

# NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

No. CCXCIV.

---

MAY, 1881.

---

## CENTRALIZATION IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.

---

THE perpetuity of the American Government is an object of supreme concern to every American. This Government took a century and a half to build; and when it was finished, and our fathers, after their long and painful toil, turned to look at the work of their hands, and beheld its massive foundations and its fair proportions, they were wont, in their enthusiasm, to exclaim, *Esto perpetua!* It is for us, their children, to preserve it. To keep it as it was designed, is one of the greatest political problems of our time. There can hardly be a greater, since it affects the welfare not only of all the millions born and to be born between these oceans, but of all elsewhere, who might profit by their example. Why should we, as Americans, desire this perpetuity? Why should others, not our countrymen, desire it? Because, of all the bodies politic that ever existed, this is the only instance of a Federative Union as wide as a continent; and because, more than any other government in the world, it offers an asylum to the people of other lands, and promises to all ample protection with the largest freedom.

By the American Government, I mean that mixed system of national and State organizations which found their last and best expression in the Constitution of the United States. The vital principle of this system is the balancing of the governments,

## THE OLD VERSION AND THE NEW.

---

### KING JAMES'S VERSION.

ON the death of Queen Elizabeth, James I., the son of her rival, the unfortunate Queen Mary of Scots, ascended the throne of England. He had been brought up in the rigid school of Scotch Presbyterianism, subscribed the Scotch Confession of Faith drawn up by John Knox, the enemy of his mother, and had called the Anglican liturgy "an ill-said mass in English." But his promotion to the English throne was speedily followed by an abandonment of his Scotch Presbyterianism for Anglican Episcopalianism. The change suited his monarchical and despotic instinct, which found expression in his pet aphorism, "No bishop, no king." "A Scotch presbytery," he said, "agrees as well with monarchy as God and the Devil. Then, Jack, and Tom, and Will, and Dick shall meet and censure me and my council. Therefore, I reiterate my former speech: '*Le roy s'aviserà.*'" He was certainly no ordinary man. His reading and writing ranged from the mysteries of predestination to witchcraft and tobacco, and his courtiers lauded him as the Solomon of his age. Archbishop Whitgift said to him at the Hampton Court Conference: "Undoubtedly your Majesty speaks by the special assistance of God's Spirit." In the adulatory address of the dedication, the translators of the Bible which unjustly bears his name hail his accession to the throne as the "appearance of the sun in his strength." He was witty, shrewd, and learned, but pedantic, conceited, cowardly, mean, intemperate, and profane, and lacked practical common sense, which, for a ruler especially, is more important than uncommon sense. Henry IV. of France called him "the wisest fool in Christendom." And Macaulay

says that he was stammering, and slobbering, and talking in the style alternately of a buffoon and of a pedagogue. He reduced England from a monarchy of the first rank, which it had attained under Elizabeth, to a secondary order, and introduced the despotic, hypocritical, and semi-popish succession of the four Stuarts, which provoked the Puritan rebellion, and indirectly led to the colonization of New England and the triumph of toleration in old England. Macaulay says that England "owes more to the weaknesses and meannesses of James I. than to the wisdom and courage of much better sovereigns."

So we may say that to the vanity, rather than the wisdom and foresight of this monarch, we owe the best popular translation of the Bible which England or any other country ever possessed. He suggested it, or rather approved of the suggestion, which came from a Puritan divine, and appointed a commission for the translation, which still bears his name. But that is all; he never spent a penny on the work, he never owned or authorized it, and left it to its natural fate. For more than two hundred and fifty years the English-speaking world has been drinking the water of life "from the jaw-bones of a royal jack-ass." Fortunately, the connection of this noble work with James is purely nominal, and even that connection has long since been dropped from the American editions by the omission of the dedication "to the Most High and Mighty Prince James, by the Grace of God, King of Great Britain, France, and Ireland, Defender of the Faith, etc."

The authorized English version, so called,—although it was never properly authorized either by king, or parliament, or convocation, but simply by usage,—had its birth in the Hampton Court Conference, held in January, 1604. In that noble palace, built nearly a hundred years before by Cardinal Wolsey, on the banks of the Thames, and presented to Henry VIII., there assembled in the presence of King James, and at his invitation, Archbishop Whitgift of Canterbury, Bishop Baneroft of London, seven other bishops and eight deans, on the part of the conservative conformists, and four leaders of the progressive Puritan party, with the learned Dr. John Reynolds of Oxford, to confer about the burning questions which agitated the then undivided Church of England. The king acted both as moderator and judge, and lost no chance to display his learning and wit during the debate. He rudely rejected every petition of the Puritans,

using as his final argument: "I will make them conform themselves, or else I will harry them out of the land, or else do worse." By doing worse, he meant, "just hang them, that is all." This was his short method with dissenters.

In one point, however, he yielded to the obnoxious Puritans, notwithstanding the protest of the bishops. This was the revision of the Bishops' Bible, which had, from Queen Elizabeth's time, been used in all the churches of England, while the Geneva Bible of 1560 was the favorite version of the common people in their families. The suggestion came from Dr. Reynolds and led to an interesting debate, which we will give in the words of Thomas Fuller ("Church History of Britain," Book x. Sec. 1):

"Dr. Reynolds:—May your Majesty be pleased that the Bible be new translated, such as are extant not answering the original.

"And he instanced three particulars: Gal. iv. 25, in the original, *συτοικει*, is ill translated, 'bordereth.' Psalm cv. 28, in the original, 'They were not disobedient,' is ill translated, 'They were not obedient.' Psalm cvi. 30, in the original, 'Phinehas executed judgment,' is ill translated, 'Phinehas prayed.'

"Bishop of London:—If every man's humor might be followed, there would be no end of translating.

"His Majesty:—I profess I could never yet see a Bible well translated in English; but I think that, of all, that of Geneva is the worst. I wish some special pains were taken for a uniform translation; which should be done by the best learned in both universities, then reviewed by the bishops, presented to the Privy Council, lastly, ratified by royal authority, to be read in the whole church, and no other.

"Bishop of London:—But it is fit that no marginal notes should be added thereunto.

"His Majesty:—That caveat is well put in; for in the Geneva translation, some notes are partial, untrue, seditious, and savoring of traitorous conceits: As when from Exodus i. 19, disobedience to kings is allowed in a marginal note; and, 2 Chron. xv. 16, King Asa taxed in the note for only *deposing* his mother for idolatry, and not *killing* her. To conclude this point: let errors in the matter of faith be amended, and indifferent things be interpreted, and a gloss added unto them. For as Bartolus *de Regno* saith, that 'a king with some weakness is better than still a change'; so rather a church with some faults than an innovation. And surely if these were the greatest matters that grieved you, I need not have been troubled with such importunate complaints."

Dr. Reynolds, the real mover of the enterprise, is described by Anthony Wood as a prodigious scholar, who "had turned over all writers, profane, ecclesiastical, and divine, all the councils, fathers, and histories of the church." He was commissioned

as one of the translators of the company which had in charge the prophetic books of the Old Testament, but he died in May, 1607, four years before the publication of the work.

The king was not slow in making preparations. In July of the same year he commissioned forty-four dignitaries and scholars, who had been selected by some unknown but, no doubt, competent authority, to carry out the revision, and directed Bancroft, who in the meantime had become Archbishop of Canterbury, to make provision for the compensation of the translators by church preferment. He divided them into six classes, who were to meet at Westminster (London), Cambridge, and Oxford, two classes in each place. The original Scriptures, including the Apocrypha, were in like manner divided into six portions, one of which was assigned to each class for translation. The following rules, prescribed by the king, were transmitted to the translators :

“ 1. The ordinary Bible read in the church, commonly called the Bishops' Bible, to be followed, and as little altered as the original will permit.

“ 2. The names of the prophets and the holy writers, with the other names in the text, to be retained, as near as may be, accordingly as they are vulgarly used.

“ 3. The old ecclesiastical words to be kept, as the word *church*, not to be translated *congregation*.

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

“ 5. The division of chapters to be altered either not at all or as little as may be, if necessity so require.

“ 6. No marginal notes at all to be affixed, but only for the explanation of the Hebrew or Greek words, which cannot, without some circumlocution, so briefly and fitly be expressed in the text.

“ 7. Such quotations of places to be marginally set down as shall serve for the fit reference of one Scripture to another.

“ 8. Every particular man of each company to take the same chapter or chapters; and, having translated or amended them severally by himself where he thinks good, all to meet together to confirm what they have done and agree for their part what shall stand.

“ 9. As any one company hath dispatched any one book in this manner, they shall send it to the rest, to be considered of seriously and judiciously; for his Majesty is very careful in this point.

“ 10. If any company, upon the review of the book so sent, shall doubt or differ upon any places, to send them word thereof, to note the places, and

therewithall to send their reasons ; to which if they consent not, the difference to be compounded at the general meeting, which is to be of the chief persons of each company, at the end of the work.

“ 11. When any place of special obscurity is doubted of, letters to be directed by authority to send to any learned in the land for his judgment in such a place.

“ 12. Letters to be sent from every bishop to the rest of his clergy, admonishing them of this translation in hand, and to move and charge as many as, being skillful in the tongues, have taken pains in that kind, to send their particular observations to the company, either at Westminster, Cambridge, or Oxford, according as it was directed before in the King's letter to the archbishop.

“ 13. The directors in each company to be the Deans of Westminster and Chester, for Westminster, and the King's professors in Hebrew and Greek in the two universities.

“ 14. These translations to be used when they agree better with the text than the Bishops' Bible : Tyndale's, Coverdale's, Matthew's [Rogers's], Whitchurch's [Cranmer's], Geneva.

“ 15. By a later rule three or four of the most ancient and grave divines, in either of the universities, not employed in translating, to be assigned to be overseers of the translation, for the better observation of the fourth rule.”

The actual number of translators was only forty-seven. The remaining seven may have died or resigned. The active members were, no doubt, the best scholars of England at that time, as is very evident from the result. Yet most of them are entirely forgotten : they live only in their work. The same may be the fate of the new revisers. The work is far more important than the workmen.

The translation, or revision rather, was finished and published in 1611, and thus welcomed by Fuller (iii. 274) :

“ And now, after long expectation and great desire, came forth the new translation of the Bible (most beautifully printed), by a select and competent number of divines, appointed for that purpose ; not being too many, lest one should trouble another ; and yet many, lest, in any, things might haply escape them : who, neither coveting praise for expedition, nor fearing reproach for slackness (seeing, in a business of moment, none deserve blame for convenient slowness), had expended almost three years in the work, not only examining the channels by the fountain, translations with the original, which was absolutely necessary ; but also comparing channels with channels, which was abundantly useful, in the Spanish, Italian, French, and Dutch languages. So that their industry, skillfulness, piety, and discretion, have herein bound

the church unto them in a debt of special remembrance and thankfulness. These with Jacob, 'rallied away the stone from the mouth of the well' of life, Genesis xxix. 10; so that now even Rachels, weak women, may freely come, both to drink themselves, and water the flocks of their families at the same."

We bestow the highest praise upon the authorized version when we say that it is an idiomatic English reproduction of the Hebrew and Greek Scriptures, and reads like an original work. The strongest proof of its excellency is its universal adoption and use for more than two hundred and fifty years by all the various denominations and sects into which English and American Protestant Christendom is divided. It is the common bond of union between them all.

In properly estimating King James's version, however, we must not forget its defects, which are numerous and serious. Admirable as it is for popular and practical purposes, it is full of minor errors, inaccuracies, and inconsistencies, if tested by the standards of modern Greek and Hebrew scholarship. The forty-seven revisers are not to be blamed for this. They knew the ancient languages well enough to read them fluently and translate from them idiomatically; but they had a very imperfect apparatus of grammars and dictionaries. The niceties and shades of those languages could not be appreciated. The departures in the use of the article are so innumerable, and the neglect of the Greek tenses (the aorist, imperfect, and perfect) so constant and arbitrary, that they seem to have translated from the Latin Vulgate rather than from the Greek. Moreover, a vast amount of philological, archæological, geographical, and historical knowledge has accumulated within the last two hundred and fifty years, but more especially during the present generation, which can be utilized for the proper understanding of the Bible, and which is indisputably necessary for an accurate translation.

#### THE NEW REVISION.

THESE and other considerations have resulted at last in the resumption of the work of revision in the year 1870, by the combined labor of Biblical scholars from all the leading Protestant denominations of Great Britain and the United States. The British Committee and the American Committee are divided into

two companies, one for the Old and one for the New Testament, and each company acts as a unit, which secures greater harmony and consistency than the system adopted by King James. The New Testament was completed at the close of last year, just five hundred years after Wiclif's Bible, and will be published in the month of May, simultaneously in England, Scotland, America, and Australia. In England, it will be published in various sizes and at various prices by the University Presses of Oxford and Cambridge, which have always had the monopoly of Bible printing. In this country, the publication is left free like that of the authorized version, but, of course, with all the risk of variations and mutilations to which irresponsible reprints are subject. The Old Testament will be finished in two years.

The following are the rules of the Anglo-American revision, which it is interesting to compare with those prescribed by King James:

"1. To introduce as few alterations as possible into the text of the authorized version consistently with faithfulness.

"2. To limit, as far as possible, the expression of such alterations to the language of the authorized or earlier versions.

"3. Each company to go twice over the portion to be revised, once provisionally, the second time finally.

"4. That the text to be adopted be that for which the evidence is decidedly preponderating; and that when the text so adopted differs from that from which the authorized version was made, the alteration be indicated in the margin.

"5. To make or retain no change in the text, on the second final revision by each company, except two-thirds of those present approve of the same; but on the first revision to decide by simple majorities.

"6. In every case of proposed alteration that may have given rise to discussion, to defer the voting thereon till the next meeting, whensoever the same shall be required by one-third of those present at the meeting, such intended vote to be announced in the notice for the next meeting.

"7. To revise the headings of chapters, pages, paragraphs, italics, and punctuation.

"8. To refer, on the part of each company, when considered desirable, to divines, scholars, and literary men, whether at home or abroad, for their opinions."

The English Committee began actual work in May, 1870, and the American Committee, in coöperation with the English, in



October, 1872, but the latter was organized in 1871 by invitation of the former. Both committees embraced in all one hundred and one members; but of these, a number died or resigned during the last ten years. The present number of active members is seventy-nine, of whom fifty-two belong to the English and twenty-seven to the American Committee.

#### KING JAMES'S VERSION AND THE NEW REVISION COMPARED.

WE now proceed to state the points of agreement and difference between King James's version and the Anglo-American revision:

*First.* Both are not new versions, but revisions of preceding versions, each being based chiefly upon its immediate predecessor in authorized use, and retaining substantially the same kind of English, so as to keep up the continuity of tradition and the bond of union.

*Second.* Both are intended for popular use in churches and families. They employ the common, yet noble and dignified language of the people, as the sacred writers did. There is a consecrated Bible idiom which differs as much from the scientific language of scholars as from the vulgar language of the street. It does not either fly too high for the reach of the many, nor crawl on the dust.

*Third.* Both represent the best Biblical scholarship of the age in which they were made.

*Fourth.* King James's version, although suggested by an individual scholar (Dr. Reynolds), was undertaken and carried on by royal authority, but unaided by the royal purse and the royal seal of approval. The new revision originated in the head and heart of the Church of England, the Convocation of Canterbury, and is carried on by Biblical scholars, independent of government aid or government sanction. The one represents the Erastian principle of state control, the latter the self-government of the church.

*Fifth.* The old version was made by scholars of the one undivided Church of England, the new by scholars of all denominations which have since sprung from it and use the same Bible.

*Sixth.* The old version is the sole product of old England, the new is the joint product of both English-speaking nations. In England, very properly, the Episcopal Church takes the lead; in

the American Committee, the various leading denominations are equally represented, according to their numerical and moral strength and scholastic standing.

*Seventh.* The new revision, while retaining the idiom and vocabulary of the old, including its innocent and intelligible archaisms, is yet so far adapted to the present state of the English language as to remove obsolete or misleading words and phrases, such as *prevent* (for precede), *let* (for hinder), to *fetch a compass* (for to go round), *conversation* (for conduct), *by and by* (for immediately), *carriages* (for baggage), etc., etc.

*Eighth.* The old version represents the *textus receptus*, that is, a comparatively late, mediæval, and corrupt text, derived from a few cursive manuscripts, and published by Erasmus, Stephens, and Theodor Beza. The new revision is based upon the oldest attainable text of the best uncial manuscripts (as Codex Vaticanus and Codex Sinaiticus), the oldest versions (especially the Latin and Syriac), and the quotations of the oldest fathers (as Jerome, Origen, Tertullian, Irenæus), and digested with immense care and industry in the text and apparatus of the best critical editors of modern times (as Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Westcott, and Hort). This older text has been more recently brought to light by remarkable discoveries and researches, and is upon the whole purer, simpler, and stronger than the *textus receptus*, but will not change a single article of faith or precept of duty.

*Ninth.* The new revision represents the latest stage of Biblical philology, criticism, and archæology, and is far more accurate and consistent, though, perhaps in some cases, at a sacrifice of the rhythm of the old version. The improvements in this respect are innumerable and occur in every chapter, although the ordinary reader may scarcely observe them.

*Tenth.* The new revision greatly reduces the number of italics or interpolations of the old version (which are mostly useless or misleading), and substitutes a natural arrangement by sections for the artificial versicular division (which dates from Stephens's edition of 1551), although the popular division of chapters and verses is, for convenience' sake, retained in the margin.

All these points might be amply illustrated by examples. But, as the revised New Testament has not yet been published, it would be improper to anticipate it by indicating the changes actually made. The object of this article is simply to state the

relation of the new revision to the authorized version, and the general principles of the revision, and thus to prepare the reader for an intelligent judgment of the work itself, which will be in the hands of the public in a few days.

The scholars of the two committees have done their work faithfully and finally, and retire from the field. It is now for the Christian public of England and America to pronounce its verdict on the revision, and to decide whether or not it shall take the place of the old version in the churches, schools, and families of the English-speaking world.

PHILIP SCHAFF.