

SECTION I.

Of Accusations brought against the authorized Translation of the Bible, and the Translators, by Mr. John Bellamy and Sir James Blund Burges.

IT was anticipated by those, who made the authorized and revered Translation of our Bible, that “(a) uncharitable imputations” would be cast upon themselves and their labours. “(b) Supported,” however, “by the truth and innocency of a good conscience,” they declared “(c) the Old Testament and the New” to be by them “*newly translated out of the original tongues* ;” and delivered a very perspicuous account of the means which they employed, and the manner which they followed, in this great undertaking. Herein they have spoken of ancient Versions in other languages ; but have recorded no acknowledgment of particular obligation to those amongst them, *which they are said to have servilely copied*. But I will lay before the reader not merely their own declaration : I will produce other evidences also, in order to refute the consolidated charge, (for the following imputations mean

(a) Dedication of the Translators of the Bible, in 1611, to King James.

(b) Ibid.

(c) Title of the Translation in 1611.

one and the same thing,) lately made against the integrity as well as the skill of our Translators, and therefore against the fidelity of our Translation.

(d) "Our Translators confined themselves to the Septuagint and Vulgate." Such is the assertion of Mr. John Bellamy.

(e) "Our present Translation is no other than a servile Translation of the Septuagint and Vulgate." These are the words of Sir James Bland Burges.

The love of liberal and literary inquiry, which has often distinguished Sir James Burges, might now have easily led him to deny, instead of maintaining, Mr. Bellamy's assertion. Having assumed what he says of the Septuagint, in a partial account of this ancient Version, as completely proved; having omitted to (f) refer his reader to other opinions upon the subject, supported by men of the greatest learning; he maintains, however, the assertion of Mr. Bellamy, with the hope (g) "that those, who govern our Church and State, may take this matter into consideration; and, as the necessity may appear to require, direct an immediate revision of our received Version; or, what perhaps might be more recommendable, a new Translation of the original Text." This is intended as a modest recommendation of "an improved text," as it has

(d) Mr. Bellamy's General Preface to his Transl. of the Holy Bible, 1818. p. ii.

(e) Reasons in Favour of a new Translation of the Holy Scripture, by Sir James Bland Burges, 1819. p. 124.

(f) See the ninth section of this compilation, in which the Septuagint and Vulgate are described and characterized.

(g) Reasons, &c. p. 152.

been called, by Mr. Bellamy. For Sir James Burges, after selecting from that text several passages, entitled *(h) literal translations from the Hebrew*, and frowning defiance on those in the received Version, which he has placed in a corresponding column; with the most friendly intention, invites the reader to concur with him, in “*(i) thinking that the translation, which bears such internal evidence of its truth, is in all probability the most faithful to the sacred original.*” He had reason, therefore, to bemoan an attack made upon “*(k) Mr. Bellamy’s new Translation of the Old Testament from the original Hebrew, which was regarded favourably by many well-disposed persons, among whom were included many of our most learned divines; and was continuing to rise in general estimation; when there appeared in the Quarterly Review, No. 37, a most virulent attack upon it, evidently calculated to crush it at its outset, and to intimidate those, by whom it had been patronized from affording to it any further countenance or protection.*”

Whoever awakens the unsuspecting, or relieves from doubt the hesitating, as to the real character and influence of a specious publication, is entitled to the thanks of the country. And thus respectfully taking leave of the reviewer in question for a while, I shall proceed to consider, with great attention, assertions which are built upon the charge that has

(h) Reasons, &c. p. 110—114, 126—150.

(i) Ibid. p. 152.

(k) Ibid. p. 1.

been recited. Our learned Translators have, indeed, been lately vindicated with great judgment, zeal, and erudition, by Mr. Whittaker, Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, in a section of his *Historical and Critical Enquiry into the Interpretation of the Hebrew Scriptures, with Remarks upon Mr. Bellamy's new Translation*; "(l) which Translation," he observes, "besides misleading young students on various subjects relating to sacred criticism and the (m) principles of grammar, contains many things which have a strong tendency to alienate the affections of the people from the Translation of the Bible now in use, which must, in numerous cases, be attended by most pernicious consequences." To this valuable book, calculated, however, principally for the critical scholar, I shall be found to be much indebted. Nor will the learned author, I hope, consider his authority misplaced, where it has been in my power to cite it, in a work of no other pretension than as a humble compilation of historical proofs, in defence of our Bible, designed for the more general reader. The accusation of Mr. Bellamy is as follows: "(n) The last revision [of the English Bible] was undertaken in the year 1603, when fifty four of the most learned of the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge were appointed,

(l) *Hist. and Crit. Enq. ut supr. 1819. Pref. p. xi.*

(m) No less than *one hundred and thirty-four errors*, in Mr. Bellamy's new translation of the single book of Genesis, against these principles. See Mr. Whittaker's Appendix. p. 301. And these are termed only "the *chief* violations of grammar committed by Mr. Bellamy" in that version.

(n) *Gen. Pref. ut supr.*