

ARTICLE IV.

THE LATEST TRANSLATION OF THE BIBLE.

BY HENRY M. WHITNEY.

VII. CONCERNING CERTAIN OTHER VERSIONS, MORE OR LESS IN
THE MODERN.

THE idea of making a version of the Bible in modern English is not altogether recent, for we suppose the first of all our versions, that of Wycliffe, to have been made in the language of the time. Nor has the thought or the endeavor been that of a very few. It is likely that within the past twenty years many such manuscripts have been prepared, and have been kept from publication only by a chilly lack of faith among the publishers; it is likely that many parts of the Bible have been written out for the private satisfaction of the writers or for a circle of friends; it is likely that,—besides such work as Conybeare and Howson's version of the Epistles of Paul, scattered through their life of the Apostle,—there have been printed far more versions in the modern than most people know. We desire in this paper to consider several that have happened to come to our knowledge or to seem to us for some reason worthy of mention.

1. In 1858 Leicester Ambrose Sawyer brought out a version (Boston: J. P. Jewett & Co.) entitled "The New Testament, translated from the Original Greek, with Chronological Arrangement of the Sacred Books, and Improved Divisions

of Chapters and Verses." The first paragraph of the preface is as follows: "This is not a work of compromises, or of conjectural interpretations of the Sacred Scriptures, neither is it a paraphrase, but a strict literal rendering. It neither adds nor takes away; but aims to express the original with the utmost clearness, and force, and with the utmost precision. It adopts, however, except in the prayers, a thoroughly modern style, and makes freely whatever changes are necessary for this purpose."

The most conspicuous note of its modernness is its use of "you" for "thou," but it is very nearly consistent in being modern: the only exceptions that we have noticed are the use of "begat" for "begot" and of "I and my Father" for "my Father and I"; it sometimes is more modern than is necessary, as in using "it would be better" for "it were better," and "a change of mind" for "repentance." On the other hand, it does not make a mistake of the "Twentieth Century" version by attempting to blot out all local color: indeed, it increases local color by using the terms of the ancient coinages, as "assarion," "quadrans," "didrachma," "denarius"; similarly, it has "modius" for "bushel," and many such ancient words transferred. It is badly in bondage to the tenses of the original: for example, in John xi. 40: "*Did* I not tell you that if you *will* believe you *shall* see the glory of God?" Matthew xxv. 48 is one of the many cases where a pluperfect should be the rendering of the aorist: "Now he that betrayed him gave [had given] them a sign": Mr. Sawyer's version gives no evidence of the recognition of niceties like these. Nor does it feel the need of rendering *kai* sometimes by "but," nor is it aware of any other of the subtler influences of the Hebrew upon New Testament Greek, or of the equally subtle influence of the literary methods of the

times. It has no optional renderings, in text or margin. It is excellently paragraphed in the modern manner.

We note a few of its more striking departures from the usual renderings. The following are incorrect: Matt. vi. 12: "Forgive us our debts, as we *forgive* our debtors"; vi. 25: "Be not anxious for your *soul*, what you shall eat"; John xii. 6: "Judas had the treasure-*chest*" (they were not so rich as that!); 1 Cor. xii. 31: "I will *still more fully* show you the way."¹ The following are awkward: Matt. vi. 11: "Give us to-day our *essential* bread"; John ix. 36: "Who is he, sir, that I *shall* believe on him?" The following are interesting: Matt. vi. 13: "Bring us not into trial"; vi. 19: "Where *a* moth and *corrosion* destroy"; John ix. 8: "Then the neighbors and those who had seen him before, *because* he was a beggar, said . . ."; xi. 10: "If he walks in the night he stumbles, because the light is not in *it*."

On the whole, this version is a dignified and excellent work: it has poise,—with plenty of courage, but no bristling self-assertion; it keeps clear of the fantastic expressions that, for some reason, are found, at least occasionally, in most versions in the modern; and it does not plod heavily along. Yet, for several sufficient reasons, when it appeared it aroused little interest, and it was soon forgotten: it changed the order of a few Epistles, and we are sure that even a slight disturbance in that line greatly hinders the success of any version; it was the work of an individual, and especially of one who had no prestige from the schools; it was rather expensive, awkward to handle, and not attractive to the eye; it entirely changed the old system of chapters and verses, thus breaking too com-

¹ Weizsäcker: "Ich will euch noch einen Weg zeigen, hoch über alles"; de Wette": Ueberdies zeige ich euch einen trefflichen Weg."

pletely with the habits of those who read or studied the Bible; it found public sentiment altogether unripe for the reception of a work of the kind. All this was a pity, for the book deserved a kinder fate.

We may close our account of it with an excellent sentence from the preface: "There is a vast accumulation of knowledge to be made available by some one, or in some way, for the production of an improved English Bible, that shall bear the same relation to the advanced knowledge of these times, which Tindal's, Coverdale's, and that of King James did to theirs." Of course, much of this accumulated knowledge was used in the English and the American Revisions.

2. In 1898 Reverend Francis Aloysius Spencer brought out a book entitled "The Four Gospels: A New Translation from the Greek Text Direct, with Reference to the Vulgate and the Ancient Syriac Version" (New York, W. H. Young and Co.). The preface is by Cardinal Gibbons, and the imprimatur by the Archbishop of New York. It is paragraphed, with many synoptical headings in the text. There are brief notes, explanatory, doctrinal, or homiletical,—especially from the Roman standpoint.¹ The Magnificat, the Benedictus, the Nunc dimittis, the song of the Christmas angels, and the more poetic quotations from the prophets, are all in poetic lines. Beside each verse in the Gospels is a notation of any parallel verse in another Gospel: this valuable feature is handled very well. There are marginal variants, notes, and references, all well subordinated to the text. It is not afraid of local color, and hence uses freely the ancient names of coins, hours, officers, implements, and the rest. There is no straining after big words, nor any attempt to catch the multitude by words of

¹ The note on Luke i. 27 gives a curious derivation for the name of the Virgin Mary: "Mistress (or Bitterness) of the Sea."

the street. The text, although it shows little real acumen or felicity, runs smoothly, and evidences a careful endeavor to bring out the exact sense of the Greek: hence, where the Vulgate, and, under its influence, Wycliffe, have "do penance," Spencer has "repent." It seems to have largely followed the English Revision,—even into some of its errors: as in Matt. xxv. 5: "*slumbered* and slept," and in its bondage to the Hellenistic tenses. In the main, the translation is what any thorough scholar would approve, and sometimes it sheds helpful light upon the sense. The style is less archaic than that of either Revision. The spirit of the book is sweet.

The following are peculiar points: Matt. vi. 11: "Give us this day our *supersubstantial* bread." Footnote: "*Supersubstantial bread*: that is, of a nobler order of substance than the natural substance of bread: or in which a higher substance has taken the place of a lower: in other words, the substance of the Body of Christ under the accidents of bread—the Holy Eucharist." After this bow to the theologians, the ordinary senses of ἐπιούσιον are given. Mark vi. 25: "Straightway she came in *eagerly* to the king"; xv. 29: "Wagging their heads, and saying: 'Bah!'" Luke xxii. 32: "I prayed for thee, that thy faith may not fail; and *do thou at any time turn* and confirm thy brethren": Peter is addressed here as "thou," but Nicodemus elsewhere as "you." John iii. 8: "The *Spirit breathes* where he pleases." John i. 30 is particularly well expressed: "After me is coming a man who *ranks before* me; for he *existed before* me"; and Mark xv. 5: "Jesus made no further answer": it is curious what work has been made with the translation of this simple verse: as in the Bible Union version: "Jesus no longer made any answer," and the American Revision: "Jesus no more answered anything." In Luke xxiv. 18, a verse over which also there has been a great amount

of blundering, Spencer has the best form that we have happened to see: "Are you the only stranger in Jerusalem who does not know . . . ?"

3. In 1883 Ferrar Fenton issued the Pauline Epistles in modern English, and later the whole New Testament. He says of himself: "In early manhood, about 1852, he became convinced . . . that unless the Sacred Scriptures were translated afresh into current spoken English, a belief in the Christian Religion as a Faith would perish, for that by the unavoidable ignorance of the Old Translators, and the obsolete dialect of the A. V. and subsequently the [English] Revised Version, its documentary basis had become unintelligible to us." Our remarks are based upon his volume entitled "The New Testament in Modern English . . . second edition of the Gospels and sixth of Saint Paul's Epistles" (London: H. Marshall and Son).

This volume is typographically one of the most pleasing that we have seen. As in Spencer's version, the matter is well broken up into paragraphs, with synoptical headings. It makes its own contribution to the felicities of the rendering of the Bible: one of these we shall mention later; another is in Acts x. 33, which is, in the American Revision, "Thou hast well done that thou art come," but is rendered by Fenton, "You have been very kind in coming." We think that he has the right idea; it is a courteous recognition of a kindness: "You have been so kind as to come." We do not know that any one has used the opportunity to add a similar felicity in Phil. iv. 14: Paul was a high-bred gentleman, and would have said something more suave and less self-important than this: "You have done well in contributing to me during my affliction." What, then, should it be?

Fenton has a very curious order for the books of the New Testament. He begins with the Gospel according to John,

because it "is specially the Doctrinal Record¹ of our Lord's life," and because "there is ample reason for believing that the Gospel of John was written at an earlier date than" the rest. He then gives the First Epistle of John, because "it is evidently the concluding section of" John's Gospel, "and forms a perfect summary of the essentials of the Gospel Message." Except for these, the books are in the usual order.

Like other translators into modern English, Fenton has a very imperfect conception of the way in which the epistolary standpoint affected the tenses of the New Testament letters, as in Philemon and in Acts xxiii. 30; but, like them, he gives careful attention to putting the poetry in poetic lines.

Of Fenton's qualifications as a translator we cannot give a better example than his rendering, in a prospectus of his version of the Old Testament, of Gen. i. 1: "God created the heavens and the earth *by periods*": this absolutely original idea seems to have been meant to catch the scientists, but is open to two objections: *reshith* does not mean "period," and it is not a plural: did Fenton confuse the singular termination *-ith* with the plural termination *-oth*?

After such a rendering at the threshold of the Bible, one is prepared for such curiosities as these: "Matt. vi. 9-13: "Your Name is being Hallowed; Your Kingdom is being restored; Your Will is being done both in Heaven and upon Earth; . . . You would not bring us into temptation, but deliver us from its evil." This extraordinary treatment of the Lord's Prayer is justified by the author (author, indeed) on the ground that the imperatives are aorist, and so amount to

¹We have failed to think out yet the psychological reason connecting effusive capitals with the rendering of the Bible in the modern, but there must be such a connection if facts are of any account. By the same token, the three great versions in the archaic are extremely sparing in the emphasis that is got from the printer's fonts.

“what is called a ‘Standing Order.’” John iv. 28: The Samaritan woman left her “drawbucket.” Acts ix. 40: Tabitha “opened her eyes; but seeing Peter, she *fell backwards*.” The verb cannot mean anything except that she *sat up*, —the instinctive act of any one before a stranger, and especially of a woman before a man; x. 9: “Peter ascended the *balcony*”; does the translator know so little of Oriental ways? x. 34: “God is not a *flatterer*”; xviii. 3: “As he was of the same profession, he stayed with them, employing himself, for by profession they were *landscape painters*.” This is extremely good; it is a rare intellectual pleasure to start from *σκηνοποιοί* and study out the path by which one may get around to this discovery of early art. So Paul and Aquila and Priscilla were really with Luke in helping to remove from the apostolic church the stigma of being indifferent to beauty; xix. 31: here Fenton guesses that “Asiarchs” were “leading men among the Asiatics”: any classical dictionary would have taught him better. He renders “Asia” by “Asia Minor,”—a misleading expression; xxiii. 17: “Conduct this *gentleman* to the Commandant”: we felt sure, when we found “ladies” in the “Twentieth Century” (xiii. 50), that some other worker in the modern would get in “gentleman” too. We were once told by a tramp in regard to a fire that he “believed they had caught the gentleman that set it.” 1 Cor. xiii. 12: “We look now through a loophole into the darkness”: this is a wonderful flight. Rev. xix. 10: “The evidence of Jesus is the life of preaching.” This is the passage that, in the old form, is so dear to the church: “The testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy.” The latter is the literal form, and we believe that it exactly covers the idea: Jesus was the real subject, the burden, of the Old Testament prophets.¹ But,

¹ So de Wette: “Das Zeugniß Jesu ist der Geist der Weiss-

like Luke xii. 49 ("What will I if it be already kindled?"), the clause seems peculiarly to tempt people to try to get up something that no one else has devised. The "Twentieth Century" has, "To bear testimony to Jesus demands the inspiration of a prophet": this rendering is even farther-fetched than Fenton's. Are not both of them certainly wrong?

It is not too much to say that Fenton's version abounds in inaccurate or freakish translations. What, then, shall we say of his assertion that his "tentative first translation . . . received the approval of" two Archbishops, Professor Blackie, "Professor Oliver Wendell Holmes," nine less prominent persons, whom he names, "and numerous others, who urged the Translator to complete his work by a version of the whole Bible on the same plan"? We are painfully aware of the infirmities of human nature in regard to commending books after little more than a glance, but we mean to think that Fenton misunderstood these men, for either they had read his book or they had not: in either case, their commendation would leave them in a not very creditable light.

4. A version of which we are able to say much better things bears the title "The Modern Speech New Testament: An Idiomatic Translation into Every-day English . . . , by the late Richard Francis Weymouth" (New York: Baker and Taylor Co.). It is a relief to find that this author is satisfied with the old order of the books, his idea of the order of composition being indicated in another place. The paragraphs are of moderate length, with occasional summaries in the upper left-hand corner. The book is light in the hand, and very agreeable to the eye.

gung." Weizsäcker's rendering is essentially the same. Weymouth has: "Testimony to Jesus is the spirit which underlies prophecy."

It is good to find in the preface that in translation "there are two dangers to be guarded against. . . . On the one hand there is the English of Society, on the other hand that of the utterly uneducated, each of these *patois* having also its own special, though expressive, borderland which we name 'slang.' But all these salient angles (as a professor of fortification might say) of our language are forbidden ground to the reverent translator." It is a pity that certain other translators into the modern were not impressed with this truth.

It is refreshing also to find him saying: "Again, a *modern* translation—does this imply that no words or phrases in any degree antiquated are to be admitted? Not so, for great numbers of such words and phrases are still in constant use. To be antiquated is not the same thing as to be obsolete or even obsolescent, and without at least a tinge of antiquity it is scarcely possible that there should be that dignity of style that befits the sacred themes with which the Evangelists and Apostles deal." Both these propositions we firmly believe.

It is here that the "Twentieth Century" makes one of its two worst mistakes. It was evidently constructed on the wholly arbitrary and academic ground of using only words and structures that are in common use to-day on the street. It is a fatal defect in a version when a word that is perfectly modern but has only religious associations is rejected for a word not having such associations but not fitting the sense so well: this is true in the "Twentieth Century" again and again. We have spoken of the importance of using words that match the original in their dignity and in their degree of intensity. "Glory" and "glorify" are proper, in many places they are the only proper, equivalents for *δόξα* and *δοξάζω*; there are places where representing the Greek words by "praise," as in the "Twentieth Century," is little better than bathos.

The "Twentieth Century" turns in every direction to avoid using the word "grace,"—as "the grace of God,"—using, for example, "mercy" in John i. 14, 16, and rendering Heb. xiii. 25: "May God bless you all." The essence of *χάρις* in very many places is unmerited favor, and there is no word that will express that idea so well as "grace." "Grace" is exceedingly dear to the church: a New Testament not containing the word can be only a literary curiosity, —certainly not a book to be used as a manual of religion; it is fair to say that in many cases *χάρις* goes untranslated unless it is rendered "grace." There are two opposite standpoints in this matter: one is that of being utterly modern and secular in diction, whether one really translates or not; the other is that of translating faithfully, whether one makes out to be absolutely modern or not. Weymouth, seeing things from the latter standpoint, makes free use of "grace."

There is a point about which Weymouth does not seem to us to do so well, and it is a point that many do not at all understand. There are in the New Testament four ways of indicating that one believes, or has faith, toward Christ. The mildest is to put a dative, without a preposition, directly after the verb *πιστεύω*: for example, John iv. 21: "Woman, believe me." The next stronger is to put *ἐν* with a dative after the verb; as, perhaps, in Eph. i. 13: "*In* whom, having also believed, ye were sealed"; but this may mean, "In whom ye were sealed." With *πίστις*, the noun, there are cases of *ἐν* of which there can be no doubt,—as Eph. i. 15: "Faith *in* the Lord Jesus," Col. i. 9, etc. All are agreed that "*in*" is the word to be used in rendering this second form. The next stronger is to put *ἐπί* with a dative or an accusative after the verb, the accusative being evidently the stronger of the two; for example, Rom. x. 11: (dat.) "Whosoever believeth *on*

him"; Acts ix. 42: (accus.) "Many believed *on* the Lord." It is evident that both these express a movement of the soul, throwing itself *upon* Christ: plainly, "believe *on*" is the necessary rendering here. Another form, which seems to us the strongest, puts *eis* (into) with an accusative after the verb: this is especially Johannean, but is frequent in the books that come after John; it evidently stands for a movement of the soul, by figure, *into* Christ. For example, Matt. xviii. 6: (A. V.) "Little ones which believe in me"; (A.R.) "—on me." "Into," the exact rendering in these cases, has never, we believe, been used. Obviously the place of "into" should be taken by no weaker word than "on," if "on" is to be used at all. In John iv. 21 Wycliffe has, "Bileve *to* me"; in the other forms he has always "in," this, of course, being due to his translating from the Latin, which had no apparatus for distinguishing among believing "in," "on," and "into." Tyndale, our first translator from the Greek, carefully puts *in* for *en* and *eis*, and "on" for the two uses of *emf*. The King James version is not careful to distinguish between "in" and "on"; the American Revision is strict. Weymouth generally uses "in," and seems to have no real reason for the difference when he uses "on." The "Twentieth Century" never uses "on," thereby in another respect throwing itself out of the class of real translations,—for insistence upon this distinction is not pedantry, nor pettiness, nor a recalling of men to an obsolete method of speech, but it is essential to that bringing out of the exact sense of words which is the only real translation. To repeat, Weymouth does not sacrifice to modernness any chance to get closer to the sense, but he does not seem to realize the difference between believing in Christ and believing on him.

Weymouth's version is better than the "Twentieth Cen-

ture" in another respect, namely, in that it has excellent notes¹ and variant renderings, while the "Twentieth Century" eschews everything of the kind. It makes valuable suggestions as to the implications of the tenses; these, however, he makes tedious by repetition, and the effort to bring out those implications in the translation is often overdone. A representative case occurs in Heb. xii. 28: "Therefore, receiving, *as we now do*, a kingdom which cannot be shaken, let us cherish thankfulness so that we may *ever* offer to God an acceptable service." Upon this is the note that the two bits here italicized are implications of the tenses in the Greek. ("Cherish thankfulness," by the way, is a phrase chosen to bring out the especial sense of a verb.) As cases of overdoing we quote also Luke iv. 9: "Tempted *all the while* by the devil," and v. 26: "Glory to God was the *abiding* feeling. Yet fear *flashed* through their minds": in the latter case a note explains that these lively expressions bring out the distinction between an imperfect and an aorist; to us the effect is disagreeable; hence we should have used less elaborate or original terms.

An excellent thing in Weymouth's version is its care, not only to preserve the metaphors that are brought out in the older translations, but to bring out others and to explain by footnotes those that cannot be made clear in the text. The "Twentieth Century," on the other hand, is open to the charge, not only of blurring metaphors (as in Heb. xii. 1, where the "cloud" of witnesses becomes a "throng"), but of suppressing many picturesque and enlivening expressions, as in Luke xvi. 23, where "Lazarus in his bosom" is re-

¹Those who are curious as to "the Second Coming" of Christ will find some rather unusual things in the notes on the verses that are most studied in that connection.

A peculiar doctrine of resurrection may be found in a note on Heb. xi. 25.

duced to "Lazarus with him." As well might one take the color out of the sunset-sky.

Nor does Weymouth generally make the grievous mistake of minimizing the activity of God in events. This is the second chief mistake of the "Twentieth Century," and it occurs again and again; it is a part of the atmosphere of the book. In 1 Peter i. 13 we have no choice but to say, "the revelation of Jesus Christ": the "Twentieth Century," however, makes it "the Appearing"; and Weymouth, "the re-appearing." We give this particular example because it illustrates the less emphatic points in which the Bible steadily makes God the chief actor, the real mover, in all that occurs. To fail to represent that fact in a translation is to make something that is not the Bible. There is much more that we might say in this connection.

Weymouth often roots his version in acquaintance with the usages or the conceptions of Bible-times, and his notes of this kind are sometimes helpful in a high degree. For instance, in Heb. i. 7, quoting Ps. civ. 4, is a very interesting double case of uncertainty produced by the impossibility of deciding absolutely, by the structure, which of two nouns is the object of the verb, and which is in apposition. In English the first noun would have to be the object, but it is not necessarily so in either of the Bible-tongues. Hence the possibility of renderings so diametrically opposite as these:—

(Revs.)	Who maketh his	(T. C.)	He makes the winds
	angels winds,		his angels
And his ministers	a flame of	And the fiery flames	his ser-
fire.		vants.	

Decision between these is not attainable by reverting to the Hebrew, for the uncertainty is there as well. Weymouth agrees with the Revisions, but puts it more explicitly:—

"He changes His angels into winds,
And His ministering servants into a flame of fire";

adding the footnote: "A precarious tenure of existence is here attributed to the angels in contrast to the eternity of the life and reign of the Son of God. It was an ancient Jewish belief that angels sometimes lose their personality and are reduced to impersonal forces of nature." De Wette, Weizsäcker, and others are with the Revisions and Weymouth in this matter: de Wette's rendering is: "Der da macht seine Engel zu Winden, und seine Diener zu Feuerflammen." The point is that the decision turns, not upon the necessary meaning of the original in either tongue, for there is no one necessary meaning, but upon known Hebrew ideas; and these Weymouth has laid before us.

Weymouth has his own infirmities, too. He sometimes uses expressions that are alien to the simplicity required in the Bible: as "commencement" (Luke i. 3), "incidents" (ii. 51), Simon's "mother-in-law was *suffering from an acute attack of fever*" (iv. 38); and uncouth words: as, "Capharnahum" (iv. 31); and redundant words: as, "They were both *of them* upright" (i. 6); and erroneous words: as, "He dealt *pitifully* [in pity] with our forefathers" (i. 72), "a baptism of the *penitent*" (iii. 3: the original word expressly excludes emotion, and so must be rendered "repentant"); and a few undignified words, as "money-grubbers" (Eph. v. 5). He has the peculiarly English weakness for getting "only" too early in the sentence, as: "He was only sent [sent only] to a widow" (Luke iv. 26). He has another especially English solecism, a dreadful solecism, in Gal. ii. 3: "They did not insist upon even *him being* circumcised." Perhaps he is a little lacking in humor: in Rom. xiv. 15 he has: "Your brother is pained by the food you are eating": this would seem to be a remarkable case of sympathetic or vicarious colic.

Weymouth has some vigorous expressions; as in 1 Cor.

iv. 80: "Apostolic authority is not a thing of words, but of power." We think he stands alone in the excellent change by which, in 1 Peter i. 12, the idea of *stooping* is brought out: "Angels long to stoop and look into these things": there are occasional felicities like this.

Weymouth was an excellent, a distinguished, scholar. We must confess to preferring his version, for suggestiveness, to any other that we know. In scores of cases we have fixed upon a rendering that suited us best, and then have found that Weymouth had substantially the same. Revised by some one who knows good English, the English that is needed for the Bible, his version might easily become a very acceptable and useful book.

We may close our account of this work by quoting the following very true remark from the preface: "The aorist as a rule is more exactly represented in English by our perfect with 'have' than by our simple past tense; . . . in this particular the Authorized Version is in scores of instances more correct than the [English] Revised Version." The two Revisions are equally open to this stricture. Their blindness on this point really amounts to a calamity to the church.

5. In 1892 there was presented to the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States a memorial from Massachusetts, asking for permission to use the English Revision in public worship; this permission was refused. The outcome of the agitation was the appointment, in 1895, of a Commission, one half of the members being bishops, to prepare a body of alternative readings that clergymen should be allowed to substitute when reading in public from the Authorized Version. The Commission were by the General Convention expressly refused the help of biblical experts in their work. It is worth noting that, in a similar movement

in England, Bishop Westcott favored adopting the whole English Revision, and not selections made from it by a commission; in England the use of the English Revision is "now allowed in churches with the consent of the Ordinary,"—which doubtless means freedom of use. The American Commission put a great deal of labor upon the preparation of their list of alternative readings; the list was adopted by the General Convention; and in 1901 the Commission were empowered to print a Bible or Bibles containing these readings in the margin. Their edition was copyrighted in 1903. It has 4,722 renderings from the English Revision, more than 600 from the margin of the English Revision, and over 100 from the American suggestions that had been rejected by the English Revisers but printed in the back part of their book. The Commission retained also nearly 600 of the 7,557 marginal readings in the Authorized Version. Thus, if we exclude a few general marginal readings, their recommendations amount to 6,813. Of course, the great mass of these proposed changes are gains. The Commission recommended many other changes of their own devising: these the General Convention did not authorize to be used in the churches, but permitted to appear in an appendix for instruction and study. Many of these suggestions, however, are matched by forms used in the American Revision. That Revision came too late to be of much use to the Commission in its task, or to enter into the general question as to what might be used.

For the purpose of these papers there is little to be learned from the book that the Commission brought out. Only those who are bound to the use of the Authorized Version would regard this modification of it as being of very great account; for them it should be only a stage in the adjustment of the English Bible to advance in knowledge and to change in the

use of words. By the rules the Commission were limited to what had appeared in the English Revision, and of that material they selected only part, and not always, according to some Episcopal critics, in a complete or consistent way. Their Bible is a curious, but not, to the eye, a pleasing, book. And the Authorized Version might well have prayed to be delivered from its friends. If the aim of the conservatives in the General Convention was to maintain the credit of the Bible to which they were used, they were signally unwise in allowing it to be gridironed with heavy black lines,—sometimes looking almost like a newspaper that a Russian censor has “blacked,”—all the lines indicating that the passages thus underscored are wrong; and it was especially unwise to allow the text and the marginal substitute to say exactly opposite things. A case of this latter is in Isa. ix. 3:—

(A. V.) Thou hast not increased the joy. (Marg.) Thou hast increased their joy.

To any outsider who has watched ecclesiastical bodies long enough to know how unskillful they often are in working out their own better mind, and how badly they are hampered, often, by a blind conservatism in very good men, or by a timidity that gets panicky at any call to think, the conclusion seems inevitable that the Episcopal General Convention meant better than they made out to do. At any rate, they should have authorized the use of the American Revision as the best attainable version, and have rested with that. Such we believe to be still the wisest way; it is the course to which the General Convention will surely come, unless, under equally favorable auspices, a version is made that reaches yet nearer to the ideal form. Doubtless some of the Commission themselves felt, more or less clearly, more or less consentingly, that, after all, the chief usefulness of their labors would lie in the service of their work as a bridge by which the transfer of the Epis-

copal body to the untrammled use of the American Revision would at last be made.¹

Are there any generalizations that may safely be drawn from the facts that have been here reviewed and from the characteristics of the versions that have been considered in our previous papers? It is safe to say that the individual translator is free to put in his personal whimsies, to use his personal mannerisms, and to make his personal mistakes, but that a company, unless dominated by some one personality,—as when Lightfoot got Satan put into the Lord's Prayer,—are more likely to keep such things out. On the other hand, a company are more likely, unless organized from a wing of opinion, to be collectively conservative, and so to block many improvements that an individual or a small group would have made. A version made by a small company tends, consciously or unconsciously, to have a specialty or two, as that of the Bible Union version for the reduction of "shall" to "will." To be overruled in regard to something that one believes to be extremely important is the frequent lot of a member of a revision-committee, and to him the experience must be sometimes bitter: from the standpoint of the public, the most obvious remark would be that sometimes it is unfortunate, and sometimes it is exceedingly fortunate, that the man could not have had his way.

¹ Since this article was put in type, the General Convention of 1904 has rejected a petition for leave to use the American Revision. The vote settles the question for three years.