translation of this passage thus: "Jehovah wished to place him (Moses) in deathly circumstances. [*lit.* death-place, i. e. circumstances tending to death.]" and says that it is a softening of the phrase "Jehovah sought to kill him." We wonder whether the objector would consider the "being put to death," (which is the meaning of the Chinese phrase,) a lenient method of killing. He says further, that the expression "putting in a death-place" means to put one in a place where death would ensue, as for instance by starvation. We would refer him to the well-known passage in Mencius, where a Chinese king, on seeing an ox going to be slaughtered, pities his going to "deathly circumstances." Does he think the ox was going to be starved to death?

In a note, the objector relents, and thinks the phrase not "very objectionable."

The objector complains that the words "there being no alternative" have been added in the Chinese version. But, had he waited for the revision executed a year ago, he would have found no such words; so that the parade he makes about "the text not being the place for explanatory glosses," is in this instance thrown away.

The objector complains that we have "cruel husband," instead of "bloody husband." A "bloody" husband is translated by Dathe *cruentus*, which means bloody, blood-thirsty, cruel.

6. Exodus xxxii. 23. Here the objector complains that we have rendered "make us gods," by "make for us images of God;" and asks "by what authority is the word *image* inserted here?" We reply, by the authority of Gesenius who, under the word *Elohim* B. 2. quoting Exodus xxxii. 1, says, that *Elohim* means "an idol," or in other words, an image. Robinson, in his Greek and English Lexicon, under *Theos*, d. says, that *Theos* is used by metonymy for "an image, an idol," quoting Acts vii. 40, where the passage in dispute is referred to. In an edition of the Delegates' version in Chinese, printed at Ningpo by the Presbyterian Mission, and sent to us with the compliments of M. S. Culbertson himself, the passage in Acts above referred to, has the word "image" inserted. So that, we can plead the practice of the objector as an authority, who, although he

says that "*make us Shang-ti* would be nonsense to the Chinese, but *Shin* requires no such adjunct;" yet has dared in that passage to print the words "*make us an image of Shin!*" This he was not necessitated to do, because, by the Resolution of the Delegates, passed August, 1850, the said Delegates released themselves from any responsibility with respect to the rendering of the words *Theos* and *Pneuma*, and threw upon the Bible Societies of Europe and America, and upon all and every one of the Protestant Missionaries at present engaged, or who may hereafter be engaged in the work of evangelizing China, all the responsibility of any action with respect to the version then offered to them.

The objector says "it was felt that to say '*make us Shang-ti*' (God) would be nonsense to the Chinese. '*Shin*' (spirit) requires no such adjunct, because it answers so exactly to Elohim in such a connection." We believe, that our knowledge of Chinese is not inferior to that of the objector, and our native assistants are men of acknowledged ability. And we can fearlessly assert as the result of our knowledge, supported by the testimony of our teachers, that to say '*make us Shin*' would be as much nonsense to the Chinese, as to say '*make us Shang-ti*.' The assertion of the objector that it would not, we consider a controversial untruth.

III. We next proceed to comment on alleged "instances in which unjustifiable liberty is taken in altering the *form of expression*, and often the *sense*, of the original."

1. Genesis xix. 11. The objector says that the word "blind" has been rendered by "blurr-eyed and dull of vision," which he explains to mean "that kind of blindness at most which results from having something in the eyes."

Bush, on the passage, says, "The judgment undoubtedly consisted *not* in a total privation of sight, but in a confused vision, that prevented their seeing anything distinctly or steadily." The Chinese word, though originally meaning "blindness occasioned by dust getting into the eye," has come to mean indistinctness of vision generally, and we believe is a better rendering of the word in the original, than our English word "blind."

He complains further, that the clause, "they wearied themselves to find the door" has been translated by us, "they could not find the door." The Hebrew word translated "wearied themselves" is rendered by Gesenius, with reference to this passage, "to labour in vain, not to be able;" which has been exactly followed in the Chinese version.

2. Genesis xxii. 2. The objector, having had nothing before him, but the rough draught executed by the combined Committee of Delegates, complains of the rendering of this verse. Had he waited, however, until he had seen the revision which we made a year ago, he would have found the passage as closely translated as could have been accomplished in intelligible Chinese. That revision, rendered into English, reads thus: "Take thy son by thy wife, which is only one, Isaac, whom thou lovest, and go into the land of Moriah," &c.

3. Genesis xxvii. 46. The objector has again prematurely found

fault with the rendering of this verse, without waiting to see our revision accomplished a year ago.

He remarks, that "there has been no attempt to give the words of Rebekah, but simply the tenor of her remarks as understood by the translators." To give, in the language into which a version is made, the tenor, or sense conveyed by the words of an author, is we conceive the main object of every translator: to give Rebekah's words, or any other words exactly, independent of idiom, would frequently have to be done at the expense of the sense.

4. Genesis i. 19. The objector complains that the words, "Am I in the place of God?" are changed into "To recompense belongs to God. Does it belong to me?"

Bush remarks on this passage, "These words seem to signify that God is to be regarded as the great avenger of sin, and that Joseph was not so presumptuous, as to put himself in the place of Him to whom vengeance belongeth."

5. Exodus iv. 13. The objector finds fault with the phrase, "I pray thee send another man," used instead of "send by the hand of him whom thou wilt send."

Dathe renders it "*Mitte quemcumque alium.*" Schröder says, "*Mitte alium quemlibet.*" Hewlett says, "The interpretation given to this passage by the Septuagint, and by the Chaldee paraphrase is, "Send by some other person, or choose some other person, whom thou mayest send."

6. Exodus vii. 1. The objector has found fault with this passage, as it stood in the rough draught prepared by the combined Committee of Delegates, before he knew what was about to be given forth by us. In our revision last year, we rendered this verse: "Jehovah said to Moses, I have set you to be a ruler of Pharaoh, as God's vicegerent; and I have constituted Aaron to be a prophet to declare my words, as your substitute."

Kimchi says, that "the word Elohim is here used in the sense of judicial power:" and Grotius defines the sense to be, "Moses was so situated, that he might exercise divine judgments upon Pharaoh, as the king of the king."

7. Exodus xviii. 9. The objector complains that we have rendered, "*all the goodness*" by "special kindness," and have added the word "*exceedingly*" to "rejoice." He admits, however, that it produces a smooth sentence. We had anticipated that something worthy the attention of the Directors of Bible Institutions would have been brought forward, and not such frivolous remarks as these. What is the difference between *goodness* and *kindness*, and what harm in representing Jethro's joy as a little more than usual, if the sentence be after all idiomatically expressed?

8. Exodus xxiii. 21. The objector translates the Chinese version, "My messenger having come, that is, I having come." He should have rendered the passage: "When my messenger comes, it is the same as if I came." The phrase "*my name is in him*" is difficult of interpretation. Gesenius says, it means "for my name

(divinity) is in him." Schröder translates it "*instar mei est.*"

The objector says, that no one can be sure that the translators have given the true sense. It appeared to them doubtless the true one; and, if men are not to translate a phrase, until they can be *sure* that they give the true sense, they must leave a great portion of the Scriptures untranslated.

In reply to the question of the objector, "is it not evident that it is not the true sense?" he may be referred to the authorities above given. In the Chinese translation objected to, it is not affirmed that the speaker said, "he would send himself," as the objector insinuates.

9. In remarking on our rendering of Exodus xxxiii. 18—23. the objector thinks that the Chinese phrase, "that I may see it with my own eyes" may be literally rendered, "that my eyes may be smitten," thereby shewing that he does not comprehend the Chinese expression. It really means "that my eyes may light upon (your glory)." Morrison renders the phrase "to see with one's own eyes."

In his rendering of our Chinese version into English, he has represented us as saying, "Whom I pity, [do you] pity them; on whom I have compassion, [do you] compassionate them." It will be observed, however, that he has been obliged to put the words [do you] in brackets, intimating that they are supplied by himself, and do not appear in our version. To make the phrase read as he has rendered it, these words ought to have been supplied in the Chinese. They have not been supplied; and the sense attached to the phrase, as it now stands, is "whom I pity, I pity; whom I compassionate, I compassionate;" any Chinese scholar reading the passage in its connection, would not misunderstand it.

Under the head of alterations, the objector includes "those cases in which the figures used in the original are, (as he says,) without sufficient reason, dropped or changed."

Before proceeding to the consideration of the instances adduced by him, we may remark that the objector himself implies that the figures used in the original *may* be dropped or changed, if *sufficient reason* can be shown for so doing. The question resolves itself then into a case of degree: the thing may be done, but not to the extent to which he thinks it has been done, or "without sufficient reason." Who then is to be the judge of the extent to which licence may be given to translators, or of the validity of the reasons which they urge for availing themselves of the said licence?—the objector, who has evidently shown himself ignorant of the requirements of the Chinese language?—or more experienced men, who are more likely to be acquainted with the real difficulty of rendering Hebrew idioms into idiomatic Chinese? Any unprejudiced person would undoubtedly say the latter.

Genesis xlviii. 15. The objector complains that the words, "two sons," are inserted after Joseph. He cannot deny that the persons blessed were the two sons, because, in the 14th verse, Jacob is said to have laid his hands on the heads of Ephraim and Manasseh; and, in the 16th verse, Jacob in his prayer said "Bless the lads:" yet

he says, "Joseph was blessed *in* his two sons." We conceive, however, that it would be extremely difficult to bring out that idea in Chinese; and to say directly "Jacob blessed Joseph," would lead the Chinese reader to imagine that *Joseph* was blessed, not his sons.

He complains further, that the figure "before whom they walked" is changed into "whom they served." This phrase is rendered by Schröder and Dathe "*colere*." Bush says, it means a uniform course of holy obedience. If the sentence were literally rendered in Chinese, it would not convey the sense intended.

Genesis xlix. 21. The objector complains that, in our translation, the hind to which Naphtali is compared, is said to have uttered "a joyful sound" instead of "goodly words." Does he believe that the sacred writer intended to say, that a hind is capable of uttering articulate sounds, or, does it not rather mean, that a hind let loose, utters a cry of joy, in which respect Naphtali resembled that animal?

Exodus xx. 5. The objector complains that, for the phrase "I am a jealous God" has been substituted a translation which he terms paraphrastic, and renders "I will not permit you to pair another god with me," but which we translate thus, "I will by no means permit any other god to be put on a par with me." He does not say, whether he considers incorrect the idea suggested by what he calls the paraphrase; nor does he state what Chinese term he thinks ought to be put in its place. The translators were obliged to render the passage as they have done, because the Chinese language does not contain any single term to express the idea of being intolerant of a rival, as it regards the feeling of superiors towards their inferiors. The words, generally employed by former Chinese translators, express the idea of jealous, mean, envious, spiteful and malignant, which epithets could not be attributed to the Deity.

Gesenius says that the Hebrew word, when spoken of God, means "impatient of a rival." Castalio and Dathe translate it "*impatiens socii*." Rosenmüller has "*impatiens perfidiæ*."

The objector complains further, that the phrase "visiting iniquities" is not rendered literally, but by a term which signifies "afflicting with calamities." Gesenius, quoting this phrase, says, "visiting" means "punishing." Schröder, Dathe and Rosenmüller say the same. The Chinese word employed means to punish, or visit with calamity.

The objector says again, that "the Chinese would not learn (from our version), that children were to suffer for the sins of their fathers." To which it may be replied, that they would learn it as much from the Chinese version, as the Hebrews did from the original: see Dathe's mode of rendering the passage.

Exodus xxiv. 11. The objector complains, that "elders" have been put for "nobles." The Hebrew word means "principal men," which the Chinese word "superiors" well represents.

He complains further, that the phrase "he laid not his hand upon them," has not been translated literally; but by a phrase meaning "no

injury or calamity came upon them." Hewlett says, that this phrase means "he did not hurt them;" Dathe translates "without danger to their lives." It is the same phrase that is used in Genesis xxii. 12. where the sense is "to hurt." Were the phrase rendered literally in Chinese, it would not convey the sense intended.

Genesis xiii. 10. The objector complains that in the Chinese version, Zoar has been wrongly said to be "in Egypt." He has had before him only the rough draught, made by the united Committee of Delegates; but, had he waited till he had seen our revision, made a year ago, he would have seen that there was no ground for objection on this ground. He finds fault with the word used in the Chinese version for "compare," which he says, means "mutually to fly up and down." His only objection, however, is,—not that it is wrongly employed in the case in question; but that it is found in the Chinese Book of Odes. The expression is well known to Chinese readers, none of whom would think it strange or misapplied. If we must not use a suitable Chinese phrase, because it happens to be contained in one of the classics, we shall be greatly circumscribed in our choice of phrases. The objector ventures to assign a motive to the translators, which he cannot be sure influenced them; he calls it an "attempt to make the work classical." Perhaps he would complain of us, if we were to assign as a motive for his referring to the Book of Odes, that it was an attempt to display his own familiarity with the Chinese classics.

The objector adds some cases of what he calls "palpable mistranslation." For instance, Genesis xviii. 4. where he says, that Abraham's guests were to wash their own feet; whereas the Chinese translators have represented Abraham as saying: "Permit me to take a little water and wash your feet." Bush, explaining this passage, says, "wash your feet; that is, have them washed; for this was performed by servants, and not by the guests themselves."

The objector complains of our method of translating Genesis xlix. 10. He had before him only the rough draught before mentioned; but, had he waited for our revision, he would have found his objections groundless. His translation of the phrase, "*and when* the peace-maker comes," as it stood in the Chinese version, is incorrect. He should have rendered it, "until the peace-maker comes;" Morrison renders the word, "to stand till the proper time arrives: to wait till." See his Dictionary, Part II. Vol. I. page 803. character

待 Tae.

In the third commandment, the clause "will not hold him guiltless," has, the objector says, been rendered "will not pardon." The Hebrew word, which represents this clause, is said by Gesenius, commenting on Exodus xx. 7, to mean, "to let go unpunished, to forgive:" of course, the negative being added, the phrase will mean, "will not pardon." Dathe translates it, "Non impunitum sinet esse." The objector says, that the translators have by this rendering made the violation of this commandment an unpardonable sin. We would

ask him, what law ever tolerated the violation of itself? and in what way may violators of God's law obtain pardon, except through an atonement?

The objector closes by adducing, what he calls "a deliberate alteration of the text;" Exodus x. 27. "Jehovah hardened Pharaoh's heart:" which has been translated in the Chinese version, "Pharaoh hardened his heart, and Jehovah permitted it." In so doing, the translators have followed the example of Dathe, Ainsworth, Houbigant, Schott and Winzer, besides a number of others. See Hewlett, in loco, Jonathan Edwards in his sermon on Romans ix. 18. and Horne's Introduction, Vol. II. page 592. Hartwell Horne, whilst contending against the argument of infidels, derived from such a rendering of the passage as the objector recommends, says, it ought to be rendered, "*The Lord suffered the heart of Pharaoh to be hardened.*" In the original text, we have the verb "harden" used in the Piel conjugation. Gesenius in his Hebrew Grammar, page 80, speaking of the signification of the Piel form of a verb, says, that "the Piel conjugation often takes the signification expressed by *to permit, to declare or regard, to help: as to let live, to declare innocent, to assist in child-bearing, &c.*"

We do not think that the translators are chargeable with a deliberate alteration of the text, when they selected such a signification of the Hebrew word, as is sanctioned by the best critics, and is most agreeable to the analogy of faith.

We cannot but consider the language employed by the objector, when speaking on this subject, to be very unwarrantable. "These translators," he says, "have thought proper to change the subject of the verb; and what Moses, speaking as moved by the Holy Spirit, tells us Jehovah did, they tell the Chinese, Pharaoh did." Again "I think the Christian world will agree in considering, this a daring and presumptuous tampering with God's holy word." and "It will be for the Bible Societies of Europe and America to say, whether they will print a version made on such principles." We have shown above, that the Christian world do not agree with, and that many learned and pious men differ totally from, the objector in his rendering of the passage. We cannot help thinking that the language above quoted was employed merely to inflame the minds of sober Christians at home, not all of whom are acquainted with the arguments that have been employed on both sides of the question: and that the extravagant expressions, used by the objector, were intended, by getting up the *odium theologicum* against the translators, to induce the Bible Societies of Europe and America, to reject a version which, not being able sufficiently to disparage by argument, he has sought to injure by declamation.

PART II.

"Notes on the translation of Ephesians i. 3—23."

Mr. Culbertson's conduct in regard to these criticisms, we cannot help considering as very blameworthy.

The Epistle to the Ephesians, as well as the other parts of the New Testament, was translated according to a compact entered into among the Missionaries of all denominations at Hongkong, in 1843. It was then agreed, "that the whole body of Protestant Missionaries do form a general Committee for the purpose of revising the translation of the Scriptures in the Chinese language : that said Committee be subdivided into local Committees of stations ; that the work of revision be subdivided and apportioned to the several stations ; that, when the whole of the New Testament shall have been thus revised, each station shall select one or more of its most experienced men to act as Delegates, who shall be the final judges as to the propriety of each revision ; after which, the whole shall be submitted to the Bible Societies of Europe and America for their acceptance." Accordingly, the revision was proceeded with at the several stations, and a rough draught of a translation made. In 1847, the Delegates were chosen, and appointed to meet in Shanghai. Though Mr. Culbertson was not in China, at the time of the original compact, he became a party to it, at the last-named period, by voting for two of the Delegates, viz. Messrs. Medhurst and Milne, who laboured at the revision until its completion in 1850. The other Delegates were Dr. Bridgman and Mr. John Stronach. Dr. Boone, though chosen, was prevented from attending. When the work was completed, the Delegates met on August 1st, 1850, and resolved unanimously "to offer (it) to the Bible Societies of Europe and America, and to all and every one of the Protestant Missionaries engaged in the work of evangelizing China ; with the understanding that all parties, who shall make use of this version, shall refrain from altering the text, as given out by this Committee, who reserve to a majority of their own body, the right to make any alterations therein." Ten days afterwards, the Committee of Delegates passed the following resolution : "whereas a diversity of opinion exists respecting the intention of this Committee, in regard to criticisms and suggestions which may be sent to them for the improvement of their version, after it shall have been put to press : Resolved, that this Committee will give all due attention to the criticisms and suggestions which may be sent to them, as well after as before the version is put to press ; and that they do not propose to put the version out of their hands finally, till such time as the Committee on the Old Testament is prepared to take the same step in regard to its version."

Here then is a work, executed by a select body of men, chosen by a larger body. The fullest powers are given by the larger body to the more select body, to decide finally in the case before them. The Delegates, aware of the full powers vested in their hands, interdict all and every person from altering the work as given out by them, while they present it for the use of the parties who commissioned them, and for whom it was designed. The Delegates, however, do not consider their work as incapable of improvement ; they state distinctly, that it is an unperfected work, and not given out of their hands finally, until improved by all possible means. For the

purpose of perfecting their work, they invite criticisms and suggestions, to which they promise to give all due attention, in order that, by successive corrections, the work may be rendered as complete as possible. Mr. Culbertson is one of their constituents; he is invited to offer any criticisms and suggestions that may occur to him, assured of their being duly and attentively considered. He has certain criticisms and suggestions to offer, but, instead of presenting them to the Committee of Delegates, with a view to their adopting them in improving the version, as he ought to have done, he draws them up in the form of a charge, couched in language anything but respectful towards the translators, and sends them abroad with the view of inducing the Bible Societies of Europe and America not to print, and the Missionaries in China not to circulate, a version made on the principles which he reprehends; the Committee of Delegates being all the while ignorant of these charges having been made, until they received a copy of them from Europe. This we must consider, and we have no doubt every candid man will consider, as conduct deserving severe censure.

If Mr. Culbertson has the slightest sense of common propriety, he will admit the justice of the preceding observations, and acknowledge his fault before all. He must remember at the same time, that, by this act, he has not only reflected on the persons whose names are mentioned in the paper before us, but on Drs. Bridgman and Boone, one of whom sat at the board during the whole period that the Committee of Delegates met, and the other, though unable to attend, moved the Resolution, which was adopted by all the Delegates, that the version *as it then stood*, should be offered to the Bible Societies, and Missionaries for their acceptance.

Since writing the above, we have received the following letter from Mr. Culbertson, which we stop the press to insert, along with our remarks upon it.

"To the Rev. Dr. Medhurst, and the Rev. Messrs. Stronach and Milne.

"Dear Brethren,

"By the February mail, which has just arrived, I have received a letter from the Rev. T. W. Mellor, Editorial Superintendent of the British and Foreign Bible Society, in which he informs me, that he had transmitted to you by the same mail, some extracts from a letter addressed by me to him in November last. The extracts contain some remarks on the translation of the Pentateuch, executed by the Committee of Delegates, prior to your withdrawal from that Committee. I regret to learn, that he has sent the extracts without giving the name of the writer. Nothing was further from my intention than to withhold from you the knowledge of the authorship of that letter. The letter was not designed to be a confidential one; it was the property of the Bible Society, to be disposed of as they might judge proper. I did not know of course, how much importance they might attach to the statements there made, but I certainly never dreamed for a moment, that they would allow them to influence their action;

without furnishing you with a copy of the letter, and the name of the writer.

"I beg leave to say further, in order to correct any misapprehension you may have conceived, that the object of my letter was not to endeavour to induce them to withhold the funds necessary for printing your version of the Old Testament. I knew, indeed, that it might perhaps affect their decision on this point, but that was no part of my object. My design was to justify the grounds we had assigned to the Bible Societies for going on with a translation, while you were at the same time preparing one, and also to correct some wrong impressions, which I conceived your letter of August last to the Editor of the Chinese Repository, was calculated to create. The impression conveyed in that letter was, that you were ignorant of any difference of opinion, among the members of the Committee of Delegates, in reference to the principles of translation. The inference of course was that, other members had acted a dishonourable part in concealing from you their real sentiments. My object, in my letter of November, was to show that those differences had been freely stated in the Committee-room, and to exhibit their real nature and importance. This of course could not be done, without a discussion of particular renderings, in which, the principles of translation acted upon were brought to view; I distinctly stated, in my letter, that this translation had not received your final revision, and that, in revising it, I had no doubt you would make some alterations. The work already done, however, was that from which we formed our opinion of that which remained to be done, and which led us to conclude that the translation about to be made by you would not suit our wants. This was the reason assigned by us to the Bible Societies, for going on with a separate translation; moreover, the proof that a difference of opinion existed among the members of the Committee, must of necessity be drawn from the work, as it stood at the time of your withdrawal, by showing that some of the members approved, while others disapproved, of the principles involved in that mode of rendering.

"I am authorized also to inform you, that Bishop Boone is the author of the strictures on the translation of a portion of the New Testament. I am under the impression that he requested the Committee of the Bible Society to furnish you with a copy of his remarks.

"I may add that I would have printed my letter, and sent you a copy, but that I exceedingly deprecate the trumpeting of our differences before the public from the press, unless the good of the cause in which we are alike engaged will manifestly be promoted thereby.

"I am, Dear Brethren,

"Yours very truly,

"M. S. CULBERTSON.

"Shanghai, May 29th, 1852."

Mr. Culbertson says, in the foregoing letter, that he did not intend, by his remarks on Genesis and Exodus, to induce the Bible Society
"to withhold the funds necessary for the printing of our version of

the Old Testament. He knew indeed, that it might perhaps affect their decision on that point, but that was no part of his object." Let the reader turn to his closing observations quoted on page 15, and say, whether the writer did not *intend* that the Bible Societies of Europe and America, should refrain from printing our version. We conceive that the appeal with which he winds up his "Notes", and the disclaimer in the present letter are directly at variance. Mr. Culbertson says, that his object was to justify the grounds they had assigned to the Bible Societies, for going on with a translation, while we were at the same time preparing one. Those grounds he says further on, were that the translation about to be made by us would not suit their wants; but, granting that our version would not suit their wants, might it not have suited the wants of others? why should he then urge the Bible Societies of Europe and America not to print it? He says, he did not intend that; why then did he recommend it?

Another object he had in view, in sending home the papers we have commented on, was to correct some wrong impression, which he conceived our letter of August last to the Editor of the Chinese Repository was calculated to create: viz. that *we* were ignorant of any difference of opinion among the members of the Committee of Delegates, in reference to principles of translation. The letter in question was printed, and a copy sent to Mr. Culbertson immediately after its issue, as well as to all the other Missionaries. But, instead of addressing us, or his Missionary brethren, he preferred writing to the Bible Society a series of strictures, drawn up by himself, after the Committee had separated, to shew that these differences of opinion had been freely stated in the Committee-room. The only point that Mr. Culbertson specifies, as having been repeatedly discussed in Committee, and resisted by the others, was in reference to the hardening of Pharaoh's heart. Mr. Culbertson himself was only a short time present in Committee, and, during that time, made but few observations on the principles of translation. Some that he did make have been attended to in our revision, at least one on Genesis ii. 4, 5. It is impossible to charge the memory with what was *said* during a period of six months. Certain it is, that no question on principles of translation was ever pushed to a vote. Discussions of course were numerous, but only two instances of difference of opinion have been left on record, which both parties agreed to insert in the margin: viz. Genesis xxxi. 30, and Exodus xxxii. 2, 23, regarding the insertion of "images" after the blank left for God, which blank we were allowed by our rules to treat as we severally pleased: and Lev. xix. 31, xx. 6, 27, regarding the translation of "familiar spirit." In every other instance, the Delegates were supposed to be unanimous; at any rate if they were not, the objections of either party were not of such a nature as to lead them to press for a division, or to threaten the dissolution of the Committee. When we separated from the other Delegates, we did not assign for a reason, any differences of opinion on the principles of translation. We simply stated that the Directors of our Society had intimated

their wish, that we should proceed with the translation of the Old Testament, unconnected with the agents of any other Institution. The resolution of our Directors was dated in London, July 22, 1850, several days before the Delegates on the Revision of the Old Testament commenced their sittings in Shanghai. The ground of their Resolution could not have been any differences of opinion on the principles of translation, as nothing had then been done on the Old Testament.

Mr. Culbertson says, that he distinctly stated, in his letter to the Bible Society, that our translation had not received our final revision, and that, in revising it, he had no doubt we should make some alterations. Why then did he not wait till those alterations had been made? or why did he not apply to us to know whether the passages, on which he intended to comment, were retained by us in the revision. He would by that means have gone on certain grounds, and saved himself some writing, as well as the Bible Society much annoyance.

Mr. Culbertson adds, that he would have printed his letter, and sent us a copy, but that he exceedingly deprecated the trumpeting of our differences before the public from the press. We think he acted very wrong in not furnishing us with a copy. It was not necessary to print and publish the document, in order to make us acquainted with it. He could have transcribed it and sent us a copy. His strictures amounted to an attack on our version; an unprovoked and unnecessary attack. Any man of candour and fair dealing, when commencing an attack of this kind, would have made known to us what he was about to do, before assailing our literary reputation and integrity, as translators of the word of God. Mr. Culbertson has not done this. The excuse he urges is but a poor subterfuge. It will not stand. We have therefore just ground of complaint, that such a communication should have been sent home without first affording us an opportunity of knowing its contents, and enabling us to explain our course or defend our version.

Mr. Culbertson says, also, that he is authorized to inform us, that Bishop Boone is the author of the strictures on the translation of a portion of the New Testament, and he is under the impression that he (Bishop Boone) requested the Committee of the Bible Society to furnish us with a copy of his remarks.

This statement has filled us with astonishment; of course it exonerates Mr. Culbertson from any blame as the author of those strictures, and we hereby retract all the condemnatory expressions, which we have used regarding him, in commenting on the second part of the papers before us. But, while we exonerate Mr. Culbertson, we think Bishop Boone culpable in a tenfold greater degree.

In order to show how exceedingly Dr. Boone is to be blamed in this matter, we have only to detail the history of his connection with the Delegation for the Revision of the New Testament. In 1847, Dr. Boone was chosen one of the Delegates for the Ningpo-Shanghai station, and thereby constituted one of the final judges of each

revision. The work commenced on July 1st, 1847 : on the 5th of the same month, an objection was brought up by Dr. Bridgman, and seconded by Dr. Boone, against the term used for the name of God, in the copy prepared by one of the local Committees of stations. After an oral discussion of a few days, it was resolved to conduct the controversy in writing ; six papers were thereupon prepared, three on each side of the controversy ; the first, amounting to 36 pages, was from the pen of Dr. Boone, aided by Mr. Lowrie. The third amounting to 51 pages, and the fifth to 32 pages, were both from the pen of Dr. Boone alone. These discussions occupied the Committee until Nov. 22d, when they met to decide the question, and found their votes equal. They therefore resolved to adjourn until the beginning of January, to allow time to prepare statements of their respective views for the public. During this recess, Dr. Boone prepared his " Essay " of 70 pages. On the re-assembling of the Committee, Dr. Boone's health prevented his attendance until Jan. 25th, when he attended for half a day. From that time till the close of the Committee's labours, Dr. Boone was never present, unless to discuss some point relative to the controversy. A paragraph having appeared in the English Missionary Record, March 1850, p. 121, apparently extracted from the publications of the American Episcopal Missionary Society, intimating that Dr. Boone had continued, " with very little remission, to work at the translation of the New Testament," Dr. Boone's attention was called to it, and he wrote Jan. 13th, 1851, to say that he had " never worked one hour on said translation." And yet, in 1850, he published his " Defense of an Essay " amounting to 170 pages, on the subject of the controversy. Thus it appears that Dr. Boone has done nothing towards the work of translation, during the four years that he retained his office as a Delegate, except to carry on a controversy for the sake of promoting his own views regarding a particular term ; a controversy which has thrown the Bible Society into a state of endless perplexity, and retarded in no small degree the circulation of the Bible in China. We know from experience that controversy is a very exciting thing ; and that it requires an amount of research and attention with which the ordinary labours of translating and revising can bear no comparison. As long as the Committee of Delegates was engaged in controversy, Dr. Boone never relinquished his efforts ; and, after they had as a Committee ceased to discuss the question at issue, Dr. Boone, though he could not work one hour on the translation, could yet find time and strength for preparing one work of 70 pages and another of 170 pages. We cannot accept his excuse, therefore, that ill-health alone prevented him from attending in the Committee-room for the space of two years and a half. Even supposing that the regular meeting with others, and engaging in oral discussions, might have been too fatiguing for a person in a weak state of health, what was to prevent his attending occasionally, or inspecting the work at home ? Copies of the translations were sent to him by the Secretary of the Committee, or if they were not, he might readily have obtained them. In Jan. 1850, the Missionaries at

Fuh-chow applied for a copy of such portions of the Chinese New Testament as had been prepared, and, it having been resolved to grant the same, Dr. Boone undertook to see the copy made and forwarded. He must, therefore, have had in his possession a transcript of all that was done at that time. The Delegates were then engaged on the 'book of the Revelation. On the 11th Sept. 1850, Dr. Bridgman informed the Bible Society that "manuscript copies of the entire version had been, or soon would be, sent to all the several stations." Dr. Boone cannot, therefore, plead ignorance of the way in which the translation was carried on. If he did not know it, he ought to have known it; he was to be one of the final judges as to the propriety of each revision. It is to be presumed that many of his fellow-missionaries, and the American Bible Society, were depending very much on his opinion, and he declared himself responsible to those who had delegated him. During these four years he has retained all his powers as a Delegate, and invariably exercised them when a vote on controversial subjects was called for; how could he then divest himself of responsibility with regard to the main work for which the Delegates were elected? Had everything gone on well and satisfactorily, he ought to have made himself acquainted with its progress, in order that, when the period for giving out the version arrived, he might know what he was about in "submitting the whole to the Bible Societies of Europe and America for their acceptance." Still more so, if he disapproved of the style and principles of translation adopted by the Committee. It was his duty, in that case, to have given to his Fellow-Delegates, in an official form, an intimation of his disapproval; and to have sounded the note of alarm to his brother Missionaries and to the Bible Societies, that they might be on their guard against accepting and adopting a version the principles of which he disapproved of. We can safely aver, however, that up to this period the Committee has never had the slightest intimation of any disapprobation on the part of Dr. Boone regarding the principles of translation adopted in the New Testament version. So much were we sure of all absence of disapprobation on his part, that we argued in our printed letter of August last, that whoever else might disapprove of our version, Dr. Boone could not be the man.

In April, 1850, a correspondence took place between Dr. Boone and one of our number regarding the giving out of the Delegates' version of the New Testament with the blanks for Theos and Pneuma, to be filled up by anybody as he might think proper. Dr. Boone at that time resisted this proposal, on the ground that the version was joint property, in which all the Delegates had a joint interest and responsibility. "One party" he said "could not stand quietly by, and see their joint property used for the detriment of" what he called "the common cause, and be guiltless." Should any one, he said, propose to fill up the blanks with Shang-ti, he should feel it his duty to protest, conceiving that his right in the version was violated. Dr. Boone's part of this correspondence extended to about thirty pages folio. He

must have felt strongly on the point, or he would not have written at such length, at a time when his health was so feeble as to prevent his attendance at the Committee. His frequent mention in the course of the correspondence above alluded to, of rights, interests, responsibility, and ownership, shows that he considered the version, a property worth contending for, and one which he would not very willingly let slip out his hands. If he did not then approve of it, his contending for it was absurd. To show, however, that he did, we transcribe the following words used by him : "Certainly great thanks are due from all parties concerned, and all those who hope to be benefited by this version, to the London Missionary Society for the handsome contribution they have made towards it. And still greater thanks are due to those Missionaries, who have laboured assiduously in its preparation." Does this language mean anything, or is it only an empty compliment ? we cannot allow ourselves to think, that the Bishop was cajoling us. We fully believe, he meant what he said, when he penned those words ; that is, he considered the version an acquisition, a real benefit to China, and he regarded those who had been labouring in its production deserving of all praise.

But the clearest proof, that Dr. Boone approved of our version during the year 1850, is his coming forward with the proposition that it should be given out to all. He had expressed himself in his correspondence of the preceding April to the following effect : "The Committee of Delegates no doubt can agree now, if they see fit, to allow these blanks to be filled, by any individuals as may suit their views ; but they have not done so, and I trust never will." In the following August, however, he changed his mind on this subject. He probably found that among his own friends, or at least suspected that with the public, there would be strong objections to a course, that would debar those from using the version who had made it, even though they might employ Shang-ti for God : and, on the 1st of August, he came forward with the following Resolution, which was carried unanimously :

"The Committee of Delegates, engaged on the revision of the translation of the New Testament in Chinese, having now completed their work, the words Theos and Pneuma being left untranslated, according to the resolution of the Committee of Delegates passed in 1847, do hereby Resolve,

"That the version, as it now stands, be offered to the Bible Societies of Europe and America, and to all and every one of the Protestant Missionaries at present engaged, or who may hereafter be engaged, in the work of evangelizing China ; with the understanding that all parties who shall make use of this version shall refrain from altering the text, as now giving out by this Committee, who reserve to a majority of their own body the right to make any alterations therein."

The Missionaries who met in Hongkong in 1843, had resolved that the whole work, on its completion, should be submitted to the Bible Societies of Europe and America, for their acceptance. By the proposition

of Dr. Boone it was thus offered ; the only stipulation being that all parties making use of it should refrain from altering the text, as given out by the Committee. In what way could approval of a work be more strongly testified ? It would have been indecorous to have accompanied the offer by a single word of praise ; offering it was all the commendation the Delegates could bestow on it. For ourselves we felt that we had done our best, and, with mingled feelings of gratitude for the past, and hope for the future, we laid our contribution on the altar, humbly praying that the work might prove extensively useful to the souls of men. It had cost us much labour, but to God we ascribed the glory. But we ask, what could Dr. Boone have meant by the part he took on the occasion referred to ? We will not suppose for a moment, that he meant to insult the Bible Society and the Missionaries, by presenting to them what he did not think worth their acceptance : by restricting them from altering what he considered manifestly defective, and giving out, as the translation of the New Testament, something that “ struck him was not Gospel ? ” We cannot believe him capable of such duplicity. He meant what he said, when he proposed to offer it to the Bible Societies of Europe and America.

A short time afterwards, the Secretary of the Shanghai Corresponding Committee of the British and Foreign Bible Society applied to the Delegates, for a certified copy of the New Testament, to be put to press under direction of the aforesaid Committee, when it was resolved, that a certified copy should be furnished as requested. On this occasion, no word of disapprobation was uttered by a single member of the Delegation, nor the slightest intimation given that it was defective, or unworthy the acceptance of the important Institution that had applied for it.

On the same day the resolution inviting criticisms, a copy of which may be seen on the 16th page, was passed. This resolution was published in the Chinese Repository of October following, so that no one could plead ignorance of it. Up to this period, we have no reason to believe, that Dr. Boone felt unfavourably towards the Delegates' version of the New Testament.

On the 1st of August, 1850, we became connected with the Committee of Delegates for the revision of the Old Testament, and laboured, in conjunction with the other Delegates, in the translation of the Pentateuch, as far as the 9th of Deuteronomy. On the 12th of February, 1851, in consequence of instructions from the Directors of the London Missionary Society, we separated from the Committee of Delegates on the Old Testament, and resolved to proceed with the translation of the Old Testament alone ; after which we intended to offer the result of our labours to the Bible Societies of Europe and America, and to all the Protestant Missionaries in China. We also passed a resolution, which was published, “ that, so far as was practicable, we should adopt in the Old Testament the style which, when associated with the Rev. Dr. Bridgman, we had adopted in the translation of the New.”

It appears from Mr. Culbertson's letter, that the other Delegates had resolved on proceeding with a translation of the Old Testament, at the same time that we were preparing one. It was found necessary to justify this conduct to the Bible Society. They could not pretend to produce a translation that would be more idiomatic than ours, but they thought they might succeed in supplying one "that would suit their wants." Mr. Culbertson therefore proceeded to attack our principles of translation, and to illustrate his remarks by a critique on parts of the translation of Genesis and Exodus. We have already seen of what value his remarks are. It appears, however, to have been thought requisite that something else should be done. We had stated, in the resolution above alluded to, that we should follow in the Old Testament the style which we had adopted in the New. We presume it was felt that, if the style of the New Testament translation was approved of, that of the Old would be received also: but if the first could be disparaged, the credit of the latter would be necessarily weakened. We now avow our full conviction, that it was with this view Dr. Boone undertook to criticize our translation of Ephesians. We may be mistaken, but such is the inference we draw from his conduct. He cannot say that he sought the improvement of the New Testament version by such a course as this:—if that had been his object, the means he adopted were unsuitable. He was well aware of the resolution that stood on our books, inviting criticisms and suggestions for the improvement of the version; and he knew that the proper mode of proceeding was to send them directly to us. If he had taken that method, and it had proved unavailing, it was then time enough to adopt what should only have been taken to as a dernier resort,—namely, the appeal to the Bible Society. But we believe, that his object was to ruin our influence and reputation as translators, with the view of making out a case of necessity for their proceeding with another translation. His great anxiety to secure the success of that translation is manifest from the fact of his attending the so-called Committee of Delegates, for some time after the period of our separation, but never giving one hour to the translation of either the Old or New Testament, as long as we remained his Co-delegates. On the 9th of August, 1850, the Committee of Delegates on the Old Testament wrote to the Secretary of the Bible Society to the following effect: "Dr. Boone, who attended the first day, said that, from ill-health, he should be prevented attending in future." He did not attend up to the 20th February, 1851, (the date of our separation); but, from and after that date, notwithstanding the state of his health, he attended frequently. He thus manifested an anxiety for the preparation of the translation, after our separation, which he never displayed before. We conclude that the same anxiety for the success of what he had a more especial interest in has led him to attack our version of the New Testament, for the purpose of undermining our translation of the Old.

We have said already, that we consider Dr. Boone ten times more blameworthy than Mr. Culbertson, and this will appear if we consider

that Dr. Boone's relation to ourselves, and to the version, was very much more intimate than Mr. Culbertson's. The latter had merely voted for us as Delegates for the translation of the New Testament, was only a spectator when the version was given out, and was not a member of the Committee, which passed the Resolution of September 11th, inviting criticisms on it. The former was, and is, one of the Delegates; he himself proposed that the version should be offered to the Bible Societies, and he was party to the Resolution inviting criticisms. We may be excused for dwelling a moment on these points. Dr. Boone himself tells us that he "never worked one hour on the said translation," and yet, from the beginning of 1848 to the middle of 1850, he retained his seat in the Delegation, by which means he kept up what he calls the "tie" in the Committee, and tied up our hands from employing the most appropriate term for translating a certain word, which, as the real translators, we were most likely to know was the most suitable. He resolutely maintained all the *power*, with which he was invested as a Delegate, and uniformly declined doing any of the *work*; and indeed manifested no interest in its progress. This we patiently submitted to; we might have shaken him off, as we did the Committee of Delegates on the Old Testament in 1851, and gone on alone; but we thought that, by tolerating the obstruction he occasioned, we might at any rate secure his influence as a Co-delegate in standing by the version, and thus prevent the getting up of a separate translation,—judging (as he himself expressed it), that it "would cause less injury, if all parties used the same version, instead of having different versions." But in this we were mistaken. No tie it seems could bind Dr. Boone, to co-operate with an association with which he is connected, when he deems it suitable to act against it. He is still a Co-delegate on the New Testament, and has acted in that capacity, since we dissolved our connection with the Old Testament Committee. On the 5th of April, 1851, he attended a meeting of the New Testament Delegates, when they passed a resolution expressive of regret regarding "the circulation of the same version of the Scriptures in Chinese in two separate editions, with different terms for God and Spirit." To obviate this, he and Dr. Bridgman stated their willingness to accept of the term *T'een-shin* for God, if all the Missionaries in China would agree to it; but, the other members of the Delegation not agreeing, the proposition was dropped. The Committee of Delegates was, however, unanimous on that occasion in "rejecting the principle of marginal readings." At that meeting, Dr. Boone acted in connection with the Committee of Delegates, giving no intimation that he disapproved of the version; and yet, in November following, he attacked the work of a Committee, with which he had remained in connection for four years. When the anonymous paper containing his attack reached the Committee last month, he authorized Mr. Culbertson to inform them that he was the author of the strictures on the New Testament version. He must surely have forgotten that that version was a work which he himself proposed for adoption, or been utterly regardless of the astonishment, with which

the friends of Bible circulation at home would view him, offering them a work with the one hand, and knocking it down with the other. Then again, what did he mean by allowing a Resolution of the Committee of Delegates to pass "that they would give all due attention to the criticisms and suggestions which might be sent to them, as well after as before the version was put to press"? Did he intend that the other Missionaries should meekly send in their remarks to the Committee of Delegates, and patiently wait for any action the Committee might choose to take regarding them; while he, being a Committee-man, might shoot over the heads of his brethren, and forward his criticisms immediately to the Bible Society? was there to be one law for the generality, and another for himself? Is it the peculiar privilege of a Committee man, that he has no need to make his suggestions known to his brethren, and may appeal at once to those who hold the purse-strings? But it is to the *mole* in which the thing was done that we have, and we believe every honourable man will have, the strongest objections. His criticisms, being the criticisms of a Co-delegate, and constituting as they do, a charge against us of unfaithfulness and incapacity, were sent to the Bible Society, without the parties accused being made aware of the fact. Mr. Culbertson says, that he is "under the impression, that Dr. Boone requested the Committee of the Bible Society to furnish us with a copy of his remarks." He is "under the impression"! so then, he is not sure even of this point! Dr. Boone was at his elbow when he penned those words, and he might have made himself certain about the matter. But supposing it were so, is that, we ask, (and in so doing we appeal to the common sense and common justice of mankind,)—is that the way for Dr. Boone to go to work in accusing brethren? Men who lived next door, and with whom he was on terms of friendly intercourse, to say nothing of official connection,—these men are to be accused at the distance of half the globe, in the presence of those who have it in their power, by withholding pecuniary supplies, to render nugatory the greatest work of their lives, for which they have toiled during the best years of their existence; and, when the force of his statements has taken such effect at least as to startle the friends of Bible circulation, then the accused may be furnished with a copy of the accusation! The excuse is worse than paltry, that "Dr. Boone requested the Committee of the Bible Society to furnish us with a copy of his remarks." He could, and he ought to have done it himself. He knew very well that the communication would reach us much sooner by a five minutes' route, than by a five months' route; and yet he chose the latter; for what reason, we cannot divine, but that he did not want us to know what he said, until what he said had done its work? This is the conduct which we designated as ten times worse than that of Mr. Culbertson. A Co-delegate, and the very man who in Committee moved that the version be presented to the Bible Society, and one of a Committee who invited criticisms to be sent to them, is the man who acts as the accuser of his brethren, and that without their being aware of it; the very man too who in January

16th, 1849, writing to one of us (in relation to the great controversy), in a letter intended for us all, says "believe me when I assure you, that I am very sincerely a brother Missionary, yea, your brother in Christ, Wm. J. Boone."

Having thus vindicated the correctness of our opinion, regarding the blameworthiness of Dr. Boone as to this matter, we will now proceed to examine the strictures he has submitted to the Bible Society.

Our translation of ver. 3d is thus rendered by the objector: "Blessed be Shang-ti, the father of our Lord Jesus Christ, (who) because (of) Christ causes us to receive spiritual blessings in heaven." The objector observes, that in his rendering the Chinese version into English, he has bracketed the word "who," to indicate that there is nothing for it in Chinese. He surely must be very partially acquainted with Chinese, to suppose that it admits of the use of the relative, in the way that western writers employ it. Any Chinese scholar would know that the relative is understood in the passage before us. The objector further observes, that he has bracketed the word "of," for the same reason. In this, again, he has displayed a lamentable ignorance of the language which he is criticizing. The Chinese word *yin*, rendered by him *because*, Morrison says means *on account of, for the sake of*. In order to prove, however, that the omission of the relative is important, the objector says, that he has submitted the passage to three of his Chinese teachers, who all said, that the person "who gives us spiritual blessings in heaven is Christ." They said, however, it might be understood of God, though they should not have so understood it unless told. The omission of a comma in the printed edition has made them thus hesitate. The insertion of this point, and not the relative, would have made the allusion unmistakeable.

The objector renders our translation of the 4th verse thus: "(Who) from the creation, because (of) Jesus Christ, chose us, that we might be clean and without spot before the Lord, according to His benevolent love." His objection to this verse, on account of the relative not being expressed, is still more groundless than the one on which we have just animadverted. He says, "his teachers being asked, 'who chose us?' replied 'Jesus;' and when told that the writers meant not Jesus but Shang-te, declared that it could not be so understood in this verse, though it might in verse 3." This weakens the objection against the third verse, and strengthens our conviction that the teachers employed were very incompetent men. We have confessedly better Chinese assistants than any that have hitherto been procured in Shanghai, and these declare that the person choosing us could not by any means be understood to be Jesus in this instance.

The objector renders our translation of the 5th verse thus: "According to His goodwill, having in mind Jesus Christ, He predestinated us to be children." Remarking on this verse he says, that his "teachers understood the sense to be, 'according to his goodwill, we having in mind Jesus Christ, He predestinated us to be children.'" If they so understood it, they must have conceived the translators to have been writing nonsense. There is nothing in the Chinese version

to represent "WE," and the objector himself has not given it in his rendering of our version, though he has intensified it in giving his teacher's view of our translation. The subject of the verb, in every one of these verses, is seen by a careful reader to be God: if then the person referred to by the word *His*, in the clause *His goodwill*, and by the *He*, in the clause *He predestinated us*, (one of which immediately precedes, and the other follows the clause in which WE is said to be understood) —if this person be God, then the person who is said to "have in mind Jesus Christ" must be God also: and, in no language under the sun, could the subject be considered as changed in an intermediate clause, unless some intimation thereof were given. The objector believes that "ninety-nine Chinese in a hundred would understand it just as his teachers did." We believe just the contrary; and our faith is grounded on good evidence. A Chinese scholar of considerable eminence, on perusing the above criticism on Eph. i. 5, under the impression that Mr. Culbertson was the author, wrote home to the following effect: "The writer says his teachers understood the rendering of the phrase *by Jesus Christ* to mean *WE having in mind Jesus Christ*. Now I dare to contradict the assertion. They could not understand it to mean so. It does not mean so. It is possible, that being men of no principle, and caring nothing about the matter, they did not contradict him when he said that it meant so—or it is possible that the writer did not understand the words of his teacher, any better than he understood a written text."

The objector renders our translation of the 6th verse thus: "To display His great grace in causing us to receive gracious gifts by His beloved son;" and complains that *the glory of His grace* is rendered *His great grace*. Bloomfield says that *the glory of his grace* means *his glorious grace*. Robinson says that *glory* is here used in place of an adjective, *excellent, splendid, glorious*. The Chinese word employed in the version is one which is derived from an extensive inundation of water, and means *great, vast, overflowing*. The objector complains of what he calls the paraphrastic rendering of the last clause, "wherein he hath made us accepted in the Beloved." Bloomfield translates it, "hath favoured us with his grace, i. e. richly imparted grace to us." Robinson renders it, "with which grace he hath graced us, i. e. in which he hath richly imparted grace unto us." The phrase "in the beloved" is rendered by Bloomfield, "by or through the beloved one," which, he says, is a title of our Lord. It was found necessary to express the word *Son*, which was so manifestly understood, in order to convey an intelligible idea to the Chinese. We scarcely think the objector could have consulted his critical helps when he complained of the rendering of this clause.

The objector renders our translation of the 7th verse thus: "Moreover, because Jesus Christ shed his blood, we through his grace obtain redemption from sin, and the pardon of offences." In remarking on this verse he complains that, while "the Apostle says, 'we have redemption *through his blood*,' this translation makes it 'through his grace.'" The Apostle says, "we have redemption through his blood,

according to the riches of his grace:" the word rendered *according to* is said by Robinson to mean *by virtue of*; hence we conclude that we have redemption through the grace, as well as by the blood, of Christ. This idea is expressed in the Chinese version, as nearly as the idiom of the Chinese language would permit. The translators do not say, that we have redemption and forgiveness through grace, but through grace in consequence of the shedding of Christ's blood. The objector says, "something is made of the several distinct propositions of the Apostle, *blended together*, that strikes me is not Gospel." What the objector meant by this statement it is difficult to divine. If he thought that his Co-Delegates, in translating the New Testament, had made something of the Apostle's words which was not Gospel, it was his duty to have admonished them of it, and to have advertized "the Bible Societies of Europe and America, and all and every one of the Protestant Missionaries engaged in the work of evangelizing China," to whom he proposed that the version should be offered, for their use, *without alteration*, except by the Committee of Delegates—he ought to have advertized them that it contained "something that struck him was not Gospel." We know of no greater dereliction of duty than this. If, after having proposed that the version should be given out, he discovered the faults on which he animadverted, it was still his duty to have addressed the Committee who had invited criticisms and suggestions. Instead of this, he sent in his criticisms to the Bible Society, without informing his Co-delegates of what he had done. In conduct like this, it strikes us there is something not according to the practice inculcated in the Gospel.

The objector translates our rendering of verse 8th thus: "Whereupon wisdom was the more displayed:" and in commenting thereon says, that the expression *wherein*, as it appears in the English version, "refers clearly to grace;" we think it might refer to the whole of the blessings spoken of in the preceding verse, viz "redemption through his blood and the forgiveness of sins, by the riches of his grace," or as A. Clarke says, "*wherein*, that is in the dispensation of mercy and goodness by Christ Jesus." The idea conveyed by the word would therefore be well expressed in Chinese by *in the doing of which*, as the Chinese phrase employed might have been rendered in English. The "wisdom and prudence" may, according to Bloomfield, be referred either to God, or to the Ephesians. He preferred the latter, the translators have preferred the former, in which they have followed Koppe and Rosenmüller. They were surely entitled to make their choice among the authorities before them, in construing a passage, which may confessedly be translated in different ways.

The objector says that the word "prudence" is not rendered: any person at all acquainted with the way in which the terms "wisdom and prudence" are used, both in the Old and New Testaments, will see that they are nearly synonymous, and merely intended to intensify the idea that would be fully expressed by one. It would not be easy to point out what separate meaning was intended to be set forth by the

use of these two almost synonymous terms. Bloomfield attempts it by saying, that the first alludes to wisdom in plan, and the latter to prudence in execution. This however, is rather a fanciful distinction than otherwise, particularly when applied to the work of redemption. However, if any insist on having two terms expressed, they have them already in the Chinese version, *which the objector ought to have stated*. We think it will puzzle him to point out the precise distinction between the two Chinese terms employed for wisdom and prudence, as it seems to have done western commentators, to distinguish *sophia* and *phronesis*, the words in the original text.

The objector complains that the word "abound" has been rendered "display." Here he is mistaken. The *idea* of the original is expressed by two words in Chinese, which mean "were *increasingly* manifested," the stress being felt by the Chinese reader to be on the word *increasingly*.

The objector translates our rendering of the 9th and 10th verses thus: 9. "Further He shows us His mysterious will, according to his good, which He hath established" 10. "That at the appointed time he will restore to Christ all things in heaven and earth"

On the 9th verse, the objector makes no remarks; but we have to remark on his translation of the Chinese version, in which he has omitted "will" or "pleasure" after "good." However, this is perhaps a typographical error.

In remarking on the 10th verse, the objector complains that the phrase "in the dispensation of the fulness of times," has been rendered into Chinese "at the appointed time." The word "dispensation" is rendered by Robinson "economy, i. e. a disposition or arrangement of things;" and the phrase "dispensation of the fulness of time" is rendered by Bloomfield, "the plan to be put in execution at the fulness of time." Macknight says, "By this some understand the last dispensation of religion, in which all the former dispensations terminated; and which was erected, when the time fixed for it by the prophets was fully come." This sense the translators have attempted to express by saying, that "when the appointed time should arrive." The objector ought to have known that the Chinese word *keae* means "to arrive at," and the word *ke*, "an appointed time:" but he has neglected to express the former idea.

The objector complains that "the magnificent description given by the Apostle '*gathering together in one* all things in Christ, *both* which are in heaven and which are in earth, even *in Him*,' is packed into the words 'will restore to Christ all things in heaven and earth.'" The Chinese version, properly rendered, reads thus: "that when *the appointed time should arrive*, he might take all things (lit. the myriad of objects), which are in heaven and in earth, and cause them *completely* to revert to (or terminate in) Christ." The objector, in his translation, has omitted some important expressions and ideas contained in the Chinese version, and then says that the translators have "packed" the words of the Apostle into the remainder. He must surely be sensible here of having failed in justly

representing us. If not, he will compel us to think as little of his candour as we have done of his judgment. The phrase "gather together in one," (which is one word in the original) means, according to Bloomfield, "to unite all under one head." Robinson says, that it means "to reduce under one head," and in the passage before us, "to bring all things into one in Christ." This we conceive is adequately and exactly rendered in Chinese by the words 悉歸 seih-kwei.

The objector says, he questions if any attempt has been made to *translate the words* of the Apostle in this verse. *The mere translation of the words* of an author, into a language differing widely in idiom from that in which the author wrote, must in many instances be done at the expense of clearness. We conceive, however, that all the significant words of the Apostle, that contribute anything to the sense of the passage, have been faithfully translated. The objector has italicized the words *in him*, to intimate perhaps that these words are not rendered in the Chinese version. We may remark on this point, that it would have been extremely difficult to introduce these words in the Chinese version: and if introduced, they would have contributed nothing to the sense. Our English translators have not been able to introduce them, without adding the word *even*, which ought not to have been done, if their object had been merely to give the words of the Apostle. Bloomfield has brought down the words *in him*, into the 11th verse. See also Castelleo *in loco*.

The objector translates our rendering of the 11th and 12th verses thus: "But He who according to his will doeth all things, hath predestinated us because of Christ to obtain an inheritance, that we who first trusted in Christ might praise him:" and pronounces that "the liberties taken with the Apostle are so manifest to any one who will take the pains to compare what he wrote, clause by clause, with this translation, that he would add no comments." The only liberty taken by the translators with the Apostle, is to invert the order of his words; a liberty which every translator takes with every author, and without which it would be impossible to translate. The Chinese version runs thus: "He who worketh all things according to his own will, hath predestinated us to obtain an inheritance, on account of Christ; causing us who first trusted in Christ to praise and glorify him." The phrase *predestinated according to his purpose* is a pleonasm for *predestinated*. Bloomfield thinks that the former is a stronger mode of expression, but it would be difficult to make it stronger in Chinese. *To the praise of his glory* Bloomfield says means *an occasion for his praise and glorification*.

Our translation of the 13th and 14th verses, has been thus rendered into English by the objector. "Ye having heard the true doctrine, the Gospel that saves you, believed in Christ, and then received the promised declaration sealed by the Holy Spirit, namely, that we having obtained the earnest of an inheritance should praise him at the day of obtaining redemption." The two verses, as they stand in the Chinese version, should have been thus translated into

English: "Ye having heard the true doctrine, the Gospel that saves you, have believed in Christ, and then received the sealing of the Holy Spirit that was before promised, which is an earnest of our obtaining an inheritance, until the day when we obtain redemption, and praise and glorify him."

Here the objector has mistaken the meaning of the phrase, "the sealing of the Holy Spirit that was before promised," and has rendered it, "the promised declaration, sealed by the Holy Spirit;" connecting the "promise" with "the declaration sealed," and not as he should have done with the "Holy Spirit." He has also misunderstood the phrase, "which is an earnest of our obtaining an inheritance," and thought that it meant, "that we having obtained the earnest of an inheritance;" connecting the "obtaining" with the "earnest," and not as he should have done with the "inheritance." After having thus utterly disregarded the words of the Chinese version and misconstrued them, he complains that the translators have utterly disregarded the *words* in which St. Paul expressed himself. The fact is, that he has misrepresented the translators, instead of their misrepresenting the Apostle. Such incorrect translating from Chinese into English, shows that the objector is not a fit man to comment on the merits or demerits of a translation from a foreign tongue into Chinese.

We cannot pass over, without remark, the definition of the word "*translate*" which the objector has given. He says, "there has been no attempt to *translate*, i. e. to take up St. Paul's *words* and *render* them." Webster defines translating to be "to express the *sense* of one language in the words of another." In illustration, Webster adds, "The Old Testament was *translated* into the Greek language more than 200 years before Christ; and the Scriptures are now *translated* into most of the languages of Europe and Asia."

The objector says of the rendering of the 13th and 14th verses, "Regarded even as a paraphrase, who besides these translators ever gave such a meaning to these verses as that we have above?" We have already seen that the meaning which the objector has given us above, is a meaning derived from his own mistaken view of the Chinese version. But we must be excused if, *en passant*, we call attention to the manner, in which he alludes to the authors. "Who," he asks, "besides these translators ever gave such a meaning to these verses?" No one would imagine, from reading his words, that the persons to whom he alludes so slightly, had been selected by the body of Protestant Missionaries as their most experienced men, who were to be the final judges as to the propriety of each revision. Still less would any one imagine, that the objector was, and still is, a Co-delegate, calling himself responsible for the version, praising the men who executed it, and standing forward to present it to the Bible Society, to be "issued with the approbation of the body of Protestant Missionaries!" If Dr. Boone should meet with any expressions, unguardedly dropped by us, not such as he deems in accordance with the respect becoming his station, he will have no right to complain.

The objector has translated our rendering of the 15th, 16th, 17th

and 18th verses, from the Chinese into English thus: "I hearing that you believe in the Lord Jesus, and love all the saints, therefore give thanks for you without ceasing, in my prayers remembering you; praying the Shang-te (Supreme Ruler) of our Lord Jesus Christ, namely, the Father of Glory, to give unto you the spirit of wisdom and of revelation, that you may know the Lord, that the eyes of your understanding may be enlightened to know what is the happiness he has called you to hope for, and what is the riches of the inheritance of the saints." Let any one compare the exhibition which he has given of our translation of these verses with the original, and say whether the authors have not been exceedingly fortunate in their choice of terms. Here is a person, evidently seeking to find all the fault he can, who is obliged to retranslate them into English, almost in the very words of the English version. The only fault he has to find with these four verses is that the phrase, "the riches of the *glory* of his inheritance in the saints," has been translated "the riches of the inheritance of the saints." It is difficult to make out what is the point of the critic's objection here. He has italicized both "*glory*" and "*his*." By his laying an emphasis on the first, it may be that he objects to the apparent omission of the word "*glory*" in the Chinese version. But here we may remark, that he has not done the translators justice, with respect to the phrase which stands in the Chinese version for "the riches of the glory," by simply rendering it "riches." The phrase consists of two characters, which mean "affluent abundance." Dr. A. Clarke has it, "the glorious abundance of the spiritual things to which the saints are entitled." Stockius says, "*divitiæ gloriæ innuunt abundantiam et copiam gloriosissimæ gratiæ et bonitatis divinæ.*" By the objector's laying an emphasis on "*his*" in the phrase "his inheritance in the saints," it may be that he understands it as referring to "the rich abundance and revenue of glory which the Lord would derive from his saints, as his chosen inheritance." If so, he differs from most commentators. Bloomfield says, that the whole clause means "how gloriously rich is the inheritance which he has prepared [for true Christians.]" Whitby says it means, "How great and glorious is the inheritance which he hath designed for Christians." The objector says, that by the rendering given in the Chinese version, "the idea is completely changed." We deny the charge, and deem it very unsuitable in a Co-delegate to bring an accusation against the translators of completely changing the idea of the original, when he does not even condescend to point out in what respect the sense is altered.

The objector has rendered our translation of the 19th and 20th verses thus: "And moreover that ye may know that the Almighty Lord powerfully works in the midst of believers, and by great power raised Christ to sit at his own right hand in heaven."

Remarking on the 19th verse, the objector complains that the phrase "and what is the exceeding greatness of his power to usward who believe, according to the working of his mighty power," is rendered in Chinese by "that ye may know that the Almighty Lord powerfully works in the midst of believers," or it may

be "in believers." Here again he has misrepresented the translators. He should have rendered the passage thus : "and that ye may know that the Lord, possessing a power insurpassably great, energetically works in those who believe." Chandler renders it "that you may be able to form some suitable conception of that amazing and infinite power of God, which he shall exert in our (resurrection)." The objector would connect "according to the working of his mighty power" with the 20th verse ; Bloomfield retained its connection with the 19th verse, and the Chinese translators followed him ; carrying the idea, however, into the 20th verse as follows : "moreover how by his great power he raised Christ from the dead, to sit at his own right hand in heaven."

Here it will be observed, that in our translation of the latter clause of the 20th verse, we have differed from the objector, by inserting the words "from the dead" after the word "raised." The reason of our having done this, is that the word *Soo* employed in the Chinese version means, according to Morrison, "to come to life again from the dead, to resuscitate, to revive."

The objector renders our translation of the 21st and 22d verses thus : "Of all those having might, power, dominion, and name, whether of the present time or hereafter, none can excel Him. He hath subdued all things under the feet of Christ, and caused him to be the head of all things to profit the Church."

Remarking on the word "him," of the clause "none can excel him," intended to represent the phrase "(who is) far above all principality," &c. the objector says, that his teachers understood it of Shang-te, and not of Christ. They must have been a strange class of teachers so to understand it,—as the person spoken of immediately before, who is said to have been raised and set at God's right hand in heavenly places, is the same person who is said to be far above all principality ; no Chinese teacher of any worth could so miserably mistake the sense of the passage.

The phrase "head over all things to the Church," is said by the objector to have been rendered "head over all things to profit the Church ;" and in writing to the Bible Society says, "I do not know how the addition of this phrase 'to profit' may strike your minds ; but it seems to me very unjustifiable." The word rendered "to profit" should have been translated "for the benefit of." Bloomfield remarks here : "On this is engrafted another, and more striking view, under which Christ's power may be considered,—viz. as it is exercised towards his *friends* ; wherein it is suggested that, in his capacity of Supreme Head over the Church Catholic he will use his power,—not in the way that earthly Supreme Potentates usually do, for his *own* good, but exercise it solely *for the benefit of his people*, as the head exerts itself for the benefit and support of the other members of the body, of which it is chief, and with which it is indissolubly united." The word in the original is in the dative case, and is called by grammarians the "*dativus commodi*." The objector calls the phrase "for the benefit of" an *unjustifiable addition*. We should like to know how otherwise the idea could be expressed in Chinese.

The objector renders our translation of the 23d verse thus : "The Church may be compared to the body of Christ. Christ gives grace to all men, and completēs himself with the Church ;" or "contents and satisfies himself with the Church."

In commenting on this verse, the objector complains that the phrase "which (i. e. the Church) is his body" is rendered "the Church may be compared to Christ's body," and asks "Is this an allowable liberty to be taken with a sacred inspired writer ?"

Robinson, in remarking on the use of the substantive verb in Greek says, "Tropically and metonymically, the substantive of the predicate often expresses, not what the subject actually *is*, but what it *is like*, or *is accounted* to be, or *signifies*, viz. by comparison, substitution, &c. or as cause or effect ; so that the substantive verb may be rendered *to be accounted*, *to be like* or *in place of*, *to signify*, &c." On the soundness of this canon of interpretation depends the great controversy between Protestants and Romanists. There can be no doubt that the passage means "the Church may be compared to the body of Christ." The translators felt that they were obliged to express that sense in Chinese, in order to avoid a misconception of the meaning by the native reader.

The objector asks, in conclusion, "and what shall we say to the rendering of the words, 'the fulness of him that filleth all in all' by 'Christ gives grace to all men, and completes himself with the Church?' Could the best biblical scholar in England, with this translation before him, if he had no hint from whence it was taken, find the passage of Scripture the translators had before them?" We cannot help considering this rather contemptuous enquiry of the objector uncalled for. The phrase "Who filleth all in all" is rendered by Bloomfield, "who filleth all with all (things) ;" by which, he says, is meant "filleth all his members each with their peculiar spiritual gifts and graces." This the Chinese translators have expressed by "giving grace to all men," meaning of course the members of "the Church" just spoken of.

But the phrase which seems most to stumble the objector is the declaration, that the Church is Christ's fulness, which is expressed in Chinese by "Christ completes himself with the Church." Macknight remarks on this passage, that "he who is universal Lord would want a principal part of his subjects, if the Church among men on earth were not united and subjected to him as its head." Under Romans xi. 12, referring to this very passage, he also observes, "The Church is called the fulness of him who filleth all with all, because without the Church, which is his body, Christ would not be complete." Theophylact says, "The Church is the completion of Christ, as the body and limbs are of the head." See Scott, Henry, Guyse, Boothroyd, and Parkhurst.

Having thus as we conceive exposed the groundlessness of the above criticisms, we may now remark, that Dr. Boone has not ventured to propose what he would deem better translations than those which the Delegates have produced. It is comparatively an easy task to criticize others, but it is much more difficult to suggest what would

be deemed an improvement upon their productions. He knew full well the difficulties of the case : the rendering of the first chapter of Ephesians into any language is one of the hardest enterprises of the translator of the New Testament. From the third to the twelfth verses, it is one continuous sentence, so also from the 15th to the end. The sense is frequently involved and not a little obscure. A string of relatives and participles runs through the whole. Those who have had anything to do with translating into Chinese, know that the rendering of such a complicated mode of writing constitutes their chief difficulty. He considered that the Delegates had failed in presenting the Apostle's words exactly to the Chinese. Why then did he not try and do it himself?—his readers would then have seen, not only how the fault had been committed, but how it could be remedied ; and not only how slight the difficulties were, but with what ease they might, and ought to have been overcome. Had Dr. Boone attempted this, and succeeded, none would have been more cordial in awarding him their thanks than his fellow-delegates. But he knew the difficulties, and he knew, if he failed, how justly his much-injured Co-delegates might have animadverted on his production, and therefore wisely abstained from making the attempt.

Our attention having now been directed anew to the Delegates' version of this important chapter, we cannot help expressing our satisfaction that it has been so correctly and idiomatically translated, and we earnestly pray that the effort to make it plain to the understandings of the Chinese may be followed by the Divine blessing. When rightly rendered into English, it will be found to convey as much of the spirit of the original, as could have been expressed in so difficult a language as that of China. It does not appear that a single truth has been overlooked ; and we can boldly affirm, that, as far as we are concerned, not the slightest inclination has been felt to avoid giving the fullest expression to all the peculiar doctrines of the Gospel therein contained, however humbling they might be to human pride, or distasteful to the unrenewed heart. Any person who should insinuate a single syllable to the contrary, would do us a most cruel injury ; as we will yield to none in strenuously advocating the truth as it is in Jesus, to the propagation of which we have solemnly consecrated our whole lives.

We cannot conclude our strictures better than by bringing forward the *principles of translation* which as Delegates we were *required* to adopt, and on the adoption of which the Bible Society was *pledged* to support us.

At the meeting of Protestant Missionaries assembled at Hongkong, in 1843, for the purpose of devising means for procuring a revision of the Chinese version of the Sacred Scriptures, it was resolved : " That any translation of the Sacred Scriptures into Chinese, issued with the approbation of the body of Protestant Missionaries, be in exact conformity to the Hebrew and Greek originals in sense ; and, so far as the idiom of the Chinese language will allow, in style and manner also.

“That the Textus Receptus shall form the basis of the proposed revised version.

“That the amounts of weights, measures, and pieces of money, being ascertained, the same be translated by corresponding terms in Chinese.

“That terms of natural history be translated by corresponding terms in Chinese, as far as they can be ascertained.

“That passages occurring in different places, but expressed in the same way in the original, be translated in a uniform manner; and that the spirit of this resolution be applied, as far as possible, in the case of individual terms. That no periphrasis be substituted for the possessive pronoun, when used in connection with the name of God.

“That the interchange of the noun and pronoun be allowed, when deemed necessary by the translators.

“That euphemisms in the originals be rendered by corresponding euphemisms in Chinese.”

The Report of the Bible Society for 1846, contains the following passage :

“On the subject of the revision of the Scriptures now carrying on in China, your Committee have had repeated communications and interviews with the Directors of the London Missionary Society, whose Missionaries take a large share in this important work. With the view of encouraging their willing friends, and urging on the work as fast as prudence will allow, your Committee thought it well to adopt and transmit the following resolutions :

“1. That an urgent request be addressed to the Directors of the London Missionary Society, to call the attention of their Missionaries to the importance of proceeding with the revision of the Chinese New Testament, *on the principles laid down in the circular received from Hongkong*, with as little delay as practicable, and to authorize them to consider this, if not their exclusive, at least their primary work.

“2. That the Directors of the London Missionary Society be informed, that the Committee of the British and Foreign Bible Society are quite prepared to contribute a large share of the expenses, that will be incurred by the adoption of the view above given, and indeed to take upon themselves the whole expenses of the Missionaries, if their whole time is devoted to the work.

“3. That it be further pressed upon the Directors of the London Missionary Society, to urge their Missionaries to print portions of the New Testament as they are prepared; and to assure them of the readiness of this Society to defray the expenses of printing such editions, or to assist by sending out a printer, whose whole expenses shall be defrayed, if his time be exclusively devoted to the printing of the Scriptures, or in such proportions as he may give up his time and labour to the work.

“4. That this Committee having received in this conference, as well as from former communications with the Directors of the London Missionary Society, and from the Directors of the Missionary Societies in America, sufficient information as to the competency of the parties now engaged in the revision, can cheerfully leave it to the united

judgment of the Missionaries to determine when the revision of any parts of the Chinese New Testament may be considered sufficiently perfected to justify their being printed."

Such then were the principles on which we were required to set to work, and such the pledges of support when the work was done. In the principles above laid down, two things are imperative on the translators; first, that their translations be in exact conformity to the Hebrew and Greek originals *in sense*, and secondly, *so far as the idiom of the Chinese language will allow*, in style and manner also. The first is imperative, the latter is contingent, and to give way where the idiom of the Chinese language requires it. Nothing is said about "translating etymologically, without regarding the usages of the language into which we translate," and nothing approaching to the definition of the word *translate* suggested by Dr. Boone, "i. e. to take up St. Paul's words and render them." (The italics are his own.) Had such a duty been prescribed to us, we should have declined entering on the task. We were required to translate *ad sensum*, and we have endeavoured so to construct our work that that demand should be complied with. No person could insist more strongly on literal translations than Ernesti, in his principles of Biblical Interpretation, and yet he considers that such a mode of translation should give way to the more liberal one, which only requires that the sense be given in any words, provided they mean the same thing.

In pointing out the proper method of making a version from one language into another, he says, "In the first place, in order that the sense may be fully preserved, words must be chosen, which, in their power, exactly correspond to those of the original; and which are not ambiguous, but possess a fixed and clear signification among those for whom the version is prepared." When words can be found which agree with those of the author in etymology, trope, figure, and construction, they are certainly to be preferred. In this, however, we must be careful that the usage of the language into which we translate be also consulted: without which, we produce a version unintelligible to those who are unacquainted with the original; and darken, and sometimes pervert, the real sense.

"But if we cannot proceed thus literally, which is often impossible, from the different genius of different languages, expressing the same thing in different terms, which do not correspond each to each, either in etymology, or in proper signification; * * * * we must, then, abandon this literal exactness, and consider it enough to express the sense of the original in any words, provided that, according to the usage of the language into which we translate, they mean the same thing."

It has been our aim to express the exact sense of the original, according to the idiom of the Chinese language. Doubtless certain shades of meaning may not have been caught, or may have been slightly represented in a different hue in the translation, as must be the case with any work of human origin. But if any person will point out, in a suitable and honourable manner, with a view to the improvement of the version, any part of our translation, in which we

have failed to give the sense of the originals, or have not done it idiomatically, we shall be much obliged to him for the suggestion, and will give it all due attention. We desire nothing so much as the perfection of our work, in order that the mind of the Spirit may be faithfully exhibited, and the nations using the Chinese character be made acquainted with the lively oracles. May the same Spirit that indited the word guide us in all attempts to render the translation faithful and idiomatic, and condescend to bless the effort for the good of souls.

W. H. MEDHURST.

JOHN STRONACH.

WM. C. MILNE.

Shanghae, June 16th, 1852.