

OFFICIAL LETTERS AND DOCUMENTS  
OF THE  
**American Bible Revision Committee,**

PRINTED (NOT PUBLISHED)

FOR THE  
USE OF THE COMMITTEE

BS188  
A515  
COPY 2

From the Library of  
Professor William Henry Green  
Bequeathed by him to  
the Library of  
Princeton Theological Seminary

1872









HISTORICAL ACCOUNT

OF THE

WORK OF THE

✓  
AMERICAN COMMITTEE OF REVISION

OF THE

**Authorized English Version of the Bible,**

PREPARED FROM THE DOCUMENTS  
AND CORRESPONDENCE OF THE COMMITTEE.

NEW YORK:  
CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS.  
1885.





## PREFATORY NOTE.

THE following Historical Account of the Anglo-American Revision of the English Version of the Bible, so far as it relates to the work of the American Committee, is based upon the documents and correspondence in their possession, and is, accordingly, of the nature of a Documentary History. These documents and papers were arranged with great care by the President, Rev. Philip Schaff, D.D., and presented by him to the Committee at their meeting in May, 1884; whereupon it was voted that an Historical Account should be prepared under the direction of a special committee of three appointed for the purpose. At a subsequent meeting of the Committee of Revision, held at the Bible House, New York, on the 28th of November, 1884, the History which is contained in this volume was read, and the following vote was unanimously passed :

“That the Documentary History of the Revision which has now been presented be adopted and printed, and that a copy of the same be sent to each subscriber to the Memorial Edition of the Revised Version of the Old Testament.”

*May 21, 1885.*



HISTORICAL ACCOUNT  
OF THE WORK  
OF THE  
AMERICAN COMMITTEE OF REVISION.

---

THE American Committee of Bible Revision, as they close the labors in which they have been engaged for more than twelve years, desire to present to those who have co-operated with them by providing for the necessary expenses of their undertaking, a brief historical account of the origin and progress of the work. Such an account demands for its completeness a statement respecting the organization of the English Committee, and the purpose which the Convocation of Canterbury had in view in calling it into being and committing to it its appointed task. The American body, as is well known, was invited to act by the Committee which had already been constituted in England. It was thus summoned to participate in a work, the aim and principles of which were determined before it began to exist, and no proper understanding of its own history can be reached, except as the history of what had taken place on the other side of the Atlantic is made known.

For this reason the Committee avail themselves of an "Authoritative Exposition of the History and Purpose of Revision," which appeared in the *London Times* (weekly edition), May 20, 1881, and was understood to have been written by a late prominent member of the New Testament Company,—believing that it will give the clearest and briefest presentation of what is introductory to the narrative of their own work, while, at the same time, it will describe the method of working in America as well as in England. This Exposition is in the following words :

"On a December day, 346 years ago, the members of the Upper House of the Convocation of Canterbury were engaged on the same subject which will this day come before that ancient body

—the faithful rendering of the Holy Scriptures into the vulgar tongue. They then unanimously agreed that the King should vouchsafe to decree that the Scriptures should be translated “by some honest and learned men to be nominated by the King, and to be delivered to the people according to their learning.” As we know, no immediate results followed this very laudable resolution. The King, however, two years afterwards, made a proclamation in which, while he stoutly forbade the public reading of the Scriptures in English, he did, nevertheless, graciously allow “such as can and will read in the English tongue” to do so “quietly and reverently,” and “by themselves secretly, at all times and places convenient for their own instruction.” The Archbishop, too, appears to have done his best. Cranmer is said to have sent portions of Tyndale’s Testament to several bishops to be reviewed and considered, and it is said that all returned their revisions. But there the matter ended. The subject, indeed, was revived in 1542, but in a reactionary spirit, and in the sequel with an equally unproductive result.

The Convocation of Canterbury of our own day have, however, been more fortunate. They have not only suggested that a faithful rendering of the Scriptures should be undertaken, but, by means of members of their own body and co-optated scholars and divines, they have completed one portion of the work, and to-day will publicly receive it. The Revised Version of the New Testament will be presented this morning to both Houses of Convocation.

Before we make any comments on the work itself we may, perhaps not unprofitably, give our readers some general account of the origin of this really great undertaking, and briefly specify the manner in which the work has been done. Our columns for the last eleven years have contained short notices of the meetings that have been held by the Companies, and of the silent progress of the work. We may now give the history of that progress, and also mention the various circumstances connected with the early history of that portion of the work that has now been completed.

To find the true origin of this undertaking we must look back about twenty-five years. The year 1856 was marked by several distinct movements in favor of a revision of the Authorised Version, and by one particularly, on which, as a sort of first step in the now completed work, it may be desirable to speak a little in detail. The subject was alluded to both in Convocation and in

Parliament. On February 1, 1856, the late Canon Selwyn, who had long been deeply interested in the subject, gave notice in the Southern Convocation of a resolution in which Convocation was to pray the Sovereign to appoint a Royal Commission for receiving and suggesting amendments in the Authorised Version of the Bible. The same course was recommended in Parliament by Mr. Heywood, one of the members for North Lancashire; but in both cases the result was the same. Neither the clerical nor the lay mind was prepared for such a leap in the dark as the appointment of a commission to modify the venerable version that has so long maintained its supremacy. Sir George Grey more blandly, and Archdeacon Denison more trenchantly, disposed of the Royal Commission, and, as far as any public action went, no steps were taken, though there were few probably, either in Convocation or Parliament, who did not feel that the subject could not long be postponed.

Private effort, however, was much more successful. The Rev. Ernest Hawkins, then secretary of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, was so deeply impressed with the importance of making some organized effort that he determined to try and gather together a small body of scholars that should undertake the revision of a portion of the New Testament, and that should show by actual results not only that the work needed to be done, but that it could be done, and that, too, on safe and conservative principles. After many efforts he succeeded in gaining the support and co-operation of a few scholars who were known, either by their works or by general reputation, to be interested in the study of the New Testament. He drew together, in the summer of 1856, the Rev. Henry Alford, afterwards Dean of Canterbury; Rev. John Barrow, D.D., Principal of St. Edmund Hall; Rev. C. J. Ellicott, now Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol; Rev. W. H. G. Humphry, Vicar of St. Martin's-in-the-Fields; and Rev. G. Moberly, D.C.L., then Head-Master of Winchester College and now Bishop of Salisbury. These five scholars agreed to make an attempt by the revision of the Authorised Version of St. John's Gospel. They began their work in the autumn, meeting regularly at the vicarage of St. Martin's-in-the-Fields, with their gentle taskmaster, Ernest Hawkins, acting frequently as their secretary, and they concluded the first portion of their revision in the course of the ensuing year. The Preface—a composition that will still bear attentive perusal—was written by Dr. Moberly; the press

arrangements were superintended by Canon Hawkins ; and a thin volume in royal octavo, bearing the title "The Authorised Version of St. John's Gospel, revised by Five Clergymen," appeared in March, 1857, as the first sample of a revision of the Authorised Version produced by the co-operation of several different minds. It was followed by the Epistle to the Romans, the Epistles to the Corinthians (the preface to which was written by Professor Elliott), and subsequently by the Epistles to the Galatians, Ephesians, and Philippians, by four of the number, Dr. Barrow having then left England. The work was very favorably received both in England and America. It received the commendation of Archbishop Trench, and was spoken of in America by Mr. Marsh, in his lectures on the English language, as "by far the most judicious modern recension" that was known to him. It passed through several editions, and, though now almost forgotten, must certainly be considered as the germ of the present revision. It showed clearly two things—first, that a revision could be made without seriously interfering with either the diction or the rhythm of the Authorised Version ; secondly, that a revision, if made at all, must be made by a similar co-operation of independent minds and by corporate and collegiate discussion. A third fact also was disclosed which had a salutary effect in checking premature efforts—viz., that, as these revisers themselves said, the work was "one of extreme difficulty," and of a difficulty which they believed was "scarcely capable of being entirely surmounted." And they were right: the present revision, good in the main as we certainly believe it will be found to be, confirms the correctness of their experience. As we shall hereafter see, there are difficulties connected with a conservative revision of the existing translation of the Greek Testament that are practically insuperable.

After this effort, which from the very first was felt to be only prelude and tentative, the immediate interest in revision sensibly languished. There were those, however, who were determined that the efforts already made should not become utterly fruitless. As year by year went onward, every change in public opinion was closely watched by those who had taken part in the revision just mentioned, and especially by the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol and Dean Alford. It was thought in 1869 that many things pointed to a revival in the interest felt in the revision. The Bishop and Dean frequently conferred on the subject, consulted all those who were in any degree likely to forward the under-

taking, and at length obtained the hearty aid and support of Bishop Wilberforce. The Bishop entered into the movement with real interest, and, as the sequel proved, materially contributed to its finally receiving a definite and authoritative sanction. The real difficulty was how to break ground. It was urged by those most interested that precedent seemed in favor of a Royal Commission. In the revision of 1611 the King was the sole actor; and, in the case of the only other Bible that rests on any really valid authority, the Great Bible, the king's vicegerent, Lord Cromwell, has always been deemed to have been the real mover, and the one to whom the sole editor, Coverdale, was entirely responsible. It was also not forgotten that, in the two abortive attempts in Parliament and Convocation which have been already referred to, the proposal to proceed by way of a Royal Commission was not in itself objected to. There was, further, this very important consideration, that the extreme difficulties connected with the choice of those who were to undertake the revision would be much diminished in the case of a Royal designation. Those not chosen would be more likely to accept the decision, and in the sequel to prove more impartial and tolerant critics. The *sprete injuria formæ*, as the case of Hugh Broughton in reference to the Authorised Version very distinctly shows, and as the Revision of 1881 will also find out to its cost, is a very serious element in the early criticisms that are passed upon a work done by a necessarily selected few out of a larger and hardly less competent body. For these reasons it was deemed desirable that an address to the Crown should be moved for in the House of Lords, and in the following terms: "That a humble address be presented to Her Majesty praying Her Majesty to appoint a Royal Commission to revise the Authorised Version in all those passages where clear and plain errors, whether in the Greek text originally adopted by the translators, or in the translation made from the same, shall, on due investigation, be found to exist." Before, however, so responsible a step was taken, careful inquiry was made how far such a resolution would obtain the support of those in authority. It was found that support could not be promised. It was pointed out that the choice of the future revisers would involve the greatest possible difficulties; that a Commission, really to carry weight, must be very inclusive; and that both its size and the necessarily heterogeneous nature of its elements would involve difficulties in the execution of the work, and still more in the final reception of

it, that were judged to be too great to justify the experiment. The advice, frankly and considerately given, was acted upon, and the plan of a Royal Commission was at once given up.

It was obvious that the only other authoritative body before which the subject could be brought was Convocation. It was, indeed, feared that if Convocation undertook the work it would not unnaturally choose the revisers mainly out of its own members, and that thus, however well the work might be done, the results would never secure a really national acceptance. Still, there was no choice left. If Convocation were not applied to, it was clear the work would have to be postponed till a Royal Commission might seem more attainable; and this, with the rapid movement of modern thought, and the necessity for the inclusion of very heterogeneous elements, would evidently become year by year a more hopeless anticipation. So it was finally resolved to bring the subject before Convocation, and to place that confidence in the wisdom of the venerable body which the sequel showed was not placed there in vain.

All was then arranged, and on February 10, 1870, the then Bishop of Winchester moved, and the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol seconded, the following resolution :

“That a committee of both Houses be appointed, with power to confer with any committee that may be appointed by the Convocation of the Northern Province, to report upon the desirableness of a revision of the Authorised Version of the New Testament, whether by marginal notes or otherwise, in all those passages where plain and clear errors, whether in the Greek text originally adopted by the translators, or in the translation made from the same, shall on due investigation be found to exist.”

The resolution was afterwards extended, on the motion of the Bishop of Llandaff, seconded by the Bishop of St. David's (Dr. Thirlwall), to the Old Testament; the necessary words were inserted; the practically unanimous assent of the House was given to the amended resolution, and a committee appointed. The committee consisted of the Bishops of Winchester (Dr. Wilberforce), Gloucester and Bristol, St. David's, Llandaff, Ely (Dr. Browne), Lincoln, Bath and Wells, and Salisbury. This resolution was communicated at once to the Lower House, and there assented to very readily. It was moved by Canon Selwyn, and seconded by Dr. Jebb, that the Convocations of Armagh and



Dublin should be consulted, as well as the Convocation of York, but this addition seems afterwards to have fallen through. The following committee of the Lower House was then appointed: The Prolocutor (Dr. Bickersteth), the Deans of Canterbury (Dr. Alford), Westminster, and Lincoln (Dr. Jeremie); the Archdeacons of Bedford (Mr. Rose), Exeter (Mr. Freeman), and Rochester; Chancellor Massingberd; Canons Blakesley, How, Selwyn, Swainson, and Woodgate; Dr. Kay, Dr. Jebb, and Mr. De Winton.

The subject was discussed shortly afterwards by the Convocation of York, but, unfortunately, owing to completely exaggerated fears as to the nature of the proposal, the Northern Convocation declined to co-operate.

The Joint Committee of the Convocation of Canterbury, formed of the two lists just specified, met March 24, 1870, and drew up their report in the form of the following resolutions:

“1. That it is desirable that a revision of the Authorised Version of the Holy Scriptures be undertaken.

“2. That the revision be so conducted as to comprise both marginal renderings and such emendations as it may be found necessary to insert in the text of the Authorised Version.

“3. That in the above resolutions we do not contemplate any new translation of the Bible, or any alteration of the language, except where in the judgment of the most competent scholars such change is necessary.

“4. That in such necessary changes the style of the language employed in the existing version be closely followed.

“5. That it is desirable that Convocation should nominate a body of its own members to undertake the work of revision, who shall be at liberty to invite the co-operation of any eminent for scholarship, to whatever nation or religious body they may belong.”

The report was presented May 3, and the following resolution adopted:

“That a committee be now appointed to consider and report to Convocation a scheme of revision on the principles laid down in the report now adopted. That the Bishops of Winchester, St. David's, Llandaff, Gloucester and Bristol, Salisbury, Ely, Lincoln, and Bath and Wells, be members of the committee. That the committee be empowered to invite the co-operation of those whom

they may judge fit from their Biblical scholarship to aid them in their work.”

This resolution was communicated to the Lower House. After one day of discussion, and some consideration of details on the following day, the report of the large Joint Committee was adopted, and the following members of the Lower House appointed to co-operate with the Bishops above mentioned in carrying out the work : the Prolocutor, the Deans of Canterbury and Westminster, the Archdeacon of Bedford, Canons Selwyn and Blakesley, Dr. Jebb, and Dr. Kay.

This second or, so to speak, executive, committee then seriously took the work in hand. They first met May 25, divided themselves into two bodies, or, as they were afterwards called, Companies, the one for the Old Testament, the other for the New, and proceeded to the difficult and delicate task of choosing colleagues, and of framing general and special rules for the carrying on of the work. The labors of the Committee were lightened by the fact that those originally most interested in the cause had already carefully collected the names of scholars who were judged to be most likely to aid the undertaking, and, when the Committee met, had a sufficiently full list to present to it. The general and special rules had also been prepared beforehand in draft by the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol, and were accepted with but slight modifications.

The names of those invited at the above meeting, and at a short subsequent meeting on July 5, to become members of the Old Testament Company were as follow : Rev. Dr. W. L. Alexander, Mr. Bensly, Professor Chenery, Rev. Canon Cook, Rev. Professor A. B. Davidson, Rev. Dr. B. Davies, Rev. Dr. Douglas, Professor Fairbairn, Rev. F. Field, Rev. J. D. Geden, Rev. Dr. Ginsburg, Rev. Dr. Gotch, Ven. Archdeacon Harrison, Rev. Professor Leathes, Rev. Professor M’Gill, Rev. Canon Payne Smith, Rev. Professor J. H. Perowne, Rev. Professor Plumptre, Rev. Canon Pusey, Rev. Dr. Weir, Dr. Wright (British Museum), and Mr. W. A. Wright (Cambridge).

The names of those invited at the meetings of May 25 and July 5 to become members of the New Testament Company were as follow : The Archbishop of Dublin, the Bishop of St. Andrews, Rev. Dr. Angus, Rev. Dr. David Brown, Rev. F. J. A. Hort, Rev. Prebendary Humphry, Rev. Canon Kennedy, Ven. Archdeacon

Lee, Rev. Dr. Lightfoot, Rev. Professor Milligan, Rev. Professor Moulton, Rev. Dr. Newman, Rev. Professor Newth, Rev. Dr. Roberts, Rev. G. Vance Smith, Rev. Dr. Scott (Master of Balliol College), Rev. Dr. Scrivener, Rev. Dr. Thompson (Master of Trinity College, Cambridge), Rev. Dr. Tregelles, Rev. Dr. Vaughan, and Rev. Canon Westcott.

Of this long list of names some declined to take the position offered to them, though in every case with a courteous and friendly recognition of the proffered honor. Among these were Canons Cook and Pusey, Dr. Thompson and Dr. Newman. The Bishop of Lincoln and Dr. Jebb also soon afterwards resigned their places on the Old Testament Company. Of the New Testament Company (with which we are now more immediately concerned), it may be here mentioned that four were removed by death previous to the completion of the work—viz., Dean Alford, Dr. Tregelles, Bishop Wilberforce and Dr. Eadie. As Dr. Tregelles was never able to attend, and Bishop Wilberforce only attended once, their places were not filled up. The place of Dean Alford was supplied by Dean Merivale, who, after attending for a short time, resigned, and was succeeded by Professor Palmer, now Archdeacon of Oxford. The place of Dr. Eadie was not filled up, as his death took place at a time when much of the work was done. The number of the working members of the New Testament Company was thus for the greater portion of the time twenty-four, and so continued to the close of the work.

The first meeting of the New Testament Company took place on June 22, 1870, under the presidency of the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol, who held the position of chairman uninterruptedly to the end of the ten years and a half, over which the labors of the revision extended. The titular chairman, Bishop Wilberforce, attended once for about a couple of hours; but it became, even in that time, apparent to the Company, and perhaps was so to the Bishop himself, that a little lighter hand and looser rein were required to guide the Company pleasantly through the intricacies of criticism and scholarship in which they were almost hourly finding themselves involved. The Bishop, however, remained a kind friend to the movement, which his own eloquence had so largely assisted, and was interested in it to the time of his lamented death.

During the remainder of the year the work went quietly onward. The New Testament Company found an able and accurate

secretary in the Rev. J. Troutbeck, one of the Minor Canons of Westminster, and soon became thoroughly organized and habituated to their complicated labors. In the second year of the work some difficulties that beset them were completely removed. The Delegates of the Oxford University Press and the Syndics of the Cambridge University Press entered into a liberal arrangement with the two Companies by which funds were regularly forthcoming for all their expenses. It may be remembered that the revisers of 1611 were by no means so fortunate, and that the way in which their expenses were met during the greater period of their labors was very far from satisfactory.

The year that followed was marked by an event of great importance to the cause of revision—the formation in America of two Committees \* to co-operate with the two English Companies. Into the details of this movement in America, all of which are full of interest, our space will not allow us to enter. In this more general narrative it may be enough to say that on July 7, 1870, it was moved in the Lower House of Convocation by the present Prolocutor (Lord Alwyne Compton) that the Upper House should be requested to instruct the Committee of Convocation “to invite the co-operation of some American divines.” This was at once assented to by the Upper House. It was, we believe, afterwards unofficially agreed that Bishop Wilberforce and the Dean of Westminster should undertake to act for the Committee in opening communications—the Bishop with the Episcopal Church, the Dean with the leading members of other communions. The result of this was that towards the close of 1871 two Committees were formed in America to communicate with the two English Companies on the basis of the rules that had been already laid down for the revisers in this country. Very soon afterwards portions of the first revision that had by that time been finished in England were transmitted to America, and a system of communication fully established. The work then went on continuously in both countries, the English Companies revising, and the American Committees reviewing what was thus revised, and returning their suggestions, both as regards the first and second revision, to the two Companies at Westminster. The volume that will be published this day will contain a list of readings and renderings in which the American divines ultimately differ from the revisers in

---

[\* One Committee, divided into two Companies.]

this country. When this list is fully considered, the general reader will, we think, be surprised to find that the differences are really of such little moment, and in very many cases will probably wonder that the American divines thought it worth while thus to formally record their dissent.\*

Such is a brief sketch of the history of the movement. It may now be convenient to mention the manner in which the actual work of revision was carried on by the Company. This will be more easily understood if we specify the principal rules which were laid down at the commencement of the undertaking, and to which allusion has already been made in the earlier part of this narrative. These rules were as follows :

“1. To introduce as few alterations as possible in the text of the Authorised Version consistently with faithfulness.

“2. To limit, as far as possible, the expression of such alterations to the language of the Authorised and earlier English versions.

“3. Each Company to go twice over the portion to be revised, once provisionally, the second time finally, and on principles of voting as hereinafter is provided.

“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 Authorised 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 thereupon 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.”

In conformity with these rules the whole of the Authorised Version of the New Testament underwent a first revision. This

---

[\* With this judgment few Americans will agree.]

extended over six years. The results were arrived at, in accordance with rule 5, by simple majorities, the Authorised Version having no further advantage than this—that it was considered to be the form before the Company, and that in accordance with the system of voting in the House of Lords it was maintained if the votes were equal. This first revision was transmitted, portion by portion, to America, and returned with the suggestions of the American Committee, their rules (as we have already implied) being the same as those laid down for the English Company.

On the completion of the first revision, the whole was gone over again, with the advantage of the criticisms and suggestions of the American Committee, but the voting was under changed principles. The Authorised Version was placed in a position of distinct advantage, and if raised in competition with the first revision, whether English or American, could only be prevented from returning by two-thirds voting against it. Where there was a difference of reading in the Greek, the rule of two-thirds was not considered applicable, and the question was decided by a simple majority. Many renderings that had been removed from the Authorised Version were thus brought back again, though by no means to so large an extent as might have been beforehand supposed. The Company had been silently accumulating for itself a rough code of principles, and commonly remained true to them, even when the Authorised Version was raised in opposition to the newly formed revision. Close and continued inspection had also served to reveal that, admirable and thoroughly idiomatic as the Authorised Version might be, it was frequently very far from consistent: nay, even that it studiously affected a variety of diction when there was nothing to justify it in the original. These and other considerations led to the maintenance of the first revision to a greater extent than at first seemed probable.

The second revision, like the first, was communicated, portion by portion, to the American Committee, and by them returned with criticisms and suggestions. This, combined with the obvious necessity of endeavoring to preserve a harmony of rendering, as far as it was reasonable and possible, led to a further review of the whole work, under, however, this common-sense condition, that the now twice-revised version was not to be changed except by a majority of two-thirds. The Revised Version, in fact, then had the prerogative which had belonged to the Authorised Version at an earlier stage of the work.

Such in general outline was the course of the procedure. Fuller details will be found in the Preface, but the above fairly represents the broad principles on which the Revised Version was constructed, and will probably suggest some confidence in the results. The Authorised Version had that supremacy assigned to it which the spirit of the rules absolutely required, and which, it may be said, the revisers were always ready most loyally to concede to it. The occasions, however, would of course be many in which the grave question of what constitutes "faithfulness" (Rule 1) would be somewhat differently interpreted by the individual members of a large company. A merely tentative revision, after which much would still remain to be done at a future time, would have been a grave mistake. This has certainly not been the case with the present work. Revision has been carried out to a fair and reasonable extent, but not, as it would appear, in any degree beyond it.

The same remark applies in great measure to the critical work of the Company in connection with the Greek text, which, we are glad to find, is to be published in a clear and handsome form by the University Press of Oxford. The principle in regard to textual criticism, it will be observed, was prescribed to be that of change only on "decidedly preponderating evidence." But here, as in the case of faithfulness in regard to the rendering, it is obvious that the estimate of what really constitutes decidedly preponderating evidence will be widely different with equally honest and impartial critics. To one, the long array of uncial witnesses, even though it may be almost certain that the mass of them were reproductions of some common exemplar, will seem clearly to constitute "decidedly preponderating evidence." To another, who may be guided by the well-known canon *non numerare sed appendere*, the concurrence of a comparatively small number of ancient authorities, representing independent textual traditions, and found by experience to be most worthy of credit, may be regarded, and justly regarded, as distinctly evidence of the nature referred to in the rule. It seems clear that this last was the prevailing interpretation given to the rule by the majority of the Company, so that, in textual criticism as well as rendering, a decided line has been taken, and a standard maintained happily beyond that of a mere provisional and temporary revision.

There seems reason to believe that a close examination will show this to have been very consistently maintained, and that the evil of a text sometimes up to a good critical standard, and some-

times decidedly below it, has been successfully avoided. It might have been supposed from the action of the rule requiring two-thirds to reverse a reading supposed to underlie the Authorised Version, and, still more, from the necessarily fluctuating nature of the Company from month to month, and sometimes even from day to day, that such a standard could hardly have been maintained. It must, however, be remembered that loyalty to principles already felt out would always tend to repress any disturbing use of the rule; and, further, that, in spite of fluctuations, there was a stable element in the Company which greatly helped in keeping up its traditions and principles. The punctuality of attendance is, indeed, one of the most striking features of this undertaking; and when the length of the time is considered, and the distances at which many of the members resided from the place of meeting, probably unexampled in the history of committees. Out of the 407 meetings the chairman attended 405 times. Some others reached also a very high standard; and, of those who attended more than three-fourths of the whole series of meetings, the number amounted fully to one-third of the whole Company. The existence of this comparatively stable element has tended to preserve harmony and consistency, and will be found to have been an important element in the success which we believe has been achieved by the work.

A very noticeable feature in the volume is the large amount of marginal notes. Of these some are short notes bearing on differences of reading in the Greek text adopted by the revisers, but the greater number are short notes specifying differences of rendering, which, either as having been preferred by a minority of the Company or as having been advocated by scholars of eminence, it seemed proper to specify. In the case of the Authorised Version, it has often been said that the marginal note presents the rendering which was probably deemed by the revisers of that day to be really the most accurate. However this may be, the remark will not apply to the Revised Version. The text adopted represents that rendering which was deemed by at least one-third of the Company then present to be correct in the case of maintaining a rendering of the Authorised Version, and of at least two-thirds in departing from it. The text, therefore, as is obviously most desirable, records plainly the opinion either of the actual clear majority of those who considered and discussed the rendering, or of that portion of them which constituted a legal majority.



We have thus in the Revised Version a clear expression of an opinion, and are left in no uncertainty, as is sometimes the case in the Authorised Version, as to the actual meaning that is deemed to be conveyed by the original Greek.

The last portion of the work of the revisers is the Preface, a carefully constructed and elaborate document, in which the principles on which the revision has been made are set forth with considerable fulness of detail. This important introduction to the study of the volume was thus constructed: it was prepared in draft by the chairman several months before the conclusion of the work. A copy was sent round to each member inviting remarks and corrections. The copies so sent out were returned to the chairman, and formed the basis of a second and revised edition of the original draft. The document so amended was finally considered by the whole body collectively, and, after careful revision, accepted as the authoritative description of their work. It is to be hoped, in justice to the revision, that no formal criticisms will be passed on the labors of the Company until this careful and explicit document has been thoroughly mastered. If it teaches anything it will teach this—first, that the revision of a translation such as the Authorized Version is a work of almost insuperable difficulty; secondly, that criticism, to be just, must not content itself with merely sporadic approval or disapproval of the renderings adopted, but must first intelligently master all the circumstances, conditions, and modifying details of the highly complicated undertaking.

What is stated by the revisers on the subject of alterations rendered necessary *by consequence* is well worthy of the most careful attention. From the single example that is adduced it will readily be inferred what strong reasons there may be in the background for changes which a mere off-hand critic might condemn with some passing show of plausibility. A work executed with the obvious care and devotion to the subject which every paragraph of the revision abundantly displays may, with justice, deprecate a criticism that has not taken equal pains to arrive at the true aspects of the passage or the circumstances under consideration. That there will be, especially at first, much criticism of a very precipitate nature is a matter of the most perfect certainty, but it is equally certain that criticism of this nature will not affect in the slightest degree the ultimate and probably slowly formed estimate of the present revision. What that estimate will finally be, it would be

new utterly premature even to attempt to forecast. Our belief is that in the main it will be favorable, and the belief is founded upon the unquestionable fact that a body of competent scholars has bestowed extraordinary pains, for a lengthened period of time, on the revision alike of the text and the current rendering of the original. It seems contrary to experience that such carefully organized efforts should ultimately fail. It is quite probable that here and there throughout the volume particular renderings will be objected to on reasons that will be ultimately considered valid ; and it is to be hoped that where such should be the case nothing will prevent the revisers from reconsidering their former decisions. This, as we know, took place in the case of the Bishops' Bible in 1568, and may properly take place, if found necessary, in the Convocation-Testament of 1881. What is desired on all hands is, not only a technically correct rendering, but one also that by its diction, rhythm, and loyal adherence, where possible, to the version now in use, should commend itself to the religious judgment of English-speaking people throughout the world."

---

The following account of the meeting of Convocation, at the time when the Revised Version of the New Testament was presented to it by the Revisers, will give the reader additional information.

### CONVOCATION OF CANTERBURY.

May 17, 1881.

On Tuesday both Houses of the Convocation of the Province of Canterbury met at Westminster for the despatch of business.

#### THE UPPER HOUSE.

The Archbishop of Canterbury presided over the Upper House, which met in the Board-room of Queen Anne's Bounty Office. There were present the Bishop of London, the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol, the Bishop of St. Alban's, the Bishop of Hereford, the Bishop of Exeter, the Bishop of St. Asaph, the Bishop of Truro, the Bishop of Lichfield, the Bishop of Rochester, the Bishop of St. David's, the Bishop of Chichester, the Bishop of Ely, the Bishop of Bath and Wells, the Bishop of Bangor, and the Bishop of Llandaff.

The Archbishop read a message, which he had ordered to be sent to the Lower House, to the effect that his Grace the President desired the attendance of the Prolocutor and such members of the Lower House as could conveniently attend to receive the report on the revision of the Scriptures.

In obedience to this message the Prolocutor (Lord Alwyne Compton) and a very large number of members of the Lower House attended.

The Archbishop, addressing them, said,—

“ I have requested the presence of the Prolocutor and such of the members of the Lower House as might wish to take part in this solemnity, as I regard it as a matter of great importance for you to hear now what are the results of the deliberations of the body who for many years have been engaged upon the solemn and onerous task of a revision of the Holy Scriptures in the English tongue. The first report—that upon the New Testament—is to be presented to-day. We have good reason for believing and hoping that at no far distant date we shall have the second report—that upon the Old Testament; but to-day you will have only the first, and I have to call upon the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol, who is the chairman of the Joint Committee on the Revision, to lay the report before you.”

The Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol presented the following report:—

“ The Joint Committee of the two Houses of Convocation, appointed May 5, 1870, for the revision of the Authorised Version of the Holy Scriptures, beg leave to report that, with the assistance of the scholars and divines whose co-operation they were authorized to invite, they have completed one portion of their labors,—viz., the New Testament,—and now present the volume containing the same to his Grace in Convocation.”

His Lordship then expressed his deep thankfulness for the mercies vouchsafed to the Committee during the long time in which they had been engaged in the solemn and important task committed to their care; and he expressed also his hope that the blessing of God would further rest upon those labors, and that the Holy Scriptures would more and more be brought to the hearts and homes of every English-speaking people.

The Archbishop, addressing the Lower House, said that he had

thought the occasion should not be allowed to pass without his expressing, on behalf of this Convocation, the deep thanks of both Houses to the Committee who had undertaken and carried out this work. Of course, this work had not yet been examined, and the Houses had yet to examine the revision in detail; but, nevertheless, the House would be thankful to the Committee for their labors.

The Lower House then retired to their own chamber.

The Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol then rose and said,—

“I have now the honor and responsibility of placing before your lordships a portion of the important work assigned by Convocation eleven years ago to a joint committee of the two Houses of this province. I now lay upon your lordships’ table the revision of the Authorised Version of the New Testament as completed by the Company of which I have the honor to be the chairman. In placing before you such a work, so intimately connected with the past, and so closely bound up with the noblest labors of former centuries, it is not possible for me to leave unnoticed in such a speech as the present the various public efforts of which this is the last, that for well-nigh 350 years have had for their object the setting forth, in the tongue wherein we were born, of the holy and inspired words of the written Book of Life. I must therefore ask your lordships to bear with me if I briefly allude to the various stages in the progress of the great work, and especially to the share which this House of Convocation has had in aiding and furthering the labors of the translators and revisers of the past. That share has not been a large one. Convocation, till this last revision, has never taken any prominent part in reference to the successive translations of the Holy Scriptures. Nay, at times, I fear, it has shown itself hostile and reactionary. Still it has its history in reference to the English Bible; and now to that history, as well as to the other movements that have publicly been made, I will at once very briefly advert. We must look back 350 years. Tyndale’s version of the New Testament had come over to this kingdom, and had been about four years in private but widespread circulation. The souls of men were profoundly stirred, and the desire to have at length the Word of God in our own mother-tongue was vivid and universal. The first public action on the part of the Church was, I grieve to say, to condemn that version which was the bone and sinew of all that have followed

it,—Tyndale's translation of the New Testament. At a Council held at Westminster, under Archbishop Warham, in May, 1530, that version was condemned, but we may be thankful also to remember that it was agreed that the Archbishop should send out a document to be read by all preachers, in which the King's promise that the Scriptures should be translated in English was fully set forth. Four eventful years then passed away. The King's supremacy was acknowledged the next year, and the first steps taken for emancipating this country from the tyranny of Rome. In 1534 the subject of the translation of the Scriptures was renewed, and on the 19th of December in that year this Upper House of Convocation agreed that the Archbishop should, in the name of the members of the House, 'make instance with the King that Holy Scripture should be translated into the vulgar tongue.' Cranmer at once set about the work: he appears to have sent portions of Tyndale's Testament to several bishops for review and revision. The bishops, it would seem, all returned their revisions; but, from some cause or other, it miscarried. The next year (1535) Coverdale's translation, dedicated to the King, stole into this country, and was allowed to circulate, though not formally licensed till 1537. The prayer of Convocation was thus still before the country. It was not directly granted, but it appears to have had this indirect effect, that, not more than three years afterwards, the royal license was given to the second edition of Coverdale's Bible, and to Rogers' or Matthews' Bible, and that two years later, in 1539, the Great Bible was published, of which Coverdale was the sole editor. This was an event of great importance, and may be regarded, in a certain sense, as the practical answer to the prayer of Convocation three years before. Convocation, however, I regret to say, was by no means satisfied with the answer, as very soon afterwards, in February, 1542, it was decided by this House that the Great Bible should be revised according to the Bible then in current use, or, in other words, to the Vulgate. Two committees were appointed. The Old Testament Committee was presided over by the Archbishop of York; the New Testament Committee by the Bishop of Durham. The matter was subsequently referred by the King to the Universities, but in the sequel it happily fell through. A generation then passed away. The Great Bible had meanwhile been revised, though in a very different manner to what the Convocation of 1542 had hoped for and had attempted. It had now

passed, by the process of a revision, performed by several hands, into the Bishops' Bible. The Genevan version had also been published, and was obtaining so wide a circulation that in 1571 Convocation made a special enactment in favor of what it deemed the more orthodox volume—the Bishops' Bible. Every Bishop was to have a copy in his palace. Cathedrals, and, as far as possible, parish churches, were to provide themselves with this last authoritative revision. Somewhere about this time there appears to have been some thought of a movement in Parliament, as an undated paper has been found among the archives of the House of Lords, containing the sketch of a bill for 'reducing diversities of Bibles now extant in the English tongue to one settled vulgar translated from the original.' Another generation then passed away, during the whole of which three versions were in practically competitive circulation—the Great Bible, the Genevan version, and the Bishops' Bible. In Convocation there seems to have been some little reaction in favor of the Great Bible, for in May, 1604, Canon 80 was passed, by which it was provided that every church-warden was to provide for each parish a Bible '*amplissimè voluminis*,' or, as it would certainly seem to imply, the Great Bible of more than sixty years before. But a great and signal change was now very near at hand. In February of the same year (1604) a passing remark of Dr. Reynolds, at the Hampton Court Conference, led the King seriously to take up the subject of a revision of the existing translations, and before the conference broke up it appeared as one of the points desired by the King, and, in fact, carried at his instigation, viz., 'That a translation be made of the whole Bible as consonant as can be to the original Hebrew and Greek.' This was the fundamental resolution, and, as we well know, by the action of the King and some unknown but most competent advisers, learned men were called together, and the great work which we familiarly know by the name of the Authorised Version was set forth to the Church and the world in the year of our Lord 1611. In reference to this version nothing was said or done either in Convocation or Parliament. This revision is to be attributed solely to the King and to the wise and learned men whom he was providentially able to call together for the execution of this great and time-honored work. More than a generation then passed away, during which the Authorised Version was steadily growing in public favor and vindicating year by year its distinct superiority not only over the

Bishops' Bible, but over the popular Genevan Bible. And it was, perhaps, owing to this last fact that we find Dr. Lightfoot urging, in a sermon preached before the House of Commons in August, 1645, the desirableness of a revision of the Scriptures, and apparently with some effect; for, in 1653, a bill was actually introduced for a new revision. Some preparatory steps were taken; but happily the Parliament—the Long Parliament—was dissolved, and the plan entirely fell through. For two hundred years all desire for any further authoritative revision had entirely died out. There were revised portions of Holy Scripture, in this long interval, by individual scholars, but nothing that in any degree helped forward the present movement. At the end of this long period, however, it was plain that the desire for a new revision had revived, and that the subject was beginning to take its place among the leading questions of the day. In the year 1856, which might rightly be characterized as the germinal year of the present movement, Canon Selwyn (ever a true and warm supporter of revision) moved in Convocation, and Mr. Heywood a few months afterwards moved in Parliament, for the appointment of a Royal Commission to consider the whole question. The public movements failed; but a private movement made by five clergymen (one of whom is the present speaker, and another my Right Rev. brother the Bishop of Salisbury) in great measure succeeded. The publication in the following year (1857) of a revised version of the Gospel of St. John by these five clergymen was generally admitted to have established these two positions—(1) that a sober and conservative revision of the Holy Scriptures might in due time very hopefully be undertaken; (2) that when undertaken it would be, almost beyond doubt, on the principles which this little company of scholars had gradually and experimentally felt out. The time, however, was not then ripe, though the process of maturation had commenced. So half a generation passed away. Fresh critical subsidies were accumulating; new exegetical works were multiplying; and at last the time was ripe, and the great movement with which Convocation has been so intimately connected began in February, 1870, and shortly after assumed an authoritative and practical form. In that month, as your lordships well remember, the late Bishop of Winchester moved in this House, and the present speaker seconded, a preliminary resolution, which was accepted by both Houses practically unanimously, and acted upon in little more than four months afterwards. An executive

committee was formed; some forty scholars and divines outside Convocation were invited to take part in the work. Two Companies were formed, the one for the Old Testament and the other for the New Testament, and both at once addressed themselves to their long and responsible work. Soon afterwards two Committees were formed in America, and regular and systematic communication established between the scholars on this side and the other side of the Atlantic. The New Testament Company commenced its labors on June 22, 1870, and closed them on November 11, 1880, and the result of those labors is the volume which I have had the honor and responsibility of placing upon the table of this venerable House. And here I might, not improperly, close this present address; yet, if I rightly interpret my present duty, and perhaps also the wishes and desires of your lordships, I ought not to do so, on this somewhat memorable occasion, without saying a few words on the manner in which the task committed to us has been done, and also a few words, but only a few words, on the nature and characteristics of the revision. In regard of the manner in which the work of revision was carried on, I may remind your lordships that it was in accordance with rules which had been laid down at the commencement of the work. They were framed with due regard to modern requirements and ancient precedents, being in many respects identical with the rules prescribed for the revisers of 1611, and the rules which appear to have been observed by those who took part in the Bishops' Bible fifty years before. These rules were constantly tested, and I am thankful to say (for I was in some measure responsible for them), proved efficient and sufficient to the end. These rules it may, perhaps, be convenient that I should read to your lordships, as they set forth in a succinct form the course which was to be followed by the Companies in the prosecution of their work:—(1) To introduce as few alterations as possible into the text of the Authorised Version consistently with faithfulness. (2) To limit, as far as possible, the expression of such alterations to the language of the Authorised and earlier English versions. (3) Each Company to go twice over the portion to be revised, once provisionally, the second time finally, and on principles of voting as hereinafter is provided. (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 Authorised Version was made, the alteration be indicated in the margin. (5) To make or



retain no change in the text on the second and 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 thereupon 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. Of these rules, one only was found to be superfluous—the rule which prescribes that, if required by one-third of the Company, the voting might be deferred on any difficult and debated question till the following day. The object was to prevent any lingering heat of controversy having any influence on the final decision, and to insure a perfectly calm and, as far as possible, unbiassed decision. The rule, however, was never put in action. By the mercy and blessing of God, no occasion ever arose which made it in any degree necessary. Amid ceaseless differences of opinion and countless divisions, the brotherly feeling and harmony that prevailed among us remained unimpaired to the very end, and rendered all such postponement of the final expression of opinion wholly unnecessary. All the rest of these rules, as our preface will show more fully in detail, were very carefully observed. They were felt by us to present three broad principles, upon which I will venture to make a few observations, as tending to illustrate that on which I now am speaking—the manner in which we have endeavored to execute our work. In the first place, we have felt that what was required of us, not only in the criticism and translation, but in all the details of the revision, was to express a corporate and collective judgment. It is this which distinguishes our work from every other revision that has preceded it. It has been the work of a large body of men sitting together, and arriving at their results after full corporate discussion. This, as we know, was not the case with the Bishops' Bible. Our latest historian of the English versions of the Bible (Dr. Eadie) reminds us not only that there was no consultation among the revisers, but even no final supervision. We have no reason for thinking that it was otherwise with the Genevan Bible, which, though the work of persons dwelling for a time in the same city, does not

present any traces of having been executed or discussed in common. The first edition, indeed, of the New Testament is known to have been the work of a single hand. Even in our Authorised Version the work of revision was carried on, in the case of the New Testament, by two separate companies, that only communicated their results to each other, but never discussed them in common. In the final supervision, which, however, only lasted nine months for the whole Bible, the discussion was probably corporate, but it was only by a small number, and, from the very nature of the case, was probably more of a merely harmonizing nature than a revision in the true sense of the word. In our case it has been utterly different. Revision and supervision have been carried through by the whole Company. Every detail has been submitted to it; every decision has emanated from it; every judgment rests solely upon its authority. The volume now lying upon your lordships' table is the result, in every part and portion, of united and corporate discussion. And if this was our first principle, not less strictly observed was our second principle, viz., to express that corporate judgment with precision and distinctness. I do not think there will be found in the whole volume the faintest trace of a rendering which would adjust itself to one or other of two competing views of the meaning of the original Greek. Our rule was invariably to put in the text the judgment of the majority, and that of the minority in the margin, that majority and minority being of the nature defined by the rules. There is thus nowhere any uncertain sound. Nor is there any ground whatever for supposing, as is sometimes the case in the Authorised Version, that the margin is the more correct rendering, which, for some reason or other, it was not deemed desirable to place in the text. However it may be with the Authorised Version, it is certainly not so with the Revised. The text expresses the rendering or decision of the majority of the Company—that which it deliberately preferred; the margin expresses the view of the minority, and is to be so regarded by the reader. Our third principle was not only to express our corporate judgment with clearness, but to do so only after the fullest and most varied consideration. There is not a hastily arrived at judgment to be found in any page of the Revised Version. No precipitate decision has any place whatever in the results that are now submitted to you. When I mention that the work has actually gone through seven revisions I feel that I am justified in making the statement which I have just

made to your lordships in regard to the decisions arrived at in this volume. Yes, my lords, seven revisions, all more or less thorough and complete. First, the whole of the version committed to the Company was revised by it, and then transmitted to America. It was then reviewed by the American Committee, and returned back again to England. It then underwent, in accordance with the rules, a second revision in England, and was again transmitted to America. After these four revisions it yet underwent a fifth revision in England, mainly with a view of removing any hardness of diction, or of remedying any rhythmical defects which might have been introduced through the various changes which had been imported in the course of this fourfold revision. There was yet a sixth and most important revision in the form of a harmonizing review of the whole, thus far, completed work. A Greek concordance of the New Testament was divided into fourteen parts. Of these, twelve of the members most constant in their attendance each took a part (the chairman taking two), and made themselves individually responsible for a close examination of all the renderings of the words, each in the portion allotted to them. All varieties of rendering were thus brought up before the Company, and wheresoever necessary the judgment of the collective body formally taken upon them. Thus there was a sixth revision. And even, in a certain sense, a seventh; for it so happened that one of the two portions taken by the chairman contained the article and the relative pronouns. This involved on the part of the chairman a careful reading through, line by line, of the whole volume. This reading revealed several inconsistencies in the use of the English relative that had escaped notice, and also disclosed a few slight inconsistencies in other words or expressions which had in some way or other eluded the vigilance of the revisers. When I add to this that throughout all this lengthened process the attendance was most remarkable in regard to numbers and punctuality—the average attendance during the whole ten and a half years being as high as sixteen out of twenty-four—I think I may be justified when I say that the third principle at which we aimed—the expression of opinions only after the fullest and most varied consideration—was thoroughly and faithfully observed. I now pass, in the last place, to a few remarks on the nature and characteristics of the version itself, which is now lying on our table. Much I need not say, as the Preface which is prefixed to the volume really tells this with a fulness and a detail that leave

little to be added on the present occasion. Perhaps, as before, it may be best for me to gather up my remarks into the form of two or three general comments. Permit me, then, to say that these three characteristics will certainly be found on every page of the Revised Version—thoroughness, loyalty to the Authorised Version, and due recognition of the best judgments of antiquity. Our version is certainly thorough—thorough both in regard of the text and the rendering. That thoroughness, as your lordships will remember from the rules which I but recently read to you, was to be regulated by the principle of faithfulness in regard of the translation and a due regard to decidedly preponderating evidence in the case of the Greek text which we regarded as the basis of our rendering. Faithfulness and decidedly preponderating evidence are, of course, both of them expressions which admit of a great variety of interpretations, and in a numerous body like that of the New Testament Company, were certain to receive them. Without troubling your lordships with any enumeration of these varying shades of opinion, it may be sufficient to mention, as the general result, that the revision both of the Greek text and of the Authorised translation has been thorough and up to a full standard of correction. And it would have been a great misfortune if it had been otherwise. A timid revision that had not the nerve to aim at comparative finality, but was simply suggestive of a renewal of the process when the public mind might be judged to be again ready for it, would have had a very unsettling effect, and really would have frustrated the very progress that it contemplated; for such a kind of revision would be used as a standing argument against any revision at all. Moreover, to modify a high standard, in some subsequent review, is a process comparatively easy; but to elevate a lower and tentative standard, in the case of a translation of the New Testament, would be found, if attempted, a work of such peculiar difficulty that it would be very speedily abandoned. No such misfortune has happened to the Revised Version. It represents as full a measure of correction as is required by faithfulness, fairly estimated, but nothing beyond it. The minor changes by which it is marked are certainly numerous, but all have only one common object—the setting forth with greater clearness, force, and freshness the language and teaching of the inspired original. Eleven years ago I alarmed your lordships by the estimate which I then formed of the amount of change that would be needed; and, I remember, I

led my brother of Salisbury to say that my words would frighten people from one end of the land to the other. If the estimate was deemed to be alarming, I fear I may alarm your lordships still more when I state the actual results and compare them with what was then only anticipated. I comfort myself, however, with the thought that when you go to the revision itself these alarms will speedily be dissipated. What I stated as the very lowest estimate was six changes for every five verses, one of these six changes being for critical and textual reasons. What has actually taken place is an average for the Gospels of between eight and nine changes in every five verses—somewhere about one and a half, or three in every ten verses, being for critical changes. As might be expected, the average for the Epistles is still higher. It appears to amount to about fifteen changes for every five verses—one and a half as before being due to critical changes. I have formed this calculation on a rigidly accurate examination of the revised version of the Sermon on the Mount and the General Epistle of St. James, two connected portions of Holy Scripture containing each about the same number of verses. Yet, with all this thoroughness of revision and numerically high standard of correction, the effect to the general hearer or reader will really hardly be perceptible. This is due to the second characteristic of our version, its persistent loyalty to the Authorised translation. To any candid reader nothing will be more patent than this throughout the whole volume. Our words in the Preface will show the great reverence that we have ever felt for that venerable version, and our practice on every page will show how, even when words may have been changed, our reverence has shown itself in such a careful assimilation to the tone and rhythm of that marvellous translation that the actual amount of change will scarcely ever be felt or recognized. Sometimes this has been effected by the choice of a word of the same rhythmic quality as that which is displaced; sometimes by a fortunate inversion; sometimes by the reproduction of a familiar and idiomatic turn; sometimes by the preservation of the cadence even when more than one of the words which had originally helped to make it up had become modified or changed. In a word, our care throughout has been, while faithfully carrying out revision wheresoever it might seem needed, to make the new work and the old so blend together that the venerable aspect of the Authorised Version might never be lost, and its fair proportions never sacrificed to the rigidity of a

merely pedantic accuracy. The third characteristic of the version—due recognition of the best judgments of antiquity—though not equally patent, will, I hope and believe, rarely be looked for in vain. In all more difficult passages we have ever given especial heed to the great early versions, and to the voice, wherever it could be heard in the same language as that which we were translating, of primitive and patristic antiquity. In many of those passages, perhaps, on which hereafter we may be most severely criticised—as, for instance, in the ‘deliver us from the Evil One’ of the Lord’s Prayer—it will be found that we are but reproducing that which had always been the interpretation of the best and earliest writers of the Greek-speaking Primitive Church. We have thus sought to tread the old paths as well as the new, and, while never neglecting modern scholarship, have never reversed old interpretations without such a clear amount of contextual or linguistic authority as rendered such a reversal a matter of distinct and indisputable faithfulness. But, my lords, I must detain you no longer. Such, in general outline, is the Revision which I now have the honor of placing before you. Whatever may be its faults and shortcomings, it has been done faithfully, and it has been done prayerfully. Its pages bear the results of long-continued and arduous labors; but those labors would have been as nothing if they had not been hallowed and quickened by prayer. Such is this revision of 1881; not unworthy, I trust and believe, to take its place among the great English versions of the past; not also without the hope of holding a place among them of honor, and, perhaps, even of pre-eminence. But those things belong to the future. For the present, it is enough that I commend this volume to the favorable consideration of your lordships, and ask for it your fatherly prayers.”

The Archbishop, on behalf of the House, recorded thanks to those members of the Revision Committee who were not appointed by Convocation, and his Grace also expressed his opinion that the House was very fortunate in having had the advantage of the services of a scholar such as the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol to take part on behalf of the House in this revision.

The Bishop of London expressed his hope that the position this Revised Version would take would not be misunderstood. He feared that this position had been misunderstood. The Revised Version had been spoken of as if it would at once take the

place of the Authorised Version. He begged to remind the House that no one could at present use this Revised Version. When the whole work was completed it would go out to the public and would be before the Church for consideration; it might be years before the proposed alterations from the Authorised Version had so approved themselves to the Church—both clergy and laity—that steps could be taken to give authority for the use of the Revised Version. However, it must be understood that the Revised Version could not now be used in the churches. He begged to express the hope that there might not be, for the next two or three years, frequent speaking and discussion by young clergymen, especially by those who most probably could not construe the original, on the proposed alterations set forth. A great deal of patient study ought to precede any attempt at criticism of the proposed alterations, and clergymen—young clergymen especially—who had little knowledge of the original, should be careful not too readily to express an opinion as to the superiority of the one version over the other. The real purpose and value of the revision was that it laid before the Church and the laity alike the opinions of ripe scholars and of the ancient Church, and the result was an exceedingly valuable one, upon which, however, no opinion could be given until after full study and with adequate knowledge. The House would be thankful for the work which, under the blessing of God, had thus been carried out—a work, however, which did not supersede that version of the Scriptures which all English-speaking Christians had learnt to esteem and love.

---

#### ORGANIZATION OF THE AMERICAN COMMITTEE.

The first steps towards the formation of an American Committee of Revision were taken almost immediately after the organization of the English Companies. As stated in the "Historical Exposition" (see page 9 above), the first meeting of the New Testament Company in England was held on the 22d of June, 1870. On the 7th of July next following, the two Houses of Convocation voted "to invite the co-operation of some American divines," and to Bishop Wilberforce and Dean Stanley was assigned soon afterwards the duty of holding such communications with America as might be necessary for the accomplishment of the desired result.

As the Rev. Dr. Angus was at that time intending to visit the United States, in connection with a proposed meeting of the Evangelical Alliance in the City of New York, it was deemed expedient to authorize him to open correspondence with the Rev. Dr. Schaff, and some other scholars, while in this country. In this way it was thought that the matter might be most easily explained in its details, and an interchange of views might be held in the most satisfactory way. Accordingly Bishop Ellicott, who had been made chairman of the English New Testament Company, addressed to Dr. Angus in the name of that company, one of the two following letters which might serve to introduce the subject to scholars here, and Dr. Angus himself prepared the other, which was sent to a few of those whose views and co-operation were especially desired.”\*

[Letter of Bishop Ellicott to Rev. Dr. Angus.]

PORTLAND PLACE, London, July 20 [1870].

DEAR DR. ANGUS :

As you do me the favor of asking me, I take the responsibility, as acting chairman of the New Testament Company of the revision body, herewith to commend you as one of our most trusty helpers to the scholars in the United States who may be interested in the undertaking. Perhaps you will kindly explain to them how we work, viz., round a common table, and how it is thus difficult for us to incorporate our brethren across the water. It will, however, be very easy for us to transmit our work in its provisional state to an authorised committee in the United States, and pay all attention to the corrections they may suggest and the observations they may be pleased to offer. We shall be very interested in hearing when you come back how you may have arranged.

Pray give my respectful compliments to any scholars with whom you may confer, and believe me very sincerely,

Yours,

C. J. GLOUCESTER AND BRISTOL.

[BISHOP ELICOTT, *Chairman of the N. T. Company.*]

---

[\* These and all other letters and documents embodied in this volume, are published with the consent of the British Revisers and the University Presses.]



[Letter of Dr. Angus to American Scholars.—Sent out in August, 1870.]

MY DEAR SIR:

I am not sure whether you have seen the enclosed plan of Bible revision [the rules, etc., of the English Company]. The method adopted of having the work done by each Company together makes it impracticable to ask the co-operation of brethren in America at the initial stage of their proceeding: but there is a strong and general feeling among the revisers that we should get their co-operation to the extent at least of securing their criticisms and suggestions before our revision is finally published. Could you help in such a work by looking over the revision as we prepare it, and giving suggestions? If a committee of a dozen or eighteen were formed in the States, we could send the copy of the revise to each, and they might meet and agree on suggestions. If meetings are impracticable, we might still obtain individual judgments; but the plan of a united judgment has obvious advantages. The expense of such meetings would not be great: and probably it might be met by friends interested in our work. In England the revisers give their time and labor; and we propose to meet the expenses of printing and travelling by an appeal to the English public. Expenses in America might be met in a like way; or we might add these expenses to ours, and meet them all out of a common fund. I had hoped to confer with you on this subject during the N. Y. Alliance meetings. They, however, are postponed, and I must therefore trust largely to correspondence. Bishop Ellicott (our acting chairman) gives me an introduction and asks me to obtain such help as I am now writing about.

Dr. Schaff and Dr. Conant agree to help either individually or in committee. When you have thought the matter over, favor me with a reply addressed to the Alliance Rooms, Bible House, New York.

Yours very sincerely,

JOSEPH ANGUS.

Dr. Angus held communication in person and by letter with Dr. Schaff while in America, the result of which was the selection of certain gentlemen who were fitted for the work, and were likely to be regarded as authorities in Biblical learning by the American public, and the submission of their names to Bishop Ellicott and Dean Stanley as representing the English body. A few months later, Dean Stanley made the first formal communication by letter,

in discharge of the duty assigned to him after the vote of Convocation in July, 1870. On the 13th of January, 1871, he wrote to Dr. Schaff as follows :

DEANERY, WESTMINSTER ABBEY, }  
LONDON, Jan. 13, 1871. }

MY DEAR SIR :

I have been in communication with Dr. Angus on the subject of the revision of the Authorised Version of the Bible, now set on foot by two Companies of English, Scottish, and Irish scholars appointed under the authority of the Committee of the Convocation of the Province of Canterbury.

By that Committee, and in pursuance of a vote of the Lower House of Convocation, the Bishop of Winchester and myself were requested to ask the friendly co-operation of some divines from the United States of America in a work that, it was felt, concerned that vast part of the English-speaking races of the world as nearly as ourselves. I find that the Bishop of Winchester has already communicated on the subject with Bishop Potter, with the view of procuring the assistance of such scholars as the Protestant Episcopal Church of America may furnish; and I, therefore, undertake the charge of addressing myself to you, as having been the centre, as I understand, of the communications of the non-Episcopal churches with Dr. Angus during his recent visit. May I ask you, in consideration of the distance of space and the length of time which would be involved in repeated correspondence with each member, to enter into such negotiations as you may deem advisable with the scholars of these churches?

It will, of course, be readily understood that the object of the Committee of Convocation and of the revising Companies is to procure the assistance of which I speak purely on the ground of scholastic and Biblical qualifications—the assistance, as the vote of Convocation expressed it, “of any eminent for scholarship, to whatever nation or religious body they may belong.” With this view I have consulted with Dr. Angus and others, and venture to submit a list of such eminent persons as have occurred to us as falling within the above description. You will, perhaps, have no difficulty in arranging with them, and, also (if you think fit) with Bishop Potter, representing the Protestant Episcopal Church, and to whom I have not written, as the Bishop will understand, only because he has already received a communication from my superior in rank, the Bishop of Winchester.

The details of the mode of co-operation will easily suggest themselves: on them I need not at present enter, but will conclude with the hope that the joint and cordial co-operation in this great and holy work may add another link to the friendly intercourse and communion between English Christendom and that powerful and ever-increasing offspring that it has produced beyond the Atlantic.

Yours very faithfully,

A. P. STANLEY.

Bishop Wilberforce had, somewhat earlier, written to Bishop Potter, of New York, asking the co-operation of the divines of the Episcopal Church in this country. But as the General Convention of the Church did not meet until the following autumn, the subject could not be formally brought to the notice of the House of Bishops before that time. Under date of August 7, 1871, Bishop Wilberforce again addressed Bishop Potter in a letter which was submitted by the latter to the House of Bishops, and which is here inserted, together with the minute adopted by the House with regard to the suggestions contained in it.

[Letter of Bishop Wilberforce, of Winchester, to Bishop Potter of New York.]

(Copied from the "Journal and Proceedings of the Bishops, Clergy and Laity of the Protestant Episcopal Church," 1872, pp. 615-616.)

BUSBRIDGE HALL, GODALMING, Aug. 7, 1871.

RIGHT REVEREND BROTHER:

As the time of your General Convention approaches, it seems to me due to my high respect and brotherly affection for your venerable body that I should, as Chairman of the Committee of the Convocation of Canterbury, which is charged with the duty of preparing a revised text of our Authorised Version of the Sacred Scriptures, communicate formally to you what has been done, is doing, and is intended, touching an enterprise which must, I think, deeply interest all the English-speaking branches of the Church of Christ, and, very especially, our beloved sister communion in America. The purpose for which the Committee was appointed was this:—not to make a new translation, but to exhibit, in a revised version of the existing translations, any corrections which either the discovery of new manuscripts and versions or

the advance of scholarship, allowed the Committee to recommend. It was our universal belief that these corrections, though important as to technical accuracy, would affect no doctrine, and add to instead of diminishing the authority of the present version. We felt that there was danger in leaving suspicion free to exaggerate according to her wont, small defects, and swell them to dimensions which might weaken the authority of the existing version. The Committee having been appointed with power to seek *aliunde* the assistance of experts qualified by classical and biblical learning for the task, has formed, out of itself and such associated workmen, two companies : one of which is proceeding with a proposed revision of the Old, and the other of the New Testament. From the first, our Convocation desired the aid of your body, and I have myself made various communications from it to individual members of your Episcopate. The approaching session of your General Convention gives me the opportunity of a more formal communication, which I now make to you as the Presiding Bishop, requesting you to bring the matter, in such a way as you deem meet, before the General Convention. As our work has proceeded, it has appeared impossible for us to obtain from you in the progress of our labors that aid to which we still look forward at their close. When the work of the Companies is finished, it will be the duty of the Committee of the Convocation in its separate unity to revise the work done, and either to reject it, or to lay it, with or without alterations, before the Convocation of Canterbury. That body will then judge for itself of the merit or demerit of what its Committee so presents to it. Should the Convocation judge it so far successful, it would authorise such other steps as it may deem fit. One of these, I have little doubt, would be to submit the tentative revisions to the other English-speaking branches of the Church, and should your Convention encourage our doing so, pre-eminently to you. No such important change as any alteration in the Authorised Version of the Sacred Scriptures could be carried out without allowing full time for all such judgments as that of your branch of the Church to be formed and expressed ; nor until the revised version had received the sanction of general approbation could it, in any sense, be authorised amongst ourselves.

Commending this important matter to your care, and earnestly seeking your prayers for the due fulfilment of the work in hand, through the heavenly assistance of God the Holy Ghost, for the

glory of the eternal and ever-blessed Trinity, and the edification of the Church of Christ, I remain, right reverend and dear brother,

Yours in the bonds of the common faith,

(Signed)

SAMUEL WINTONENSIS.

THE RIGHT REV. THE PRESIDING BISHOP OF THE CHURCH IN AMERICA.

[Action of the House of Bishops on the preceding letter.]

(From the "Journal," etc., pp. 262-353.)

A communication from the Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Winchester, Chairman of the Committee of the Convocation of Canterbury on the Revision of the Authorized Version of the Holy Scriptures, to the Presiding Bishop, was read by the Secretary.

On motion of the Bishop of New York it was

*Resolved*, That this communication be laid on the table, and printed for the use of the House (p. 262).

The Bishop of New York offered the following resolution :

*Resolved*, That the Right Rev. the Presiding Bishop be and is hereby requested to return to the Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Winchester a courteous and brotherly acknowledgment of his communication relating to a revision of the English of the Holy Scriptures, stating that this House, having had no part in originating or organizing the said work of revision, is not at present in a condition to deliver any judgment respecting it, and at the same time expressing the disposition of this House to consider with candor the work undertaken by the Convocation of Canterbury, whenever it shall have been completed, and its results laid before them.

The Bishop of Louisiana moved to strike out the following words: "Having had no part in originating or organizing the said work of revision"; which was lost.

The question recurring on the original motion of the Bishop of New York, it was adopted (p. 353).

About two months after this action of the House of Bishops, an invitation was sent, at the request of the English Committee, to a number of gentlemen who had already been communicated with respecting the subject, to meet in New York, for the purpose of receiving information as to the work in England, and of forming a Committee of Revision in this country. At this meeting, which

was held on the 7th of December, 1871, the following persons were present :

Prof. Philip Schaff, D.D., New York ; Prof. Henry B. Smith, D.D., New York ; Prof. William Henry Green, D.D., Princeton, N. J. ; Prof. George Emlen Hare, D.D., Philadelphia, Pa. ; Prof. Chas. P. Krauth, D.D., Philadelphia ; Rev. Thos. J. Conant, D.D., Brooklyn, N. Y. ; Prof. George E. Day, D.D., New Haven, Conn. ; Ezra Abbot, LL.D., Cambridge, Mass. ; Rev. Edward A. Washburn, D.D., New York.

Dr. Howson, Dean of Chester, was also present by special invitation, and took part in the deliberations.

Ex-President Woolsey, Prof. Hackett, Prof. Strong, and others, were prevented from attending, but expressed by letter their hearty interest in the proposed work, and their readiness to co-operate.

The meeting was organized by the appointment of Prof. Henry B. Smith as Chairman, and Prof. George E. Day as Secretary.

After prayer by the Chairman, Dr. Schaff introduced the subject of the meeting by stating that he had been requested by the British Committee for the Revision of the Authorized English Version of the Scriptures, through the Dean of Westminster, to invite American scholars to co-operate with them in this work. He had accordingly extended such an invitation to a limited number of scholars, most of them professors of biblical learning in theological seminaries of the leading Protestant denominations. In the delicate task of selection, he had reference, first of all, to the reputation and occupation of the gentlemen as biblical scholars ; next to their denominational connection and standing so far as to have a fair representation of the American churches ; and lastly, to local convenience, in order to secure regular attendance on the meetings. He would have gladly invited others, but thought it best to leave the responsibility of enlargement to the Committee itself when properly constituted. He had personally conferred during the last summer with Bishop Ellicott, Dean Stanley, Prof. Lightfoot, Prof. Westcott, Dr. Angus, and other British revisers, about the details of the proposed plan of co-operation, and was happy to state that it met their cordial approval.

Dr. Schaff also read a list of scholars who had been invited to engage in the work and who had accepted the invitation.

A public meeting in the interests of the work of Revision was also held on the evening of the same day in Calvary Episcopal

Church, in New York, which was very largely attended by clergymen and intelligent laymen. It was conducted by the Rector, Rev. Dr. Washburn, and addresses were made by Dean Howson, of England, and Dr. Schaff.

It was hoped, at this time, that the work of the American Committee might be begun at a very early day. But it was incidental to so great an undertaking, which was to continue for years, that many preliminary arrangements should be made. Some provision was needed for the necessary expenses of the work, and it was desirable to secure the co-operation of various bodies of Christians.

As the authorities of the Established Church in the Convocation of Canterbury had originated the whole plan and undertaking in England, and learned men of other Christian bodies in Great Britain had been admitted to the Revision Companies by their invitation, it was very naturally desired by the English Revisers that some of the Episcopal Bishops in this country should become members of the American Committee, before the actual work here should begin. It was believed that their participation in the Revision would facilitate co-operation with the English Committee, and would give satisfaction to the members of the Anglican communion in England. When the House of Bishops, therefore, formally declined to take the part proposed to them in their corporate capacity, considerable disappointment was felt by the English Committee. The resolution adopted by the House, however, was not intended to be binding with reference to individual Bishops. They were understood to be left free to act in accordance with their own judgment. Correspondence was, therefore, opened very soon with several of the more eminent among them, and invitations were extended to them to become members of the American Committee. This correspondence, together with the necessary interchange of communications with England, occupied a few months, thus delaying the organization of the Committee until after the middle of the year 1872. Three or four of the Bishops felt themselves constrained by the action taken at the time of the General Convention to decline the invitations personally addressed to them, or for other reasons of a more private character found it impossible to undertake the work. All, however, expressed an interest in the proposed Revision, and stated that their grounds for declining to have an active part in it were others than those which could be connected with any disapproval

of the plan, or want of sympathy with the body which originated it.\* Bishop Lee, of Delaware, then the oldest but one of

---

[\* Bishop McIlvaine, D.D., LL.D., to Dr. Schaff.]

CINCINNATI, May 20, 1871.

REV. AND DEAR SIR :

I have just returned home after a week's absence, having received in the hour of departure your obliging communication on the subject of revision of the Scripture version.

I am glad that as the revision in England was set on foot by a Convocation of the Church of England, and is proceeding mainly under such guidance and control, in constituting an American Committee to co-operate, the work of formation has been given by the British Committee to a *non-Episcopalian*, and to *you*. This will greatly help not only the all-sidedness of the work, but in case it shall be desirable to introduce it into substitution for the present version will very materially prepare the way for such result.

I am much indebted to you for the kind estimate you evince of my revisionary qualifications, in doing me so great an honor as to ask me to be on the American Committee. But I am sure you have over-estimated my ability. The sort of life a Bishop must have led, who for almost forty years has superintended this large diocese, is not favorable to the sharpness and fulness of that sort of learning and that habit of mind which such revision demands. But there is a reason for my asking you to excuse me which admits of no question. The state of *brain-health* is such that I can undertake nothing that would require close investigation, and especially critical study. It seems to have become so established that, during the few years, at the very longest, that I may be continued here, I can expect nothing but, by great caution and quietness, to be enabled to do my moderate and untasking work. I shall carefully mind your word "*confidential*."

Yours very respectfully,

CHAS. P. MCLVAINE.

---

[Bishop Williams, D.D., LL.D., to Dr. Schaff.]

MIDDLETOWN, Feb. 26, 1872.

MY DEAR DR. SCHAFF :

In some correspondence with the Bishop of Winchester I have respectfully declined to take even the very humble part I could take in the now pending revision of the Bible.

Let me assure you it is from no feeling that a revision is not needed, nor yet from an unwillingness to invoke aid in making it from others than members of the Church of England that I have been led to this view of my duty. Quite other grounds than those are the ones I stand on, though I need not trouble you with any details as to their character,

With great respect truly yours,

J. WILLIAMS.

---

[Bishop Whittingham, D.D., LL.D., to Dr. Schaff.]

BALTIMORE, Feb. 24, 1872.

MY DEAR DR. SCHAFF :

I have already, some time ago, declined an invitation from the Bishop of Winchester (late of Oxford) to take part in the revision of the Authorized Version



the American Bishops (now the Senior Bishop), and held in esteem as one of the best qualified among them for the special work devolved upon the Committee, accepted the invitation and joined the New Testament Company in May, 1872. Soon after this the final arrangements were consummated by Rev. Dr. Schaff, who visited Europe in the summer of 1872, and on his return in the autumn the Committee, being duly organized, began its work. The delay occasioned by the various causes, which have been referred to as incidental to the formation of such a body, and by the necessity of communication and co-operation between the representatives of the two Committees on opposite sides of the ocean, caused the American Companies to be nearly two years later than the English in beginning their duties. They pressed forward their work with much energy, however, and were enabled to complete it contemporaneously with their English brethren.

---

The first meeting of the American Committee, when its organization was completed, was held at the Bible House in New York on the 4th of October, 1872. The following record and letters will give the reader the account of this meeting and organization.

[Circular Letter of Dr. Schaff to the American Revisers.]

NEW YORK, Sept. 13, 1872.

DEAR SIR :

I have the honor to inform you that, during a recent visit to England, I have succeeded in completing the arrangements for co-operation with the British Committee on Bible Revision, and that confidential copies of the revised version of several books of the Old and New Testaments have been forwarded to me for the use of the members of the American Committee.

You are therefore requested to attend a meeting of the American revisers to be held on Friday, Oct. 4, 1872, at 2 P.M., in my study in the Bible House, for the purpose of completing the

---

now carrying on by the Convocation of Canterbury, for reasons made known to him—not arising out of any hostility on my part to the revision itself.

Of course, I am unable to accept the gratifying and courteous invitation which you now extend to me.

I am glad of the opportunity thus afforded me of saying how much pleasure I have in any approach to the renewal of well-remembered profitable intercourse enjoyed in former days, and how truly I am

Your faithful and affectionate friend and brother,

W. R. WHITTINGHAM.

organization and commencing actual work. It is especially important that this meeting should be fully attended.

Respectfully yours,

PHILIP SCHAFF.

REV. DR. WOOLSEY, AND OTHERS.

---

## MEETING OF THE COMMITTEE,

OCTOBER 4, 1872.

*The Organization Completed.*

[From the Minutes of the American Committee.]

NEW YORK, Oct. 4, 1872.

The American Committee on the Revision of the English Authorized Version of the Bible met this day, at 2 P.M., at the study of Dr. Schaff, No. 40 Bible House, to complete their organization and make arrangements for the work before them.

Present: Drs. DeWitt, Green, Hare, Strong, Lee, Woolsey, Abbot, Kendrick, Thayer, Schaff, and Day.

Rev. Dr. Woolsey was appointed temporary Chairman. After prayer by Bishop Lee, the minutes of the last meeting were read and approved.

Prof. Charles Short and Prof. James Hadley were unanimously elected, and took their seats as members of the Committee.

Letters, or messages, were received from Profs. Krauth, Lewis, Smith, Hackett, Warren, and Riddle, expressing their regret at not being able to be present, with the assurance of their continued readiness to co-operate.

Printed copies of the revision by the British Companies, so far as completed, viz., in the O. T. of Genesis, Exodus, and Leviticus; in the N. T. of the Gospels of Matthew, Mark, and Luke, were then distributed to the members of the American Companies, with the express understanding that they should be regarded and kept as strictly confidential.

After a brief statement by Dr. Schaff in regard to the present state of the work of revision in Great Britain, and the desire of the British Committee to come into immediate connection with the American Committee, the following officers were appointed by ballot:

Rev. Dr. Philip Schaff, *President.*

Prof. George E. Day, *Secretary.*

Prof. Charles Short, *Treasurer.*

It was then *voted* :

1. That the two Companies hold their meetings in New York.
2. That the officers of the Committee be authorized to secure the room No. 42 in the Bible House for one year or less, and to purchase the necessary furniture.
3. That Professors Short, Day, and Green be a Committee to report upon the means of obtaining the necessary funds for the prosecution of the work of the Committee.

The two Companies then separated for the purpose of organization. On meeting again, the O. T. Company reported that they had made choice of Prof. William Henry Green as Chairman ; and Prof. George E. Day, Secretary. The N. T. Company reported that they had elected Rev. Dr. Woolsey, Chairman ; and Prof. Charles Short, Secretary.\*

The Committee then adjourned to meet at No. 40 Bible House on Saturday, Nov. 2, at 9 A.M.

GEORGE E. DAY,  
*Secretary.*

---

[Dr. Schaff to Bishop Ellicott.]

NEW YORK, Oct. 12, 1872.

MY LORD :

I have the honor to inform you that the American Committee of revisers is now fully organized, and has entered upon its work.

A meeting of the revisers was held in my study on the 4th of October. Bishop Lee opened the meeting with prayer. Most of the members were present ; the rest sent letters asking to be excused for unavoidable absence, but expressing deep interest in the work, and their readiness to co-operate.

I distributed among the members present copies of the revised version of Genesis, Exodus, and Leviticus, and of the Gospels of St. Matthew, St. Mark, and St. Luke, which were intrusted to me by the British Committee for the exclusive use of the American Committee. The confidential character of these documents will be sacredly respected.

The organization was then completed by the unanimous election of the undersigned as President ; of Prof. George E. Day,

---

[\* Afterwards Prof. Thayer was also elected Secretary of the N. T. Company and relieved Prof. Short of a part of the work, which became very laborious as the revision proceeded.]

D.D., of Yale College, New Haven, as Corresponding Secretary ; and of Prof. Charles Short, LL.D., of Columbia College, New York, as Treasurer.

The Company for the revision of the Old Testament elected Prof. W. Henry Green, D.D., of the Theological Seminary at Princeton, its Chairman, and Prof. Day, Recording Secretary. The officers of the New Testament Company are the Rev. Ex-President Theodore D. Woolsey, D.D., LL.D., of New Haven, Chairman, and Prof. Charles Short, Recording Secretary.

Both Companies agreed to hold periodical meetings every month. The next meeting will begin November 2. We have rented and furnished a room in the Bible House, and shall soon take measures to provide for the necessary expenses.

As President of the whole Committee it is my duty according to Art. III. of our constitution to conduct the official correspondence with the British revisers.

It is in discharge of this duty that I write this letter.

I look forward with great pleasure to a continuance of the correspondence with our brethren in England.

I may add that our recent meeting was a very harmonious one, and gives good promise of earnest and vigorous co-operation with the British Committee. We apprehend no material difference, and feel confident that so noble and holy a work, which engages the united labors and prayers of Christian scholars from all branches of Anglo-Saxon Christendom, will be crowned with the blessing of the Divine Author of the Scriptures.

I assure you and the members of the Company you represent of my profound regard and best wishes and prayers for the success of your work.

Truly yours,

PHILIP SCHAFF.

The LORD BISHOP OF GLOUCESTER AND BRISTOL,  
Chairman of the New Test. Company of Revision.

[Bishop Ellicott to Dr. Schaff.]

GLOUCESTER, Nov. 21, 1872.

DEAR DR. SCHAFF :

I am requested by the New Testament Company to thank you for your kind note and to express their sincere pleasure at hearing so excellent an account of your progress.

The Company present their kind compliments and best wishes to the distinguished scholars over whom you preside.

Very faithfully yours,

C. J. GLOUCESTER AND BRISTOL.

The List of the American Committee as finally constituted, and including both those who participated in the organization of the body and others who were added to the membership by election at some of the earliest meetings, may be appropriately inserted at this point. The membership was necessarily limited to scholars whose residence was not so remote from the City of New York as to make their attendance at the monthly meetings of the Committee impossible.

#### GENERAL OFFICERS OF THE COMMITTEE:

PHILIP SCHAFF, D.D, LL.D., President.

GEORGE E. DAY, D.D, Secretary.

##### (1) *Old Testament Company:*

Professor WM. HENRY GREEN, D.D., LL. D. (Chairman), Theological Seminary, Princeton, N. J.

Professor GEORGE E. DAY, D.D. (Secretary), Divinity School of Yale College, New Haven, Conn.

Professor CHARLES A. AIKEN, D.D., Theological Seminary, Princeton, N. J.

The Rev. TALBOT W. CHAMBERS, D.D., Collegiate Reformed Dutch Church, New York.

Professor THOMAS J. CONANT, D.D., Brooklyn, N. Y.

Professor JOHN DEWITT, D.D., Theological Seminary, New Brunswick, N. J.

Professor GEORGE EMLEN HARE, D.D., LL.D., Divinity School, Philadelphia.

Professor CHARLES P. KRAUTH, D.D., LL.D, Vice-Provost of the University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Professor TAYLER LEWIS, LL.D., Union College, Schenectady, N. Y.

Professor CHARLES M. MEAD, PH.D., Theological Seminary, Andover, Mass.

Professor HOWARD OSGOOD, D.D., Theological Seminary, Rochester, N. Y.

Professor JOSEPH PACKARD, D.D., Theological Seminary, Alexandria, Va.

Professor CALVIN E. STOWE, D.D., Hartford, Conn.

Professor JAMES STRONG, S. T. D., Theological Seminary, Madison, N. J.

Professor C. A. VAN DYCK, D.D., M.D., Beirut, Syria (Advisory Member on questions of Arabia).\*

NOTE.—The American Old Testament Company lost by death Prof. TAYLER LEWIS, d. 1877; Dr. KRAUTH, Philadelphia, d. Jan. 2, 1883; and Dr. STOWE, by resignation.

(2) *New Testament Company.*

Ex-President THEODORE D. WOOLSEY, D.D., LL.D., (Chairman), New Haven, Conn.

Professor J. HENRY THAYER, D.D. (Secretary), Theological Seminary, Andover, Mass.

Professor EZRA ABBOT, D.D., LL.D., Divinity School, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

The Rev. JONATHAN K. BURR, D.D., Trenton, N. J.

President THOMAS CHASE, LL.D., Haverford College, Pa.

Chancellor HOWARD CROSBY, D.D., LL.D., New York.

Professor TIMOTHY DWIGHT, D.D., Divinity School of Yale College, New Haven, Conn.

Professor JAMES HADLEY, LL.D., Yale College, New Haven, Conn.

Professor HORATIO B. HACKETT, D.D., LL.D., Theological Seminary, Rochester, N. Y.

Professor CHARLES HODGE, D.D., LL.D., Theological Seminary, Princeton, N. J.

Professor A. C. KENDRICK, D.D., LL.D., University of Rochester, N. Y.

The Right Rev. ALFRED LEE, D.D., Bishop of the Diocese of Delaware.

Professor MATTHEW B. RIDDLE, D.D., Theological Seminary, Hartford, Conn.

---

\* Dr. Van Dyck has rendered important aid to the Old Testament Company, both in his correspondence with them, and by the preparation of a full list of the variations, in the renderings of the recent Arabic translation of the Book of Job, from the renderings of the Authorized English Version.

Professor PHILIP SCHAFF, D.D., LL.D., Union Theological Seminary, New York.

Professor CHARLES SHORT, LL.D. (Secretary), Columbia College, New York.

Professor HENRY BOYNTON SMITH, D.D., LL.D., Union Theological Seminary, New York.

The Rev. EDWARD A. WASHBURN, D.D., LL.D., Rector of Calvary Church, New York.

NOTE.—The American New Testament Company lost by death Prof. JAMES HADLEY (who attended the first session), d. 1872; Dr. HENRY BOYNTON SMITH (who attended one session, and resigned from ill health), d. 1877; Dr. HORATIO B. HACKETT, d. 1876; Dr. CHARLES HODGE (who never attended the meetings, but corresponded with the Committee), d. 1878; Rev. Dr. WASHBURN, d. Feb. 2, 1881 (after the completion of the N. T. Revision); Rev. Dr. BURR, d. April 24, 1882, and Prof. EZRA ABBOT, d. March 20, 1884. Dr. G. R. CROOKS and Dr. W. F. WARREN, who accepted the original appointment, found it impossible to attend any meetings and resigned.

It is an interesting fact connected with the work of Revision in America, that only one of those who were actively engaged in the Revision of the Version of the New Testament—Professor Hackett—died before it was completed. Professors Henry B. Smith and Charles Hodge attended no meetings after the actual work began, and thus had only a nominal connection with the Company, while Professor James Hadley was present only at the first meeting, his death having occurred in November, 1872. Of the Old Testament Company Dr. Krauth is the only active member who has died—Professor Tayler Lewis, who died in 1877, having been unable to participate in any of the meetings. It is also interesting to note the fact that the few members who were not in the Committee at its first organization were elected by the body almost immediately afterwards, so that all those who brought the work to its completion had a part in all its stages from the beginning. The Revision, so far as it is the work of the American Committee, is, thus, the result of the joint labors of an almost unbroken company during a period of eight years in the New Testament part of it, and twelve years in the Old Testament part.

---

The rules under which the English Companies carried on the work were as follows :

## PRINCIPLES AND RULES OF THE BRITISH COMMITTEE.

At the first meeting of the Committee, appointed by the Convocation of Canterbury, May 6, 1870, in accordance with the sub-joined Report,\* accepted by Convocation at its last session, the following resolutions and rules were agreed to as the fundamental principles on which the revision is to be conducted :

RESOLVED,—

I. That the Committee appointed by the Convocation of Canterbury at its last Session separate itself into two Companies, the one for the revision of the Authorised Version of the Old Testament, the other for the revision of the Authorised Version of the New Testament.

II. That the Company for the revision of the Authorised Version of the Old Testament consist of the Bishops of St. David's, Llandaff, Ely, Lincoln, and Bath and Wells, and of the following members from the Lower House: Archdeacon Rose, Canon Selwyn, Dr. Jebb, and Dr. Kay.

III. That the Company for the revision of the Authorised Version of the New Testament consist of the Bishops of Winchester, Gloucester and Bristol, and Salisbury, and of the following members from the Lower House: the Prolocutor, the Deans of Canterbury and Westminster, and Canon Blakesley.

IV. That the first portion of the work to be undertaken by the Old Testament Company be the revision of the Authorised Version of the Pentateuch.

V. That the first portion of the work to be undertaken by the

\*“1. That it is desirable that a revision of the Authorised Version of the Holy Scriptures be undertaken.”

“2. That the revision be so conducted as to comprise both marginal renderings and such emendations as it may be found necessary to insert in the text of the Authorised Version.”

“3. That in the above resolutions we do not contemplate any new translation of the Bible, or any alteration of the language, except where, in the judgment of the most competent scholars, such change is necessary.”

“4. That in such necessary changes, the style of the language employed in the existing version be closely followed.”

“5. That it is desirable that Convocation should nominate a body of its own members to undertake the work of revision, who shall be at liberty to invite the co-operation of any eminent for scholarship, to whatever nation or religious body they may belong.”



New Testament Company be the revision of the Authorised Version of the Synoptical Gospels.

VI. That the following scholars and divines be invited to join the Old Testament Company :—

ALEXANDER, Dr. W. L.	GINSBURG, Dr.	PLUMPTRE, Professor
CHEENERY, Professor	GOTCH, Dr.	PUSEY, Canon
COOK, Canon	HARRISON, Archdeacon	WRIGHT, Dr. (British Museum)
DAVIDSON, Professor A. B.	LEATHES, Professor	WRIGHT, W. A. (Cam- bridge)
DAVIES, Dr. B.	M'GILL, Professor	
FAIRBAIRN, Professor	PAYNE SMITH, Canon	
FIELD, Rev. F.	PEROWNE, Prof. J. H.	

VII. That the following scholars and divines be invited to join the New Testament Company :—

ANGUS, Dr.	LEE, Archdeacon	SCOTT, Dr. (Balliol Coll.)
BROWN, Dr. DAVID	LIGHTFOOT, Dr.	SCRIVENER, Rev. F.
DUBLIN, Archbishop of	MILLIGAN, Professor	II. A.
EADIE, Dr.	MOULTON, Professor	ST. ANDREWS, Bp. of
HORT, Rev. F. J. A.	NEWMAN, Dr. J. H.	TREGELLES, Dr.
HUMPHRY, Rev. W. G.	NEWTH, Professor	VAUGHAN, Dr.
KENNEDY, Canon	ROBERTS, Dr. A.	WESTCOTT, Canon
	SMITH, Rev. G. VANCE	

VIII. That the general principles to be followed by both Companies be as follows :

1. To introduce as few alterations as possible into the text of the Authorised Version consistently with faithfulness.
2. To limit as far as possible the expression of such alterations to the language of the Authorised and earlier English versions.
3. Each Company to go twice over the portion to be revised, once provisionally, the second time finally, and on principles of voting as hereinafter is provided.
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 Authorised 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 thereupon 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.

IX. That the work of each Company be communicated to the other as it is completed, in order that there may be as little deviation from uniformity in language as possible.

X. That the special or by-rules for each Company be as follows :

1. To make all corrections in writing previous to the meeting.
2. To place all the corrections due to textual considerations on the left-hand margin, and all other corrections on the right-hand margin.
3. To transmit to the chairman, in case of being unable to attend, the corrections proposed in the portion agreed upon for consideration.

---

The rules of the American Committee included those adopted in England in all essential points, and were set forth in the following Constitution :

“ I. The American Committee, invited by the British Committee, engaged in the revision of the Authorized English Version of the Holy Scriptures, to co-operate with them, shall be composed of biblical scholars and divines in the United States.

“ II. This Committee shall have the power to elect its officers, to add to its number, and to fill its own vacancies.

“ III. The officers shall consist of a President, a Corresponding Secretary, and a Treasurer. The President shall conduct the official correspondence with the British revisers. The Secretary shall conduct the home correspondence.

“ IV. New members of the Committee and corresponding members must be nominated at a previous meeting, and elected unanimously by ballot.

“ V. The American Committee shall co-operate with the British Companies on the basis of the principles and rules of revision adopted by the British Committee.

“ VI. The American Committee shall consist of two Companies,

the one for the revision of the Authorized Version of the Old Testament, the other for the revision of the Authorized Version of the New Testament.

“VII. Each Company shall elect its own Chairman and Recording Secretary.

“VIII. The British Companies will submit to the American Companies, from time to time, such portions of their work as have passed the first revision, and the American Companies will transmit their criticisms and suggestions to the British Companies before the second revision.

“IX. A joint meeting of the American and British Companies shall be held, if possible, in London, before final action.

“X. The American Committee shall pay their own expenses.”

The meetings of the two American Companies were held every month, from September to May inclusive, in each year, at rooms No. 42 and 44 Bible House, New York. A summer meeting was held in the month of July at some place designated by the Companies,—usually at New Haven, Andover or Princeton. The summer meetings continued for a week; the other meetings for two days. The members sat around a common table, and freely and fully discussed such passages or chapters as had been previously assigned for the particular meeting—each member having already examined and investigated them for himself. In this way the whole of the New Testament, and of the Old, was minutely considered and discussed. The work was reviewed in this careful manner twice from beginning to end. In the first revision, changes in the Authorized Version were recorded for further consideration in case they were favored by a majority of votes; but, in the second revision, the rule demanded a vote of two-thirds in order to adopt the proposed change. Finally, all passages were examined a third time in which unreconciled differences still remained between the views of the English and American Companies. The thoroughness and patience with which the work was done will be manifest to the reader from this brief statement. It may safely be said that no criticism has been made on the New Testament portion of the work already published, which was not anticipated, and accorded a fair and full discussion by the Revisers in the progress of the work. The same will, doubtless, prove to have been the case with respect to the Old Testament, which is issued simultaneously with this Historical Statement.

The membership of the two Companies included scholars of the principal Protestant denominations. The opportunity was thus given for a fair and able presentation of the views of each, so far as such views have a bearing upon the matter of the translation of words and sentences. Controversy, however, never arose in the meetings on points dividing religious bodies. The spirit of scholarship rose far above the sectarian spirit, and the latter was at no time manifest. It is a satisfaction to all the revisers in the retrospect, to know that there was, from the beginning to the close of their labors, a constant and delightful exhibition of Christian unity. This fact, which it is pleasant to remember, may also, it is believed, bear with itself a testimony to the general accuracy of their work.

The relations between the Committees of Revision in the two countries involved some questions of importance which called for extended correspondence, but were finally settled by an agreement between the two parties which met the approval of both. At an early period in the history of the work, an arrangement had been made between the English Companies and the officers connected with the University Presses of Oxford and Cambridge, by which the Revised Version in Great Britain became the property of those institutions, on condition that the large expenses incidental to the preparation of the work in that country should be paid by them. The copyright, in Great Britain, accordingly, passed into their control. It was at no time desired by the American Committee to have any such arrangement made between themselves and publishers in the United States, or in any way to put a restriction on the sale of the new book, for the purpose of securing any remuneration for their own services or any benefit for themselves whatever. No copyright was thought of or wished for in this country with any such end in view. At one time, however, the subject of securing a copyright here for the sole purpose of preventing the publication of inaccurate and imperfect editions, was considered and discussed. This led to a series of communications with the managers of the University Presses, and also to some inquiries addressed to legal authorities in the United States. The feeling, however, on the part of the members of the American Committee was so general and so permanent, that the book should be made a free gift to the public, with no limitation whatever in the way of its widest circulation, that the whole matter was laid aside by common consent. Diffi-

culties might, not improbably, have arisen in the case of a work having such a character—the authorship being in the persons of citizens of two different countries. The correspondence also incidentally developed the fact that no satisfactory arrangements could be made with the Presses, had there been a desire to accomplish that end. The determination of the American gentlemen was that they would not receive pecuniary benefit from their work, or even, in any way, seem to do so ; and, after due consideration, it was thought that the danger of the appearance of undesirable editions was not sufficient to lead them to reverse or turn aside from their settled purpose. As some standard edition, however, was necessary, the American Committee agreed to make a public statement, that the one issued by the University Presses was the one for whose accuracy they would hold themselves responsible.

As the American Committee was organized later than the one in England, and only in accordance with a vote of Convocation “to invite their co-operation,” it was natural that questions should arise as to the precise relation of the American body to the English—whether they were to hold the place of advisers merely, or of fellow-revisers with their English brethren. The difficulties connected with the deciding of questions by the votes of two different bodies of men three thousand miles apart ; the apparent necessity that the final determination should be made in one place and by those who could confer with one another ; the reasonable claim to a certain priority on the part of the English Companies by reason of the fact that the work was originated in their country ; and the equally appropriate feeling that the representatives of our nation should have a recognized participation in the work to which they devoted, as fully as did the scholars in England, years of labor,—all these points, together with others closely related to them, were made the subject of communication and, as far as possible, of conference. Several plans were suggested by which the ends desired by the two parties might be attained. One or two of them, after some consideration, found favor for a time with both Committees, but, as unforeseen objections arose, they were afterwards abandoned. The one most worthy of mention was a plan by which certain members of each Committee should be elected into the membership of the other, and should have the right of voting by letter. This arrangement, however, seemed

cumbersome, and likely to be attended by delay and other difficulties in its practical operation. It was also exposed to some objections connected with the relations of the English Committee to the Presses which had a certain control of their work. In view of these points it was rejected, and, indeed, was never altogether approved as a feasible and desirable one by either party.

The attitude of the English Committee towards the suggestions of the American Revisers was always that of readiness to give them most respectful consideration. In July, 1873, when the question of the relations of the two bodies was first brought under consideration, both the Old and New Testament Companies in England declared that they were "glad to have the opportunity of repeating the assurance that they will give the most careful consideration," and "will attach great weight and importance to all the suggestions of the American Committee." Two years later the same assurance was repeated, the two Companies again declaring that they "will continue to give the greatest possible weight to every suggestion of the American Committee and will also endeavor, whether by conference or otherwise, to arrive at an agreement upon any points of importance as to which the English Companies and the American Committee may not be fully agreed." Soon afterwards, and in connection with an able presentation of the case in London by Rev. Dr. Schaff, the plan of electing two members of each body into the other, which has been already alluded to, was proposed and adopted by both of the English Companies, and subsequently accepted by the American Committee. The difficulties in the way of making the plan effective, and certain complications connected with the transference of the pecuniary rights in the work from the Revisers in England to the Universities having, however, led to its abandonment, further negotiations were held with the Syndics and Delegates of the two Presses and the Revision Companies. These negotiations led to the result which was embodied in the following provisions :

---

#### MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT.

(DRAFT SUBMITTED BY THE UNIVERSITY PRESSES, AUG. 3. 1877.)

As a preliminary it seems desirable to state, that the primary object of the American Committee and the two English Companies is assumed to be, To obtain one and the same revision

of the present English Authorized Version of the Holy Scriptures.

For this end the following arrangement is proposed:

1. The English Companies will continue to send their first and provisional version to the American Committee from time to time for their observations thereon.

2. Such observations will be taken (as before) into careful consideration by the English Companies in connection with their second revision. The English Companies will then communicate to the American Committee the results of their second revision.

3. The English Companies will give reasonable time for the American Committee to return their remarks on any points that they may think important in these last communications; and, although the English Companies are precluded by the terms of their Constitution from undertaking a third revision, they will nevertheless take such remarks of the American Committee into special consideration before the conclusion of their labors.

4. If any differences shall still remain, the American Committee will yield its preferences for the sake of harmony; provided that such differences of reading and rendering as the American Committee may represent to the English Companies to be of special importance, be distinctly stated either in the Preface to the Revised Version, or in an Appendix to the volume, during a term of fourteen years from the date of publication, unless the American Churches shall sooner pronounce a deliberate opinion upon the Revised Version with the view of its being taken for public use.

5. The English Companies will communicate to the American Committee copies of their revision in its final form before it is given to the public.

6. All communications between the American Committee and the two English Companies relating to the work of revision to be regarded (as heretofore) as made in the strictest confidence.

7. The American Committee will in no case interfere with the interests of the two University Presses in the Revised Version as finally settled.

They will do what lies in their power to promote the freest cir-

ulation of the editions of the University Presses in the United States, not only by abstaining from issuing any editions of their own, but by recognizing the editions of the University Presses as the authorized editions, and in all proper ways favoring such issues and discouraging irresponsible issues, for the period of fourteen years.

8. If the Revised Version be adopted by the American Churches, it shall, after such term of fourteen years, become public property in the United States, as the Authorized Version is now.

NOTE.—By the term “American Churches” is understood all religious bodies in the United States which use the present Authorized Version in their public services.

This arrangement, which was proposed in August, 1877, was accepted by the American Committee a month later—the following resolution having at that time been passed :

(From the Minutes of the American Committee, Sept. 28, 1877.)

*Resolved*, That the American Bible Revision Committee hereby accept and ratify the agreement contained in the Memorial from Dr. Cartmell accompanying his letter of 3d of August, 1877, with the understanding in regard to Article 8th that the American Committee assume no responsibility in regard to the action of the American Churches, or in regard to any term beyond the period of fourteen years.

In consequence of this action, and as carrying out what was understood by both parties to be intended by the 8th Article of the agreement, the American Committee caused the statement which follows to be signed by their President and Secretary, and given to the American press before the publication of the Revised Version of the New Testament.

“The American Committee of Bible Revision hereby announce to the American public that only those editions of the New Revision, including marginal renderings, which are published or approved by the University Presses of England will be recognized by us as the authorized editions.”

The agreement thus finally made between the two bodies of Revisers secured some important results. It led to the utmost effort, consistent with due regard for honest convictions, to reach an en-



tirely harmonious conclusion in all cases. It prevented all possibility of a twofold Revision; and, in case the Authorized Version should be given up and the new work preferred, it continued to the churches of both nations one and the same English translation of the Scriptures. It guarded the public from irresponsible and imperfect editions, with all their errors, by establishing a single standard with which all must be compared, and to which all that would hope for success must conform. It freed the book from all restrictions from copyright in this country, and made it a gift to the people. A large proportion of the suggestions of the American Committee were adopted and embodied in the Revised Version. Many others, which were not adopted in their exact words, were inserted in a modified form which satisfactorily expressed the American views. A considerable number of those which were not thus incorporated in the text of the book were not deemed by the American Revisers of sufficient importance to render it necessary to insist upon them. In cases, however, where such importance was strongly felt by the American Committee, they were, in accordance with the agreement, distinctly recorded in an Appendix, which the English Revisers and the University Presses obligated themselves to publish in all their editions. The reader of the Revised Version will discover in the Appendix only a very small part of the results of the work of the American Committee. These results are found everywhere throughout the entire book.

It may be proper here to remark, that the heading of the American Appendix to the Revised Version of the New Testament, which was prepared by the Committee and forwarded with it to England, was as follows:

The American N. T. Revision Company, having in many cases yielded their preference for certain readings and renderings, present the following instances in which they differ from the English Company, as in their view of sufficient importance to be appended to the revision, in accordance with an understanding between the Companies.

This form sets forth more precisely the character of the Appendix, and the design in confining it within narrow limits, than the one which was substituted for it, and which appears in the New Testament as published.

The work of the American New Testament Company continued until the autumn of 1880 ; that of the Old Testament Company till the close of the year 1884. The whole Bible, after these twelve years of labor, appears in its Revised English Version, at this time, before the people of Great Britain and America. This Revised Version is now a fact in history. Those who have labored in the preparation of it have carefully and conscientiously examined and re-examined every verse and sentence and word. They now commit it to the English-speaking world. That it will meet unfavorable criticism—sometimes severe, sometimes thoughtless, sometimes from the conservative, and sometimes from the progressive side—as a part of it has already met such criticism, they do not doubt. But they entrust it to the future, knowing that the book will live, while the critics will die, and wishing only that their labors may contribute, in this generation and the coming ones, to make the Scriptures clearer in their true meaning to all men of the English race.

Whatever may be the final result of their work, the members of the Committee will find an abundant reward for the years spent upon it in the memory of their common studies and their long-continued and friendly association.

---

The Committee desire to record, in this review of their labors, their acknowledgment of the great service rendered to the cause of Revision by their President, Dr. Philip Schaff. His untiring energy and constant devotion to the interests of the work, from its inception to its close, deserve the thanks of all who have co-operated in any way in the preparation of the Revised Version, and also of all who shall find in it help and light in their reading of the Word of God. It was owing to him, more than to any other, that the work was undertaken in this country, and to him likewise is largely due the success with which the means for carrying it forward have been secured.

## MEMORIAL PAPERS.

It is believed that those who have aided in the work of the Committee, and all friends of the Revision, will be interested in the following commemorative papers respecting some of those who were engaged in the work, but were removed by death, either before the completion of the New Testament portion of it, or before the publication of the entire Revised Version. They have accordingly been inserted in this volume at this place, between the Record of the work itself and the account of the generous aid furnished by many benevolent friends, who enabled the Committee to carry it forward.



## MEMORIAL PAPERS.

---

### DR. HACKETT.

[From the Minutes, Nov. 26, 1875, p. 89.]

A committee consisting of Drs. Kendrick, Woolsey and Abbot was appointed to draft a minute commemorative of our associate, Dr. Hackett, deceased since our last meeting. They prepared the following paper, which was ordered to be placed on our records and a copy to be given to the press for publication:—

“With profound regret this Committee have to record the death, since their last session, of the Rev. Dr. Horatio Balch Hackett, one of our country’s most eminent biblical scholars and a loved and honored member of this board of revision. Dr. Hackett was born in Salisbury, Mass., December 27, 1808. Having been graduated with high honor from Amherst College and Andover Theological Seminary, he served for four years, first as adjunct Professor of the Latin and Greek Languages and Literature in Brown University, afterwards for many years as Professor of Biblical Literature in Newton Theological Institution, and during the last six years as Professor of New Testament Exegesis in the Rochester Theological Seminary. In all these positions his varied duties were discharged with eminent ability.

“As a biblical scholar he rose rapidly to take rank with the ablest scholars in our own and other lands. As a teacher he was no less distinguished. Uniting exact learning and vigorous method with a devout reverence for the sacred Word, and an intense enthusiasm that kindled into life even the driest grammatical details, he made his lecture-room, to all who frequented it, a place of unwonted quickening and inspiration. As an author, his various contributions to sacred literature have been exceedingly valuable. His Commentary on the Acts is regarded abroad as well as at home as of standard excellence; and his enlarged edition (undertaken in conjunction with Dr. Ezra Abbot) of Smith’s Dictionary of the Bible, to the English edition of which he was a contributor, has greatly enhanced the value of that excellent work, and won for him the lasting gratitude of students of the Scriptures.

“Dr. Hackett came to feel deeply the need of improving our excellent standard version of the Bible. For several years he lent

his valuable services to the American Bible Union, and when the American Board of Revisers was organized to co-operate with the English Revision Committee, he entered heartily into the work as a member of the New Testament section of our body. Though his increasingly delicate health forbade his uniform attendance at the meetings, yet his presence was always warmly greeted by his colleagues in revision, and to his opinions, expressed with invariable modesty, was accorded the weight due to ripe learning and an admirably balanced judgment.

“In his personal character he was no less estimable. Retiring as he was in disposition and living in scholarly seclusion, few knew how deep and warm were his affections, and how tender his sympathies; how refined were his tastes and how varied his culture; how wide was his outlook, and how just were his judgments of public affairs; how fervid was his patriotism, and how humble and unaffected was his piety; in short, what a wealth of noble and Christian qualities lay hidden beneath that quiet exterior. In all his relations as a man, a teacher, a scholar, and a Christian he commanded at once love and veneration, and his later pupils were wont to trace in his gentle and chastened enthusiasm a resemblance to the ‘Beloved Disciple’ whose writings he so genially expounded. Nobly has he accomplished his earthly work, and in the higher sphere to which death has translated him, he is enjoying, we doubt not, the fruits of a life of faithful consecration to the service of the Church and the Church’s Lord. With heartfelt gratitude to Him who has given to the Church the blessing of such a life we place on record this imperfect tribute to his high scholarly and personal excellence.”

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of this Committee be requested to transmit to the family of Dr. Hackett a copy of the above minute, with the assurance of our tender sympathy with them in their sore bereavement, and our prayer that the Heavenly Comforter may impart to them His abundant consolations.

GEORGE E. DAY, *Sec.*

---

#### PROFESSOR TAYLER LEWIS.

[From the Minutes, Jan. 25, 1878, pp. 132, 134.]

42 BIBLE HOUSE, NEW YORK, Jan. 25, 1878.

The following paper respecting the life and services of the late Prof. Tayler Lewis was adopted unanimously. It was also voted

that it be recorded in the minutes and published in the religious newspapers :

“ The death of so distinguished a scholar as Dr. Lewis calls for a passing tribute from his brethren of the American Bible Revision Committee. While his physical infirmities limited his cooperation in our work to the occasional communication of written suggestions, these were always highly prized, and his interest in the progress and success of the work was by many signs known to be deep and genuine. It was a source of much regret to the Old Testament Company that they could not enjoy more frequently and abundantly the results of his prolonged and profound biblical and philological studies.

“ From the profession of the law, which he had entered, Dr. Lewis early turned to the more congenial work of a scholar, teacher, and man of letters. For more than forty years he was by profession a teacher, and was nearly the whole of this period connected first with the University of New York and later with Union College. His special department was that of the Greek language and literature ; and after disabling infirmities cut him off from the ordinary work of the recitation room, his own genius and enthusiasm continued to inspire class after class in the lecture room, and in his parlors, with something of his own admiration for Greek literature and philosophy. His studies in Hebrew and the cognate languages began early and were prosecuted with characteristic energy and with rich results. His well-worn Hebrew Bible bears witness, through his memoranda, to the frequency with which he had many years ago re-read it in course. And he left behind him numerous and carefully elaborated comments on many of its difficult passages. The Committee cannot withhold the expression of the wish that these notes, or a judicious selection from them, may yet be published, in addition to the biblical studies which he had given to the public during his life. Dr. Lewis was no recluse. In philosophical, political and theological discussion he was deeply interested, and with unusual versatility and power took ready part in such debates. He was not merely a loyal and valiant, but an aggressive, champion of what he held to be the truth. Especially were all his energies and resources ready for the most prompt and vigorous use in maintaining the supremacy of the Word of God over all human thinking and living. With him has passed away one who in the variety and extent of his resources and attainments has reflected honor upon

American scholarship, and whose memory will be cherished by all who appreciate his faithful labors for Christ."

---

DR. NATHAN BISHOP.

[From the Minutes, Sept. 25, 1880, p. 148.]

The following paper, prepared by Dr. Schaff, commemorative of the late Hon. Nathan Bishop, LL.D., was adopted :

"The American Revision Committee record with profound sorrow the death of Dr. Nathan Bishop, Chairman of the Committee on Finance, who was called to his reward August 7, 1880, at Saratoga, aged seventy-two years.

"We share in the universal esteem for his pure and consistently Christian character, his amiable and catholic spirit, his sound judgment, his generous liberality in promoting every good cause. He was a man who delighted in doing good without ostentation, from principle and from pure love to his Lord and his fellow-men. He took a deep and intelligent interest in the revision movement from the start, and never doubted for a moment its final success. He was the most liberal and cheerful contributor toward the expenses of our Committee, and considered it an honor and privilege to promote a cause so sacred and important to all readers of the Word of God. His name is identified with the labors of this Committee, and his memory will be cherished by all who personally knew him.

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this minute be sent to the widow of Dr. Bishop."

---

DR. WASHBURN.

[From the Minutes, Oct. 28, 1881, p. 163.]

The following memorial paper, prepared by Bishop Lee, on the death of Rev. Dr. Washburn, was read and adopted, and the Secretary was directed to send a copy of the same to his widow, and also to the public press :

"Since the conclusion of the labors of the New Testament Company, it has pleased Almighty God to take out of this world one of their number, the Reverend Edward A. Washburn, D.D., Rector of Calvary Church, in the City of New York.

"It is the desire of those associated so long with him in this



important work to place upon their records an expression of their high estimate of the character of their lamented fellow-laborer, and of their affectionate regard for his memory.

“Dr. Washburn was a man whose marked ability and noble qualities commanded universal respect, while his ready sympathy and kindness endeared him to a large circle of friends. He was a scholar, assiduous and well trained, whose powerful mind readily grasped and fed upon knowledge, both secular and sacred. As a faithful pastor and an instructive, forcible preacher, he stood in the foremost rank. In the pursuit of truth he was honest and earnest, and in the avowal of his convictions fearless and outspoken. In his whole intercourse he was remarkably transparent, open and genuine—a man to be admired, trusted and loved.

“In the present revision of the English Bible his interest was enlisted from the beginning. He took an early and decided stand as its advocate, and the first public meeting in this country in behalf of the undertaking was held in his church. Disease, against which he manfully struggled through a large part of his life, drove him to a foreign land in search of health soon after the labors of the Committee commenced, and after his return the same cause often interrupted his attendance at our meetings. It has been a source of great regret to his associates that they lost so much of the advantage that would have accrued from his more frequent co-operation. But when he could be with us his presence was gladly welcomed, and his suggestions highly valued. Upon his connection with this work we look back with satisfaction and gratitude. He was not permitted to hail the public appearance of the volume to which he had given so much time and thought, but its saving truths were dear to his heart, and we cannot doubt through divine grace were instrumental in preparing him for the event which came so unexpectedly.

“Removed in the fulness of his ripened powers and in the height of his usefulness, his end might seem to us premature, but we bow in submission to His will who doeth all things well.”

---

#### DR. BURR.

[From the Minutes, Oct. 26, 1882, pp. 175-177.]

The following tribute to the memory of the Rev. Jonathan Kelsey Burr, D.D., of the New Testament Company, deceased

since our last meeting, presented by Dr. Strong, was unanimously adopted, and directed to be placed upon our minutes, with the request to Dr. Strong to communicate the same to the surviving members of Dr. Burr's family :

“ The Rev. Jonathan Kelsey Burr, D.D., a member of the New Testament Company of the American Bible Revision Committee, who died April 24, 1882, was born in Middletown, Conn., September 21, 1825, and graduated from the Wesleyan University in 1845, and in 1846 was a student in the Union Theological Seminary. With the exception of the last two years of his life, when he was gradually failing with consumption, he spent the intermediate years in the active ministry of the Methodist Episcopal Church, occupying several of the most important pulpits within the bounds of the New Jersey and the Newark Conferences. As a preacher and pastor he held a high rank in his denomination, and was universally respected and beloved for his scholarly attainments, his uniform urbanity, and his diligent habits. He was the friend of the rich and the poor alike, and was equally welcome and at home in the elegant mansion and in the humblest dwelling. He was a man of extensive reading, of refined taste, and of thorough culture, as well as of deep but undemonstrative piety. Modesty combined with activity was a marked feature of his character, and his conduct in every relation of life evinced a genuine heartiness and an earnest sobriety which were the result of much self-discipline, a just estimate of his own powers and duties, and a manly integrity of purpose. His literary qualification for the position which he filled among us with so much ability, credit and acceptableness, was also shown in a very excellent series of annotations on the book of Job, and in occasional contributions to the religious journals. His estimable widow has since deceased, and two promising sons are thus left entire orphans. We record this memorial in token of our appreciation of his character and services, and our sympathy with his surviving friends.”

---

#### DR. KRAUTH.

At the regular monthly meeting of the Old Testament Company of the American Bible Revision Committee held in the Bible House, New York, February 23d, 1883, the following tribute to the memory of our late associate, the Rev. Dr. Charles P. Krauth, Vice-Provost

of the University of Pennsylvania, prepared by the Rev. Dr. Chambers, was adopted and directed to be presented to the whole Committee at their next annual meeting in order to be placed upon their records.

GEORGE E. DAY, Secretary.

CHARLES PORTERFIELD KRAUTH, D.D., LL. D.

Born March 17th, 1823, in Martinsburg, Va.

Died January 2d, 1883, in Philadelphia, Pa.

His paternal grandfather came to this country from Germany in the latter part of the last century, and was teacher and organist in one of the Reformed churches. His father, Charles Philip Krauth (1797-1867), was successively pastor of Lutheran churches in Martinsburg and Philadelphia, President of Pennsylvania College at Gettysburg, and Professor in the Theological Seminary at the same place. Our friend and associate was his oldest son, and consequently enjoyed great advantages in his early training. He was graduated in 1839 from the college of which his father was president, and immediately commenced theological studies under Drs. Schmucker and Schmidt. Having concluded these with high honor, he was ordained in 1842, and became pastor of a church in Baltimore. Subsequently he held the same office in Winchester, Va., and in Pittsburgh, Pa. In 1859 he was called to St. Mark's Lutheran Church, Philadelphia, and two years afterward became editor of the *Lutheran and Missionary*, through which he made himself widely felt throughout the religious press. In 1864 he was appointed Professor of Theology and Church History in the new Seminary then established in Philadelphia. In 1868 he was elected to the chair of Moral and Intellectual Philosophy in the University of Pennsylvania, and five years afterward was made Vice-Provost of the institution. In the discharge of the duties of these various offices, together with occasional preaching of the Word, he continued until his death, constantly growing in influence and usefulness as time developed his rare qualities in guiding and stimulating the young men under his charge. But his earthly tabernacle proved frailer than one would have supposed from his commanding presence. He sought to gain relief from growing infirmities by a visit to Europe in the year 1880, but the improvement was superficial and short-lived, and on the 2d day of this year, after an illness of a fortnight, he quietly fell asleep in Jesus.

Our friend did not round out the usual measure of man's days,

but he performed enough work to satisfy the most exacting demand. His course, whether in the pulpit, or the editorial room, or the professorial chair, was one of incessant activity. His published writings are numerous. They consist not only of such elaborate volumes as the *Conservative Reformation and its Theology*, the translation of Tholuck's *Commentary on the Gospel of John*, the enlargement of Fleming's *Vocabulary of Philosophy*, a new edition of Berkeley's *Philosophical Writings*, but also of various minor treatises touching questions in Theology and Church History, by which he exerted a vast influence in his own denomination. His mind, strong and versatile by nature, was assiduously cultivated from early youth. His studies were confined mainly to theology in its various branches, to philosophy and literature in its wide acceptance. He had accumulated a very large private library (14,000 volumes) which was a selection as well as a collection. He was, consequently, unusually well informed on all matters relating to his chosen sphere, being a careful as well as a constant reader. This fact made him a formidable antagonist in any question respecting the history of opinion.

In his theological views he was a Lutheran of the Lutherans, being a zealous defender and maintainer of the *Augustana*, pure and simple, and he headed the reaction which has been going on for a generation in our country against the influences which were thought to assail the integrity or the authority of the venerable Confession of Augsburg. But while he strove with all his might for the preservation of Lutheran doctrine and order, he cherished a catholic spirit, and took a cordial interest in the prosperity of all evangelical Christians. He became a member of this body at its commencement, and although hindered, sometimes by professional engagements, at others by the state of his health, from being as regular in attendance as was desirable, his presence was always an advantage, and his large acquaintance with the early English versions of the Scriptures, and with the best idioms of our tongue, made his suggestions often of very great value in the settlement of a disputed issue. In personal intercourse he was one of the most delightful of companions, genial, courteous, full of resources, sparkling with wit and anecdote, yet always preserving the elevated tone of a Christian gentleman. It would have been gratifying if he had been spared to witness the termination of our labors, and rejoice with us in a successful result. But the Lord saw fit to order events otherwise, and we bow in

submission to His holy will, taking a melancholy pleasure in putting on record this testimonial to our departed brother. His death is a great loss not only to the important religious body of which he was a shining ornament, but also to the whole Church of Christ in this land, and to the republic of letters. Our country has produced few men who united in their own persons so many of the excellences which distinguish the scholar, the theologian, the exegete, the debater, and the leader of his brethren, as did our accomplished associate. His learning did not smother his genius, nor did his philosophical attainments impair the simplicity of his faith. All gifts and all acquisitions were sedulously made subservient to the Gospel of Christ. He illustrated his teachings by his life, and has left behind him a memory precious and fragrant not only to his own large communion but to multitudes beyond its pale.

---

EZRA ABBOT, D.D., LL.D.

Born in Jackson, Maine, April 28, 1819.

Died in Cambridge, Mass., March 21, 1884.

*"The grass withereth, and the flower falleth; but the word of the Lord abideth forever."*

In the death of Professor Abbot the New Testament Revision Company are summoned a third time, since the completion of their work, to mourn the departure of one of their number. With their associates of the Old Testament Company they would reverently bow to the Divine appointment, and thoughtfully take to heart its admonitions.

The secluded life of Dr. Abbot, and his singularly modest and retiring disposition, rendered him almost, if not quite, a stranger to every one of us till we entered on our work together in these rooms. In general deliberations respecting matters of business, and particularly in those discussions, alike animated and delicate, which involved our relations to the English Revisers and the University Presses, his voice was heard but seldom. Yet whenever he spoke, his characteristic clearness of apprehension, his accurate and complete recollection of facts, his judicial impartiality and dispassionate-ness, and above all his personal willingness to become anything or nothing, if so be the Word of God in

its purity might have the freer course, seldom failed to become manifest.

His sphere of conspicuous service, however, was the Revision work. Always one of the first in his place at the table, and one of the last to quit it, he brought with him thither the results of careful preparation. His suggestions were seldom the promptings of the moment. Hence they always commanded consideration; often secured instant adoption. Well versed in the resources of our ancestral tongue, gifted with an ear for its rhythm, and trained to a nice discrimination in his use of it, he rendered appreciable service in securing for the new translation certain felicities of expression to which its critics, amid their clamorous censure of its defects, have hitherto failed to render due recognition. But it was in questions affecting the Greek text that Dr. Abbot's exceptional gifts and attainments were pre-eminently helpful. Several of his essays on debated passages, appended to the printed reports of our proceedings which were forwarded from time to time to the brethren in England, are among the most thorough discussions of the sort which are extant, won immediate respect for American scholarship in this department, and had no small influence in determining that form of the sacred text which will ultimately, we believe, find acceptance with all Christian scholars.

To his distinction as a scholar, Dr. Abbot added rare excellence as a Christian. Such chastened sweetness of disposition, such disciplined regard for the sensibilities of his associates, such studied generosity in debate, such patient deference when over-ruled, such magnanimous equanimity in victory as were habitual with him, were never surpassed among us. Differing from the rest of us as he did in some of his theological tenets, his Christ-like temper rendered him a brother beloved, and lends a heavenly lustre to his memory.

We, his survivors, desire to place on record our affectionate tribute to his worth, and to offer to his bereaved kindred a tender expression of our sympathy.

REVISION ROOMS, 42 AND 44 BIBLE HOUSE, NEW YORK,  
FRIDAY, April 25, 1884.

The above minute, presented by Dr. Thayer, was unanimously adopted by the Committee.

# REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE AND LIST OF DONORS AND SUBSCRIBERS.

---

## ORGANIZATION OF THE FINANCE COMMITTEE.

THE Revision of the English Scriptures for public use was undertaken as a labor of love, without any prospect of reward except the conscientiousness of doing a good work for the benefit of English-speaking Christendom. But no enterprise of such magnitude, embracing so many workers and extending through nearly fourteen years, can be accomplished without considerable expense for traveling, printing, clerical aid, books, room-rent and incidentals. The expenses of the English Committee, to the extent of \$100,000 and more, were assumed at an early stage by the University Presses of Oxford and Cambridge in consideration of the exclusive right of publication within her Majesty's dominions. The expenses of the American Committee were raised in our usual American fashion by voluntary contributions. No aid was ever asked or offered from any foreign quarter.

For four years the contributions were solicited by the President and a few members of the Committee, Professor Short acting as Treasurer. A report was made from time to time to contributors in parlor meetings. Some kind lay friends volunteered to relieve the Committee of this additional burden; and in May, 1875, a Committee of Finance in co-operation with the Revision Committee was organized.

All the necessary funds for the Revision work have been raised, first by soliciting donations, and afterward in the more convenient way of offering to contributors of \$10 each a presentation copy of the Memorial volume of the New Testament. The responses enabled the Committee to return to the subscribers what may be regarded as a full equivalent for their contribution. The Memorial volumes were ordered from the University Presses and delivered free of charge. They are gotten up in the very best style of printing and binding, and have given universal satisfaction. The Memorial copies will increase in value as they grow older and rarer.

The success of this plan induced the Finance Committee to offer by a circular, dated January 3, 1882, a Memorial Copy of the Revised Old Testament, bound in levant morocco, to every contributor of \$20 toward meeting the expenses for the completion of the work. In the autumn of 1884 another circular was issued, informing contributors that it had been determined to bind the Memorial copies of the Old Testament in four volumes, and that the Committee could offer the four-volume copy at \$30, or the two-volume copy at \$25, and that those who had hitherto contributed \$20, in consideration of which they were entitled to a two-volume copy, could increase the contribution to \$30 for the other copy, if that was preferred. The answer to the circulars was prompt and liberal. The result is thought to be sufficient for the further expenses. If there should be a balance

left in the treasury, it will be devoted to some benevolent object connected with Bible Revision or Bible distribution.

The gentlemen who first constituted the Finance Committee, or who afterward became connected with it, are :

Nathan Bishop, LL.D., New York. (D. 1880.)  
 Rev. William Adams, D.D., New York. (D. 1880.)  
 Rev. Thos. D. Anderson, D.D., New York. (D. 1881.)  
 Mr. A. S. Barnes, New York.  
 Mr. M. C. D. Borden, New York.  
 Mr. Alexander Brown, Philadelphia.  
 Mr. Jas. M. Brown, New York.  
 Mr. Wm. A. Cauldwell, New York.  
 Mr. Wm. E. Dodge, New York. (D. 1883.)  
 Rev. H. Dyer, D.D., New York.  
 Mr. John Elliott, New York.  
 Judge E. L. Fancher, LL.D., New York.  
 Prof. Wm. Gammell, LL.D., Providence, R. I.  
 Mr. John C. Havemeyer, New York.  
 Mr. Morris K. Jesup, New York.  
 Mr. Francis T. King, Baltimore, Md.  
 Rt. Rev. Henry C. Potter, D.D., New York.  
 Mr. Howard Potter, New York.  
 Mr. S. B. Schieffelin, New York.  
 Mr. Elliott F. Shepard, New York.  
 Mr. John Sloane, New York.  
 Mr. Roswell Smith, New York. (Resigned 1881.)  
 Rev. R. S. Storrs, D.D., Brooklyn, N. Y.  
 Mr. Andrew L. Taylor, New York.  
 Mr. Chas. Tracy, New York. (D. 1885.)  
 Mr. John B. Trevor, New York.  
 Mr. Alexander Van Rensselaer, New York. (D. 1878.)  
 Mr. Samuel D. Warren, Boston, Mass.  
 Mr. Norman White, New York. (D. 1883.)  
 Mr. F. S. Winston, New York. (D. 1885.)

The officers of the Finance Committee have been :

Nathan Bishop, LL.D., Chairman (died, 1880).  
 Judge E. L. Fancher, LL.D., Chairman (since 1880).  
 Andrew L. Taylor, Treasurer.

The Treasurer reports the total amount of contributions (including remission of duties and other items) from the beginning of the work in 1872 to May 11, 1883, as \$44,761.60.

The expenses during the same period for traveling, for clerk hire, for office expenses, for printing, and for books have been \$35,225.66, leaving a balance in the treasury of \$9,535.94 on May 11, 1883, on which date the account was examined and certified to by the Auditing Committee.

The supplemental statement of the Treasurer from May 11, 1883, to January 29, 1885, shows total receipts to that date \$47,561.46, and total payments \$38,469.67, and a balance in the treasury of \$9,091.79.



The balance in hand will be used for the further expenses of the Committee, for the publication of a Documentary History, and for the purchase of Memorial copies of the Revised Old Testament.

The following resolution, passed unanimously by the Revision Committee, finds an appropriate place at this point :

[From the Minutes, Jan. 27, 1881, p. 160.]

*Resolved*, That the American Bible Revision Committee recognize and acknowledge the efficient and cordial co-operation which has been given to their work by the gratuitous services of Mr. Andrew L. Taylor, and hereby record their thanks for the financial furtherance of their labors due to his ready activity as their Treasurer.

This acknowledgment was unanimously adopted.

BOOKS PUBLISHED BY  
OR IN CONNECTION WITH  
THE AMERICAN REVISION COMMITTEE.

---

THE REVISION OF THE ENGLISH VERSION OF THE  
NEW TESTAMENT,

BY

J. B. LIGHTFOOT, D.D.,  
CANON OF ST. PAUL'S,  
AND HULSEAN PROFESSOR OF DIVINITY, CAMBRIDGE;  
RICHARD CHEVENIX TRENCH, D.D.,  
ARCHBISHOP OF DUBLIN;

C. J. ELLICOTT, D.D.,  
BISHOP OF GLOUCESTER AND BRISTOL.

WITH AN INTRODUCTION

BY

PHILIP SCHAFF, D.D.,  
PROFESSOR OF DIVINITY IN THE UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, NEW YORK.

NEW YORK:  
HARPER & BROS.  
1873.

The *Introduction* was published separately by order of the Committee (3d ed. 1875), and distributed among the patrons of the Revision as a sort of programme.

---

ANGLO-AMERICAN BIBLE REVISION,

BY

MEMBERS OF THE  
AMERICAN REVISION COMMITTEE.

PRINTED FOR PRIVATE CIRCULATION.

NEW YORK:  
NOS. 42 & 44 BIBLE HOUSE.  
PUBLISHED BY THE AMERICAN SUNDAY-SCHOOL UNION, PHILADELPHIA.  
1879.

This book has gone through several editions and was twice reprinted in London by James Nisbet & Co., and the London Sunday-School Union, 56 Old Bailey.

The following is a list of articles :

List of English Revisers.

List of American Revisers.

Anglo-American Revision.

Introductory Statement. PHILIP SCHAFF.

The Authorized Version and English Versions on which it is based.

CHAS. P. KRAUTH.

The English Bible as a Classic. T. W. CHAMBERS.

Reasons for a New Revision. THEODORE D. WOOLSEY.

The Current Version and Present Needs. G. EMLEN HARE.  
 The Hebrew Text of the Old Testament. HOWARD OSGOOD.  
 Hebrew Philology and Biblical Science. W. HENRY GREEN.  
 Helps for Translating the Hebrew Scriptures at the Time the Ancient Version  
 was Made. GEORGE E. DAY.  
 Inaccuracies of the Authorized Version of the Old Testament.

JOSEPH PACKARD.

The New Testament Text. EZRA ABBOT.  
 Inaccuracies of the Authorized Version in respect of Grammar and Exegesis.

A. C. KENDRICK.

True Conservatism in Respect to Changes in the English and Greek Text.

TIMOTHY DWIGHT.

The Greek Verb in the New Testament. MATTHEW B. RIDDLE.

Unwarranted Verbal Differences and Agreements in the English Version.

J. HENRY THAYER.

Archaisms; or, Obsolete and Unusual Words and Phrases in the English  
 Bible. HOWARD CROSBY.

The Proper Names of the Bible. CHARLES A. AIKEN.

The Use of Italics in the Bible. THOMAS CHASE.

Paragraphs, Chapters, and Verses in the Bible. JAMES STRONG.

Revision of the Scriptures and Church Authority. ALFRED LEE.

General Index. )

Index of Texts. )

---

## THE NEW REVISION AND ITS STUDY,

JOHN D. WATTLES.

PHILADELPHIA :

1881.

### CONTENTS.

The Gospels in the New Revision. By Professor EZRA ABBOT, D.D., LL.D.

The Acts in the New Revision. By Professor M. B. RIDDLE, D.D.

The Pauline Epistles in the New Revision. By Professor TIMOTHY DWIGHT, D.D.

The Epistle to the Hebrews in the New Revision. By Professor J. HENRY  
 THAYER, D.D.

The Catholic Epistles in the New Revision. By Professor A. C. KENDRICK, D.D.,  
 LL.D.

The Revelation in the New Testament. By Chancellor HOWARD CROSBY, D.D.,  
 LL.D.

---

## PRAISE-SONGS OF ISRAEL.

A NEW RENDERING OF THE BOOK OF PSALMS,

BY

JOHN DE WITT, D.D.

OF THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, NEW BRUNSWICK, N. J.  
 A MEMBER OF THE AMERICAN OLD TESTAMENT REVISION COMPANY.

NEW YORK :

RICHARD BRINKERHOFF.

1884.

Dedicated to the American Revision Committee.

---

A COMPANION TO THE GREEK TESTAMENT AND  
THE ENGLISH VERSION,

BY

PHILIP SCHLAFF,

PRESIDENT OF THE AMERICAN COMMITTEE ON REVISION.

WITH FAC-SIMILE ILLUSTRATIONS OF MSS. AND STANDARD EDITIONS OF THE NEW  
TESTAMENT.

HARPER & BROS.

NEW YORK

MACMILLAN & CO., LONDON.

1883.

2D EDITION, REVISED, 1885.

Dedicated to the American Revision Committee.

---

A COMPANION TO THE REVISED OLD TESTAMENT,

SHOWING THE LEADING CHANGES MADE AND THE REASONS FOR MAKING THEM.

BY

TALBOT W. CHAMBERS, D.D.

A MEMBER OF THE OLD TESTAMENT REVISION COMPANY.

NEW YORK :

FUNK & WAGNALLS.

1885.

















W. G. P. ... of the ... of the ...



1 1012 00059 7270