VINDICATION OF COMMENTS

ON THE

TRANSLATION OF EPHESIANS I.

IN THE


BY WILLIAM J. BOONE, D.D.
MISSIONARY BISHOP OF THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH
OF THE UNITED STATES TO CHINA.

CANTON.

1852.
VINDICATION OF COMMENTS

ON THE

TRANSLATION OF EPHESIANS I.

IN THE


BY WILLIAM J. BOONE, D.D.
MISSIONARY BISHOP OF THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH OF THE UNITED STATES TO CHINA.

CANTON.
1852.
HAVING recently received a paper from Rev. Dr. Medhurst and Rev. Messrs. Stronach and Milne, entitled “Strictures on the Remarks contained in Papers relating to the Shanghai version of the Chinese Scriptures,” a few words of explanation seem due both to them and to myself.

The circumstances, which led me to write the comments on their translation of the first chapter of the Ephesians, will appear from the following narrative. After the withdrawal of Messrs. Medhurst, Stronach, and Milne from the Committee of Delegates, it became a serious question, whether the other Delegates should go on with the work, or leave it wholly in their hands; satisfied, we should obtain from them a version suited to our wants. This matter was fully discussed by the members of the Committee, and on the 4th of March we passed a resolution that we would go on with the translation: and at the same time it was resolved, “That with reference to the present state and prospects of our work, letters be addressed to the English and American Bible Societies, and that these be prepared by Dr. Bridgman.” In pursuance of this resolution, Dr. Bridgman drew up a letter to the Bible Societies, of which I will now give all that has any reference to the three Delegates who withdrew.

“Shanghai, March 4th, 1851.

“Dear Sir,—On the 19th ult., at a meeting of the Committee of Delegates engaged in preparing a version of the Old Testament in Chinese, the Rev. Messrs. Medhurst, Stronach and Milne signified their withdrawal from said Committee, and their intention also to send in their resignation to their constituents. This, and their reason for it, they will have reported to you by last overland mail, closed here on the 18th, and when it was too late for this Committee to write to you of this matter, no notice having been given until about noon that same day.
"As soon as the resignation of Messrs. Medhurst and Milne was handed in to the Shanghai Local Committee, a meeting of the same was appointed to fill the vacancy, and the Rev. T. McClatchie, of the English Church Missionary Society, was duly elected. Of this change in their delegation, you will be informed by a letter from the Shanghai Local Committee, which will be forwarded to you with this.

"The withdrawal of the Rev. Messrs. Medhurst, Stronach, and Milne, would be cause of regret to this Committee, but for the fact that their method of translation, especially of late, has been such as we could not concur in; this method—questioned not a little while on the New Testament, and much more since we have been engaged on the Old—has made it evident that upon a review of the Pentateuch (which was soon to be undertaken), a crisis must arise, involving us all in great perplexity. In addition to that questionable degree of conciseness insisted on by them, liberties were being taken with the sacred text, unwarrantable, as we think, and such as will be deprecated, we believe, by all who hold, as we do, that in a translation of the Inspired Word, nothing is to be altered, nothing added, and nothing taken away.

"Instead therefore, of its being any cause of regret, their withdrawal we look upon as a grateful relief from a most embarrassing situation. They have chosen their course; and it leaves us no prospect that the result of their labors can suffice for us, or for those whose delegates we are. This we regret, but could not prevent. They have done what they regarded as their duty: we will try to do ours."

This letter, I contend, was a suitable and proper statement to the Bible Societies of the circumstances of the position we found ourselves in; those who withdrew were left to report to these Societies their reasons without any comments from us; whilst we, in language respectful to them, assign the reasons why their withdrawal was not a matter of grief to us: we gave them credit for doing their duty, and we professed our determination to try to do our's. It is true we express an opinion adverse to their method of translation, and suppose it will be deprecated "by all who hold, as we do, that in a translation of the Inspired Word, nothing is to be altered, nothing added, nothing taken away;" but whether we were justifiable in making these remarks or not, will depend upon the facts of the case commented on; which may be left for a subsequent part of this paper. As neither Mr. McClatchie nor myself had been present during the time the portions of the Pentateuch referred to were translated, the following words were, at our request, appended at the foot of the letter, viz.,—""The statements in this letter respecting the style, &c., of the translation of the Old Testament, are made on the authority of those of our number who have been personally engaged on the version with those who have withdrawn."
A letter was at the same time addressed to the Local Committees, and a copy of this letter to the Bible Societies was sent along with it. A copy of this letter I here give entire:

"Shanghai, March 4th, 1851.

"Dear Brethren,—The peaceful conduct of an ancient patriarch, when a perplexing strife had arisen, may suggest a line of conduct most becoming to us under present circumstances; an account of these will be communicated to you in letters from the missionaries of the London Society, and from the brethren of the Shanghai Local Committee, interested equally with you in preparing an improved version of the Old Testament in Chinese.

"In addition to what will be communicated in those several letters, and relating to the same matters, we deem it proper to send you the following "minutes," copied from the Delegates' book of records, under this day's date:

"The Committee of Delegates met at the residence of Rev. J. K. Wight. Present, the Rev. Drs. Boone and Bridgman, and the Rev. Mr. Shuck. The meeting was opened with reading the Scriptures and prayer by Dr. Bridgman. Immediately after prayer, the Rev. M. S. Culbertson, who had just returned from Ningpo, came in and resumed his seat as delegate from that station.

"Papers were then read from the Shanghai Local Committee, giving notice of the resignation of the Rev. Messrs. Medhurst and Milne, and of the election of the Rev. T. McClatchie in their stead; Mr. McClatchie, being present, took his seat as a Delegate jointly with Dr. Boone and Mr. Shuck.

"The Committee now again engaged in devotional services, a portion of Scripture being read, and prayer offered by Dr. Boone. Dr. Bridgman was then appointed Chairman of the Committee of Delegates, and the Rev. Mr. Culbertson, Recording Secretary.

"It was resolved that this Committee now turn back to the first of Genesis, and prepare a few chapters in a plain and simple style, and send them at once to our brethren at the local stations; then others in like manner and so on; and when these shall have been examined and returned, and again revised by us, book by book, that we will offer the same to the Bible Societies and to our constituents in China, to be immediately printed if funds are at command, and circulated among the people. With reference to the present state and prospects of our work, it was resolved that letters be addressed to the English and American Bible Societies, and to the several local committees, and that these be prepared by Dr. Bridgman.

"After some conversation on the style of translation to be preferred, and on the place and time of meeting, &c., &c., and prayer by the Rev. Mr. Shuck, the Committee adjourned.'

"Further, it is proper to state that no intimation was given to this Committee of the intended "withdrawal" on the 19th ult., till about noon on the preceding day, when the Recording Secretary received the following note from the Rev. W. C. Milne:

"As we think it proper that you should be, as early as possible, apprized of the step which we are about to take, I herewith beg to inform you that Messrs. Medhurst, Stronach and myself will, on our meeting to-morrow, give
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notice of our withdrawal from the delegation for the translation of the Old Testament, and our purpose to hand in our resignation to our respective constituents—this being the only alternative left us by the instructions received from the Directors of our Society."

"Accordingly, when the Committee met at ten o'clock next forenoon, the withdrawal was announced and recorded in due form; but no reason assigned for the step, except that it was "the only alternative" left them, nor any explanation given why such was imposed by their Directors.

"You are now, Dear Brethren, in full possession of all the circumstances of our case. Thus situated, we have, with no inconsiderable degree of anxiety, endeavored prayerfully to consider the work before us in its various aspects, as it presents itself to us, and as it may to you and to our respective Societies and friends abroad.

"With regard to those who have at this stage of our work thus suddenly withdrawn, we would hold the language of the patriarch: Let there be no strife between you and us, for we are brethren. They have chosen their course, and have, while engaged on the Old Testament especially, persisted in a mode of dealing with the inspired text in which we could not concur; and now, upon their withdrawal, leaving us no prospect that the result of their labors can suffice for you or for us. What we want is a translation of the Bible in Chinese, that shall be as faithful, and as plain and simple as is our common English Version.

"You feel, no doubt, as we do, the pressing want of a standard version so prepared, that we can all unite in spreading it far and wide among this dark-minded people—a version to which we can appeal, and declare to them that it is a faithful and plain translation of the revealed Word of Jehovah, the God of heaven. And on each of us in regard to this work there is an incumbent duty; and it is a very weighty and solemn one. Too long already has it been delayed, and the Bible kept back from the people; while considerable amount of funds are held in abeyance ready to be used as soon as the work is prepared.

"As your delegates, we have felt bound to proceed, steadily adhering to the plan you have marked out for us. Since the withdrawal, we have in the most sober and careful manner, contemplated every expedient our own minds and others could suggest; and we have told you the result. We would not act rashly, nor be in too much haste. Having put our hands to the work, we are unwilling to turn back; nay, rather we would pledge ourselves anew to do all we can—anxious to secure for the furtherance of this work, the Divine blessing and the aid of your counsels and your prayers. Thus sustained, we have confidence that what we all so much desire will be accomplished in an acceptable manner; and the word of God, through the instrumentality of both you and us, prove a blessing to great numbers of this pagan people.

"You see, Dear Brethren, what are our views; and we earnestly call upon you to aid us all you can, and in such manner as you deem best; our progress shall be faithfully reported to you from time to time, while we endeavor to pursue our work to the end."
The tone of this letter is perfectly friendly towards the delegates who withdrew. The only remark that could be complained of at all, is, that they "persisted, especially while engaged on the Old Testament, in a mode of dealing with the inspired text in which we could not concur." In making this assertion, the Committee are to be justified or condemned according to the actual-facts of the case, as I have said above.

Dr. Williams, as a chronicler of passing events, in the April number of the Chinese Repository for 1851, made some observations on the withdrawal of these three Delegates from the Committee, deriving part of his information no doubt from these letters; which came into his hands from his connection with the Local Committee at Canton. Upon the receipt of the April No. of the Repository in Shanghai, there was some correspondence with Dr. Bridgman with respect to this article in the Repository, he being erroneously supposed to be the author of the remarks objected to. I was absent from Shanghai during this correspondence, and when I returned and heard of it, I used all the endeavors I could with both parties engaged in it, to have the matter composed without an appeal to the public. Our Committee had no agency or connection with those remarks, but as their letter to the Bible Society was complained of, I offered to procure a copy to be sent immediately to Messrs. Medhurst, Stronach and Milne, if they would apply for it. This offer was rejected.

On the 1st of August, Messrs. Medhurst, Stronach, and Milne published a letter to the Editor of the Chinese Repository, complaining of the remarks made upon them in said periodical; but as neither I, nor the Committee of which I was a member, had any connection whatsoever with those remarks, as I have said above, I shall not enter into that discussion at all, nor notice any part of their letter to the Editor of the Chinese Repository, except that which refers to our Committee, and which led to my letter to the B. & F. Bible Society. On the 5th page of their letter, Messrs. M., S., & M. wrote as follows:—

"From the above it is evident, that a letter has been written by a body calling itself the Committee of Delegates, to a public body (the British and Foreign Bible Society) regarding the principles of translation adopted by the London Society's missionaries. That the remarks in the letter above referred to were prejudicial to the said missionaries, is evident, because it is said, that "their associates did not approve of their principles of translation," and that "this difference of opinion had become so marked, as to jeopard the further harmonious action of the Committee." Here we ask, was it fair, was it honorable, in the so-called Committee of Delegates, to remark disapprovingly upon the principles adopted by their former associates, in a letter to a public
body with which they both wish to stand on good terms, without giving those associates a sight of the letter, and affording them an opportunity of defending themselves; leaving them to glean a few scattered hints of what has been written from the pages of a periodical four months after the date?"

It is plainly intimated here that "the so-called Committee of Delegates" was guilty of unfair and dishonorable conduct, because they sent to a public body an opinion disapproving the principles of translation adopted by Messrs. M., S., & M. without having first shown said letter to them. I have already given the letters that were written, and I am perfectly willing to submit to the judgment of any impartial persons, whether there is anything unfair or dishonorable in those letters; and also the question, whether we were bound, under the circumstances, to send said letters unasked for, to Dr. M. and his friends. As soon as we knew that any offense was taken at the letter to the B. & F. Bib. Soc., we offered to furnish a copy to the parties aggrieved if they would apply for it. Can not a party express in a letter, an opinion in perfectly respectful language, of the methods of translation pursued by another party, especially when the expression of this opinion is necessary to account for a course of action they themselves are about to pursue, without rendering themselves justly liable to be published as unfair and dishonorable? Will Dr. Meunier and the other signers of this letter, say that they have never sent to any "public body," "remarks prejudicial to any missionaries in China," without first sending his or their letters to the parties remarked on for their perusal? Would he or they be willing to have every such letter publicly denounced as unfair and dishonorable? It is the general sentiment, certainly of all with whom I am acquainted, that in their correspondence, they are fully entitled to express their opinions on the conduct of others, especially if they are engaged on a public work in which many are interested; they must only see to it, that the opinions expressed do not offend against Christian charity, are couched in proper language, and are justified by the facts of the case.

The opinions expressed in the letters given above do not offend against any one of these points: their whole tone is kind and respectful to those who had withdrawn, and though an opinion adverse to their methods of translation is expressed, there is not the slightest insinuation of any improper motives; the desire to do their duty is as fully accorded to them, as it is claimed for ourselves. We did not deserve to be published as unfair and dishonorable for writing such letters. Though I have no more taste, I suppose, than other people have, for seeing what I have joined in doing, publicly characterized
in this way, I was disposed to let these remarks pass without any notice, at any rate from myself; and this resolution would no doubt have been adhered to, but for two reasons:—1st, letters received from friends out of Shanghai led me to suppose that some justification of the opinions expressed in these letters should be given; and 2dly, a personal acquaintance with the method of translation pursued in the Pentateuch, and in some of the Epistles, determined me to bring before the public the question of the principles of translation which should guide the translators of the SS., with particular reference to the question of what freedom should be allowed, and what denied to translators in the Chinese language. It was under these circumstances that I wrote the letter of the 10th of November, in which the remarks on the translation of the 1st chapter of the Epistle to the Ephesians were contained.

I intended, when that letter was written, to have prepared and published immediately, a review of the translation of the New Testament made by the Delegates, pointing out as fairly as I could its excellencies and defects; and calling the attention of the Bible Societies in England and America to liberties taken in rendering portions thereof, which I think should not be allowed in any translations patronized by either of those great Societies. This intention was frustrated by a return of the affection of my head soon after that letter was dispatched, which led to the use of painful medical remedies, and to my being laid aside from all work for weeks, nay months.

I fully admit that such a letter, as the one written on the translation of the 1st of Ephesians, should not be sent without the parties, whose translation was commented on, having some notice of said comments, that they might explain away the objections and justify their own course; and I sincerely regret that these three missionary brethren should have been subjected to the extreme irritation, which a supposition that I had intended a covert and secret attack upon their translation, could not but cause them. I had no such intention, and wrote nothing to the Bible Societies about their modes of translation, that I did not intend immediately to lay before them and the public; but I did not design either in public or private to assail their motives, or to call in question either their fairness or honor. It is true I did not deem it necessary to send them a copy of my letter, for the courtesy shown by them to Dr. Bridgman and myself in their letter of 30th of January, 1850, and the manner in which supposed inconsistencies of mine were published in their letter of Aug. 1st, 1851, without a single private line to ask an explanation of these apparent in-
consistencies, certainly absolved me from any obligation to pursue such a course to them, as I intended to publish immediately. But I repeat it again, that I am exceedingly sorry my comments on their mode of translation should have come before them in a manner peculiarly irritating; the only amend I can make them, is to state publicly, as I have done, the circumstances of the case, and to express my sincere regret for the unnecessary pain and vexation the whole thing has caused them. I must, however, here say that I attach not the slightest blame to the Secretaries of the B. & F. B. S. in printing my letter for private circulation, and sending it to the parties concerned, as they did not know that I intended publishing myself; I only regretted that they did not transmit my name with the comments.*

Before I can come to the only question in which the public can be supposed to have any permanent concern, I must continue my narrative to show my connection with the translation of the New Testament, and to explain some supposed inconsistencies in my conduct that gave Dr. M. and his friends a great deal of trouble in their letter of Aug. 1st, 1851; and which they endeavor to display to my great disadvantage in their recent strictures, dated June 16th, 1852; which, I can not but think, could have been all well spared, if they had addressed a private note to me asking an explanation, instead of publishing a great many guesses and probable conjectures.

In consequence of an attack of illness, involving a very great derangement of my nervous system, my health has never been such, since the commencement of this version in 1847, as to allow of my engaging, for any consecutive weeks, in any kind of labor requiring daily application for several hours. If I take my own time, and work when I am able, and lie by when I can not, I am, by God's goodness, in the course of a year enabled to do something; some days undergoing a

---

* I have mislaid or lost the copy of my letter to the Bible Society, and from my having been taken ill so soon after it was sent away, and my mind turned to other matters, I can not speak positively on some points that have been brought up. Mr. Culbertson, in his letter says, "I am under the impression that he (Bishop Boone) requested the Committee of the Bible Society to furnish you with a copy of his remarks." My impression differs from Mr. C.'s. I saw this statement before it was sent; Mr. C. had written "I feel very confident," or some such words; and I requested him to change them to, "I am under the impression," for I could not remember having made this request. I may also state here that it was proposed to publish Mr. Culbertson's letter containing criticisms on the translation of the Pentateuch immediately, but he was dissuaded from doing so by myself and others, on the ground that it would be bringing before the public, an unpublished work. I was also influenced in the advice I gave him by the consideration that the review of the New Testament proposed by myself would bring the subject sufficiently before both the translators and the public.
good deal of labor; on other days, and these often many in succession, not able to look into a book or touch a pen: at no time in all the last five years have I, I think, for one month, certainly not for two, been able to carry on any work in common with others. It would have required too much of well persons, to ask them to wait for me when sick, and there is no interest or profit in carrying on a work, which goes on in one's absence, and of which the thread is lost every week or ten days.

In their recent paper, Dr. M. and Messrs. S. and M. insinuate that my ill health is a mere sham, and that my non-attendance at the translation-table was owing to want of interest in the work; and state that as soon as they withdrew, I attended the meetings of the Committee. In this they do me injustice; and they should have known better, as the means of knowing were at their hand. I would have been always glad to have attended the meetings of the Committee, had my health and strength permitted the amount of labor that would have rendered my attendance of any value even in my own eyes.

This was very strongly my feeling when the work was first commenced, and for a long time after; but the affection of my spine put it out of my power to attend with any regularity that would have compensated for my relinquishing other pursuits. At the time of which I speak, in such work carried on even in my own house, and by the members of my own mission, from whom I could naturally expect more indulgence towards my infirmities than from any others, though they were for several months engaged only a few hours a day in making a colloquial version of St. Matthew's Gospel, I was not able to work with them a single week. All that I could do was to take their work into my own study, and add what help I could, at such times and such hours as I found myself able.

To a Committee composed of much better Chinese scholars than myself, I could give no aid in this way. Had I been well enough to attend and to discuss every point as it came up, I should have hoped to have been able to contribute my quota towards a common version, and should have gladly contributed it: as it was, I could not attend the meetings of the Committee, and had to relinquish the privilege of contributing anything, however slight, to so good a work.

But it is urged, that after the separation of Dr. M. and Messrs. S. and M., I attended the meetings of the Committee frequently, and "manifested great anxiety for the preparation of the translation." I did feel much interest in the translation, and my brethren in the Committee were very desirous of my attendance and aid; my health
had been gradually and slowly improving for two years and a half, and I promised myself much gratification in aiding them to some extent in their work. This expectation was, however, doomed only to disappointment. Through no one week could I make good my attendance: during the months of May and June I was away; in the summer months, though they were kind enough to hold their meetings in my own house, there were many days I could not sit with them; when autumn came on, I found it useless to attempt any further continuance of my efforts, and the matter has remained so ever since.

It is next made a matter of complaint against me that I kept my position in the Committee merely for purposes of controversy, and that I had health enough for controversial writing, but not enough for the easier work of translation. I really feel it to be small work answering to the public such charges and insinuations as these against my character and motives; but as I wish to make this communication a narrative one, I will go on. My position in the Committee was retained because it was the desire of my constituents that I should do so. The version was to be made in the name and for the use of all the Protestant missionaries in China, by missionaries chosen by them to act as their delegates. A great majority of the missionaries were in favor of Shin to render God, and they thought that this word should have been used in the version as it was made by their delegates, in their name and for their use: on the contrary, as the majority of those who had the labor of preparing the version, which was not small, were in favor of Shângti, they thought this term should be used—the arrangement made under these circumstances was to leave a blank. My continuance on the Committee only served to keep matters in this state. It gave me not the slightest advantage in conducting the controversy in writing, or in any other manner. It was very competent for Dr. M. or Messrs. S. and M., to have withdrawn from the arrangement which made the version that of the whole body of Protestant missionaries, at any time it suited them; but while it was to be the version of all the Protestant missionaries, they could not expect the majority of these missionaries to give up to a minority in their own version. With respect to my controversial writings, I will only say that they were undertaken from a sense of duty,—that they cost me much pain, and were written, especially the last, with many interruptions: and that if the total amount of 814 octavo pages published by Dr. Medhurst (the pamphlets severally containing pp. 280, 170, 107, 16, 88, 75, 22, 16, 40); and those of 282
pages by Dr. Legge (severally 43, 73, 166,) are thrown into the opposite scale to my two pamphlets of pp. 69 and 168, the inference must be, that I am either particularly disinclined to controversy, or that my health must have proved a great hindrance, to account for my allowing them to have so many more words than I. My publishing two hundred and thirty-seven pages of controversial writings in five years, is to be taken as proof that I could attend the daily meetings of a Committee that sat four hours per diem, and carry on discussions from day to day, because Dr. M. thinks the Committee sessions the easier of the two. He has had ample experience of both kinds of labor, and his opinion therefore should not lightly be called in question; but then the worthy Doctor's nerves are sound, he suffers from no affection of the spine, and these things should be taken into the account before his opinion is allowed to settle the question.

Dr. M. andMessrs. S. and M., after mentioning my two pamphlets, remark, "thus it seems 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 Societies into a state of endless perplexity, and retards in no small degree the circulation of the Bible in China." To persons at a distance, and unacquainted with the relative position of the parties in this controversy, the above paragraph would convey a very incorrect impression. We have here an attempt to make me responsible for all the consequences of this controversy as the stirrer-up and continuer of it. Now what are the facts of the case? After China was opened, and the missionaries had proceeded to the five ports, dissatisfaction with the use of Shāngtī grew up at all points; this was while I was absent in the United States. Upon my return, I found the point whether Shāngtī or Shin should be used to render the word God, already undergoing a discussion. It was sometime before I became in favor of the use of Shin. The objections to Shāngtī seemed fatal to me, long before I saw my way clear to the use of Shin; the point on which I stuck being that Shin was not the name of the highest class of beings known to the Chinese. "Shāngtī is not a shin," it was said. On this point my mind was balanced for some time, until ample proof was found that Shāngtī was a Shin, that he was expressly called the "chief of the Shin," and that he is always worshiped among the Shin, and as a Shin. Since I ascertained these facts, my mind has never doubted of the propriety—nay, necessity—of the use of this term to render the word God, god, gods.
But I did not raise this discussion, I only engaged in it after Dr. Medhurst and others had been discussing it more than a year. The missionaries at the five ports, I am very confident, have not adopted their views from any influence of mine, but from their own reflections and researches. Instead of leading the forlorn hope, in carrying on against all reasonable hope a desperate controversy, to the disquietude of the minds of the Directors of the Bible Societies, as persons would infer from the mention made of me above; I have expressed, at very moderate length compared with my opponents, the views of a very large majority of the missionaries in China, chiefly for the information of parties in England and America. With what propriety then can it be said that I have carried on this controversy “to promote my own views,” and have thrown the “Bible Societies into a state of endless perplexity?” How could Dr. Medhurst pen this, when he has himself written nearly a thousand pages on this controversy, and withstood the known views and wishes of a large majority of his missionary brethren? If he sees good reason to do so, of course no one will question his right, but what is the meaning of this attempt to throw the consequences of this discussion upon an individual who belongs to the majority, which majority have scarcely written one page to five of their opponents?

The truth is, those in favor of using Shin for God and god have been, and still are so confident that a fair and practical experiment on the spot, will result ultimately in Protestant missionaries using Shin, that they have not felt themselves under the great pressure to write that the other party has apparently felt. Their argument is a simple one, and all their intercourse with the people, and every fresh investigation from books, only serve to illustrate and confirm their views more and more. Their argument is that Shin is the general name of the Chinese gods from the highest to the lowest, just as Θεός was the name common to all the gods of Greece. When it was objected that Shin was never used for God αρχής θεός, they felt confident if a Chinese writer could be found who ascribed the making of the heavens and the earth to a personal, independent, and intelligent Being, that he would call this being Shin. Neither Dr. Medhurst nor myself after much search were ever able to light on such a passage. Dr. Legge has been more successful, and gives us several passages where Shin is used for God αρχής θεός. At the 53d page of his book he tells us that the two principal temples at Peking, those of Heaven and Earth, are equally dedicated to Shāngtǐ, but under different titles. “In the one it is, the Eternal Spirit (Shin) whom they adore; in the other,
the Spirit (Shin) the Creator and Preserver of the world." This last is particularly striking, as the word Shin stands absolutely, without adjunct or qualifier, on the portals of this temple, as the name of the Creator and Preserver of the world: e.g. this temple is dedicated to "Shin, the Creator and Preserver of the world." At the 28th page he quotes an ode used at a sacrifice to the highest Being worshiped by the Chinese. In the ode, this Being is addressed as Ti 帝 Ruler, Hwang 皇 Sovereign, Shin Hwang 神皇 Divine Sovereign, Shin 神 God, and Hwang Shin 皇神 Sovereign God. The following sentences occur:—"Thou didst produce, O Shin, the sun and the moon and the five planets, and pure and beautiful was their light. The vault of heaven was spread out like a curtain, &c."

Shin here standing absolutely is used as one of the names of the Being who produced the sun and the stars, and who spread out the vault of heaven. This being is also addressed as Ti 帝 Ruler. The authority of this ode can therefore be quoted in favor of calling the Supreme Being by either of these terms. Which term, then, shall we use in rendering Elohim and Θεος? Ti, a title common to the worshiping Emperor, and this the highest worshiped Being; or Shin, a name common to this the highest of the worshiped Beings and all the other worshiped beings? If we are to be guided by Greek and Roman mythology, can we hesitate? The adherents of Shin do not hesitate as to their course, and they feel confident that free intercourse with the people themselves, and fuller investigation, will lead all ultimately to the same conclusion to which they have themselves come. They would not for one moment put any impediment in the way of this discussion, while it is conducted with becoming temper, however much more profitable methods they may fancy they can find of spending their own time: but I will say for myself, as one of them, that I cannot brook the assumption by any party, especially by a party, who has written at great length himself, and who belongs to the minority, of a right to characterize the publication, at a very moderate length, of views opposed to his own, as a controversy carried on "for the promotion of private views:" nor the attempt to throw upon an individual, who has so moderately used a liberty common to all, the odium and responsibility of perplexing Bible Societies.

The next point upon which I find myself arraigned is that of having written my letter of Nov. 10th to the Bible Society for the purpose "of ruining the influence and reputation of Dr. M. and Messrs. S. & M. as translators, and with a view of making out a case of necessity for proceeding with another translation;" and to prove this, a long
list of my acts and doings is given. As in the case of previous charges, so here I will meet this, by a plain narrative of the facts of the case, and leave the reader to judge for himself. As I have stated above, my health did not permit me to meet with the other members of the Committee, when, in the early part of 1848, they entered upon the translation of the Gospels. I felt, however, very considerable interest in all they did, and kept myself informed of the progress of the work through Dr. Bridgman, who was my next door neighbor.

When the Gospel of St. Matthew was finished and reviewed, I procured a copy from Dr. Bridgman and read it very carefully with two good Chinese teachers: they were pleased with the style, but I observed that they missed the meaning of many passages from the brevity with which they were expressed. This brevity, I should here observe, is greatly admired by the Chinese, who esteem terseness and rhythm much more than perspicuity. I thought the translation of Matthew by my brother delegates, better than anything I had yet seen in Chinese; the renderings were in general close, some of them strikingly apt and beautiful, and the style, though not the one I thought likely to be most useful, was yet preferred by the Chinese I consulted, to that of previous versions. I remember very well the opinion expressed by a man then recently baptized, and who is now a candidate for deacon's orders. He said he thought that one who had studied three years would be able to read a version in the colloquial dialect of Shanghái; that one who had been to school seven years would be able to understand the version by Mr. Gutzlaff; but that one would have to go to school for ten years before his scholarship would be sufficient to enable him to understand this version: for himself, however, he expressed his decided preference for the style of the new version. I must also add that the boys in our school, who are made to memorize portions of the New Testament on Sunday, as they memorize their Classics during the week, have always expressed a decided preference for the New Version on account of its greater smoothness and rhythm.

Notwithstanding all this Chinese commendation, and though I was well aware this kind of style would make our translation more popular with Chinese scholars, even of very moderate attainments, I preferred very decidedly a plainer and more perspicuous style. This taste of the Chinese with regard to terseness, I consider faulty and perverse, and think it should not be yielded to; especially when it leads them, as it frequently does, to leave the subject to be understood from the context, and that too under circumstances where different persons would supply different words. I have known instances, in my own
efforts to make translations with the aid of Chinese teachers, of their insisting upon the non-necessity of inserting words, which they declared no one could fail to supply; when the very parties themselves, having forgotten, after the lapse of some time, what word was to be supplied, have made blundering work in the attempt to explain what they had themselves written. I therefore have never thought this terse style the best one that could be chosen, especially as the Bible is to be circulated without note or comment.

These views I expressed freely to Dr. Bridgman at the time, and had no doubt that he spoke of them to the other members of the Committee. I afterwards procured a copy of St. John's Gospel, and examined it in the same careful manner; and having done so, I expressed to Dr. Bridgman the opinion, that judging from the comparison of Matthew and John, this fondness for terseness at the expense of perspicuity was growing upon the Committee. There were however the same things to admire in the translation of John as in Matthew; there was abundant evidence of great labor and pains, and of fine Chinese scholarship; and though there was sometimes a liberty taken, which transgressed the rules I would lay down for myself in translating an inspired author, I observed no departures from the original that would have caused me to hesitate in pronouncing it a faithful version. There was nothing to cause me to mark the date of this review of the Gospel of St. John, and therefore I can not say when I read it; but I know the Committee had been at work for a long time, I should think much more than a year; they had gone over all the Gospels and reviewed their work. I concluded, therefore, their style and principles of translation were settled, and carefully examined the abovementioned portions, and formed my opinion of the work from them; and it is upon that opinion so formed that I acted under all the circumstances cited by Dr. Medhurst and Messrs. Stronach and Milne in their "Strictures."

When I joined—cheerfully joined—in giving forth the version to the Bible Societies, and to all our brother missionaries in China, I judged of the whole from my examination of the two books abovementioned; and though, as I have said above, the style was not the one I would have preferred, yet I considered the version superior to any that had preceded it, and rejoiced in its prospective publication. Having examined into the merits of the translation thus far, I rested satisfied with the judgment formed, as this judgment (i.e. as to the general merits of the translation) was questioned by no one. The state of my health was not such as to have prevented my reading over
the whole version several times, if I had deemed myself called upon
to do so from any cause: but the work was not yet published; it
would have cost my teachers many hours' labor to have copied it, and
made it necessary to lay aside other work I had for them. This could
easily have been done, if there had been any sufficient motive for my
having the copy made but I saw none; the Scriptures used in our
public services were in the local dialect of Shānhǎi; I did not pro-
pose to myself any private labor on the version; no one at that time
made any objection to the version on the score of want of closeness
to the original; of the style I had satisfied myself by the examination
made.

This will account, I hope satisfactorily, to Messrs. M., S., & M.
for my joining cheerfully with them on all the occasions they have
mentioned; but there is nothing in all this to prevent my discovering
faults in this new version, either in the parts examined, or in those
not examined by me; or to hinder me, upon the discovery of these
faults to adopt the means I should judge most suitable, for preventing
their doing injury, and to procure their correction. The publication
of an edition of the Epistles was long delayed from the fact that the
first edition of the New Testament at the press of the London Mission-
ary Society was in large type, and was not carried through the
Epistles; and at Ningpo no edition of the Epistles has ever been
published.

The first time I heard that unjustifiable liberties had been taken in
the Epistles, and that to such an extent as should affect the printing
of them, was when in carrying the Ningpo edition through the press,
they came to the Epistle to the Romans. The parties, who were
carrying that edition through the press, found what they regarded as
such unwarrantable liberties in the rendering of St. Paul, that they
hesitated about going on with the edition. I was consulted, and exam-
nined the passages objected to, and gave my opinion it would be better
to cease printing any further until the Epistles were published from
the press of the London Missionary Society, and we could examine
them with the last corrections of the Committee of Delegates. Since
they have been examined in print, there has, I believe, been no desire
to publish them by any of those engaged in the Ningpo edition.

When the letter from the Committee of the 4th March, 1851, was
written, I had not yet examined the Epistles, and understood that the
gravest complaints were made against the freedom of renderings in the
Old Testament, and the right there claimed to omit, alter and add, as
to the translators seemed best. Dr. Bridgman was the only member of
the Committee who had labored on the New Testament, he was the writer of the letter, and he was the party who it was understood had questioned not a little the method of translation pursued while on the New Testament; his mind, however, was much more impressed by what had recently been done in the Pentateuch. Mr. Shuck and Mr. Culbertson had the same feelings with Dr. Bridgman with respect to the Old Testament, and they together with Dr. Bridgman, called the attention of Mr. McClatchie and myself to many passages, and made such statements of what had occurred in the Committee, that Mr. McC. and I readily concurred in the letter; only asking that the note which I have inserted above (see page 4) might be appended to the letter.

Even when I returned from Ningpo in the end of June last year, I had not yet examined the version of the Epistles (with the exception of the passages in Romans above referred to) with a view to ascertain whether the charge of unjustifiable looseness in rendering was just or not. Some parties may think my conduct remiss, being, as I was, a member of the Committee, in not examining the version more carefully for myself before, I joined in handing it over to the Bible Societies and the missionaries; but as my doing so arose from my confidence in the translators, they are surely the last persons who should reproach me with the act. They do me nothing more than justice, when they give me credit for “meaning what I said,” and acting in a straightforward manner when I joined with them in giving out the version as I did. They do me, however, great injustice, when they suppose that my criticisms were the result of a combined plan “to ruin their influence and reputation as translators.” They resulted from the train of events I have just narrated.

After the Epistles were published, having heard this charge of looseness, I examined them for myself, and found a degree of freedom taken with the inspired writers which I was certainly not prepared for, and which had I known, I certainly would have opposed, and animadverted on this version when it was proposed to give it over to the Bible Societies, just as I intended to do last November. My letter to the Bible Society did not contain by any means so full a statement, nor such explicit proof of the unjustifiable liberties taken in this translation, as I intended to set forth in my review, and as I shall now attempt to set forth in this paper. Because my criticisms were not sent in to the Committee, but I claimed and exercised the right of shooting over their heads, and sending them immediately to the Bible Society, I am considered an accuser of brethren, and as bring-
ing a charge against them of "unfaithfulness and incapacity."* Had my object been to submit my criticisms to the Committee, supposing they would have called meetings to take them into consideration, and that they would have corrected the faults I complained of, I would of course have sent my paper privately to them; but I had no reason to expect any such result from my privately sending in these criticisms. Those who had been recently at work with them on the Pentateuch declared that they were resolute in their determination to pursue the course I complained of, and the principles they have defended in their own recent "Strictures," show that they were not misrepresented.

These brethren misunderstand very much my feeling towards them, when they suppose my object is to injure them in any way, or to bring a charge of incapacity against them. I have no such feelings towards them; not the slightest personal rivalry in the matter. That Dr. Medhurst has made extensive acquirements in Chinese, far beyond any other Protestant missionary in China, no one doubts; that his associates Messrs. Stronach and Milne, from their general scholarship and their attainments in Chinese, are well able to second him in his labors, I cheerfully acknowledge; there is no charge of incapacity brought against them, there is no personal rivalry felt; we are all the servants of a common Master; all gifts are from Him; all are laboring for his glory, and none would rejoice more than I, at seeing these brethren made the honored instruments of giving to the Chinese a version, which all who are laboring for the good of China, would be glad to join with them in using. I have prayed for Divine guidance in their behalf, and for a blessing on their labors, since they withdrew from the Committee of Delegates, just as I did before. There is, therefore, I beg to assure them, nothing personal in what I have to say of the translation made by the Committee of Delegates for the New Testament; let it stand or fall on its own merits, utterly irrespective of the men who made it. I am supposed to have been influenced by personal feelings in having criticised their version as I

* The Committee of Delegates for the revision of the New Testament was virtually broken up when Messrs. Medhurst, Stronach, and Milne withdrew from the Committee of Delegates for translating the Old Testament. I say virtually broken up, for the members of said Committee could never have been brought into continuous session again to attend to any work. The agreement to receive further criticisms, until the Old Testament was completed, contemplated the members of the Committee who had translated the New Testament being constantly together for the translation of the Old, so that criticisms could be easily considered by them and settled. After the withdrawal of the three Delegates from the Committee for the translation of the Old Testament, this became impracticable.
have done; let this be judged of by the nature of the objections I now bring forward, and the manner in which they are sustained: if the objections are either frivolous or unsustained, then let my criticism be laid to this account; but if on the contrary, the defects complained of are of a character to affect the statement of important Christian doctrines, and the actual existence of the defects is made clearly to appear, then I hope that, not only indifferent persons, but that Dr. Medhurst, Mr. Stronach, and Mr. Milne, will themselves absolve me from any such motive, and not suffer their feelings of regard for me to be lessened by my pointing out improvements necessary to the greater and more extensive usefulness of their work.

Apologising for this very long preface, rendered necessary by the misconception under which I should otherwise have come before the reader, I shall now address my remarks wholly to the merits of the version in question. The point at issue will probably be discussed at much length, and perhaps by several pens; I would bespeak the absence of all personality from the future discussion: it can answer no purpose to dispute in public how much notice the respective parties took of the different views of translation adopted by the other. I have no personal connection with the matter myself, and therefore may be allowed to say, that when a matter of fact of this kind gets into a tangle, discussion never unravels it; and that in this case, it is not worth unraveling; the only real question of importance is, which view is Right? To the consideration of this subject, we will now proceed.

We shall best facilitate this inquiry by laying down, in the words of some generally acknowledged authorities, the principles which should guide a translator in his work; and then test this version by the standard so established. Ernesti, in his work on the Principles of Interpretation, Part III, lays down the following rules:—

"§ 188. The object of interpretation is to give the sense of an author, without addition, diminution, or change. A version ought to be an exact image of the original or archetype, in which image nothing should be drawn either greater or less, better or worse, than the original. It should be so composed that it might be acknowledged as another original itself. It follows, that a translator should use those words, and those only, which clearly express all the meaning of the author, and in the same manner as the author. But this needs illustration.

"§ 189. The words of the version ought to correspond as exactly as possible to those of the original. First, as the same meaning must be conveyed, those words are to be selected, the force of which plainly corresponds to that of the original, and which are not ambiguous, but of a plain and established mean-
ing among those for whom the translation is made. Those words are to be preferred (if such can be found) which correspond altogether with the words of the author, in respect to etymology, tropical use, and construction. But great caution is necessary here, in judging whether the usage of the two languages agrees. Otherwise no version can be made, which can be well understood by those who are ignorant of the original language; but rather an obscuration of the author ensues, and not unfrequently a perversion of him. For men will understand a Latin version, according to the Latin usus loquendi (and so of a German translation); when they ought to be understood, if the rule above be violated, according to the Greek or Hebrew idiom. Or perhaps the unlearned reader will not understand them at all, although from the habit of hearing and using the words he may think he understands them. A frequent case indeed among the unlearned, and I may add, among their teachers also.

"§ 190. When one can not translate ad verbum, he must translate ad sensum. But if appropriate words as above described can not be selected, on account of the difference of idiom between the two languages (the original and that of the translator), which often express the same things by words that do not correspond in their etymology or their proper signification (specially is this the case with the oriental and occidental languages, so that a literal translation of the former would often be unintelligible in the latter), then we must relinquish the design of translating ad verbum, and content ourselves with merely giving the sense of the original plainly designated."

In §§192, 193, 194, he gives "cases where we must adhere to the mode of translating ad verbum, in which he mentions various causes, which operate to prevent a translator from strictly following the rule in §190; and in §195, he lays down the following very important rule, viz., "In very difficult and doubtful passages also, a literal translation must be given, because a version ad sensum would be assuming that one definitely understood the real meaning of the passage. This might do in a commentary, but not in a translation. With propriety says Castalio on 1 Pet. iv. 6, "This I do not understand, therefore I translate it ad verbum."

These rules have commended themselves to the minds of the ablest scholars of Europe and America, and are remarkable for the happy mean which they take between over-strictness on the one hand, and a careless liberty on the other: a departure from the words of the author is allowed, when a difference of idiom requires it; but the onus probandi lies upon the translator whenever he departs from a literal rendering; and when translating doubtful passages where Christians have differed, he must translate ad verbum.

The Christians of Great Britain and America have ever been greatly in favor of a close translation of God's word, and it is for this feature
that they most highly prize their own inestimable translation, the version of King James. Of this translation, John Selden, 'the learnedest man of the nation,' says, "There is no book so translated as the Bible for the purpose. If I translate a French book into English, I turn it into English phrase, not into French-English. *Il fait froid,* I say 'tis cold; not, makes cold. But the Bible is rather translated into English words than into English phrase. *The Hebraisms are kept, and the phrase of that language is kept."

Bishop Horsley says, "When the translators in James the First's time began their work, they prescribed to themselves some rules, which it may not be amiss for all translators to follow. Their reverence for the Sacred Scriptures induced them to be as literal as they could, to avoid obscurity; and it must be acknowledged that they were extremely happy in the simplicity and dignity of their expressions. *Their adherence to the Hebrew idiom is supposed at once to have enriched and adorned our language; and as they labored for the general benefit of the learned and unlearned, they avoided all words of Latin original, when they could find words in their own language, even with the aid of adverbs and prepositions, which would express their meaning."

Dr. Geddes says, "The highest eulogiums have been made on the translation of James the First, both by our own writers and by foreigners. And indeed, if accuracy, fidelity, and the strictest attention to the letter of the text, be supposed to constitute the qualities of an excellent version, *this of all versions must, in general, be accounted the most excellent.* Every sentence, every word, every syllable, every letter and point, seem to have been weighed with the nicest exactitude, and expressed either in the text or margin, with the greatest precision. Pagninus himself is hardly more literal, and it was well remarked by Robertson, above a hundred years ago, *that it may serve for a lexicon of the Hebrew language, as well as for a translation."

In bringing this Chinese version to the test of the rules to be gathered from the opinions of the learned men quoted above, I shall follow the order in which the points complained of are mentioned in the letter of Dr. Bridgman to the Bible Societies; viz., first, "a questionable degree of conciseness;" and secondly, "unwarrantable liberties which will be deprecated by all who hold that in a translation of the Inspired Word, nothing is to be altered, nothing added, nothing taken away."

In my letter to the British and Foreign Bible Society, in order to illustrate both these points, I took the first chapter of the Epistle to
the Ephesians, the liberties there taken having struck my mind most forcibly. In the remarks made in my letter to the Bible Society, I had reference to both the defects objected to above, but I did not in any way prefer a charge of incapacity against the translators, or question either their piety or motives. With a view of calling attention to the mistakes which readers are liable to fall into from the conciseness of the style, I inclosed some words in brackets which are not in the text, and which may, or may not be supplied, according as the reader understands the characters before him. I also mentioned a few, and only a very few, of the cases, in which my teachers made mistakes in supplying the subjects of sentences, and in pointing out the antecedents of the pronouns used. Because of this Dr. M. and Messrs. S. & M. regard me as "very partially acquainted with Chinese, to suppose that it admits of the relative in the way western writers employ it;" and state "that any Chinese scholar would know that the relative is understood in the passage before us (Eph. i. 3.)."

Where I supply the correct subject in my translations, and mention what my teachers supposed to be the subject of the verb; they say my object is to "intensify" the objection by giving it as my teacher's; and the opinion of "a Chinese scholar of considerable eminence" is quoted (I suppose with approbation) by these brethren, who undertake, without having seen or consulted these teachers, to contradict my statement flatly. He says, "now I dare to contradict the assertion;" and that for no better reason than "they could not so understand it;" and implies that I either myself crammed the teachers with this meaning, and then represented it as their's; or that I could not understand the words of my teachers." These brethren also set a small estimate on the teachers whose opinions are given, and state that they themselves have confessedly the best assistants.

We shall make sad work in discussing this point, if the assertions of fellow-missionaries are to be disposed of, and questions of fact set aside in this way. I make these remarks, because the question, whether the translation of any given portion of the Bible is clear or obscure, is a question of fact, to be settled by experiment—which experiment must be conducted by the missionaries here in China, and made known to others by their testimony. The appeal must not be made to the men who make a version, however learned, but to those for whose benefit it is made. If the parties consulted are fairly within this class, and can not understand—I do not say the deep meaning of an inspired Apostle—but the simple grammatical construction of the sentences employed in translating him, so as to make them correspond
VINDICATION OF COMMENTS.

Having been assailed, as I have stated above, for mentioning my teacher's translation of some of the passages, I have spent considerable time in submitting this chapter to six Chinese teachers, who are employed in the mission with which I am connected; and I faithfully give below their understanding of several clauses in this chapter, which I think are very obscure to Chinese readers. And here I will solemnly declare that I have abstained from giving any one of them the slightest hints to lead them to any particular interpretation. They do not know what object I have in view; I have merely requested them carefully to read this chapter over and over again, to study its clauses minutely, and to give me their understanding of the meaning of them. Four of these men are siútsái, two of them of more than twenty years' standing; the others are as fair scholars as are generally obtained by foreigners for teachers. I will give their surnames, and some description of them, that the reader may judge if their opinions are to be despised. The surname of the first is Wú. He is the teacher I followed in the translation I sent to the B. & F. Bible Society, and whose opinions are given in some instances in which I did not follow him. He is now 54 years of age; he took his degree of siútsái when 19, and has been engaged in teaching all his life. Thirty-one of his pupils have taken the degree of siútsái, and one of them that of kújin. The second is Chau Siensang, who is also a siútsái; he took his degree when 21, and is now 52 years old; his life has been devoted to literary pursuits. The third is Ts&u Siensang, a man 41 years of age, of fair scholarship. The fourth is surnamed Kú, aged 31; he took his degree of siútsái when 17, and is a very clever man and a good scholar. The fifth is a descendant of the celebrated Paul Sú; he took his degree of siútsái at 18, and is a man of good talents and scholarship. The sixth is surnamed Tsien, and is a very good teacher. That the reader may have before his eye at a glance the various misconceptions that arise from the conciseness of the style, I will give the opinions of all the teachers on each clause, before I proceed to the next.

The 3d verse of Ephesians I. reads as follows in English:—"Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ." The translation given in the Delegates' Version, closely rendered, is as follows:—"Blessings and thanks to my (or our) Lord Jesus Christ's father Shángtí, (here follows a preposition that may be rendered either)
because (or because of,) Christ causes me (or us) to receive divine gifts in heaven."

1st. Wú Siensang translates this verse from the new version as follows:—"Blessings and thanks to Shângtì, the father of our Lord Jesus Christ, because Christ causes us to receive divine gifts in heaven." I may here say that, thinking the opinions of this man of most importance, I gave him this Epistle, and requested him to write a commentary on the first chapter; he spent two days on it. The result of his studies is here given. When asked the meaning of Shin, in the phrase Shin hwâng 神 in, he said it meant the father of Jesus, Shângtì. When asked who caused us to receive these "divine gifts;" he answered, "Christ."

2d. Chau Siensang translates the same as the above; says Christ causes us to receive the divine gifts, and that Shin refers to Shângtì.

3d. Tsâu Siensang's translation is as above; Christ causes us to receive the gifts. Shin, in the phrase Shin hwâng, is Shângtì.

4th. Kú Siensang renders, "Blessings and thanks to Shângtì, the father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who, because of Christ, causes us to receive divine gifts in heaven." The Shin, in the phrase Shin hwâng, is Shângtì. This man, when I first consulted him last autumn on this verse, read it as the others do; but having been told then that the original made Shângtì the author of these gifts; he reads it now in the manner I have given it; but he did not discover this himself.

5th. Sâ Siensang translates as Wú does, and says that it is Christ who causes us to receive divine gifts. He says also that Shin is Shângtì.

6th. Tsien Siensang:—"Shângtì, because of Christ, causes us to receive divine gifts." Shin is Shângtì. This man also was told last autumn how it was in the original.

The 4th, 5th, and 6th verses read in English as follows:—\(^4\) "According as he hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before him in love: \(^5\) having predestinated us unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to himself, according to the good pleasure of his will, \(^6\) to the praise of the glory of his grace, wherein he hath made us accepted in the beloved." The Chinese closely rendered is:—\(^4\) "From before the making of the world (here a preposition occurs which may mean either) because (or because of) Jesus chose me (or us), caused me (or us) to be clean without spot before the Lord, according to his benevolent love; \(^5\) according to his good will, remembering Jesus Christ, predestinated us (this pronoun is plural) to be sons, \(^6\) to display his
great grace by causing me (or us) to receive gracious gifts by his beloved Son." It will be observed that there is not a single verb in these three verses whose subject is expressed, unless Jesus be regarded as the subject of the clause "Jesus chose us;" they are all left to be supplied. We will now see how this is done by these six teachers severally.

Ist. Wú Siensang renders as follows:—"From before the making of the world, because Jesus chose me (Paul), and caused me (Paul) to be clean and without spot, before the Lord's (Shāngtī's) presence, according to his (Shāngtī's) benevolent love, ⁴ according to his (Shāngtī's) good will, I (Paul) remembering Jesus Christ, he predestinated us (Paul and all the Ephesians) to be sons, ⁵ and to display his (Shāngtī's) great grace, by causing us to receive gracious gifts by his (Shāngtī's) beloved Son." When Wú translated this last autumn, he supposed that the pronoun wo 我, translated above "me (or us)," was to be taken in the plural, and include the Ephesians with Paul; now, after having spent two days on his commentary, he says it decidedly means Paul; accordingly he reads the fifth verse, "I, Paul, remembering Jesus," instead of "we," as he did formerly. To prove that this last view is correct, he points to the change of the singular pronoun wo 聞 in the 4th verse, to wo tsái 我載 (the plural) in the 5th verse.

2d. Chau Siensang spent an hour on this verse, and had great difficulty in deciding upon what was the meaning of the passage. He first understood it as follows:—"From before the making of the world, because Jesus chose me (Paul) and caused me (Paul) to be clean before the Lord (Jesus), according to his (Jesus) benevolent love; ⁴ according to his (Jesus) good will, I (Paul) remembering Jesus Christ, he (Jesus) predestinated us to the adoption of sons, ⁵ to display his (Jesus) great grace, by causing me to receive gracious gifts by his (this, he said, must be Shāngtī's) beloved Son." This last verse made him suppose he had mistaken the meaning of the passage, and he spent nearly an hour in studying it, when he gave the following with some degree of confidence:—"From before the making of the world, because Jesus chose us, and caused us to be clean and without spot, before the Lord (Shāngtī), according to his (Shāngtī's) benevolent love, ⁴ according to his (Shāngtī's) good will, he (Shāngtī) remembering Jesus Christ predestinated us," &c., to end. This was the best he could make of it, and no one certainly can reproach him for so understanding it.

3d. Tsáu Siensang, renders:—"From before the making of the world, because Jesus chose us, and caused us to be clean and
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without spot before the Lord (Shângti), according to his (Shângti's) benevolent love, ⁵ according to his (Shângti's) good will, we (the chosen people) remembering Jesus Christ, he (Shângti) predestinated us (the chosen people) to be sons,” &c.

4th. Kú Siensang:—⁴“From before the foundation of the world, because Jesus Christ chose us, and caused us to be clean and without spot before the Lord's (Jesus) presence, according to his (Jesus) benovolent love; ⁵according to his (Shângti's) good will, he, (Shângti) remembering Jesus Christ, predestinated us to be sons,” &c.

5th. Sū Siensang:—⁴“From before the making of the world, (Shângti) because of Jesus, chose us and caused us to be clean and without spot, before the Lord's (Shângti) presence, ⁵according to his (Shângti's) good will, he, (Shângti) remembering Jesus Christ, predestinated us to be sons,” &c. This man seems to have understood these verses just as the translators intended he should, notwithstanding he misunderstood the 3d verse.

6th. Tsien Siensang complains that the sense is not clear, and renders:—⁴“From before the making of the world, because Jesus chose us, (Shângti) causes us to be clean and without spot before the Lord's (Jesus) presence, according to his (can not say whether this refers to Jesus or Shângti) benevolent love; ⁵according to his (doubtful as above) good will, (Shângti) remembering Jesus Christ predestinated us to be sons,” &c.

From these renderings the reader may judge whether a style that leaves so many words to be supplied, and which educated and clever men supply so variously, is clear or not. Dr. M., and Messrs. S. and M., speaking of the 3d verse say, “Any Chinese scholar would know that the relative is understood in the passage before us.” It may be safely said, that every one of these teachers is much better acquainted with his own language than any missionary in China is; and yet not one of them knew from the context that the relative was to be supplied; for though Kú and Tsien both supply the relative now, I had to tell them last autumn that it was to be supplied before they discovered it. The idea which the majority of the teachers get from the passage is “that because Jesus chose us, and caused us to be clean, according to his own benevolent will; Shângti, remembering this that Jesus had done, predestinated us to be sons.” The nominatives of the verbs not being expressed, those who have no original to refer to, might quarrel endlessly which of the above methods is best, without ever being able to come to a decision; and in deciding, it seems to me that it would not be learning that would stand a man in
stead, but *conjectural sagacity*; for the man who is unquestionably the most learned of these six, seems to have missed the meaning of the translators most.

Though the Chinese do not use the relative as western writers do, they can manage to write with much more perspicuity than the translators have here written. Dr. Medhurst, in his translation made at Batavia, has avoided all ambiguity by introducing the noun, where we have the relative. That translation reads thus:—" Many thanks to Shângtî, our Lord Jesus Christ's father, for that Shângtî because of Christ gives all kinds of spiritual blessings (ling chuh 灵祝) in the heavenly places; before the creation, Shângtî having regard to Christ chose me (or us) according to (his) holy will, to be holy disciples, causing his benevolence to be completely spread abroad; moreover Shângtî, according to his holy will," &c.

I shall not here make any remarks on the translation of verses 7 to 12 inclusive, as my object at present is merely to call attention to the obscurity which arises from the conciseness of the style, but shall have occasion to consider these verses when remarking on the principles of translation manifested in this chapter. In the 13th and 14th verses, however, all my teachers fail to understand the meaning of the translators. These verses read as follows in English:—"In whom ye also trusted, after that ye had heard the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation; in whom also, after that ye believed, ye were sealed with that holy Spirit of promise, which is the earnest of our inheritance, until the redemption of the purchased possession, unto the praise of his glory." The translation, when literally rendered from the Chinese, is as follows:—" Ye having heard the true doctrine, the glad sound that saves you, believed in Christ, and thenupon received, which (or whom) promised holy Shin's sealed declaration (or orders), namely, I (or we) obtain inheritance's earnest, arrived at redemption-day and praise him." The translators themselves render their translation as follows:—"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." None of my teachers so understand what they have here written, nor did I so understand it when I wrote my letter to the Bible Society. Whether the fault is in the readers or writers, can only be learned by asking the opinion of a larger number of readers: that so many have misunderstood it so completely is, I think, proof that the style is too
obscure for a book that is to be published and circulated without note or comment.

1st. Wú Siensang explains as follows:—“Shing Shin is the holy Father, holy Son, and holy Spirit; ming 命 is ming ling 命令 declaration or order; it means 言能信基督即受聖神應許之印命也 that being able to believe in Christ, they thereupon received the holy God’s (i. e. the Trinity’s) sealed declaration. The 14th verse he gives as follows:—“namely, that Christ would give us a pledge that we should obtain an inheritance, and arrived at the day of obtaining redemption, praise him.”

2d. Chau Siensang, explains 命 in the same manner as Wú, viz., as meaning the Trinity. Gives the whole passage as follows:—“Ye believed in Christ, and thereupon received the Trinity’s sealed promised commands (or declarations), viz., that we should obtain the earnest of an inheritance, and arrived at the day of obtaining redemption, praise him.”

3d. Tsáu Siensang:—“Shing Shin is Shánti. Ye believed in Christ, and thereupon received the Holy God’s (Shánti’s) sealed declaration, viz., an earnest that we shall obtain an inheritance, and arrived at the day of obtaining redemption, praise him.”

4th. Kú Siensang says, “The relative so (which or whom) refers to Ti (Shánti); it is Tí who promises. Shing Shin, it appears to me, may be explained in two ways; 1st, as an adjective most lofty, most excellent; or secondly, as a noun, and refer to Shánti; if we make it a noun, the so 所 (relative) is redundant: if we make it an adjective phrase, the character chi 之 is redundant; yin 印 means sealed, ming 命 is hâu ling 號令 official orders or proclamations. “Ye believed in Christ, and thereupon received Shánti’s promised, most excellent sealed declaration, viz., an earnest that we shall obtain an inheritance, and arrived at the day of redemption praise him.”

5th. Sū Siensang:—“Ye believed in Christ, and thereupon received the holy God’s (Shánti’s) sealed declaration, viz., that we should obtain the earnest of an inheritance, and arrived at the day of obtaining redemption praise him.”

6th. Tsien Siensang explains:—“Shing Shin may mean most excellent, or may refer to Shánti; can not say whether it is Shánti or Christ that promises; yin ming means sealed declaration, promised by Shánti or Christ, viz., that I (Paul) should obtain the earnest of an inheritance, and arrived at the day of redemption praise him.”
This concise, abrupt, clipped-short, style is undoubtedly admired by the Chinese; their classics are written in this style, but those classics are unintelligible without a commentary; and the writer of this style is so liable to be misunderstood, that it becomes a serious question whether it should be employed in rendering the Sacred Scriptures into Chinese. The subjects introduced are so foreign to the Chinese mind and modes of thought, that they fall into innumerable mistakes in reading passages that are quite clear to one acquainted with the Sacred Scriptures.

Dr. M. and Messrs. S. & M. think that my object was to "intensify" a misconception of the meaning by representing it as that of my teacher; they must have read the translations of the Scriptures into Chinese, especially the new one, very little with Chinese who had no hand in making them, not to know that any missionary, who has been only three or four years studying the language, would be much more likely, from his knowledge of the subject, to catch their meaning than any member of the Hanlin College, or the whole College put together. In those cases where the subject is left to be supplied, knowing as he does from his acquaintance with the original what the subject is, the missionary supplies it as a matter of course and reads on, not aware that his teacher, who is reading with him, has perhaps quite another subject in his mind. The experiments I have made with the teachers employed in our mission, who are men of much more education and intelligence than nine tenths of the men into whose hands this version must fall, have convinced me, that if this concise style is to be employed in the version circulated by the Bible Societies, they must alter their rule "without note or comment," and allow us to give in the margin some purely philological notes to indicate the subjects of the various sentences and the antecedents of the pronouns; the errors that must otherwise grow up will be wild and fearful indeed.

As my testimony concerning the opinions of my teachers has been so flatly contradicted, and the subject in itself is of so much importance, I will here seriously beg all my missionary brethren, who have been three or four years in the field, and who can put plain questions to their teachers and understand their answers, to put the following queries to their teachers, and write down their answers:—According to this text, who gives us the blessings spoken of in the third verse, Shangti or Jesus? Who chooses us, Shangti or Christ? Who causes us to be clean? To whom does wo refer? To whom does chu refer? To whom does k'i and kiu ch refer? Who
remembers Jesus Christ?—and such others as occur to their own minds. I would beg them also to take down other passages which they meet with in their reading, that will serve to show the mistakes their teachers fall into in supplying the words omitted in this style. To make the answers of the teachers of any value for the purposes of our inquiry, they must be allowed full time to study the chapter before their answers are received, and the missionary must conscientiously abstain from giving them the slightest hint what words are to be supplied, or what his own idea of the meaning is. No matter how nonsensical the teacher's answer is he must write it down, if it is the best the man can give from his own study of the text. When these answers are so obtained, I would beg that one copy might be sent to the B. & F. Bible Society, one copy to Dr. Medhurst, and another to myself. If each missionary will pursue such an inquiry into the intelligibility of this style, and will take the trouble to write down what his teacher makes of this chapter and others, the mass of information thus obtained from the sixty or seventy missionaries on this subject will be of much value, and will fully repay the trouble of taking down the answers of the teachers, and transmitting them to the parties above mentioned.

I now pass on to the consideration of much the most serious objection which I have to make to this translation, viz., "that unwarrantable liberties" have been taken therein, "which will be deprecated by all who hold that in a translation of the Inspired Word, nothing is to be altered, nothing added, and nothing taken away." And here, as I desire to do the translators all the justice I can, I will avail myself of their own translation where it differs from mine.

The third verse of the new translation, rendered as I suppose the translators themselves would render it, is as follows:—"Blessed be Shângtî, the father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who on account of Christ, causes us to receive spiritual blessings in heaven." I object to the rendering here given of the words ἐν Χριστῷ, "on account of Christ." This is a meaning which ἐν in this connection never has; this phrase stands connected with important Christian doctrines (as we shall see), and should have been literally translated, and not rendered according to the translators' view of the sense. They can find, I fancy, no authority for such a rendering of ἐν in connection with a person. Winer, in his Idioms of the Language of the New Testament, says, "ἐν is never connected with proper names in the sense of propter." Robinson, in his Lexicon, says, "In the sense of propter, ἐν does not occur with the dative of a person;" and confirms this statement by
citing Winer as above. With such authorities against them, and knowing how much in theology is made to depend on this phrase, the translators should not have rendered \( \tau \nu \) by a preposition wholly equivalent to \textit{propter}, but have translated literally.

The 4th, 5th, and 6th verses of the new translation may be rendered as follows, respect being had to the translators' own understanding of what they have written:—•\( ^4 \) "Who, from before the making of the world, on account of Jesus chose us, and caused us to be clean and without spot before the Lord, according to his benevolent love; \( ^5 \) and who, according to his goodwill, having in mind Jesus Christ, predestinated us to be children, \( ^6 \) to display his great grace in causing us to receive gracious gifts by his beloved Son."

The first objection I make here is that the word \( \kappa \alpha \lambda \delta \epsilon \), "according as," is not rendered at all, and the connection of the verses, as written by the Apostle, does not appear in the translation.

2d. That \( \kappa \alpha \lambda \tau o \) is rendered "on account of Jesus," instead of "in Jesus," or "in Christ," as it ought to have been.

3d. That the sentence, "that we should be holy and without blame before him in love," which expresses the proximate end of our election, is so rendered that this does not appear in the version; and the words "in love," which, in the opinion of many able commentators, refer to Christian love, in which the elect are to be holy and without blame, are made to refer definitely to God, thereby cutting off any such explanation.

4th. "By Jesus Christ," is rendered "remem bering Jesus Christ." The preposition \( \delta \alpha \) here denotes "the agent or minister through or by whom" God's predestination was to be accomplished, and this is in no way expressed by the verb \textit{nien} \( \Delta \) to remember.

5th. That the words "to himself" are omitted in the translation.

6th. The phrase. "to the praise of the glory of his grace," is rendered "to display his great grace."

7th. That the words, "wherein he hath made us accepted in the beloved," are rendered "in causing us to receive gracious gifts by his beloved Son."

The first objection is sufficiently stated above; and the reader can judge of its importance by putting a full stop after the word Christ in the third verse, and beginning a new one with the words "he hath chosen us," \&c. The second objection is much the most important that I have to urge against any rendering in this chapter, inasmuch as the translators assign a cause for God's eternal election, which is neither in accordance with the words of the Apostle they are translat-
ing, nor with the teaching of the Scriptures in other parts. A ccording to this translation, we are taught that "God on account of Jesus, chose us before the foundation of the world," a reason for our election which is never assigned anywhere in the Scriptures. The language of the Apostle here is so striking that it can not escape any one's attention. To be "in Christ," "to be chosen in another," is a mode of speaking peculiar to the Scriptures; it did not prevail among the Greek, Roman, or the classical writers of any language with which we are acquainted; and yet St. Paul, under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, wrote "hath blessed us with spiritual blessings in Christ," "hath chosen us in him;" and not "because of him," or "by or through him." His phraseology is very remarkable, and has been followed by his translators in Latin, French, Spanish, Italian, English, and other languages. The phrase "chosen in Christ" was probably as strange a phrase in Latin, or in any of the other languages, as it was in Greek, or is now in Chinese.

Winer, in §51 of his "Idioms," lifts his voice against the perpetual alleged interchange of the prepositions the one for the other in the New Testament; declaring, "it is time to relinquish this absurd enallage of prepositions, which has introduced so much arbitrariness into interpretation, and to return to rational, philological principles." In this connection he remarks that the Apostles, though Hebrew writers, "had become accustomed to conceive the prepositional relations in the Greek manner," and "that especially in Paul and John a use of many prepositions foreign to the Greeks (e. g. of ἐν) stands in close relation to the dogmatical language, and belongs to the complexion of the Apostolical (Christian) diction." Again he says, "an arbitrary interchange of the prepositions one for another (of which the New Testament commentaries are full, and which was sustained in part by the abuse of the parallelism, especially of the Evangelists), would never have been thought of, if it had been more customary to consider the languages as a living means of communication. It is absurd to believe, that any one could have said he travels to Egypt, for he travels in Egypt (ἐις for ἐν); or to him is all, for from him is all. It is even not quite indifferent whether through or by is denoted by διὰ or ἐν. The latter is not very suitable before the names of persons (ἐν Χριστῷ, ἐν Κυρίῳ, is not exactly the same as διὰ Χριστοῦ); and the Latin language also usually places per before names of persons, and uses the ablative of things. Close observation generally proves how correctly the New Testament writers have used the kindred prepositions, and that we should honor them, as well as our-
VINDICATION OF COMMENTS.

In looking over the lexicons and commentaries within my reach, I can not find any authority for giving to ἐν in this context the meaning of προτέρον.

Let us now look at the effect this rendering has on a most important and mysterious doctrine. Burkitt remarks, in loc. "Note, 4. God is said to have chosen us in Christ as our head. Consider Christ as God, so we are chosen by him. I know whom I have chosen, says Christ. Consider him as a Mediator; so we are chosen in him, not for him: because not Christ's undertaking for us, but the Father's good pleasure toward us, was the spring and fontal cause of our election. The truth is, God was so far from choosing the Gentiles out of faith foreseen, that he did not choose them for the sake and obedience of Christ foreseen; God did not love us from eternity because Christ was to die for us in time, but because he loved us with an everlasting love; therefore, in the fulness of time Christ was sent to die for us: so that the death of Christ was the fruit and effect, but not the cause of our election. No other reason, says Bishop Fell upon this place, can be assigned of this privilege but the good pleasure of God; and if Christ's sufferings were not the cause of our election, much less our own deserving, as he adds there; Almighty God not choosing us because worthy, but to make us worthy by choosing us." see Vol. II. p. 349.

In John iii. 16, our Savior himself ascribes the plan and origin of our salvation to the Father's love, and not to what he himself has done in our behalf; "God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish but have everlasting life." In his Horæ Homileticae, commenting on this text, the late venerable C. Simeon writes, "The doctrine of our reconciliation with God through the death of his Son, is calculated to impress our minds with a deep sense of the love of Christ in undertaking for us: but if not cautiously stated, it may give us very erroneous conceptions respecting the Father. If, for instance, we imagine that the Father needed the mediation of his Son to render him propititious, then we must ascribe all the glory of our salvation to the Son, and consider the Father as merely acquiescing in the Son's wishes, and showing mercy to us for his sake. But the whole plan of our salvation originated with the Father; the very gift of a Savior was the fruit of the Father's love; and therefore, in contemplating the wonders of redemption, we must trace them to their proper source, the love of God the Father." Vol. xiii. p. 254.
In his sermon on Eph. i. 3-12, enlarging on the gift of spiritual blessings "in Christ," he writes:—“All of them, without exception, are the purchase of his blood, the fruit of his intercession, and the gifts of his grace. They are all treasured up in him; and when He is given to us, they are made over to us, as the ore in the mine. They were all given to Him in the first instance, as our head and representative, and can be possessed by us only as we are found ‘in him.’ Are we chosen?—it is ‘in him.’ Are we predestinated to the adoption of children?—it is ‘in him.’ Are we accepted?—it is ‘in him.’ Are we forgiven?—it is ‘in him.’ Are we brought into one body?—it is ‘in him.’ Have we obtained an inheritance?—it is ‘in him.’ Are we sealed with the Holy Spirit as an earnest of that inheritance?—it is ‘in him.’ Are we blessed with all spiritual blessings?—it is ‘in him,’ and in him ‘alone.’” See Vol. xvii. p. 267.

The view here taken by Burkitt and Simeon, viz., that the elect are chosen in Christ, who is the federal head of his people, as Adam was the head of the whole human race; and which is founded on the direct language of the Apostle, has been, and is held by too many distinguished names in theology, to permit us to sit quietly by, and allow this most important passage (and others too as we shall presently see) to be so translated that their view is entirely turned out of the Scriptures by the translator. This view is that of Hooker,* Usher, Beveridge, Leighton, and a host of other divines, who are the glory of English theology.

The 17th Article of the Church of England is based on this chapter, and with that scrupulous attention to the language of the holy Scriptures, which marks the whole dogmatic theology of that Church, carefully distinguishes between the prepositions εν and οἰκον used in this chapter by the Apostle. The Article reads as follows:—“Predestination to life is the everlasting purpose of God, whereby (before the foundations of the world were laid) he hath constantly decreed by his counsel, secret to us, to deliver from curse and damnation, those whom he hath chosen in Christ out of mankind, and to bring them by Christ to everlasting salvation, as vessels made to honor.”

* Hooker says:—“We are by nature the sons of Adam. When God created Adam, he created us, and as many as are descended from Adam have in themselves the root out of which they spring. The sons of God we neither are all, nor any one of us, otherwise than only by grace and favor. The sons of God have God's own natural Son as a second Adam from heaven, whose race and progeny they are by spiritual and heavenly birth. God therefore loving eternally his Son, he must needs eternally in him have loved and preferred before all others them which are spiritually sithence descended and sprung out of him.”—Book V. Ch. 56, Sec. 6.
VINDICATION OF COMMENTS.

weight of authority against rendering ἐν in this passage "on account of," is so great, that one would suppose if it did not suffice to affect their own opinion of its meaning, it would at any rate have been sufficient to have prevented the translators putting their own private opinion into the text, and to have constrained them to an ad verbum translation.

I have said that the rendering of the preposition ἐν in contexts like the present, by other words than its Chinese equivalents, is to be found in other passages. I will now proceed to call attention to some of these. We have six instances worthy of notice in this single chapter. In the 3d verse, where the Apostle says, "we are blessed with spiritual blessings in Christ," the translators have "because of Christ." In the 4th verse they say, we are chosen "on account of," the Apostle says "in Christ." In the 6th verse, "he causes us to receive gracious gifts by his beloved Son," is put instead of "he hath made us accepted in the beloved:" (what Christian heart does not feel the difference of this phraseology?) In the 7th verse, for "in whom we have redemption through his blood," we have "because Christ shed his blood," &c. In verse 11, for "in whom also we have obtained an inheritance," we have "on account of Christ we have obtained an inheritance." In verse 13, "in whom also, after that ye believed, ye were sealed," the "in whom also" is left out; whether as unimportant, or on what principles I can not tell. If I know my own heart, I do not wish to be captious or to find fault; but I must ask the reader to take his Testament, and having changed the preposition "in" in all the abovementioned instances, to read from the third to the fifteenth verse, and say if the whole complexion (to use Winer's phrase) of the Apostolic doctrine is not altered in this translation by this change.

We have to complain, also, of the same misrendering of the preposition in Ephesians ii. 10th and 13th verses. The tenth verse, instead of "we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them;" is rendered, "we are those whom Shângtî made; Shângtî predestinated us to follow the good; because of Jesus Christ he made us and causes us to do good." We have here a reason assigned for man's creation I never saw assigned anywhere else. The thirteenth verse, which is as follows, "but now, in Christ Jesus, ye who sometime were far off are made nigh by the blood of Christ;" is rendered, "now imitating (or reverencing) Christ Jesus, ye who formerly were far off, relying upon his blood are nigh."
At Eph. iii. 11, the Apostle writes, "according to the eternal purpose which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord." The translators give us, "Shângti early (or formerly, tsâu 甲) determined that he would because of Jesus Christ complete this affair." Here we have brevity enough surely; but we look in vain for the Apostle Paul. The preceding verses are in the same concise style. Romans viii. 1. "There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh but after the Spirit," is rendered, "now those whose hearts are in Christ Jesus, and who do not follow their lusts, but follow the Spirit, are not condemned." Here, though the translators have retained the preposition "in," they have spoiled all by adding the word heart. We are not "in Christ" by the exercise of our affections, by love, but by faith: this is the bond which unites the sinner to Christ, and makes him one with him—incorporated into his mystical body.

1 Cor. xv. 20-22. 20"But now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the first-fruits of them that slept; 21 for since (διὰ) by man came death, by (διὰ) man came also the resurrection of the dead. 22 For as in (ἐν) Adam all die, even so in (ἐν) Christ shall all be made alive." This passage is rendered as follows; 20 "So Christ is verily risen from the dead; his resurrection is the first of all the dead. 21 Now because of one man death came, also because of one man came the resurrection. 22 Those who belong (or pertain to, shuh ㄦ) Adam die, those who pertain (shuh ㄦ) to Christ rise from the dead." Here we have many things to complain of. The translators must have known that many very interesting questions have arisen from these words, and that every figure, every turn of expression is important in deciding these points. Of whom does the Apostle say Christ was the first-fruits, of all deceased men, or of all the righteous? He says "of them that slept;" the translators say "of all the dead;" this is of course of all men; and settles the question against the usus loquendi of the phrase "of them that slept," which is not applied in Scripture to the death of the wicked; and also against the fair inference from the figure "first-fruits;" which figure does not appear in the translation. The translators may have given the sense of St. Paul, but as this is disputed, how can it be known that they have done so? They were bound to put the readers of their version in the best possible position for forming an opinion for themselves on these points, not from the sense the translators attach to the Apostle's words, but from the Apostle's own words. The word "first-fruits" must be rendered in the Old Testament, and the phrase employed for it there should have been used
here; if the reader could not understand it, he could, under instruction, look it up in the Old Testament. It is just as intelligible in Chinese to say "those who sleep," as to say "those who are dead;' and the Apostle's own words should have been given, and not what the translators regard as their equivalent.

In the 21st verse of this chapter, for the phrase "since by (διὰ) one man," (the διὰ, with genitive indicating, according to Robinson, "the person by or through whose agency an effect is produced,"') we have propter, "on account of" one man, which makes a change of meaning very important, at least in the last clause, "by one man came the resurrection of the dead;" as the Apostle does not design to teach that the resurrection is "on account of Christ," but that by and through his agency this effect is to be produced. The 22d verse presents a case of the most remarkable liberty I ever knew to be taken by a translator. For the sentence, "for as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive;" we have, "those who pertain to Adam die: those who pertain to Christ rise from the dead." The comparison is omitted entirely, "As in Adam...So in Christ." To the question, who die? the reader can only answer all who pertain to Adam? Are they all men?—Can not say. For that most interesting phrase "in Adam," the translators give us, what I am sure they themselves can not regard as a translation, but only as a general equivalent: "those who pertain to Adam." In deciding whether those whom the Apostle here affirms "shall be made alive," are all mankind, or Christians only (which the translators must have known is a disputed point), how important the phrase "in Christ."

Let any one consider what would be the effect on his mind, if after being accustomed to such a translation as this in his mother tongue, he should study Greek, and read the passage in St. Paul's own words. Would Christians in England and America allow any men in those countries, however learned, thus to substitute their own words and ideas in the place of the Apostle's in the Bibles read in their churches, and at their firesides? Could the Bible Societies circulate among those speaking English a version made on such principles, by any Committee of uninspired men, no matter how learned or pious they might be? If it be said, the translators have rendered the passage as near "as the idiom of the Chinese language will permit," (though I can not believe they will say so,) any one who has any knowledge of philology will feel certain that it can not be so. A phrase for "first-fruits" can be formed in every language, and has been so in Chinese by these very translators: there must be a verb to sleep in every lan-
guage: there must be a way in every language to express "the agent by or through whom an effect is produced." No language can be without a preposition answering to ἐν, in: every language must furnish the means of making a comparison such as that we have here, "for as in Adam, even so in Christ." If the translators have made the closest rendering of St. Paul here that the idiom of the Chinese language will allow, then I am sure the reader will agree with me that anything like dogmatic theology is an impossibility in idiomatic Chinese.

I have a large number of passages marked to show the manner in which these translators have rendered ἐν when standing in connection with a person. John i. 4. "In Him was life," they render "life was in the (λόγος) Táu."—John vi. 56. "He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him." "Then I am in them, and they in me."—John x. 38. "That the Father is in me and I in the Father." These are all rendered in the same manner, and so are John xiv. 10, 11.—John xiv. 20. "At that day ye shall know that I am in my Father, and ye in me and I in you," is rendered in the same manner: "I in Father, you in me, I in you." So in John xiv. 4, 5, 6, 7. We have here "in the Logos," "in the Father," "in me," "in you," &c., which shows that these phrases can be expressed in Chinese, and that they are expressed in this translation of the Gospels.

Let us now turn to the Epistles, and see how ἐν is rendered. The phrase ἐν Xπ ifu occurs twice in close connection in 2 Cor. v. 17, 19. "If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature...To wit that God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself." The first is rendered "those who reverence (or imitate, tsung 宗) Christ, these are new made men.* The second, "To wit that Shangti commissioned (toh 丁) Christ to cause men of the world to be reconciled to him." Both of these renderings are very objectionable; the impropriety of the last, "God was in Christ, reconciling the world to himself," being rendered by "Shangti commissioned Christ to cause the men of

* This word is rendered in the Pei Wan Yun-fu, 1st, by tsun 尊 honorable, or to honor, respect; 2. by fūh 仿 to imitate, as in the phrase hiau fāh 報法 3d. an ancestor; 4. by chū 丘 a lord. The character is used of ancestors and of Confucius in the sense of reverencing their virtues and imitating them. My teachers suppose that this is the sense in which the writers use it in the phrase tsung Ki-tuh ché 宗基督者 "those who reverence and imitate Christ;" and I can not think of any other. But I hesitate to give it as theirs, for it makes St. Paul teach undisguised Socinian doctrine. "The imitators of Christ are new creatures." "Ye imitate him to obtain completeness."
the world to be reconciled to him," is too apparent to need comment. I may say, however, that this text is quoted by good writers as one of the proofs of Christ's divinity.

Col. i. 28. "That we may present every man perfect in Christ Jesus," is rendered, "wishing to cause all men to stand thoroughly intelligent in the presence of Christ."

Col. ii. 9, 10, 11, 12. "For in him dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily, and ye are complete in him, which is the head of all principality and power; in whom also ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ; buried with him in baptism, whereby ye also are risen with him, through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead." These words are translated as follows: "The full virtue of Shângtâ all is in Christ; Christ is the head of all power and strength, ye reverence (or imitate) him to obtain completeness; and ye receive his circumcision to put away the sins of the body; for the performance of this rite, hands are not borrowed from men, but ye receive it from Christ (i.e. ye are circumcised not by human hands but by Christ); when ye also received baptism, ye were buried together with Christ: Shângtâ raised Christ from the dead; ye borrowing (or depending upon) his strength, are also raised from the dead with him."

The ninth verse is on a subject so mysterious, and one to be learned so entirely from Scripture, that one would think that nothing but the closest literal translation would content any translators. Instead of that we have here, "the full or abundant virtue (virtue, not nature) of Shângtâ is (not dwells, ἀνασκίνει) in Christ." The word ἀνασκίνει is omitted entirely—can we suppose designedly: or is this a case of oversight, or a typographical error? "And ye are complete in him," is rendered, "ye reverence (or imitate) him to obtain completeness."

Can the Bible Societies or the missionaries in China, take upon themselves the responsibility of giving this to the Chinese as the words or teaching of the Apostle?

2 Tim. i. 1 "Paul, an apostle of Jesus Christ by the will of God, according to the promise of life which is in Christ Jesus," is rendered, "Paul, who received Shângtâ's will to be an apostle of Jesus Christ, to proclaim Christ Jesus' doctrine which promises life."!

1 John iv. 15, 16. "Whosoever shall confess that Jesus is the Son of God, God dwelleth in him, and he in God. And we have known and believed the love that God hath to us. God is love; and he that dwelleth in love, dwelleth in God, and God in him." These are ren-
dered, 15“All who say that Jesus is the Son of Shângti, Shângti thereupon in heart communes (or has fellowship) with them, and they in heart commune with Shângti. 16 Shângti loves us; we know and believe it. There are none whom Shângti does not love. Those who constantly love, in heart commune with Shângti, and Shângti in heart communes with them.” Is this a translation of St. John? Does the phrase “God is love,” mean “there are none whom God does not love?” Is this last assertion true?

I will cite but one more instance of their translation of the preposition ἐν, which is in 1 John, v. 11, 12. 11“And this is the record, that God has given unto us eternal life, and this life is in his Son. 12 He that hath the Son, hath life; and he that hath not the Son of God, hath not life.” These words are rendered, 11“And this record is what? That Shângti will (or wishes to) give us eternal life, and we must rely upon his Son to obtain it. 12 If any one in heart communes (or has fellowship) with Shângti’s Son, then he will obtain life; if in heart he has no fellowship with Shângti’s Son, then he will not obtain life.” There is no other alteration of the statements of the Apostles, which I have met with, that has affected me more than this. The Apostle says, God (ἐδώκεν) gave us eternal life;” the translators say, “God will (or wishes to) give us eternal life.” The Apostle next declares a simple fact as easily expressed in Chinese as in any other language, “this life is in his Son;” the translators make him say, “and we must rely upon his Son to obtain it.” Can any uninspired men be trusted to alter God’s word in this way? In the 12th verse, the Apostle says, “(Ὁ ἔχει τὸν υἱὸν ἔχει τὴν ζωὴν) he that hath the Son, hath life.” Is there no verb “to have” in Chinese, that the translators render ἔχει by “in heart has fellowship with Shângti’s Son.” Should not St. John in a professed translation of his own epistles be allowed to speak in his own words?

To show how the translators’ paraphrase of the 11th verse excludes the views of many excellent Christians, I will quote a few passages from a sermon on this text by a late eminent divine. He says, “This eternal life, or this condition of immortal happiness, God the Father testifies, and even records his testimony, is in his Son. What does this expression mean? Persons who are in the habit of taking superficial views of Scripture truth, even if those superficial views should in the main be correct, are in danger of misapprehending the completeness of God’s scheme. For instance, on a superficial view, it is supposed by many that the expression, ‘eternal life is in his Son Jesus Christ,’ means no more than that it is in consequence of the mediation of our
Lord Jesus Christ sinners receive the benefit of the pardoning mercy and the sanctifying grace of God. The doctrine here announced is unquestionably true, but it stops far short of the importance and the intensity of the meaning of the text. It is a most precious doctrine, that the whole mercy of God flows down to sinners through the mediation of his dear Son. The sacrifice of Jesus Christ is the meritorious cause of that justification of the sinner, which not only delivers him from present condemnation and future wrath, but in consequence of the grant annexed to the sacrifice, invests him with a title to everlasting life. Hence we are said to live through him:—"In this was manifested the love of God towards us, because that God sent his only begotten Son into the world, that we might live through him."

"But to every individual who seriously reflects upon the minuteness and perfection of divine truth, there will appear an obvious difference between living through, or by means of Christ, and having eternal life in him. This is the peculiarity of the expression of the text, not that believers live through Christ, though this is a truth unquestioned, but that they have eternal life in him; a form of expression which is far more intense." This he afterwards explains by saying, "Another form of expression for this idea is, that eternal life, or happiness which is given to those who believe, is given in Christ as a security that they shall get it. If it were not so, even a true believer would have no security. Eternal life was given to Adam in Paradise, but it was given to him in such a way that he himself was the guardian of it; it was intrusted to his keeping. Being thus intrusted to his keeping, he lost it himself through the devices of the great adversary. And if eternal life was given unto believers precisely in the same way in which it was given to Adam, such is the fallen condition of man, there is no security that he could preserve it for an hour. He would be robbed of it more speedily than Adam was. But the eternal life which is given to believers, is declared to be in his Son Jesus Christ; therefore the Lord Jesus Christ is the guardian of that life which is imparted to believers; and while they sustain the relation of believers in him, it is safe...Suppose I tell you of a treasure hid in a particular field; you would scarcely be guilty of the practical absurdity of searching for it in another place distant and remote. God the Father tells us, and records his testimony, that eternal life is in his Son. Can you find it anywhere but in his Son?"

I shall also quote a long passage from a sermon of Bp. Beveridge, styled "The New Creature in Christianity," for in it he discusses some texts, the translation of which we have objected to above. "If any
man be in Christ, he is a new creature.* In which words we shall first consider the terms, and then the truth asserted in them: the terms to be explained are two, as in all such propositions, the subject and the predicate. 'What it is to be in Christ;' and then 'What it is to be a new creature.' As for the first, it is a phrase which the Holy Ghost delights often to use; and therefore I could never persuade myself, but that there is something particular and more remarkable in it, than what is commonly taken notice of: I shall not recite the many places where it occurs, but such only from whence the meaning of it should be gathered. 'There is,' saith the Apostle, 'now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus.' From whence we may conclude that they are said to be in Christ, who are not only in his Church, but in his Person, so as to be really vested and interested in him, in his merits for the pardon of their sins, and in his righteousness, whereby they may be justified, and accounted righteous before God; for otherwise they could not but be condemned.

"There are many such places in the Holy Scriptures, whereby this notion of our being in Christ might be confirmed; but I shall rather choose at present to explain it by that similitude, which Christ himself is pleased to make use of for that purpose, where he saith to his disciples, 'Abide in me, and I in you. As the branch can not bear fruit of itself except it abide in the vine, no more can ye except ye abide in me. I am the Vine, ye the branches.' . . . Now, as we take a scion of one tree, and graft it into the stock of another, by that incision it soon becomes of the same body with that into which it is grafted, as if it had naturally sprouted from it, and partakes, as the Apostle speaks, of the 'root and fatness' of the stock, as much as the natural branches do: so here, by nature we are all of the old stock, the wild olive, Adam; God is 'the husbandman,' as our Savior calls Him in this very case. He cuts us off from the old stock, and grafts us 'into Christ,' the 'true vine;' by which means we are, as it were, incorporated into him, and so partake of what is in him, as much as if we had proceeded from him, as we did from the first man, and in some sense more; forasmuch as we are joined to Adam only by nature, but to Christ by the Holy Spirit himself; for, as the Apostle saith, 'He that is joined unto the Lord, is one Spirit,' which must needs be the highest union that can be imagined. In short take it thus; our whole nature, and so we ourselves who are of it, being in the first Adam, we were really concerned in everything that he did

* These words are rendered in the Chinese translation, ' Those who imitate for reverence, tsung,) Christ are new made men.'"
or that was done to him; we sinned in him, we were corrupted in him; and so Christ also, having taken our whole nature upon him; and thereby become, as he is called, the second, or another Adam, as all are capable of it, so they who are really in him are really concerned and interested in all that he did or suffered in our nature; 'in him' they are sanctified; 'in him' they fulfilled all righteousness; 'in him' they suffered the death which God threatened against them; and so in him they are absolved from their sins, and justified before God."

The Rev. Wm. Jay in his Lectures delivered in Argyle Chapel, Bath, commenting on the phraseology, "the Christian in Christ," says, "It is needless to multiply examples, as the thing is undeniable. But admitting the fact, there must be some reason, and some powerful reason, not only for the frequency of the expression, but for the expression itself. The language is perfectly peculiar. There are indeed various relations and connections in life; and some of our fellow-creatures are much attached to others, and very dependent upon them; yet we never say, a patient is in his physician; or a servant in his master; or, a disciple in his teacher. But we constantly read of our being in Christ; and 'if any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God.' New terms imperceptibly make way for new doctrines; nor has any subtlety of the enemy of souls succeeded better in corrupting the mind from the simplicity there is in Christ, than modernizing the language of divinity. When men are shy of the 'words which the Holy Ghost teacheth,' we are always afraid they are beginning to be ashamed of the things."

I have quoted these last words, not to have it inferred, that I suppose the change of phraseology, which I grieve to see these brethren have fallen into, has arisen from their being ashamed of the thing spoken of; but that they may serve as a caution to us all not to tamper with God's holy word, or yield one iota to heathen prejudices in declaring all the great things that God has done for us.

Before passing to the remainder of the first chapter of the Epistle to the Ephesians, we may number up the different renderings the translators have given of  ἐν  connected with a person, noticed above. 1st. In; "in the logos;" "in the Father;" "in me," &c. 2d. because of, on account of; "Shāngtī, because of Christ, chose us before the foundation of the world;" "Shāngtī on account of Christ made or created us." 3d. hearts in; "there is no condemnation to those whose hearts are in Christ," e. g. Rom. viii. 1. 4th. imitators (or reverencers) of Christ; for "those in Christ." 5th. stand perfectly
intelligent in the presence of Christ; for "perfect in Christ." 6th. imitate him to obtain completeness, for "complete in him." 7th. pertain to Adam, pertain to Christ; for "in Adam," "in Christ." 8th. hearts have fellowship with Shangti; for "dwell in God." 9th. Shangti commissioned Christ; for "God was in Christ." 10th. Jesus Christ's doctrine which promises life; for "according to the promise of life which is in Christ Jesus." From a translation made on these principles, how can the reader form any opinion of the manner and style of the inspired writer, or of the usus loquendi of any of his phrases?

To the translation of Ephesians i. 7, I took very grave exception in my letter, which exception I think is fully sustained by the rendering of that verse, and other passages, which I will now proceed to quote. Eph. i. 7 is as follows: "In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins according to the riches of his grace." The translators render, "Moreover, because Jesus Christ shed his blood, we relying upon his great favor (or benevolence), obtain redemption from sin and the pardon of offenses." The principal points objected to in this verse, are 1st, that "in whom" is rendered, "because Jesus Christ." 2d. that what the Apostle speaks of the manner of our justification, "according to the riches of his grace," the translators here make the instrument or means of our justification. This was what I had specially in view when I said, they had made "something of the several distinct propositions of the Apostle blended together, that strikes me is not Gospel." 3d. what the Apostle makes the intermediate cause, instrument, or means, "through his blood (διὰ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ)" the translators make the procuring cause.

Their translation of Rom. iii. 24, is open to the same strong animadversion; the doctrine the Apostle is made to teach is directly the reverse of his own doctrine on the subject of our justification. This verse reads in English, "Being justified freely by his grace, through the redemption which is in Christ Jesus;" which the translators have rendered, "But Christ Jesus having made an atonement for sin, those who rely upon his (Christ's) grace are without labor rendered righteous." The translators, I contend, have neither rendered the Apostle ad verbum, nor ad sensum. Prof. Hodge, commenting on this passage, writes, "He says we are justified freely by his grace, this is, in a manner which is entirely gratuitous." Moses Stuart says, "δωρεάν freely, gratuitously, in the way of mere favor; τῷ αὑτοῦ Χριστοῦ, by his grace, epexegetical of δωρεάν, and added to give intensity to the whole sentence or affirmation." Bloomfield says, "τῷ αὑτοῦ Χριστοῦ; we have not here what some suppose a tautology, but an emphatic
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repetition; or rather as Hyperius suggests, 'the Apostle meant by this to point at the principal efficient cause on the part of God in our justification; namely, his mere grace and favor.' Calvin says, "with regard to the efficient cause, he says that we are justified freely, and further by his grace; and he thus repeats the word to show that the whole is from God, and nothing from us."

The word δωρεάν, gratuitously, freely, refers then to God, to his manner of justifying; the translators render it by pull law 不勞 without labor, fatigue, effort, thereby making it refer to the justified. "By his grace," whether understood as epexegetical of δωρεάν, or with Hyperius and Calvin as denoting the efficient cause, is surely misunderstood by the translators, when they make it the ground of the sinner's reliance; that on which he relies for justification. The grace spoken of in the text is that of God; the translators make it that of Christ. Had the translators rendered, "God being gracious, those who rely upon Christ's atonement for sin, are freely reckoned righteous," they would, I think, have come nearer to the sense of the Apostle.

There are many in the West, who say, "that as Christ has died for us, we do the best we can, and rely upon God's grace' for the rest." The object of the sinner's reliance is the atonement of Christ; and I say here again, "it strikes me it is not Gospel" to make "Christ's grace" instead of his blood the object of the sinner's reliance. As Dr. Medhurst and Messrs. Stronach and Milne say, "That if he (Dr. Boone) 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 admonish 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:" I trust they will justify my now calling their attention and that of all the other parties mentioned, to their translation of this verse.

Eph. i. 9 is rendered, "Further he shows us his mysterious will, according to his goodwill, which he hath established." "Hath established" is a very insufficient rendering of "hath purposed in himself." Verse 10. "That in the dispensation of the fullness of times, he might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven and which are on earth; even in him." The translators themselves have rendered this verse as follows: "That when the appointed time should arrive, he might take all things (lit. 萬物 the myriad of objects), which are in heaven and earth, and cause them
completely to revert to (or terminate in) Christ.” As the translators complain of my translation I gladly give their own, but it does not in any way mitigate my objection that the phrase, “that when the appointed time should arrive,” is not a proper translation of the phrase “that in the dispensation of the fullness of times.” Dr. Medhurst has a better rendering of the phrase in his former edition of the New Testament; and the latter part of this verse is especially much better done in that version. So also, in Mr. Gutzlaff’s version: “Universally to bind together all things, whether in heaven or in earth, and unite them into one in Christ.”

The defense of their translation shows pretty plainly what the principles of translation that prevailed were. “The objector questions,” say they, “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 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.” Can these brethren tell us with any certainty how many insignificant words, that contribute nothing to the sense of the passage, this holy Apostle has used in the verse before us; or in the passages to which I have called attention above? This is dangerous ground for uninspired translators, and those who venture on it must not be surprised to learn that others set great store by words they consider insignificant, and contributing nothing to the sense of the passage.

Verses 11 and 12. “In whom also we have obtained an inheritance, being predestinated according to the purpose of him who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will; 12that we should be to the praise of his glory, who first trusted in Christ.” Here I am happy to be able to give the translators’ own rendering of their version:—“He who worketh all things according to his own will, hath predestinated us to obtain an inheritance, on account of Christ; 12causing us who first trusted in Christ to praise and glorify him.” On their translation of these verses into Chinese I remarked, “the liberties here 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 I would add no comments.” To this they say, “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.” I make no
objection to the inversion of the order of the Apostle's words, but let us see if this be the only liberty taken with him. The Apostle says, "in whom we have obtained;" they say, "on account of whom." The Apostle says, "we have obtained an inheritance;" they say, "predestinated to obtain;"—quite a different statement, and which is very important from the context. The Apostle says, "being predestinated according to the purpose of him who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will;" they render it, "he who worketh all things according to his own will, hath predestinated us to obtain an inheritance." Here I would observe that "the counsel of his own will," is rendered only "his own will." It is disputed whether the predestination here is to the "adoption of children," spoken of in verse 4, upon which adoption the inheritance follows, according to the Apostle's words elsewhere, "if sons, then heirs, joint-heirs," &c.; or whether the predestination is to the inheritance directly: it would have been more proper in the translators to have left it in the same undecided state in which it is left in the English version.

Next, I must observe that the words, "according to the purpose of him," are all omitted in the translation. The plea set up is that it is a pleonasm for "predestinated." But who says so? And who says that a translator has a right to reject any words of his author he pleases, whenever it pleases him to style them pleonastic, insignificant, adding nothing to the sense, &c? Both in the case of the "counsel of his own will," and "predestinated according to the purpose," Bloomfield gives his opinion expressly that "there is no pleonasm;" and even if he had expressed this opinion it would have furnished no excuse for a translator who omitted the words as useless. Bloomfield would surely not give such advice to any translator. The translators say, "Bloomfield thinks that the former is a stronger mode of expression, but it would be difficult to make it stronger in Chinese." From this the reader would infer that they have some particularly strong phrase for "predestinate," but this is not so. The phrase used is yù tìng 預定 "to determine beforehand." The translators will not deny that the phrase "according to his purpose determined beforehand," can be expressed in Chinese, and that when so expressed Bloomfield would regard it as a stronger expression; the only difficulty I suspect is that its insertion is thought to cumber the style. To make "on account of whom," for "in whom;" "to obtain," for "have obtained;" to supply the word inheritance after "predestinated," to leave out the word "counsel;" and the words "according to
the purpose of him:” these I consider very considerable liberties in themselves, and quite a large number to occur in a single verse.

In the 12th verse, we object that what the Apostle writes passively is by the translators made active: “that we should be to the praise of his glory,” is made active—“causing us to praise him.” Calvin on verse 5, says, “In hoc membro tres salutis nostræ causas exprimit: quartam paulopost subnectet. Causa efficiens est bene placitum voluntatis Dei; causa materialis est Christus: causa finalis, laus gratiæ.” On this 12th verse he adds, “Finem iterum repetit, ut simus in laudem, &c., quia tune demum illustratur in nobis Dei gloria, si nihil simus quam vasa ejus misericordiae. Ac nomen gloriae peculiariter eam significat, quæ elucet in Dei bonitate: nihil enim magis est illi proprium, in quo gloriificari velit, quam bonitas.”

The word glory, of which Calvin makes so much, does not appear in either verse. The translators render the words “sung tsän 謳 謲” “praise and glorify,” but they do not convey this meaning. Morrison defines sung, “to make known to the public praises; to publish or declare the virtues of any;” and gives the two words together, tsän sung, “praises, commendations.” Medhurst (Chinese and English Dictionary) defines sung, “to make public, to speak of;” sung tsän (the very phrase we have here) “to laud.” Morrison defines tsän, “to praise, to laud, to commend.” Medhurst, “to speak in praise of; to collect a person’s good qualities and laud them.” Thus we see, the word glory does not appear in the translation at all, and no one could infer from the translation that “laus gratiæ” could be a “causa finalis.”

Of the 13th and 14th verses we give the translators’ own rendering: “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.” I have said so much of the obscurity of the rendering of these verses in a previous part of this paper, that we will take the translators’ rendering here without any comment.

I first object here that the word “also,” in the phrase, “in whom also ye trusted,” which is very important to the connection of the Apostle’s words, is omitted; so also the words, “in whom also,” in the phrase “in whom also ye were sealed.” The words, “after that ye believed,” are also omitted in the translation; or, if it is maintained that these are translated, then the words, “in whom ye also trusted,”
are omitted. "To the praise of his glory," is rendered in the same objectionable manner as above.

In the 15th, 16th, and 17th verses, I found fault with the rendering "the riches of the glory of his inheritance in the saints," by "the affluent abundance of the inheritance of the saints," and the translators say, "It is difficult to make out what is the point of the critic's objection." It is only that they have left out two words, one of them very important, and the omission of which changes completely the author's meaning. St. Paul says, "The riches of the glory of his inheritance in the saints." This translation makes him say, "The affluent abundance of the saints' inheritance." It will be difficult to show that St. Paul meant the last, unless it is contended that he did not know how to express his own meaning: at any rate it is nothing more than is due to him, to express this word "his" in Chinese as he wrote it in Greek; and if it is necessary, explain it to them, that "his inheritance" means "the inheritance of the saints," and not that of Christ.

Verses 19 and 20, the translators themselves render: "And that ye may know that the Lord, possessing a power insurpassibly great, energetically works in those who believe; moreover how by his great power, he raised Christ from the dead, to sit at his own right hand in heaven." Have the translators, according to their own rendering, here expressed the same ideas that we have in our translation? The Apostle prays that the Ephesians may know "what is the exceeding greatness of his power to us-ward who believe:" the translators say, "That ye may know that the Lord, possessing a power insurpassibly great, energetically works in those who believe." The Apostle prays that they may be able to form some suitable conception of the power by which God works in us who believe; the translators make him pray that they may know a fact, viz., "that the Lord energetically works in those who believe." And in the subsequent part of the sentence, where the Apostle describes this power (to aid them in forming some conception of it) by saying that it was a power exceeding great, according to (or similar to) "that which God wrought in Christ, when he raised him from the dead, and set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places;" the translators make this a continuance of his prayer, viz., that the Ephesians might know "how (or rather that) by his great power he raised Christ from the dead to sit at his own right hand in heaven." Can this be called a faithful translation of the Apostle? Does he pray that the Ephesians might know the fact, that by his great power God raised Christ from the dead?
Verses 21 and 22. "Of all those having might, power, dominion, and name, whether of the present time or hereafter, none can excel him; \(^{21}\) he hath subdued all things under the feet of Christ, and caused him to be the head over all things to profit his church." I stated that my teachers misunderstood the pronoun him, in the sentence, "none can excel him." To explain why they did this, I must inform the reader that in the Chinese there is a full stop at the end of the 20th verse, and that there is nothing to indicate that verse 21 has any connection with it, as we have in English, "set him far above," &c.; but the sentence begins as it were some subject de novo, e. g. "of all those having might, power," &c. I must also add that the verb "hath subdued," has no nominative expressed, and that my teachers thought the nominative of this verb was the same being who is said to excel others; they therefore read verse 21 in connection with verse 22, instead of verse 20: e. g. "of all those having might, power," &c., none can excel him, who hath subdued all things under the feet of Christ:" and if the rule laid down by Dr. M. and Messrs. S. and M. when discussing verse 5, is to be applied here, they are correct. They say, "in no language under the sun could the subject be considered as changed in an intermediate clause unless some intimation thereof was given." Now in this case it is Shângtî, who, in the preceding sentence, raised Christ from the dead, and in the succeeding sentence it is Shângtî who subdues all things under Christ. How is a reader then, except by guessing, to discover that these words are not a description of Shângtî's power?

The last verse of the chapter, however, is the one to which I would call especial attention as showing the degree of license in which the translators have indulged themselves. The verse, as it stands in our version, which is a literal translation of the Greek, reads as follows: "Which (church) is his body, the fullness of him that filleth all in all." As Dr. M. and Messrs. S. and M. have not objected to the translation I gave, we may presume they grant its correctness: I therefore here repeat it: "The church may be compared to the body of Christ. Christ gives grace to all men, and completes himself with the church." In answer to the objection that the words, "which is his body," are rendered "may be compared to the body of Christ," they quote from Robinson to show that the substantive verb often expresses, "not what the subject actually is, but what it is like, signifies, &c.;" and state, "that on the soundness of this canon of interpretation depends the great controversy between Protestants and Romanists." When I read this, I turned to Matt. xxvi. 26, to see how they had rendered the
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Words "this is my body;" it is rendered, "this is my body;" what is
the meaning then of this allusion to the great controversy between
Protestants and Romanists? If they would not venture to apply their
canon in this very place, where it is most needed, of what worth can
it be to a translator? No doubt the remark is worth everything to a
commentator on Matt. xxvi. 26, but no translator ventures to put
"signifies," or "is accounted to be," into the text, there. If for noth­
ing else, we should translate literally these similar uses of the sub­
antive verb, that they may be employed to illustrate this use in our
explanations of Matt. xxvi. 26. But in this case in Ephesians, and
in most others, where the substantive verb is used, there is something
more meant than these cold and wordy paraphrases bring out. When
we are told, that "the church is the body of Christ;" that Christians
are "one body in Christ;" that they "are members of his body, of
his flesh, and of his bones;" and that "our bodies are the temples of
the Holy Ghost;" we must believe that something more is conveyed
than we have in the statement, "the church may be compared to
the body of Christ." There are many good Christians who believe
that this is no mere empty figure; but that the church is the real, not
natural, but mystical body of Christ. For in what does the oneness of
the body consist; is it not in the being animated by one spirit?

The translation of the last clause, however, claims most attention:
"The fullness of him that filleth all in all." This is rendered,
"Christ gives grace to all men, and completes himself with the church."
Here Ist, I remark that the church is the subject of the Apostle's
sentence: Christ is made the subject thereof by the translators. "Of
this subject the Apostle predicates that it is the fullness of him that
filleth all in all." Of their subject Christ, the translators predicate,
that "he gives grace to all men;" and further that "he completes
himself with the church." Now what correspondence is there be­
tween the Apostle and his translators? The subjects are different;
the predicates wholly different. Can such a rendering be called a
translation? In my letter to the Bible Society, I asked if the "best
Biblical scholar in England, with this translation before him, if he
had no hint from whence it was taken, could find the passage the
translators had before them." The translators say, "we can not help
considering this somewhat contemptuous inquiry of the objector
uncalled for." I beg to assure these brethren that I meant no con­
tempt towards them by my inquiry, but to call pointed attention to
the liberties taken in their translation; and with this view I say again,
that such a scholar, with a good concordance to help him, would be
puzzled to find the text. But what is the defense set up for this utter disregard of the Apostle’s words? Why that the words, “who filleth all in all,” are rendered by Bloomfield, “who filleth all with all (things).” But does Bloomfield recommend the translator to change the subject of the sentence? Is the verb “to fill” the same as the verb “to give”? Are “all things” and “grace” quite equivalent expressions? What authority is there anywhere in the Scriptures for saying “Christ gives grace to all men?” * Bloomfield gives it as his opinion that by the phrase is meant “filleth all his members, each with their spiritual gifts and graces;” but men of equal learning and consideration with Bloomfield regard these words differently. One of them says, “it would not be easy to conceive of an expression more certainly denoting Omnipresence and universal agency than this; and if it refers to the Lord Jesus, as seems to be indisputable, the passage teaches not only his supremacy but demonstrates his universal agency, and his omnipresence—things that pertain only to God.”

If Dr. Medhurst and his collaborators had been translating Bloomfield’s commentary for the edification of the Chinese, the giving his opinion as well as his translation would be very well; but how can they show that he has a better right to have his opinions published and circulated in Chinese Bibles under St. Paul’s name, than other learned commentars have? Can his authority justify any translator for limiting the phrase “all things” to “grace” alone; or for changing the subject of the sentence and the verb thereof? These last however are done against his authority, and it can not be shown that he would advise any translator to put his opinion into the text. His own translation is, “filleth all with all things.” The translators say that the phrase which seems most to stumble the objector is the declaration, that the church is Christ’s fullness, which is expressed in Chinese by “Christ completes himself with the church.” And well may one be stumbled at this being given as a translation of St. Paul’s words. The Apostle’s words are “which (church) is the fullness of him.” His subject is the church; their’s, Christ; he says the “church is the fullness of Christ;” they say “Christ completes himself with the church.” What the translators give may as a gloss be a correct view of the Apostle’s meaning; but this can never be certainly shown; and it is no translation of his words. Able and learned men have differed as to the sense, and this therefore is a case calling for an ad verbum translation, according to the rule (§195) in Ernesti.

* All my Chinese teachers understand the phrase here to mean all mankind, or all the men under heaven, as they express it.
I give a few of the various opinions that have been held of the word rendered "fullness." Rosenmüller regards the word *fullness* here as meaning "a great number or multitude; a multitude," says he, "which, not confined to its own territory, spreads far and fills various regions." Koppe also regards it as synonymous with *multitude*. Storr understands the word in the sense of "full or abundant mercy." Locke renders, "which is his body, which is completed by him alone;" and supposes it means, "that Christ is the head who *perfects* the church by supplying all things to all its members which they need." Amidst such a diversity of opinion, a translator's only course is a verbal translation.

I have now, I think, produced a sufficient number of passages in which unwarrantable liberties are taken, to show that the opinion expressed in Dr. Bridgman's letter is both correct and moderately expressed; and have also sufficiently vindicated the opinions contained in my letter of Nov. 10th, 1851, to the Bible Societies. I might therefore here close, but that I wish to make a few remarks on the principles of translation that Dr. Medhurst and Messrs. Stronach and Milne have themselves avowed in their recent "Strictures." Their frank admissions in this paper must, I think, facilitate the decision of the question by the Bible Societies and the missionaries in China, whether they can sanction a version on such principles. At page 11, they say, "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," and in applying this rule they do not hesitate to put their own sense into the text in cases where all other translators have stood abashed, and adhered to a strict verbal rendering. Their object being to give the sense of the author as they understand it, they feel at liberty to change the subject or predicate, to omit words as pleonastic or insignificant, even when some of these are words on which volumes almost have been written; and in other cases to omit not only words but whole clauses. They here, too, justify themselves in a degree of liberty in altering the words of inspired writers, which is perhaps greater than has ever been taken by any other translators.

In their recent Strictures, these liberties, instead of being deplored and abandoned, are defended, and that in some cases with a contempt for the littleness of mind that could make such objections, that it makes one sad to read. For instance, where Mr. Culbertson objects that the words of Moses, "and the children of Heth answered Abraham, saying unto him," are rendered by the words, "the Hittites said:"
their answer to this objection is, "this we can not help regarding as mere trifling." A literal translation of the words of Moses can here be made in as good Chinese as that which the translators have written; it is true it would make the style different from that of the Chinese of the present day, but the Chinese certainly have no right to claim that Moses shall write in their style. It is as easy to say, "the children of Heth," as "the men of Heth." This being the case, why not let Moses say in Chinese what he said in Hebrew? "Answered Abraham" can be said in Chinese, without either difficulty or inelegance; considering then that Moses wrote these words, and that the translators are professing to translate him, and not to be making a new book of their own, I can not understand how they regard the objection as trifling. I am satisfied that all those, who have a due respect for the Sacred Scriptures, will on the contrary agree with me, that the wantonness shown in the omission of these words in their translation, and the tone in which it is defended, make this a very serious affair.

Take another instance. At Gen. vii. 15,16, Moses says, \begin{equation} 15 \text{And they went into Noah into the ark, two and two of all flesh, wherein is the breath of life;} \end{equation} \begin{equation} 16 \text{and they that went in, went in male and female of all flesh, as God had commanded him, and the Lord shut him in.} \end{equation} Mr. Culbertson complains that the words, "and they that went in, went in male and female of all flesh," are omitted in the translation. The defense set up for this omission is remarkable; they say, "after having said (in v. 15) 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'?" That is, they insert in verse 15, words which Moses has not used, and make these inserted words of their own, the plea for leaving out in verse 16, Moses' own words as useless. Thus they do what they ought not to have done, and then plead this unauthorized liberty for leaving undone what they ought to have done.

I will cite but one instance more of justified alteration to show upon what flimsy pretenses the words of an inspired writer have been changed. Mr. Culbertson complains that the words of Joseph in Gen. l. 19, "Am I in the place of God?" are changed into, "To recompense belongs to God: does it belong to me?" The defense set up is, "Bush remarks on this passage, 'these words seem to signify that God is to be regarded as the great avenger of sin,' &c." The fact that a worthy commentator, who has since turned Swedenborgian, remarks that these words seem to signify so and so, justifies them,
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according to their principles, in writing it down in God's holy book, in Moses' name, that Joseph said so!!!

In conclusion, let me say again, as I have said above, that in the strictures made on this Chinese version, I have no desire in any way to depreciate my missionary brethren who made it. I cheerfully accord them ability, learning, and uprightness of intention; and I sincerely mourn that, possessing all these qualifications for accomplishing a much needed work, they should have adopted principles of translation, which my sense of the reverence due to God's Word, constrains me publicly to oppose. Of themselves, I shall have nothing to say to the public that is not kind and respectful; of the principles upon which their translation was made, and of the very serious doctrinal errors taught therein (unintentionally I sincerely believe), I must be permitted to speak out my feelings frankly, and in the language that comes from my heart. This is a great public question; thousands of Christians are engaged through the Bible Societies in giving the Sacred Scriptures to the Chinese; they are entitled to know what they are giving to this people as the Word of God.

I hope that other missionaries, indeed all who have been in the field a sufficient time to allow them to form a judgment on the subject, will carefully examine the whole New Testament, Epistles as well as Gospels, and make known to the directors of the Bible Societies and to their missionary brethren in China, the result to which they are led by this examination. In their letter of the 1st of August, 1851, Dr. M. and Messrs. S. & M. quote the opinions of Dr. Williams and Dr. Legge, in favor of the new version; the former stating that, "it is decidedly superior to former ones, for clearness of style and close translation." When the above was written, probably neither of these brethren had examined the Epistles; I would beg them to make a careful examination of the translation of this part of the New Testament, and would like to know if they think the translators are close renderers of St. Paul.

I regret very much that any personal feeling, from any cause, should have got mixed up with this question; and I hope what I have written will assuage any unkind feelings that my failure, from unavoidable circumstances, to follow up my letter to the Bible Society, with an immediate public statement of the grounds of my objection to the new version, may have given rise to. Feeling confident of my being in perfect charity with these brethren, whose principles of translation I am constrained to protest against, I would humbly commit the whole matter into the hands of the God of truth and peace; and pray
that he will lead us all to see what is for the honor of his WORD, and the glory of his most HOLY NAME. And now, to that Name be reverently ascribed all glory, might, majesty, and dominion, both now and for ever. Amen.
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