

THE BISHOP'S ENGLISH

GEO. WASHINGTON MOON.

UC-NRLF



QB 246 B12

LIBRARY
OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA.

Class



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation



THE BISHOP'S ENGLISH

THE
UNIVERSITY OF
CALIFORNIA



Geo. Washington Moon

THE BISHOP'S ENGLISH :

A SERIES OF CRITICISMS

On the Right Rev. Bishop Thornton's Laudation of

THE REVISED VERSION OF THE SCRIPTURES ;

AND ALSO ON THE

ENGLISH OF THE REVISERS,

SHOWING THAT THE VERSION PUT FORTH BY THEM, AND LIKEWISE
THE AUTHORISED VERSION, CONTAIN ERRORS AGAINST
RELIGION AND MORALS SO UNPARDONABLE AS
TOTALLY TO UNFIT THEM FOR CIRCULATION,

*And that it is slandering GOD to call either of them
HIS WORD.*

BY

GEO. WASHINGTON MOON, *Hon. F.R.S.L.*,

AUTHOR OF "THE DEAN'S ENGLISH," "THE REVISERS' ENGLISH," ETC.

With the Author's Portrait.

SECOND EDITION.

London:

SWAN SONNENSCHN & CO., LIMITED.

NEW YORK: E. P. DUTTON & CO.

1904

All rights reserved.

BS 188
M6
1904

TO THE
LIBRARY OF THE
CONGRESS

Dedicated

TO THE MEMORY OF MY ANCESTOR

THOMAS ALDAM

OF WARMSWORTH, IN THE COUNTY OF YORK

ONE OF THE EARLIEST MEMBERS

OF

“THE SOCIETY OF FRIENDS”

A good man, who died in peace with all men, and loving
trust in God, A.D. 1660

The Bible was to him his greatest treasure; and preaching its truths, his greatest delight. But he was persecuted, he was reviled, he was buffeted, he was spit upon, and for conscience's sake he suffered the robbing of his goods, and endured years of cruel imprisonment. However, the knowledge of his own rectitude and of God's love sustained him through it all; and, on his release, being moved with sympathy for his companions in tribulation, he visited and condoled with them in the various prisons throughout the kingdom, drew up a report of the wrongs and sufferings of his co-religionists, personally laid it before Oliver Cromwell, and pleaded repeatedly, in the name of humanity and justice, that they might be liberated. His petition being finally rejected, he fearlessly denounced the Protector to his face for his tyranny, and predicted the downfall of his government.—“Encyclopædia Britannica,” 8th edition, vol. xviii. p. 718.

221591

ABBREVIATIONS EMPLOYED IN THIS WORK

A.V.—Authorised Version.

R.V.—Revised Version.

C.A.—Codex Alexandrinus.

C.S.—Codex Sinaiticus.

C.V.—Codex Vaticanus.

PREFACE.

THE English language is the common property of us all for our mutual benefit; and our duty is strenuously to oppose all corrupting influences which would mar the beauty of the language, weaken its force, and degrade it from its proud prerogative of being a sacred shrine for our noblest aspirations.

Hence the compilation of this work, which consists of criticisms on the English of the Revisers and on the English of the Right Reverend Bishop Thornton, the latest advocate on behalf of the so-called "*Revised*" Version of the Bible.

Perhaps the public, if they care at all about the matter, will not be surprised at my taking up the gauntlet which the Bishop, in publishing his essay on this subject, has thus thrown down; for, I do so in defence of a position which I carried at the point of the pen, forty years ago in combat with the late Dean Alford, and twenty years ago in combat with the Revisers and their champions.

I am an old man now, being in my eightieth year, and consequently am not so "keen of fence" as I was then; but I may still be able to do some-

thing which, if not redoubtable, may haply be deemed of public service in an attempted overthrow of disgraceful error.

It will be said that the fearful severity of these Criticisms demands justification. I admit it; and I am prepared to justify the severity of every criticism which I have written. But I would preface the justification by saying that, for the Revisers themselves and for their advocate, the Right Reverend Bishop Thornton, I entertain profound respect; believing them to be conscientious men. They did their best; and no man could do more.

But, in their zeal for the Truth, they erred in undertaking work for which they were not qualified. Profound Hebrew and Greek scholars they probably were; but unquestionably they were lamentably deficient in the knowledge of their own mother tongue—*e.g.* what Englishman who is master of his own language would ever think of writing such a sentence as the following, unless he wished to convey the idea that GOD has a brother whom it is our duty to love! "*This commandment have we from him, that he who loveth GOD love his brother also.*"—1 John iv. 21.

Sometimes the ideas are blasphemous; as in Rev. xiv. 10, where the pronoun "*he*" grammati-

cally refers to GOD; while the pronoun "*their*" grammatically refers to HIM and to the holy angels and to the Lamb. The passage is as follows:—
"*. . . the wine of the wrath of GOD, which is prepared unmixed in the cup of HIS anger; and HE shall be tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of THE HOLY ANGELS, and in the presence of THE LAMB: and the smoke of THEIR torment goeth up for ever and ever.*"

In Rom. i. 27, the most degrading obscenity is palliated by being euphemistically designated an "*error*." The Greek word means "*wandering*"; but, in the New Testament, it means that wandering from the right path which is due to wilful corruption; consequently our word "*error*" does not adequately convey the meaning of the Greek.

In 1 Cor. vii. 36, the shocking crime of incest between father and daughter is declared to be *not sinful!*

Sometimes the ideas are humorous; as in Gen. vi. 16-22, where it says that Noah had "*stories*" [not storeys] in the ark; as if the patriarch had provided himself with a little light literature for rainy days.

And sometimes the language is execrably infelicitous in its suggestiveness; as in Job xx. 15, where we read of riches, under the similitude of food, which, it is said, "*he shall vomit up again.*"

But, before anything can be vomited up "*again,*" it must have been vomited up previously, and then have been swallowed a second time!

It is such sentences as these (combined with the fact of their occurring in the Sacred Volume) which arouse one's indignation, and fully justify the severity of the Criticisms.

I leave the work to speak for itself.

GEO. WASHINGTON MOON,
Hon. F.R.S.L.

7 PRINCE'S TERRACE,
SUSSEX SQUARE,
BRIGHTON.

EXTRACTS FROM REVIEWS.

The Times.—Mr Washington Moon's first heading is "Blasphemy." The Revisers speak of God as if he were a human being with a Christian name, as in, "There came a man, sent from God, whose name was John." They also imply that God has a brother—"That he who loveth God love his brother also." However, Mr Moon, who has written a good deal on errors in English, is editing a new "Revised English" Bible, when these things will be put right.

The Literary Guide.—Bishop Thornton deemed he was doing quite the proper and usual thing when he praised the Revised Version of the Bible as "light in all its purity and clearness." Ordinary folk do not scrutinise such rhapsodies too closely. No flattery is too gross if applied to the Bible, and the Bible never blushes. But Mr George Washington Moon keeps perpetual watch upon all evil-doers in the realm of the King's English; and his merciless lantern throws an awful gleam on misplaced adverbs and vile syntax. His present book is a record of grammatical crimes—and, worse things—committed by the bad Revisers. To complete their punishment, he prints a full list of the learned and unlearned gentlemen who pretended to give us an uncorrupt translation of God's own Word. The result is amusing enough for seaside reading.

Mr Moon cries "*Paccuse*" on every page, and, in most instances, he is justified by the text. He says: a curious slip occurs in 1 Tim. iii. 12: "Let deacons be husbands of one wife. Now, says our literary policeman:

It does not say (though doubtless Paul meant it, and the Revisers ought to have put it so), "let *each* deacon be the *husband* of one wife." No! virtually the Revisers say that the 'one wife' is to be the common property of *deacons*; they are to be her *husbands*.

The long series of Mr Moon's exposures is a treasury of recreation for the man who is moderately well acquainted with his Lindley Murray.

We are grateful to Mr Washington Moon, on purely literary grounds, for his vigorous assault on the Revised Version.

The Expository Times.—Mr Washington Moon has written another volume against the English of the Revised Version. It is like a book of the dead. For, it is forty years since Mr Moon made his name known through "The Dean's English," a clever attack on Dean Alford's "The Queen's English." But Mr Moon is not dead. Judging by the vigour of his language here, though eighty, his natural force is little abated. He calls his new book "The Bishop's English," for, it is a chastisement of Bishop Thornton, Suffragan of Manchester, for daring to recommend the use of the Revised Version in public worship.

The School World.—The Revisers themselves are

declared to have produced an “ungrammatical, immoral and blasphemous version.” This contention Mr Washington Moon expounds upon many pages, with copious examples. The Revised Version is practically a dead book, and it was scarcely worth while to devote so much attention to its deficiencies.

The London Quarterly Review.—Mr Washington Moon’s plea for absolute clearness in the framing of sentences ought to lead many of us to prune our pages. In that respect the little book is to be welcomed, and it shows that the critic who attacked “The Dean’s English” forty years ago is still as acute, and, we might add, as severe, as he was at the age of forty.

The Birmingham Daily Post.—Anyone gifted with a sense of humour will enjoy reading this remarkable little book, by the well-known author of “The Dean’s English,” “The King’s English,” and several other books of the kind, exposing common errors in speaking and writing. Forty years ago the author had combat with Dean Alford. Now, he says, “I am an old man,” and “being in my eightieth year . . . am not so ‘keen of fence.’” Yet the vim and vigour of this onslaught are amazing. They certainly afford no evidence of age or dulled perception. The sub-title admirably defines the scope of the work; it reads: “A series of criticisms on the Right Rev. Bishop Thornton’s laudation of the Revised Version of the Scriptures; and also on the English of the revisers, showing that the version put forth by them, and likewise the Authorised Version, contain errors against religion and morals so

unpardonable as totally to unfit it for circulation." This is a "large order," but most impartial readers will admit that it has been fully and ably executed. Englishmen who are masters of their own language, and have a high regard for it, will appreciate most Mr Washington Moon's efforts. Here is a minor example of his method: "Mark xiv. 3—'She brake the cruse, and poured it over his head.' Broken pieces of alabaster, even if scented with spikenard, could not have been very pleasant on the head. But probably the revisers meant the ointment. Their language often says what they do not mean." Perhaps a better illustration is the following: "In Mark vi. 7-8, another curious incident is related. It is this: 'He gave them authority over the unclean spirits; and he charged *them* that *they* should take nothing for *their* journey.' What journey were 'the unclean spirits' going to take? And why was Jesus interested in their luggage? Perhaps the Bishop will tell us, as he praises the Revised Version. To him it is 'light in all its purity and clearness.'"

The Christian Age.—Mr Washington Moon contends with some reason that many passages in the Revised Version are very bad English and worse sense. The book is largely taken up with examples, of which the following may be mentioned. In Rev. xiv. 10, Revised Version, the pronoun "*he*" grammatically refers to God, while the pronoun "*their*" refers to Him, and to the holy angels, and to the Lamb. The passage is as follows: ". . . the wine of the wrath of *God*,

which is prepared unmixed in the cup of *His* anger, and *He* shall be tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of *the Holy Angels*, and in the presence of *the Lamb*; and the smoke of *their* torment shall go up for ever and ever."

In Genesis vi. 16-22, the Revised Version says that Noah had "*stories*" (not storeys) in the Ark; as if, the author says, "the Patriarch had provided himself with a little light literature for rainy days."

The Publishers' Circular.—We are glad to meet again in the field of criticism that doughty champion of the noble language which made Addison feel very happy that he was born an Englishman. Bishop Thornton having advocated in a pamphlet the public reading of the so-called Revised, in place of the Authorised, Version of the Bible in our churches, Mr Washington Moon, in the volume before us, criticises most scathingly both the Bishop's English and that of the Revisers. The errors in the Revised Version exposed by Mr Moon are calculated to rouse a feeling of indignation at the ignorance or heedlessness of the one hundred and one persons forming the company responsible for an undertaking of such supreme importance. Mr Moon's criticisms claim the attention of Bible students.

The Scotsman.—The work will interest students of the niceties of English diction.

The English Churchman.—Just, though caustic, criticism. This little book cannot fail to attract public

attention to the many egregious errors, grammatical, moral, and spiritual, abounding in the English employed in the Revised Version of the Scriptures. We thank the venerable author for his scholarly and timely contribution to the already extensive literature on the merits of the work of the Revisers. It was the late Mr Spurgeon, we believe, who tersely summed up the characteristics of the Revised New Testament, by remarking, "Strong in Greek, weak in English."

The Morning Post.—It is due to Mr Moon to acknowledge that he has very forcibly exposed some inaccuracies in the Revisers' English, as well as in the Authorised Version.

PREPARING FOR PUBLICATION.

THE "REVISED ENGLISH" BIBLE.

Embodying the labours of many Eminent Hebrew, Greek, and English Scholars.

Edited by

SAMUEL LLOYD,

ONE OF THE LIFE GOVERNORS OF THE BRITISH AND FOREIGN BIBLE SOCIETY

AND

GEO. WASHINGTON MOON, *Hon. F.R.S.L.*,

AUTHOR OF "THE DEAN'S ENGLISH," "THE BISHOP'S ENGLISH,"
"THE REVISERS' ENGLISH," "ECCLESIASTICAL ENGLISH," ETC.

Part I.

THE NEW TESTAMENT,

Will be published on January 1st, 1904,

By Messrs BAGSTER & SONS, Paternoster Row, London.

The following is an extract from the Preface:—

"Our English Bible, which to millions of the human race will for ever remain the standard of moral and religious truth, ought to be also the standard of all that is pure, and graceful, and noble, in our language.

"The Bible is the Temple of Truth in whose solemn archives are kept the records of past ages, and the memorials of the infancy of our race.

"Therein are enshrined also all human experiences,

the utterances of holy desire, the breathings of fervent hope, the expressions of unwavering faith, and the exulting songs of a nation's triumphs.

“Therein, likewise, are heard the sighs of the broken-hearted, the groans of the soul's agonies in its wrestlings with sin; and, coming up from the dungeon-depths of despair, the smothered cry of remorse from the self-condemned.

“But these are not the only voices: therein, too, are heard the prayers of the mighty minds which have moved Heaven by their earnestness; and therein are heard the lisplings of the little ones who have taught us life's lessons of child-like trust.

“Moreover, therein above all is heard the voice of GOD!—heard in its mighty thunderings, heard in its awful holiness, heard in its yearning pity, and heard in its undying love.

“All these voices live and reverberate in this Temple of Truth, and thence are ever echoed through the long corridors of Time for the world's instruction and admonition.

“In the varied themes of the Word of GOD, there is scope for the grandest organ-utterances of language; and these, bearing those themes, should peal through the mighty cathedral of the world in tones, which could not but thrill with responsive vibrations the throbbing hearts of the many millions of worshippers.

“On the public reading of such a version, blessed by the Holy Spirit of GOD, they would tremble under the rolling thunder of its fearful denunciations of hypocrisy ; melt into tearfulness of repentance beneath the gracious offers of mercy ; and, in their depths of godly sorrow, would hear so tender a voice speaking to them in pitying accents of forgiveness that, influenced by those wondrous words of love, they would in spirit rise as on angels’ wings of ecstasy to Heaven, and adoringly bow in unutterable gratitude before the Throne of the Most High.”

Language is the vehicle of thought ; and, in the Bible, it is the vehicle of GOD’S thoughts ; therefore, if perfection in language ought to be looked for anywhere, it ought to be looked for, and found, in the Bible.

I have looked for it, both in the Authorised, and in the Revised, Version, and have not found it ; hence this work which I deeply regret is so unworthy.

Not in my day, for I am in my eighty-first year, but probably in the near future, some eminent English scholar will arise, to whom will appertain the honour of having given to the world

THE PURE WORD OF GOD IN THE PUREST ENGLISH.

To that writer, perhaps this edition may be of some little service, I hope that it will, and that his work also will be of service to some succeeding editor; for, language is ever changing, and thereby constant revision of the Bible, from time to time is rendered imperative.

The following is a List of the most important English Versions of the Sacred Scriptures, succeeded by specimens of various versions of the Lord's Prayer showing the changes through which our language has gone during the last fifteen hundred years.

THE BISHOP'S ENGLISH

CHAPTER I

I WAS engaged in my work as English editor of *The "Revised English" Bible*, Canon Girdlestone being the Greek and Hebrew editor, when my attention was drawn to a pamphlet written by the Right Reverend Bishop Thornton of Manchester advocating the public reading, in our churches, of the Revised Version of the Scriptures in the place of the Authorized Version.

Of course I eagerly perused the pamphlet, wondering what was the ground of his advocacy, and what were the qualifications which led him to nominate himself a judge of that matter. I soon found that his English was as disgraceful as is that of the Revisers themselves; and therefore I was not surprised that he commended their work. It is to be re-

gretted that he was unaware of his ignorance of the laws of the language; as, a knowledge of that ignorance might have deterred him from presuming to discuss a subject upon which he is not competent to speak with authority. I will criticize his English after exposing the Revisers' shameful errors, which the Bishop eulogizes as, "*Light in all its purity and clearness.*"

I cannot believe that he has read the criticisms which were indignantly published upon the Revisers' English more than twenty years ago; or else he is hoping that time has obliterated from the minds of Englishmen the disappointment and deep regret which the Revisers' work occasioned when scholars realized that it fell deplorably short of that which the public had so earnestly, and so reasonably, hoped that it would be—viz.

THE PURE WORD OF GOD IN THE
PUREST ENGLISH

The Revised Bible, so far from being "*the well of English undefiled,*" is defiled by the grossest errors;—errors against

religion, morals, and grammar. These are grave charges; but, in Chapter iii. and elsewhere in this book, I will establish the truth of every one of them; and yet will refrain from adducing very many grave instances, one especially, too gross even to be mentioned.

How are we to account for the Revisers' work being not only a lamentable failure, but something far, far worse? The Revisers were good men, earnest students of the Sacred Scriptures, and they devoted years of their valuable time to the carrying out of their labour of love. They numbered more than one hundred men renowned for their learning; some were eminent Hebrew scholars; most of them were proficient in Greek; and a few were masters of English. Their names and titles are given in the Appendix. Moreover, it had been resolved that every question should be settled by the votes of the majority. What could give better promise of success? Yet, utter failure was the result.

Where was the fault? The fault lay in this:—The Revisers, not being all equal in learning, it was a grave error to make their votes all equal; so that the vote of one who was a profound Hebrew scholar, counted for no more than did the vote of one who had only a smattering of Hebrew. It was the same with Greek, and also with English. My Right Reverend correspondent, Bishop Wordsworth of St. Andrews, complained to me most bitterly of this arrangement; remarking that very few of the Revisers were good English scholars; and the eminently learned few were, of course, outvoted by the comparatively unlearned many.

The course which should have been taken was the appointment of sub-committees for special studies,—committees formed of the ablest men for each specific subject, Hebrew, Greek, English, etc. And if, in any such sub-committee, there was one member preëminently learned, he should have had three or more votes;

and any one less learned than the first, but better informed than the rest, should have had two votes ; and the others, one vote each. Then, at a general meeting, the results of all the sub-committees' deliberations should have been made known, but made known as final ; no further discussion being permissible. Some such arrangement as this would certainly have had better results.

Another fatal error made by the Revisers was their not issuing a tentative edition of their work, with the object of eliciting criticisms from learned men who were not numbered among the Revisers, but were deeply interested in the work, and well qualified to render valuable assistance. I suggested this course to the Revisers by a letter in *The Times* of May 22nd, 1875, but they had not humility enough to accept external aid ; the result being that they have drawn down upon themselves the severest censures for their culpable mistakes ; and, worst of all, the Bible itself has suffered at their hands !

6 THE BISHOP'S ENGLISH

The basis of this series of criticisms is a pamphlet with this title:—

THE REVISED VERSION
OF THE BIBLE:
OUR DUTY IN REGARD TO IT,

BY

THE RIGHT REV. SAMUEL THORNTON, D.D.,
Assistant Bishop of Manchester,
and
Vicar of Blackburn.

PUBLISHED UNDER THE DIRECTION OF THE
TRACT COMMITTEE.

BY THE SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE,
LONDON, 1902.

I read the pamphlet uninfluenced by the appendages to the author's name, for I judge of an author by the knowledge which he evinces of his subject, and the language in which he imparts it.

I have too much of the old Quaker

blood in my veins subserviently to accept what is not true, even though it be proclaimed by a Bishop, a Dean, or other titled personage. As authors we all have to rank with untitled laymen, and be judged by the merits of our works.

The Right Reverend Bishop's pamphlet is a laudation of the Revised Version of the Bible, combined with a severe disparagement of the Authorized Version.

Of the two, henceforth distinguished in these criticisms, as the A.V. and the R.V., he speaks thus, on page 19:—

“If Scripture is the Spirit's two-edged sword, the A.V. presents that sword notched and blunted in many places, while [he should have said, ‘whereas’] the R.V. puts it into our hand ground and sharpened: if Scripture is the lamp of the Lord, the A.V. offers [to] us that lamp with its glass greatly clouded and blurred, while [whereas] the R.V. has cleaned the glass, and fitted it to transmit the light in all its purity and clearness.”

As for his Lordship's having employed the word "*while*," instead of "*whereas*"; does not the Bishop know that "*while*" means "*during the time that*"? And, as the notching and blunting, whatever that refers to, was done nearly three hundred years ago, his statement is equivalent to saying that the A.V. of 1611 was really cotemporaneous with the R.V. New Testament of 1881, and the R.V. Old Testament of 1885.

With regard to the Bishop's figurative remark that the R.V. puts into our hand a two-edged sword ground and sharpened, I shall be able to give full proof of the appositeness of his metaphor. The two-edged sword will cut keenly, as the Reader will soon see; for, the criticisms are a running commentary on it throughout the whole of this book, and, the sword, being "two-edged," cuts both ways.

Leaving, for the present, the Bishop's two-edged sword metaphor, let us test the accuracy of his other simile, by

examining some passages in the R.V., and ascertaining whether they do transmit "*the light in all its purity and clearness.*"

But, first of all, I must draw attention to the Bishop's reference to the "*original*" of the Sacred Scriptures. It is scarcely ingenuous of him to speak of that which does not exist, as if its existence were a verity. Surely the Right Reverend Bishop is not wholly ignorant of the fact that, of the sixty-six books constituting the Bible, *there is not one "original" remaining.* All have perished.

Doubtless this loss has been permitted, in the wise providence of GOD, for some beneficent purpose; probably to guard against the degenerating of praiseworthy reverence into superstitious adulation and ultimately into idolatry; as was the case with the brazen serpent of the wilderness. On that very account, it had to be destroyed. See 2 Kings xviii. 4.

2 Kings
xviii. 4.

There being no "*original*" in existence, the Bishop is deluding his Readers (or

those of them who do not know better) when, on p. 12 of his pamphlet, he speaks of certain men of letters as having "*access to the original.*" All that scholars have access to are what profess to be *copies*; such as the "*Codex Alexandrinus,*" the "*Codex Sinaiticus,*" the "*Codex Vaticanus,*" etc.; but not one of these is earlier than the third century after Christ; and no two of them wholly agree.

CHAPTER II

THE Right Reverend Bishop must have been thinking of the British and Foreign Bible Society's contemplated action with regard to its circulating the R.V.; for, at the beginning of his pamphlet, in reference to the fact that the Society is bound by the fundamental principle upon which it was established, not to circulate any other version of the Scriptures than the A.V., he says, "It is scarcely fair—as is commonly done—to put the Revised in contrast with the Authorized Bible, as though [he should have said, as *if*; the word '*though*' implies negation, and means '*notwithstanding*'] they were different translations. It is not, properly speaking, a new Version at all; it is only, as its title-page proclaims, the Version set forth A.D. 1611, compared with the

most ancient authorities, and revised ; that is, *it is the Authorized Version* with its mistakes corrected."

The Reader will detect the questionable nature of this statement when he learns that, by the Bishop's own admission on page 7 of his pamphlet, the R.V. contains, on the authority of the Bishop of Exeter, 30,000 emendations. How can it be the A.V. since it has been altered in 30,000 places? The Rev. Prof. Moulton says "37,000"; and he, being one of the Revisers, is a better authority than the Bishop of Exeter.

Bishop Thornton, in making the quotation, on page 7 of his pamphlet, forgot that it would clash with his statement on the first page; but he wanted the British and Foreign Bible Society to adopt the R.V.; so he "blows hot and cold" to suit his purpose: he first says that *it is the same* as the A.V., therefore the Society will not be violating the fundamental principle of its existence in adopting it; and he afterwards says that *it is not the*

same, but better by 30,000 corrections, and therefore a very desirable possession for the Society.

As to the "*corrections*," so called, I have given specimens of them in my former works, '*The Revisers' English*' and '*Ecclesiastical English*'; more shall follow, in this volume.

I had almost forgotten to say that the Bishop, by way of offering to the Society his most tempting of all baits, promises, on page 12, that, if the R.V. be adopted, he will again become a Member of the Society. How gracious! But will the Society reinstate their former Member who receded from them years ago? Will they not, the rather, treat him as Paul treated Mark, who had "*departed from them, and went not with them to the work*"? Acts xv. 38.

Acts xv. 38.

The British and Foreign Bible Society, as it values its unsullied past, should have nothing more to do with that objectionable volume, the R.V. The circumstance is much to be deplored, that that venerable

Society seeking, at the instigation of a few supporters, to identify itself with the circulation of the R.V., actually assented for that purpose, to set aside the fundamental principle upon which it was established; which principle, as shown in the very first rule in its code of laws, was that, only the A.V. of the Sacred Scriptures, or translations of it, should be issued by the Society; and for the faithful carrying out of that principle, the Society has received bequests amounting to hundreds of thousands of pounds; and the Society, having accepted those bequests, is morally and legally bound by the conditions of those bequests.

Let the Members of the British and Foreign Bible Society pause before circulating so objectionable a work as that of the Revisers. A new edition of the A.V., with its errors eliminated, is being prepared for publication by Messrs Bagster & Sons; first as a tentative work, in order to elicit criticisms, and then, in the year 1904, as a perfected work which, it is

hoped, will be worthy of all acceptance.

The Bishop evidently thinks of himself and his co-prelates as a very powerful body of men. He says, in the last paragraph of his pamphlet, "The verdict of prominent newspapers, a few years ago, that [the] R.V. was 'dead,' has now been shewn to be mistaken. The opposition to it of a few good, able, and weighty men can hardly prevail against the practically unanimous decision of the Bishops, and the deliberate verdict of the Bible Society, in its favour."

But is that verdict "*final*"? I very strongly doubt it. The Bible Society, after refusing, for 20 years, to circulate the R.V., is not likely to reverse all its former decisions respecting this matter. Why should it? What new element has been introduced into the discussion? Not one!

And does the Bishop expect that his opinion will influence the Bible Society? What influence, in such a matter as this,

can attach to the opinion of a man who does not know his own mother tongue? None whatever. The fact that he is a Bishop does not qualify him for a judge as to the relative value of the two versions of the Bible.

Of course, no one denies that the A.V. of 1611 needs revision; but that which is most emphatically denied is that the present R.V. is worthy to take its place.

Oh! that the Revisers had published a Tentative Edition of their work.

The criticisms which such an edition of the R.V. would have elicited would have opened the Revisers' own eyes to the glaring mistakes which are so evident to every one else; except, of course, Bishop Thornton, to whom the Revisers' "*darkening of counsel by words without knowledge,*" would still be "*light in all its purity and clearness.*"

He strives to influence public opinion by speaking with exultation of the R.V. as being used in Canterbury Cathedral,

and in Westminster Abbey; but those persons who can "read between the lines," know all about *that*.

In the first place, it was the *Canterbury* Convocation which was the parent of the Revision; therefore, it is not surprising that *Canterbury* should foster her own child. Indeed, it would be strange if she did not.

As for Westminster Abbey, the copy of the R.V. which is there, was presented to the Dean and Chapter by the Members of Parliament for the Oxford and Cambridge Universities; and *those Universities own the Copyright of the R.V.* Hence the pressure brought to bear on the four Members of Parliament representing those Universities.

So the Reader will see that, notwithstanding the Right Reverend Bishop's exultation over the fact, there is absolutely nothing extraordinary in it; and he ought to have related to the public not merely the aforesaid bare facts, but also the attendant circumstances ex-

planatory of those facts. Moreover, the Dean of Canterbury, and the Dean of Westminster, for the time-being, were Members of the Revision Committee.

But, brighter days are coming; notwithstanding that every "Original" of the sixty-six books constituting the Bible has perished. For ages it has been the ceaseless endeavour of students to be able to produce a faithful transcript of the lost Originals, by gathering, from ancient MSS. all attainable evidence respecting the Sacred Scriptures; and thereby be in a position to restore to the world the words which holy men of old wrote under the inspiration of THE SPIRIT OF GOD.

The *Textus Receptus* on which the A.V. of 1611 was based was formed by Stephanus from the compilations of Erasmus, Zimenes, and the Codex Bezae. Since that time many ancient MSS. have come to light; the most important being the Codex Sinaiticus of the fourth Century, A.D. Of these, the Revisers

have availed themselves; but their work is not a New Translation; it is, as they themselves tell us in their Preface, a revision of the A.V. of 1611. "It did not fall within their province to construct a continuous and complete Greek text."

However, that matter is about to be taken up by The British and Foreign Bible Society, which will shortly issue a New Greek Testament that has been prepared by Dr Eb. Nestle for The Württemberg Bible Society of Stuttgart; of which edition 40,000 copies have been sold in the short space of three and a half years. With the cordial approval of the Württemberg Bible Society, Dr Nestle has undertaken to prepare a fourth edition of his text, for the aforesaid Society and for the British and Foreign Bible Society. The text, which exhibits the combined labours of the best and most recent scholars, is based on the texts of Tischendorf, Westcott-Hort, Bernhard Weiss, and Dr Weymouth.

Therefore, all that is now needed, is an accurate translation of it into the purest English, on the basis of the language of the A.V.; but freed from its archaisms and errors of grammar.

Messrs Bagster & Sons' Tentative Edition of the "Revised English" New Testament, preparatory to the issue of the whole Bible, is an earnest of the accomplishment of that end; and all Greek students of The British and Foreign Bible Society's New Greek Testament are invited to assist in perfecting the English work by their valuable suggestions.

What the world wants is not an extended circulation of the R.V., but a version which shall give us

THE PURE WORD OF GOD IN THE
PUREST ENGLISH;

because, as Samuel Lloyd, Esq., one of the Life Governors of the British and Foreign Bible Society, has most felicitously said, in a published letter

to the Secretary of that Society,—“It is indisputable that the utterances which sink most deeply into our hearts, and of which our memories retain the firmest hold, are (*cæteris paribus*) those which are most rhythmically expressed. And what are the utterances which should, above all others, be remembered? Unquestionably the Divine truths of the Bible. All infelicities of expression, and all offences against the laws of the language should therefore be expunged from our translation of the Sacred Scriptures. The Society's acceptance and publication of such a version would be a noble memorial of the Society's devotion to the eternal cause of Truth.”

CHAPTER III

I NOW proceed to establish the justness of the charges which I bring against the Revisers' work; and I do so by giving chapter and verse for every passage on which those charges severally are based, together with criticisms thereon.

It is a source of great sorrow to me that I have to make the exposure; and I assure my readers that I do so with no ill-feeling towards the Revisers themselves; but solely from a profound sense of duty to God and loyalty to His Truth.

The charges which I bring against the work of the Revisers are that, owing to their ignorance of their own mother tongue, combined with their culpable negligence in the construction of their sentences, the R.V. contains passages of blasphemy against God, besides passages

of revolting obscenities! And I say fearlessly, that among all examples of the evils which result from unintentional errors in language on the part of learned men, there cannot exist any so awful as are those which are found in the R.V. of the Sacred Scriptures.

BLASPHEMY

To bring, against the Revised Version of the Bible, the awful charge of blasphemy, is indeed to throw into the ecclesiastical world a fulminating bomb, the detonation of which will probably reverberate throughout Christendom.

Some of the timid Uzzahs will quake with fear for the safety of the Ark of God, because of the stumbling of the oxen. I am sorry for the timid ones. 2 Sam. vi. 8-8.

Others, principally clerics, will anathematize me for my work. I care nothing for their curses; their impotency is as well known as is the fact that "curses,

like birds of evil omen, return home to roost."

But, some earnest seekers after Truth will, I hope, feel grateful for my labours; and, haply, will join me in my endeavours to free the Sacred Scriptures from the errors which give rise to the scoffings of infidels. What nobler object in life can there be than that of doing battle for the Truth?

Does any person think me irreverent because I have dared to attack falsehood in its stronghold? For, that the Bible has become the stronghold of falsehood, is shown by the fact that whenever a falsehood, no matter how egregious, gets into the Bible, the sanctity of the Book attaches to the falsehood, and renders its eradication almost an impossibility; *e.g.* in the A.V. in 2 Chron. xxi. 20, and xxii. 2, we read that a man was born two years before his father! And, palpable falsehood as this is, the Revisers have not dared to expunge it; though, of course, it is only a clerical error by some scribe,

2 Chron. xxi.
20, and xxii.
2.

writing centuries ago; and, of course, forms no part of the Truth of God.

As to whether praise or blame will be awarded me for drawing attention to passages so awful, is to me a matter of indifference. I can truthfully say that I have the testimony of a good conscience, that I have fearlessly, but with reverence, endeavoured to do my duty in eradicating the evil from the good, the false from the true, and I leave the result with God.

No! I am not irreverent. Irreverence in this matter consists in leaving untruths to fester in the Bible, and contaminate by their presence the truth of THE MOST HIGH.

For centuries this has been going on; and, through all those years, the blasphemies have been doing their evil work; and the Revisers have left the passages as they found them, thus condoning their predecessors' shameful errors; and no man, up to the present time, has been bold enough to denounce the blasphemy, which in its incipency, its progressive

development, and its awful climax, appears like a deliberate and intentional insult to GOD.

The sequence of the blasphemous texts is most remarkable. They occur in this order:—

- John i. 6. 1. GOD is spoken of as if he were a human being, with a Christian name.
- John xix. 10, 11. 2. GOD is, by implication, charged by Jesus Christ with having sinned.
- Acts xii. 21-23. 3. GOD is said to have died a loathsome and horrible death.
- Rev. xiv. 10. 4. GOD is said to have been consigned to Hell!

This seems incredible; but it is an awful fact; and I will give chapters and verses for it, and more besides; for, the R.V. out-Herods Herod in its atrocities, and goes beyond even the A.V., and actually advocates incest, and condones it; saying that it is not sin, etc. etc. etc. And as for the most degrading obscenities which it is possible to conceive, they are disgracefully pal-

1 Cor. vii. 36.

liated by being euphemistically called
 “errors”!

Rom. i.
 26, 27.

1.—First we read in John i. 6,—
 “There came a man, sent from GOD,
 whose name was John.” Now, as, in the
 English language, pronouns are under-
 stood to refer to the nouns nearest to
 them of the same number and person, the
 pronoun “*whose*,” in the foregoing passage
 clearly refers to “GOD.” The sentence
 speaks of “GOD, *whose name was John*.”
 The Revisers should have corrected the
 error thus:—“There was sent from GOD,
a man whose name was John.”

John i. 6.

2.—Next, in John xix. 10, 11, we read
 as follows:—Pilate said, “Knowest thou
 not that I have power to release thee,
 and have power to crucify thee? Jesus
 answered him, Thou wouldest have no
 power against me, except it were given
 thee from above: therefore, he that
delivered me unto thee hath greater
 sin.” Now, remembering that Jesus
 was “*delivered* up by the determin-
 ate counsel and foreknowledge of GOD,”

John xix.
 10, 11.

Acts ii. 23.

the passage in John really represents Jesus as charging GOD with sin! And the Revisers have made the charge the more emphatic by the word "*therefore*," which connects it with the preceding statement respecting GOD as being the Supreme Ruler. This blasphemy would have been avoided had the Revisers said, not, "*He* that delivered me unto thee hath greater sin"; but, "*The man* who delivered me unto thee hath greater sin."

3.—The third blasphemous passage occurs in Acts xii. 21-23, and reads as follows:—"And upon a set day Herod arrayed himself in royal apparel, and sat on the throne, and made an oration unto them. And the people shouted, saying, The voice of a god, and not of a man.' And immediately an angel of the Lord smote him because he gave not God the glory: and he was eaten of worms, and gave up the ghost."

Here again, through the erroneous use of a pronoun, a blasphemous meaning is given to a passage of Sacred Writ. It

says, "He gave not GOD the glory, and he [i.e., GOD] was eaten of worms, and gave up the ghost"!

Lastly, I have said that the awful errors in the Revised Version are mainly due to the Revisers' ignorance of English. Look at their blasphemous treatment of Rev. xiv. 10. There, by inserting, after the word "GOD," the pronoun, "*he*," instead of repeating the noun which governs the latter part of the sentence, they have made the pronoun apply to GOD; who, it says, "shall be tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy angels"; for, as I have just said, and as every schoolboy is taught, "a pronoun is understood to refer to the last preceding noun of the same number and person"; therefore, as the last preceding noun in the passage is "GOD," the pronoun refers to HIM. In the latter part of the sentence, the pronoun "*their*" intensifies the blasphemy.

The passage is as follows:—"He also shall drink of the wine of the wrath of

God, which is prepared unmixed in the cup of *his* anger; and *he* [i.e. God] shall be tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy angels, and in the presence of the Lamb: and the smoke of *their* torment goeth up for ever and ever": i.e., the smoke of the torment of God, and of the holy angels and of the Lamb! There is not, in the passage, any preceding plural to which the pronoun "*their*" can apply.

Again, 1 John iv. 21. — "And this commandment have we from him, that
 1 John iv. 21. he who loveth God love his brother also."

Here we have the statement that God has a brother! and that our duty is that "he who loveth God, love God's brother also." That is the literal meaning of the passage; and had the Revisers intended to express that meaning with the utmost clearness, they could not possibly have expressed it in more unmistakable language.

This is another instance of error arising from the misplacement of a pro-

noun. When the Revisers saw that the word "*his*," by immediately following the word "GOD," gave a false meaning to the sentence, they should have reconstructed it. It might, with perfect propriety, have been done thus:—"*And we have this commandment from HIM,—that those who love GOD should love each other also.*"

It may be said that the errors occur in the A.V. Well, what of that? The duty of the Revisers was to *revise*; and, of all passages in the Scriptures, the one in Rev. xiv. 10, was the one most in need of revision; and the Revisers, by leaving it as it is, have perpetuated the error. Rev. xiv. 10.

They boast in their Preface thus:—
 "As to pronouns and the place they occupy in the sentence, a subject often overlooked by our predecessors, we have been particularly careful." This back-handed slap in the face which the Revisers give their predecessors comes, to say the least of it, with very bad grace from the

Revisers, whose own errors in grammar are so egregious.

And this, with more like it, is what Bishop Thornton calls "*Light in all its purity and clearness.*" If there is any light at all from this dark portion of the Apocalyptic vision, it is from the lurid flame which arises from the *fire and brimstone* of which the Revisers speak so blasphemously.

OTHER UNPARDONABLE ERRORS IN THE REVISED VERSION

The last instance of verbal error resulting in blasphemy was, as we have seen, occasioned by the insertion of a pronoun. We have now to consider an error occasioned by the insertion of a noun.

In the former instance, the Revisers' error was attempted to be condoned by calling attention to the fact that the error existed in the A.V. In this instance, no such excuse can be made;

for, the offending noun is not in either the A.V. or in the Greek. The blame of its insertion therefore rests wholly with the Revisers. *Palnam qui meruit ferat.*

The offending passage is in the Revised Version of 1 Cor. vii. 36; and is as follows:—“If any man thinketh that he behaveth himself unseemly toward his virgin *daughter*, if she be past the flower of her age, and if need so requireth, let him do what he will; he sinneth not; let *them* marry.” 1 Cor. vii. 36.

The only persons mentioned being father and daughter, to whom else can the pronoun “*them*” refer? “Let *them* marry.” And the words, “*Let him do what he will; he sinneth not,*” make it appear as if the crime of incest were actually contemplated!

As has been said; for the mistranslation in this passage, the Revisers alone are to be censured; seeing that it was they who gratuitously inserted the word “*daughter,*” which is not in either the A.V. or in the

Greek ; and without it, the passage might have had reference to a guardian and his ward ; between whom marriage would be legitimate.

What could have induced the Revisers to perpetrate such an atrocity, and Bishop Thornton to characterize their work as, "*light in all its purity and clearness*" !

What are we to think of the Revisers' treatment of 1 Tim. iii. 2, and, in connection with it, of 1 Tim. iii. 12? In the former, they deviate from the Greek by inserting the definite article "*the*" before "*husband*," and so save the passage from inculcating whoredom upon Bishops ; but, in the latter, which refers to Deacons, no such alteration has been made.

The passage referring to Bishops, if translated literally, would be, "The bishop must be . . . *a* husband of one wife." "Such a rendering, however, would present unutterable horrors to the episcopal mind ; for, while forbidding the bishop to indulge in polygamy, it would give, or seem to give, Scripture sanction for

his wife's luxuriating in the barbaric dignity of polyandrisms [*alias* 'whoredom']. Therefore, for the Bishop's sake, the so-called 'Revisers' did *not* revise the passage, but continued to make the rules of grammar succumb to the dictates of sober theology."*

But why had the Revisers such respect for the sensibilities of Bishops, and none whatever for the feelings of Deacons? In verse 12 of the same chapter we read, "Let deacons be husbands of one wife." It does not say (though doubtless Paul meant it, and the Revisers ought to have put it so), "Let *each* deacon be *the husband* of one wife." No! virtually the Revisers say that the "one wife" is to be the common property of "*deacons*"; they are to be her "*husbands*," and she their prostitute!

Is this what Bishop Thornton calls, "*Light in all its purity and clearness*"? By no possible stretch of imagination

* See "*The Bibles of England*," by Andrew Edgar, D.D., London, 1899, p. 355.

can the passages be conceived to be that. The two redundant s's much more resemble what we can imagine to be the exulting sibilant hissing of the Prince of Darkness, at the Revisers' having brought ridicule on the Scriptures.

In olden times bigamy was permissible, but the promise of a hundred wives to one man was a promise with which the Revisers did not know what to do; and would have been glad to get rid of it, if they could; but that was impossible.

Litera scripta manet.

Matt. xix.
29.

In the A.V. of Matt. xix. 29, we read, "Every one that hath forsaken houses, or brethren, or sisters, or father, or mother, *or wife*, or children, or lands, for my name's sake, shall receive an hundredfold, and shall inherit everlasting life."

Mark x. 29.

Luke xviii.
29.

The same passage, with some variations, occurs in Mark x. 29, and in Luke xviii. 29; but, in all three gospels there are the words, "*or wife.*" However, the Revisers have struck out those words

in Matthew, and also in Mark, on the ground that in the *Codex Vaticanus*, though not in the *Codex Alexandrinus*, or in the *Codex Sinaiticus*, they are missing from Matthew; and in the *Codex Sinaiticus*, and in the *Codex Vaticanus*, but not in the *Codex Alexandrinus*, they are missing from Mark. While, in all three of these ancient MSS. the words occur in Luke; and the Revisers admit, in a foot-note to the passage in Matthew, that they occur also in “*many ancient authorities*.”

Matt. xix.
29.

Mark x. 29.

Luke xviii.
29.

Matt. xix.
29.

Why, then, have the Revisers struck out the words, seeing that the majority of ancient MSS. favour their insertion, and that Rule IV. of the Committee of Convocation is, “That the Text to be adopted be that for which the evidence is decidedly preponderating”?

I cannot but believe that the words “*or wife*,” were struck out by the Revisers because they dreaded to face the very questionable blessedness of being repaid a hundredfold if they forsook their

wives, i.e. of having *a hundred wives each!* They would then be in a sad plight; but one not so bad as the poor deacons, who, according to the Revisers' incorrect and immoral language, had to share one wife between them!

CHAPTER IV

MISCELLANEOUS

THE Revisers have some astounding ideas. Here is a physiological impossibility. The Revisers say that Eve bore Cain's brother, Abel, *twice*; for, in Gen. iv. 2, Gen. iv. 2. we read, "And *again* she bare his brother Abel." A similar error, with regard to the word "*again*," occurs in Acts x. 15. Acts x. 15. "A voice came unto him *again the second time*." How can there be *two* second times? See also John iv. 54. John iv. 54.

Even where the A.V. was right, in such like matters, the Revisers pervert the truth. In Gal. iv. 30, the A.V. Gal. iv. 30. speaks of a "bondwoman *and her son*." This the Revisers have altered to a "*handmaid and her son*." As if a *maid* could have a son!

Here is another similarly mysterious affair: Bilhah and Zilpah were still *maids*, though they had each borne Jacob two sons; at least, so the learned Revisers say. But the A.V. does not say so in Gen. xxxii. 22. There it is "*women servants.*"

Gen. xxxii.
22.

Isa. vii. 14.

Thus, according to the Revisers, the prophecy that, "a *virgin* shall conceive, and bear a son," was not a prediction of an event which was at all uncommon. Evidently there were more than one "miraculous conception," according to the Revisers' teaching. But if they had had the slightest acquaintance with obstetrics and the cognate sciences, I cannot think that they would have been so foolishly credulous, and naively have expected to impart their credulity to others. The primary meaning which is the basis of the word "*maid*," is "*youth, freshness, virginity*"; and that idea so dominates all others in connection with it, that even sex is subservient to it; for, the word is allied to

the Gothic “magus,” *a boy*; and to the Gaelic “mac,” *a son*. But the prevailing meaning is “*a virgin*.”

Here is a filthy simile:—“He hath swallowed down riches, and he shall vomit them up *again*.” Surely, before anything can be vomited up *again*,—Job. xx. 15.

And why have the Revisers spoken of a woman’s “*latter end*”? “Her filthiness was in her skirts; she remembered not her *latter end*.”

Lam. i. 9.

When the imagination is allowed to “*run riot*” through the realms of Nature, what wonders may we not behold! The investigation of the Revisers’ language is certainly fraught with much interest; and the careful student will meet with many surprises; as, for instance, when he reads, in Gen. iv. 12, that the earth is both neuter and feminine. But the most astounding surprise will be that which he will experience when he re-Gen. iv. 12.

Hab. iii. 10; Ezek. xxxi. 4; Rev. xx. 13. regards collectively Hab. iii. 10; Ezek. xxxi. 4; and Rev. xx. 13.

Talk of the Greek myth of Herma-phroditos! That was nothing, to the marvellous creation of the brains of the Revisers respecting the "vasty deep." They tell us that the sea is at once masculine, feminine, and neuter!

No wonder that such mysteries elicit the unbounded admiration of the Bishop; but are they emanations of "*light in all its purity and clearness*"?

Acts xxvi.
16.

Some of the Revisers' translations are very droll: e.g. in Acts xxvi. 16, we read, "Arise, and stand upon thy feet." Why "*upon thy feet*"? Did the Revisers think that Christ's appearing to Paul would so delight him, that, in his delirious joy, he might probably stand *upon his head*?

Heb. x. 13.
Luke xx. 43.

In Heb. x. 13, and Luke xx. 43, the Revisers speak of "the footstool *of his feet*." How could there be a *footstool* of any other part of the body? What nonsense!

In Luke viii. 23, we read, "As they sailed, he fell asleep: and there came down a storm of wind on the lake; and *they were filling* with water, and were in jeopardy." The words "*with water*," are not in the Greek; and possibly the Revisers conceived that it might be thought that the sailors were "*filling*" with something stronger than water, and therefore it was desirable to guard against such a misconception; so they inserted the words, "*with water*."

Luke viii. 32.—"Now there was there a herd of *many swine* feeding on the mountain: and *they* intreated him that he would give *them* leave to enter into *them*." What a book of wonders the Revisers have made of the New Testament! We are accustomed to read of pigs squeaking; but here we read of their speaking (a mere matter of *p's* and *q's*). However, that is not all: the Revisers (what a misnomer!) say that the pigs asked Jesus Christ that *they* might enter the devils! whereas it was the devils

who asked that they might enter the swine.

Isa. xliii. 13.—“I am he; and there is none that can deliver out of my hand: I will work, and who shall *let* it?” By one of the strange mutations of language, the word “*let*,” which originally meant to “*hinder*,” now means to “*allow*”: consequently the above passage in the R.V. asks a question which is the exact opposite of that which was intended: and yet, with the Revisers’ usual inconsistency, they have altered the word in 2 Thess. ii. 7.

2 Thess. ii. 7.

Psa. lix. 10.—“The God of my mercy shall *prevent* me.” Here is another word which, like “*let*,” has changed its meaning. It is derived from the Latin, “*prævenio*,” to come before, with the object of *assisting*; that was its original meaning; but it now means, to come before with the object of *frustrating*. Hence its objectionableness in the above passage; as the Revisers ought to have known. Perhaps, being mostly clergymen of the Church of England, they were accustomed to the

Psa. lix. 10.

antiquatedness of the word's signification, through having to say, in one of the collects, "*Prevent* us, O Lord, in all our doings": a prayer which I, when a boy, and knowing only the modern meaning of the word, "*prevent*," would never say.

Matt. ix. 2.—"They brought to him Matt. ix. 2. a man sick *of* the palsy." No doubt the man was sick *of* it; but the Revisers instead of employing an expression which partakes of the nature of a pun, should have said, "sick *with* the palsy."

In the next verse, we read, "And Matt. ix. 3. *behold*, certain of the scribes said within themselves." In Matt. iii. 17; and xvii. 5, Matt. iii. 17; xvii. 5. we are called upon to *behold a voice*; here we are called upon to *behold a thought*! How can we "*behold*" either?

Matt. xii. 22.—"The *blind and dumb* Matt. xii. 22. . . . *spoke and saw*; and all the multitude were amazed." And well they might be; for, the Revisers' sequence of events implies that the blind man spoke with his eyes, and saw with his mouth! In a narrative, events should follow their

natural sequence: the Revisers should have said, "The *blind and dumb saw and spoke*"; not "*spake and saw.*"

Matt. xvii.
23.

Here is a passage which, owing to the Revisers' ignorance of the right use of "*shall*" and "*will*," really points to premeditated, compulsory murder! It is in Matt. xvii. 23, "They *shall* kill him." Doubtless that which Jesus said, was, "They *will* kill him." It was a grievous prophecy, not a threat, as the Revisers' language makes it appear to be.

Matt. x.
21.

See also Matt. x. 21.—"Brother *shall* deliver up brother to death, and the father his child: and children *shall* rise up against parents, and cause them to be put to death." The word "*shall*," in this passage, makes it a decree ordaining these horrors. The Revisers should have said "*will*," not "*shall*"; it was a prediction, not a decree.

Matt. xix.
13.

Matt. xix. 13.—"Then were there brought unto him little children, that he should lay his hands on *them* and pray: and the disciples rebuked *them.*"

Poor little dears! Why did the disciples rebuke "*them*"? or, is it that the Revisers are again at fault? Oh! these pronouns.

Matt. xx. 34. — "And Jesus, being ^{Matt. xx. 34.} moved with compassion, touched their *eyes*: and straightway *they* received their sight, and followed him." Very natural for the eyes of the blind men to follow Jesus; but is not the meaning of the Greek that *the men* followed him?

What wonderful doves those must have been which were offered for sale in the Temple in Jerusalem. The Revisers tell us, in Matt. xxi. 12, that Jesus over- ^{Matt. xxi. 12.} threw "the seats of them that sold *doves*, and he saith unto *them*, It is written, My house shall be called a house of prayer: but *ye* have made it a den of robbers." Very naughty of the doves; or else very naughty of the Revisers not to have been "*particularly careful as to the pronouns.*"

It is said that "variety is charming," the Revisers seem to think so with regard to words. Hence, in Matt. xxii. 25, we ^{Matt. xxii. 25.}

are told that the man "*deceased*"; and, in verse 27 of the same chapter, that the woman "*died*."

I have given some examples of the awful immorality of the Revisers' work, now, for a change, let us look at some instances in which the Revisers' ignorance of English has made them (unwittingly, I admit) turn sacred history into profanity, and certain teachings of Christ into that which is simply drollery.

A critic in the last century once said, "When I see a writer careless of his pronouns, I tremble for him." The Revisers, however, were not troubled with fears for themselves. Indeed, their self-confidence is rather amusing, as we shall see.

We will take the first six chapters of Mark, and from them will cull a few examples of the Revisers' boastful "*particular carefulness*" as to pronouns.

Mark i. 13.

In Mark i. 13, we read in the R.V., "He was in the wilderness forty days tempted of *Satan*; and *he* was with the

wild beasts." Who was? Satan or Jesus? As a pronoun is supposed to refer to the noun immediately preceding it, the natural inference is that it was Satan who was with the wild beasts. If that is not the meaning of the sentence, the Revisers should have omitted the pronoun "*he*." The passage would then have read thus—"He was in the wilderness forty days tempted of Satan, and was with the wild beasts." And that is as the passage stands in the A.V.; for, the error does not occur there. This passage shows us how little the Revisers' "predecessors" deserved the scornful treatment which they have received from their successors.

Mark iii. 22, 23, reads thus,—“And the scribes which came down from Jerusalem, said, ‘He hath Beelzebub, and, By the prince of the devils casteth he out *the devils*.’ And he called *them* unto him.” What! called “*the devils*” unto him? If this is the result of the Revisers’ *particular carefulness* as

Mark iii. 22,
23.

to the pronouns, what should we have had, if there had been *carelessness*? The Revisers could not have done worse than they have done; and they might, perchance, have done better. Is this "*revising*" the Scriptures?

Mark v. 16. Mark v. 16 gives us another example of the Revisers' "*particular carefulness.*" There we read of, "him that was possessed with devils, and concerning *the swine.* And *they* began to beseech him to depart." This is especially extraordinary considering that the swine were dead! See v. 13. We may well ask what is the meaning of "*revision,*" seeing that such passages as these abound in the R.V.?

Mark vi. 7, 8. In Mark vi. 7, 8 another curious incident is related. It is this, "He gave them authority over *the unclean spirits*; and he charged *them* that *they* should take nothing for *their* journey." What journey were "*the unclean spirits*" going to take? And why was *Jesus* interested in their luggage? Perhaps

the Bishop will tell us, as he praises the R.V. To him it is "*light in all its purity and clearness.*"

Once more; in Mark vi. 38, 39 it says, "How many loaves have ye? go and see. And when they knew they say [it should be '*they said,*' to agree with '*knew,*' which refers to the *past*] Five and *two fishes.* And he commanded *them* that all should sit down." Fishes commanded to "*sit down*"! This is worthy of "*Alice in Wonderland.*" Fishes sitting on their tails! One cannot help smiling; but really it is the Revisers' fault; they should not have written such nonsense, as Satan keeping company with wild beasts; Jesus calling devils unto him; swine beseeching him to depart; unclean spirits instructed as to what luggage they should take on a journey; and fishes commanded to sit down! What wonder that the word of GOD is described by others, besides Greeks, as "*foolishness*"! See 1 Cor. 1 Cor. i, 23 i. 23. And this is the result of an

examination of six consecutive chapters of only one book out of the sixty-six constituting the Bible, and concerning only one class of errors; moreover, a class about which the Revisers boast of having been "*particularly careful*"!

Mark ix. 20. Mark ix. 20.—“They brought *him* unto *him*; and when *he* saw *him*.” This, instead of being “*light in all its purity and clearness*,” is certainly *very foggy*.

Mark ix. 26. Mark ix. 26.—“*The more part* said, He is dead.” What language is this? Undoubtedly it is not English. Who, except the Revisers, ever heard of “*the more part*” of a multitude? The A.V. tells us that “*many* said, He is dead.”

Mark xiv. 8. Mark xiv. 8.—“She hath anointed my body *aforehand* for the burying.” Why have the Revisers said “*aforehand*,” here; and “*beforehand*,” in verse 23 of the previous chapter? But I do not expect an answer to my question; for, the Revisers could not, I am sure, give a satisfactory reason for their vagaries.

Mark xiv. 3. Mark xiv. 3.—“She brake *the cruse*,

and poured *it* over his head." Broken pieces of alabaster, even if scented with spikenard, could not have been very pleasant on the head. But probably the Revisers meant the ointment. Their language often says what they do not mean.

Mark xiv. 41.—“Sleep on now and take your rest.” Either these words were spoken sarcastically,—as a reproof; or they were spoken interrogatively, as a reproof. They could not have been spoken in the form of a command, as the Revisers have put them; for, immediately afterwards, Jesus said, “Arise, let us be going.” The disciples could not “*sleep on*,” and yet be “*going*”; unless they were to walk in their sleep.

Mark xv. 37.—“And Jesus uttered a loud voice, and gave up the ghost.” First, he did not utter a *voice*; his voice uttered a *cry*. Next, why have we here, “gave up *the ghost*”; and, in Matt. xxvii. 50, “yielded up *his spirit*”? If a ghost is a disembodied spirit, a man cannot

Mark xiv.
41.

Mark xv. 37.

Matt. xxvii.
50.

Luke xxiii.
46.

“give up the ghost,” because it is not a “ghost,” until it *has been* given up.

Luke i. 18.

Luke i. 18.—“I am an old man, and my wife well stricken in years.”

When, in a sentence, the nominative to the verb changes, in either number or person, the verb, also, must change. In the foregoing sentence, the Revisers say, virtually, “I *am* an old man, and my wife [*am*] well stricken in years.” See also

Rev. x. 1.

Rev. x. 1. “His face *was* as the sun, and his feet [*was*] as pillars of fire.” So,

Rev. xiii. 2.

likewise, in Rev. xiii. 2. “His feet *were* as the feet of a bear, and his mouth [*were*] as the mouth of a lion.”

Luke ii. 4.

Luke ii. 4.—“And all went to enrol themselves, every one to his own city. And Joseph also went.” If “*all*” went to enrol themselves, “*every one* to his own city,” how could there be “*also*” another? Really the Revisers had very funny ideas!

Luke ii. 38.

Luke ii. 38.—“And she gave thanks unto *God*, and spake of *him* to all them that were looking for the redemption of Jerusalem.” To whom does the pronoun

“*him*” refer ; to GOD, or to the boy Jesus ? Oh, these pronouns ! How fortunate it was that the Revisers were able to say, as they did, in their Preface that they had been “*particularly careful as to the pronouns*” ; otherwise what trouble we should have had to understand the Scriptures. For instance, in Luke v. 12, we read “*When he saw Jesus, he fell on his face.*” Did the leper fall on Jesus’s face ; or did Jesus fall on the leper’s face ; or did the leper fall on his own face ? How kind of the Revisers to make it all so clear ! Can we wonder that the Bishop should describe the Revised Version, as “*light in all its purity and clearness*” ? Why did not the Revisers say, “*The leper bowed himself to the earth,*” if that is what was meant ?

Luke iii. 13.—“*And he [John] said unto them, Extort no more than that which is appointed you.*” If this is a correct rendering, there can be no doubt that John sanctioned *extortio*n. But it is much more probable that the Revisers’

wording of the passage is at fault, and that the soldiers were told to “*demand*”; not to “*extort*.” The A.V. says, “*Exact* no more than that which is appointed you.”

Luke iv.
1, 2.

Luke iv. 1, 2.—“Jesus was led *by* the Spirit in the wilderness during forty days, being tempted *of* the devil.” Why have the Revisers said, “led *by* the Spirit,” yet “tempted *of* the devil”? What difference is there between being led *by* the good Spirit, and being tempted *by* the bad Spirit, that necessitates a change in the preposition? See also Acts xxiii. 10, 27 —“Torn in pieces *by* them,” “Slain *of* them.”

Acts xxiii.
10, 27.

Luke vi. 34.

Luke vi. 34.—“And if ye do good to them that do good to you, *what thank have ye?*” Very often no thanks at all; we do not receive that which is due to us. But the question which Jesus put was not, “*What thank have ye?*” But “*What thanks are due to you?*” And no thanks were due; the act was merely a reciprocation of kindness, conferring no

obligation whatever. And that was the lesson which Jesus intended to teach; therefore the Revisers should have put the question in that form.

Luke vi. 34.—“Even sinners lend to sinners to receive *again as much*.” In the A.V. the passage says, “to receive *as much again*”; i.e. 100°/ₒ interest! and, as the money was lent by *sinners*, the latter version is probably the correct one; for, usurers are undoubtedly “*sinners*,” in the popular acceptance of that word.

Luke vii. 7.—“Say the word, and my servant *shall* be healed.” The Revisers’ use of “*shall*” and “*will*” is grossly incorrect. “*Shall*,” in the second person, is a threat: “he *shall* do it”; whereas, “*will*,” in the second person, is a prediction: “he *will* do it”; and that is it which the centurion meant; and which the Revisers should have said.

In 2 Kings xix, 35, and Isa. xxxvii. 36, we read of “*dead corpses*”; were there then “*live corpses*”? That is a horrible conception. But all things seem to be

Luke vi. 34.

Luke vii. 7.

2 Kings xix.
35.

Isa. xxxvii.
36.

possible to the fertile imagination of the Revisers. Look at Luke vii. 15. "And he that *was* dead sat up, and began to speak." If the Revisers did not mean that he *was* dead when he sat up, they should have said, "And he who *had been dead* sat up, and began to speak."

Luke viii.
51.

Luke viii. 51.—"And when he came to the house, he suffered not any *man* to enter in with him, save Peter, and John, and James and the father of the maiden and her mother." [Was, then, the "mother" a man?] "And all were weeping, and bewailing *her*." By the awkward construction of this sentence, the pronoun "her" refers to the "mother." But it was the "*maiden*" whom they were bewailing. Therefore the Revisers should have said, not "the father of the maiden and her mother"; but, "the father and the mother of the maiden"; then, the pronoun "*her*" would naturally have referred to the maiden, and not to the mother.

Luke ix. 10.

Luke ix. 10.—"And the apostles, when they *were* returned, declared unto him

what things they had done." If the apostles had been returned by somebody else, it would have been correct to say that they "*were* returned"; but, as they were free agents, and had returned of their own accord, the Revisers should have said, "And when the apostles *had* returned, they declared to Jesus those things which they had done."

Luke ix. 17. — "They *did* eat, and were all *filled*." This is extremely vulgar; and the word "*did*" seems to emphasize the vulgarity. The Revisers should have said, "They all *ate*, and were *satisfied*." Luke ix. 17.

Luke ix. 31. — "*At* Jerusalem." I am surprised that the Revisers did not know that it is incorrect to speak of being "*at*" a city. No one speaks of being *at* London; why, then, say, "*at* Jerusalem"? Correctness requires that we say *in* a city, and *at* a village. See also Acts xvii. 16. "Paul waited for them *at* Athens." Yet Paul was *in* the very heart of the city; "*in the Market Place every day*"; v. 17, "*in the midst of the*" Acts xvii. 16.

Acts xvii. 22.

- Acts viii. 1. *Areopagus*"; v. 22. See likewise Acts viii. 1, there we read "*in Jerusalem.*"
- Luke ix. 53. Luke ix. 53.—"His face was as *though* he were going to Jerusalem." The Revisers do not seem to have understood that the conjunction, "*though*" implies negation, and means "*notwithstanding*"; and that the proper conjunction to use in an affirmative sentence is "*if*," which means "*given*," or "*granted.*" Therefore they should have said, "His face was as *if* he were going to Jerusalem." See also
- Luke xxiv. 28. chapter xxiv. 28: there the same error occurs. From this circumstance we may justly infer that the error was not made inadvertently; but was the result
- Acts xvii. 25. of ignorance. See criticism on Acts xvii. 25.
- Luke x. 18. Luke x. 18.—"I beheld Satan *fallen* as lightning from heaven." What a marvellous atmospheric simile! I cannot but characterize the statement as an untruth. Not Jesus, nor the Revisers, nor anyone else ever beheld lightning which had "*fallen.*" They may have

beheld it "*falling*"; but "*fallen*,"—never! With the flash, it ceases to exist; except to the fertile imagination of Bishop Thornton, to whom it is still "*light in all its purity and clearness*." However, on second thoughts, there may be hidden a very important truth, even in this strange simile. If it teaches anything, it certainly is,—the non-existence of the devil.*

Luke xi. 22.—“When a stronger than he shall *come upon* him, and *overcome* him.” Is this intended for a pun? Of course, if he comes *upon* him, he *over-*comes him. Luke xi. 22.

Luke xi. 37.—“As he spake, a Pharisee asketh him to *dine* with him.” No one would imagine that the word here translated “*dine*” is, in the Greek, “*breakfast*”; yet so it is. Why did the Revisers not say so? Is it that the Greek signifies what the French call *déjeuner à la* Luke xi. 37.

* In the “*brevier 16mo*” edition, it is “*falling*”; but that is a misprint; for, in *all* other editions of the R.V. it is, “*fallen*.”

fourchette," which is somewhat like a dinner, though called a *breakfast*?

Luke xi. 48. Luke xi. 48.—“Ye are witnesses, and *consent* unto the works of your fathers.” The word “*consent*,” by universal custom, applies to the present, though its derivation from the Latin, “*consentio*,” shows that, originally, it was independent of time, and might be used in reference to past, present, or future. Now, in speaking of the past, it is usual to employ the word “*approve*.” We say, “By common *consent*, we *approve* of the works of our fathers.”

Luke xii. 8, 9. Luke xii. 8, 9.—“Every one who shall *confess* me before men, him shall the Son of man also *confess* before the angels of God; but he that *denieth* me in the presence of men shall be *denied* in the presence of the angels of God.” “*Confess*” and “*deny*” are appropriate words to use in reference to actions: e.g. we “*confess*” our faults; we “*deny*” the truth of certain allegations; but we cannot “*confess*” a person; nor can we

“*deny*” a person; meaning by the word, “*deny*,” that we do not recognize his authority. Preferable words, in the passage quoted above, would be “*acknowledge*” and “*disown*.”

Luke xii. 46.—“The lord of that servant shall come in a day when he expecteth [him] not . . . and shall *cut him asunder*, and appoint his portion with the unfaithful.” To cut a man *asunder* is, unquestionably, to kill him; but that that is not the meaning intended to be conveyed, is shown by the words which follow; he was still to have a portion; but it was to be “with the unfaithful.” He was not to be “*cut asunder*”; but to be cut off, *sundered*, from the privileges which he had enjoyed.

Luke xii. 55.—“And when *ye see* a south wind blowing.” I have previously spoken of the impossibility of *seeing* the wind; and here we have the impossible phenomenon reasserted. For this the Revisers only are to blame; for there are not, in the Greek, any words corresponding

Matt. iii.
17; viii. 29;
ix. 3; xiv.
30.

to "*ye see.*" For similar errors, refer to Matt. iii. 17; viii. 29; ix. 3; xiv. 30.

Luke xiii.
1-5.

Luke xiii. 1-5.—On Jesus being told of certain Galilæans, "whose blood Pilate had mingled with their sacrifices," the Revisers state that Jesus said, (verse 3) "*Except ye repent, ye shall all in like manner perish*"; and of those on whom the tower in Siloam fell and killed them; (verse 5) "*Except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish.*" There appears to be little difference in these two expressions; but the difference is simply awful. The former states that unless [not 'except'] his hearers repented, they should all perish "*in like manner*": i.e. their own blood should be mingled with that of their sacrifices! The latter expression states that unless they repented, they "*likewise*" should perish: the manner how is not told. Why have the Revisers made this awful difference, since the word in the Greek is the same in each instance? And, in the A.V. also, the word is the same. Yet the Bishop com-

mends the R.V.; and condemns the A.V.

Luke xiii. 24.—“Strive to enter in by the narrow door: for many, I say unto you, *shall* seek to enter in, and *shall not* be able.” The Revisers’ misuse of “*shall*” and “*will*” makes the Scriptures teach some fearful heresies. Can we imagine anything more awful than that Jesus said, “Many *shall* seek to enter, and *shall not* be able”? It is contrary to his own teaching: “Seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto you.” Doubtless, what Jesus said was, “Many *will* seek to enter, and *will not* be able”; and why? Because they are *half-hearted*; the promise being, “Thou shalt find Him, if thou seek Him *with all thy heart and with all thy soul*,” Deut. iv. 29. But, to represent Jesus as saying, “*They shall not be able*,” is to make him decree their damnation! And all this is, in the Right Rev. Bishop’s estimation, “*light in all its purity and clearness*.” Surely his own words do him injustice?

Luke xv. 17. Luke xv. 17. — “How many hired servants of my father’s have bread enough and to spare, and I perish with hunger!” This implies that though “*many*” of his father’s servants had bread enough and to spare, some had not enough!—an imputation not in accordance with the loving nature of him who ran and fell on his son’s neck and *kissed him much*, as the Greek says. The passage should be, — “My father’s many servants have bread enough and to spare; and I perish with hunger!”

Luke xv. 26. Luke xv. 26.—“And he called to him one of the servants, and inquired what these things *might be*.” Well, they “*might be*” anything; but that was not what he wanted to know; he wanted to know the occasion of the rejoicing; or, as the A.V. has it, “*what these things meant*.” Why did the Revisers alter the passage?

Luke xvi. 9. Luke xvi. 9.—“Make to yourselves friends by means of the mammon of unrighteousness; that, when it shall fail, they may receive you into *the eternal tabernacles*.” Whatever did the Revisers

mean by "*the eternal tabernacles*"? Were those learned men unaware of the fact that the words are a contradiction? "*Tabernacle*" is a *temporary* habitation. What, then, is the meaning of an *eternal temporary* habitation? The A.V. reads, "*everlasting habitations*"; doubtless referring to what Jesus spoke of as, "My Father's house of many mansions."

John xiv. 2.

Luke xvi. 20.—"And a certain beggar named Lazarus was laid at his gate, full of sores." At whose gate? The construction of the sentence is such as to imply that he was laid at his own gate. And then, "his gate, full of sores." Of course we know that it was the beggar, and not the gate, that was "full of sores": but, a slight transposition would have got rid of both difficulties. The Revisers should have said, "There was a certain rich man . . . and there lay at his gate, a certain beggar named Lazarus, full of sores, and desiring to be fed with the broken food which fell from the rich man's table."

Luke xvi.
20.

Luke xvii. 3.—"If thy brother *sin*,^{Luke xvii.} 3.

rebuke him; and if he repent, forgive him. And if he *sin* against thee seven times in the day, and seven times turn again to thee, saying, I repent; *thou* shalt forgive him." The very fact that the offence, which is here called "*sin*," is not *sin*, is shown by its being forgivable by man; for, who can forgive *sins* but GOD only? See

Mark ii. 7.

Mark ii. 7. The Revisers should have said, "If thy brother *offend* . . . if he *offend* seven times in the day, . . . thou shalt forgive him." *Sin* is an offence against God.

Psa. li. 4.

Luke xvii.
34.

Luke xvii. 34.—"In that night there shall be two men on one bed; *the* one shall be taken, and the other shall be left. There shall be two women grinding together; *the* one shall be taken, and the other shall be left." In each case, the definite article, "*the*," should be omitted before the word "*one*"; because there is not, in the sentence, anything definite about one of two, until one has been taken; then, it is correct to say, "*the* other shall be left."

Luke xviii.
8.

Luke xviii. 8.—"When the Son of man cometh, *shall* he find faith on the earth?"

Here we find another instance of the misuse of "*shall*" for "*will*." "*Shall he find faith on the earth?*" is a wide question which no one can answer, except for himself. And even then, the sad example of Peter recurs to one's mind: he said, "Though I should die with thee, yet will I not deny thee." But he did; and went out, and wept bitterly. Matt. xxvi. 35. The Revisers should have given the passage thus:—"When the Son of Man cometh, *will* he find faith on the earth?" Matt. xxvi. 75.

Luke xviii. 32.—"He shall be mocked, and shamefully *entreated*, and spit upon." The Revisers should have said, "shamefully *treated*," not "*entreated*." To entreat is to beseech. See Ruth i. 16: "*Entreat not me to leave thee*." The same error occurs in Acts xiv. 5, and in 1 Thess. ii. 2. Luke xviii. 32.

Luke xviii. 40.—"And Jesus stood, and commanded *him* to be brought unto *him*; and when *he* was come near *he* asked *him*, What wilt *thou* that *I* should do unto *thee*?" More than a fourth part of the words in this sentence are pro- Acts xiv. 5. 1 Thess. ii. 2. Luke xviii. 40.

nouns. Certainly the Revisers' employment of that part of speech is very infelicitous, notwithstanding their boasted carefulness. Pronouns, when employed judiciously, prevent much circumlocution; but when, through using them, we sacrifice perspicuity, their employment is to be deprecated.

Luke xix.
11.

Luke xix. 11.—“ He added and spake a parable, because he was nigh to Jerusalem, and because they *supposed* that the kingdom of God was immediately to appear.” To *suppose* an occurrence, is simply to imagine it,—to put it before the mind hypothetically. We may *suppose* the moon to be made of green cheese; but that is very different from *believing* it. And Jesus spoke the parable “because they *believed* that the Kingdom of God was immediately to appear”; and that is the statement which the Revisers should have made. See also Acts vii. 25 and Acts xxvii. 13.

Acts vii. 25.
and xxvii.
13.

Luke xix.
26.

Luke xix. 26.—“ *From him* that hath not, even that which he hath shall be

taken away *from him*." What an absurd sentence! Something *which has no existence* shall be taken *from him, from him*. The Revisers must have known that Jesus did not utter any such nonsense. The context shows that what was to be taken from the unprofitable servant, was not something which he did not possess; that were an impossibility: "*ex nihilo nihil fit*"; that which was to be taken from him was the pound which he had not increased by trading.

Luke xix. 42, margin.—“Or, *O* that thou hadst known.” It is clear that the Revisers did not know the proper use of “*O*” and “*oh*.” The former is vocative, as “*O* GOD!” The latter is an exclamation of pain, joy, sorrow, desire, etc.; and therefore should have been employed, instead of “*O*,” in the aforesaid note. “*Oh! that thou hadst known.*”

Luke xx. 14.—“When the husbandmen saw him, they reasoned *one with another*, saying, This is the heir: let us kill him that the inheritance may be ours.” If

there were only two husbandmen, the expression "one with *an* other" is wrong; it should be "one with *the* other"; and if there were more than two, the expression is equally wrong; in that case, the Revisers should have said, "they reasoned with *each* other." I cannot but express surprise that these simple matters were unknown to the so-called "*learned Revisers*." Certainly they were not learned in even the most elementary rules of English.

Luke xx. 35.

Luke xx. 35. — "They that are accounted *worthy to attain* to that world, and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry nor are given in marriage." We can understand that some may be accounted *worthy of that world*; and, being accounted worthy, *will attain it*. But what is meant by being "*worthy to attain*"?

Luke xxi.
23.

Luke xxi. 23. — "Woe unto them that are with child and to them that give suck in those days!" Again the question forces itself upon us, Why have the

Revisers changed the preposition, and, in this case, said, "*unto* them that are with child and *to* them that give suck"? I cannot imagine any reason for its being done. It is strange; and yet it is not strange that the Revisers should do it; for, it is quite in accordance with much of their work. Certainly they are consistently inconsistent. See the continuation of the verse;—"There shall be great distress *upon* the land, and wrath *unto* this people." The change is wholly uncalled for; since, in this passage, "*land*" and "*people*" are synonymes; and each should have been preceded by the same preposition.

Luke xxi. 36.—"Watch ye at every season, making supplication, that ye may prevail to escape all these things." Luke xxi. 36. What did the Revisers mean by "making supplication that ye may *prevail to* escape"? Surely the italicized words are superfluous; the obvious meaning being, "Watch ye at all seasons, making supplication that ye may escape all those things."

Luke xxii.
15.

Luke xxii. 15.—“With *desire* I have *desired* to eat this passover with you before I suffer.” The tautology of this passage would have been avoided, and yet the Hebraic meaning have been retained, had the Revisers said, “With *longing* I have *desired* to eat this passover with you before I suffer.” See also Acts xxviii. 10: “Who also *honoured* us with many *honours*.” The Revisers should have said, “Who also *honoured* us with many *favours*.”

Acts xxviii.
10.

Luke xxii.
31.

Luke xxii. 31.—“Simon, Simon, behold, Satan asked to have *you*, that he might sift *you* as wheat: but I made supplication for *thee*, that *thy* faith fail not.” Did the Revisers mean us to infer, from this change in the pronouns, that, in the former part of the address to Simon, Jesus referred to all the disciples; and, in the latter part, to Simon only? If so, the meaning would have been clearer had the Revisers said, “Simon, Simon, Hearken! Satan asked to have *you all*, that he might sift *you* as wheat; but I

made supplication for *thee specially* that *thy* faith fail not." If this was not the Revisers' meaning, they ought not to have changed the pronouns.

Luke xxii. 56-58. — "And a certain *maid* seeing him as he sat in the light of the fire, and looking steadfastly upon him, said, This man also was with him. But he denied, saying, *Woman*, I know him not. And after a little while *another* saw him, and said, Thou also art one of them. But Peter said, *Man*, I am not." As the first accuser was "*a certain maid*"; and we read subsequently that "*another* saw him," we naturally conclude that the second accuser also was a *maid*; and it is not until we read Peter's reply, "*Man*, I am not," that we find we have been misled by the Revisers' ambiguous language.

Luke xxii. 66.—"And as soon as it was day, the assembly of the elders of the people *was* gathered together, both chief priests and scribes." *Was they!* "*Assembly*" is what is called a noun of

multitude; and is to be regarded either as singular, or as plural, according to the sense in which it is employed. Now, in the verse quoted, the word "*assembly*" is used in a plural sense; as is evidenced by the expression. "The assembly . . . was *gathered together*, both *Chief Priests and Scribes*." Therefore the Revisers should have said, "The assembly of the Elders of the people *were* gathered together, both Chief Priests and Scribes."

Luke xxiii.
11.

Luke xxiii. 11.—"And Herod with his soldiers set him at nought, and mocked him." The meaning of the Revisers' word "*nought*," being intended to be "*nothing*," it should have been written thus, "*naught*"; i.e. the negation of "*aught*," anything. "Nought" is an error of the illiterate. The two words "*aught*" and "*ought*" have distinctly different meanings; and only the former admits of being made into a negation by the prefix of an "*n*." See also Acts v. 36.

Acts v. 36.

Luke xxiii.
39.

Luke xxiii. 39.—"And one of the malefactors which were *hanged* railed

on him." When we speak of a malefactor as having been "*hanged*," we mean that he was suspended by a rope round his neck until he was dead. As that was not the fate of the two who died with Jesus, the Revisers should have stated, as they previously had done in verse 33, that the malefactors were *crucified*.

Luke xxiii. 46. — "Father, into thy hands I commend my *spirit*: and having said this he gave up the *ghost*." The Revisers should not have said, "he gave up the *ghost*"; but, "he gave up his *spirit*": or else consistently have said, "Father, into Thy hands I commend my *ghost*": for, the word is the same in each part of the verse. But I believe that even the Revisers would shrink from saying that. See also Mark xv. 37.

Luke xxiii. 52, 53. — "This man went to Pilate, and asked for the body of Jesus. And he took *it* down, and wrapped *it* in a linen cloth, and laid *him* in a tomb." Did the Revisers

Luke xxiii.
46.

Mark xv.
37.

Luke xxiii.
52, 53.

believe that Jesus was not in the body when Joseph of Arimathæa took *it* from the cross and wrapped *it* in a linen cloth; but that Jesus *was* in the body when Joseph laid *him* in a tomb? How else can the Revisers' change of the pronoun, from "*it*" to "*him*," be accounted for?

Luke xxiv.
13-17.

Luke xxiv. 13-17.—“And behold *two* of them were going that very day to a village named Emmaus . . . and Jesus himself drew near, and went with them. . . . And he said unto them, What communications are these that ye have one with *another*?” “*An*” is the indefinite article, and applies to one of *several*; “*the*” is the definite article, and applies to *one only*, or to several considered *as one*. Now, as there were only two disciples journeying to Emmaus, each must have spoken to *the* other, in their mutual conversation. If, as the Revisers say, one of them spoke to *another*, it must have been to a *third* traveller. Therefore the Revisers' statement, implying that there were but “*two*,” is incorrect.

John i. 15.—“John beareth witness John i. 15. of him, and crieth saying, This *was* he of whom I said, He that *cometh* after me is *become* before me.” If when John spoke, Jesus was dead (which he was not, see verse 30), then it would have been correct to say, “This *was* he”; but as he was alive, John should have said, doubtless did say, This *is* he of whom I said, He who *cometh* after me is preferred before me.” The expression “*cometh*,” followed by “*become*,” is very infelicitous.

John i. 32.—“And John bare witness, John i. 32. saying, I have beheld the spirit descending as a dove out of heaven; and it *abode* upon him.” To *abide* is to stay, with a certain degree of *permanence*. What permanency did the Revisers wish us to attribute to the resting of the dove-like form on Jesus?

John i. 51.—“Ye shall see the heaven John i. 51. opened, and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of man.” As the abode of the angels is Heaven;

Matt. xviii.
10.

(see *Matt.* xviii. 10) and Heaven is considered to be above us; (though, with a world revolving in space, how can there be any "*above*" or "*beneath*"?) the angels must descend before they can ascend. And that is the order in which the events should have been recorded by the Revisers.

John ii. 17.

John ii. 17.—"The zeal of *thine* house shall eat me up." Why have the Revisers said "*thine* house"? as if the "*h*" in "*house*" were not aspirated, and the word had to be pronounced, Cockney fashion, 'ouse! And yet the Revisers, with their usual unjustifiable inconsistency, have said, in *Matt.* ix. 6; and *Luke* v. 24; "*thy* house."

Matt. ix. 6.
Luke v. 24.

John iii. 16,
17, 24.

John iii. 16, 17, 24.—"For God"; "For God"; "For John." In each of these instances; and in many others which are similar throughout the Revisers' work, there should be a comma after the preposition, "*for*"; the meaning there, being, "*because*"; whereas, without a comma, the meaning is, "*appertaining to*." See *Rom.* ix. 17.

Rom. ix. 17.

John iii. 32, 33.—“What he hath seen and heard, of that he beareth witness; and no man receiveth his witness. He that hath received his witness hath set his seal to this, that God is true.” This is a very strange passage; for, it apparently contradicts itself: it says that, “*no man receiveth his witness*”; and immediately adds, “*He that hath received his witness hath set his seal to this, that God is true.*” Probably the meaning is this:—“No man receiveth his witness. *Had* any received his witness, he would have set his seal to this, that God is true.”

John iv. 43.—“And after two days he went *forth from thence* into Galilee.” In verse 11 of this chapter, the Revisers employed the objectionable expression “*from whence*,” — objectionable because the word “*whence*” embodies in itself the word, “*from*”; the meaning being, “*from which* place, or circumstance.” So also is it with the words “*hence*” and “*thence.*” But, in this verse, the

Revisers have given us "*forth from thence*"! i.e. "He went *from from from* there." They should have said, "*He went thence into Galilee.*" See also Acts xvi. 12.

Acts xvi. 12.

John iv. 54.

John iv. 54.—"This is *again* the *second* sign that Jesus did." How could there be two "*second*" signs; or two *second* things of any kind? This is another example of the Revisers' nonsense. Yet, to Bishop Thornton, it is "*light in all its purity and clearness.*" Perhaps, as it is all so clear to his mind, he will explain to less gifted individuals how this impossibility is possible.

John v. 16.

John v. 16.—"And *for this cause* did the Jews persecute Jesus, *because* he did these things on the Sabbath." What are we to say of such tautology as this? It is too contemptible even for condemnation. The A.V., of which the above is a *revision*! reads thus:—"And *therefore* did the Jews persecute Jesus . . . *because* he had done these things on the Sabbath day."

John v. 31.—“If I bear witness of John v. 31. myself, my witness is not *true*.” It does not follow that, because a person bears witness of himself, his witness is not “*true*.” It may be *true*, but it is not *trustworthy*, because it is not the witness of one who is disinterested: and doubtless what Jesus said was, “If I bear witness of myself, my witness is not *trustworthy*.”

John vi. 15.—“Jesus *therefore* per- John vi. 15.ceiving that they were about to come *and* take him by force to make him king.” In the first place, “*therefore*” should have been “*thereby*.” “*Therefore*” means, for a certain reason which had just been stated; and is followed by an action, as a consequence; but in this instance it is not followed by an *action*; it is followed by an *effect*. On that account the proper word to have used was not “*therefore*,” but “*thereby*.” “Jesus *thereby* perceiving,” etc. Another error here is the using of the conjunction “*and*” in place of the

preposition "to": the verse says, "they were about to come *and* take him by force." It should be "they were about to come *to* take him by force": that was their object.

John vi.
16-18.

John vi. 16-18.—"*And* when evening came, his disciples went down to the sea; *and* they entered into a boat, *and* were going over the sea unto Capernaum. *And* it was now dark, *and* Jesus had not yet come to them. *And* the sea was rising." Here we have a passage of only six lines, in which the word "*and*" occurs six times! Such composition would disgrace even a school-boy. See also Matt. xiii. 37-39. "*And* he answered *and* said, He that soweth the good seed is the Son of man; *and* the field is the world; *and* the good seed, these are the sons of the kingdom; *and* the tares are the sons of the evil [one]; *and* the enemy that sowed them is the devil: *and* the harvest is the end of the world; *and* the reapers are angels." The word "*and*," eight times in eight lines.

Matt. xiii.
37-39.

John vi. 22.—“On the morrow the multitude which stood on the other side of the sea saw that there was none *other* boat there *save* one.” The Revisers should not have said, “none *other* boat there *save* one”; the word “*other*” requires “*than*” to follow it; therefore they should have said, “*none other than.*” But, in this case, the word “*other*” were better omitted; and the sentence made to read thus:—“*There was but one boat.*”

John vi. 46.—“Not that any man hath seen the Father, *save he* which is from God.” Did not the Revisers know that “*save,*” in the sense of “*except,*” is a preposition; and that prepositions govern the accusative case? And, if they did know this simple rule of grammar, why did they write “*save he*” seeing that “*he*” is not accusative, but nominative? The Revisers should have said, “*save (or except) him* who is from God.” The same error occurs in Matt. xi. 27.

John vi. 67, 68.—“Jesus said there-

John vi. 67,
68.

fore unto the twelve, *Would* ye also go away? Simon Peter answered him, Lord, to whom *shall* we go?" It is seldom that one meets with so strange a transposition of the auxiliary verbs as is in these two verses: the future conditional being put for the present, and the present being put for the future conditional. The Revisers should have written: "Jesus said to the twelve, *Will* ye also go away? Simon Peter answered him, Lord, to whom *should* we go?"

John vii. 9.

John vii. 9. — "And having said these things unto them, he abode *still* in Galilee." As the word "*still*" has more than one meaning, the Revisers should have been "particularly careful" as to its position in the sentence, knowing that the position often determines in which sense the word is used. One meaning of the word is "*quiet*"; and the expression, "He abode *still* in Galilee," might mean, "He remained *quiet* in Galilee." And even if you

transpose the words and say, "*He still abode in Galilee,*" the sentence, though better, is not wholly free from ambiguity. But why did the Revisers employ the word "*still*"? It has no equivalent in the Greek. A clearer expression would have been, "*He remained in Galilee.*"

John vii. 34.—"Ye *shall* seek me, and *shall not* find me." John vii. 34. Again we have that awful falsehood, "Ye *shall* seek me, and *shall not* find me"; words which it is certain Jesus never uttered; so contrary are they to the loving spirit of him who wept over Jerusalem, and said, "Oh! Luke xix. 42. that thou hadst known, in this thy day, the things which belong to thy peace." "How often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under wings, and ye would not!" Matt. xxiii. 37. Doubtless, the fault of the language is the Revisers'; and the words of Jesus were, "Ye *will* seek me, and *will not* find me." And why? Because they would seek him from unworthy motives. *See John vi. 26.* John vi. 26.

John vii. 49.

John vii. 49. — “But this multitude which *knoweth* not the law *are* accursed.” Here we have a noun which the Revisers have treated as both singular and plural in the same verse! “This multitude which *knoweth* not” (there it is singular) “*are* accursed” (there it is plural).

John viii.
11.

John viii. 11. — “And Jesus said, Neither do I condemn thee: go thy way; *from henceforth* sin no more.” The words, “*from henceforth*” are redundant; as “*sin no more*” embodies their meaning. Moreover, the word “*from*” is doubly wrong, being embodied also in the word “*henceforth*.”

John viii.
24.

John viii. 24.—“*Except* ye believe that I am he, ye shall [will] die in your sins.” Once more I call attention to the Revisers' misuse of “*except*” and “*unless*.” The words are not interchangeable: each has its own proper use. “*Unless*” refers to verbs, and “*except*” refers to nouns and pronouns in the accusative case; as in Acts xxiv. 21, *e.g.* “*Unless I mistake*, all the officers with the army in South

Acts xxiv.
21.

Africa are under seventy years of age, *except Lord Roberts.*"

Acts viii.
31.

John viii. 33, 37.—“ We *be* Abraham's seed . . . Ye *are* Abraham's seed.” Why this change in the verb? Did the Revisers mean by it to teach that there was a difference between the vernacular of the people, and of Jesus? I cannot think of any other reason; but not infrequently the Revisers appear to have acted without reason; and sometimes in direct opposition to it. Our inquiry for a motive is therefore obliged to remain unsatisfied. We can only conjecture.

John viii.
33, 37.

John viii. 55.—“ If I *should* say, I know him not, I *shall* be like unto you, a liar.” As the former part of this sentence is conditional, the latter part also should have been made conditional, thus:—“ If I *should* say, I know him not, I *should* be like you, *untruthful*.” It is offensive to call a man a “*liar*.”

John viii.
55.

John ix. 6. — “ When he had thus spoken, he spat on the ground, and made clay *of* the spittle, and anointed his eyes

John ix. 6.

with the clay." No, no; that is wrong. Jesus did not make clay *of* the spittle. He spat on the *ground*; and made clay *with* the spittle.

John ix. 25.

John ix. 25.—“Whether he *be* a sinner, I know not.” Notwithstanding what Bishop Thornton says about the Revisers' work being “*light in all its purity and clearness,*” unquestionably they had very hazy ideas as to the right employment of the subjunctive mood of verbs. The Revisers seem to have thought that whenever the word “*if,*” or the word “*whether,*” occurs, it must be followed by a verb in that mood; but there also they were wrong. The general rule is, that the subjunctive mood should be employed only when there is a concurrence of contingency and futurity. Where there is either contingency without futurity, or futurity without contingency, the verb must be in the indicative mood. In the verse quoted, there is contingency without futurity, therefore the Revisers should have said, “Whether he *is* a sinner, I know not.”

John x. i.—“He that entereth not by John x. 1. the *door* into the *fold of the sheep*.” A sheepfold does not have a “*door*”; it has a *gate*.

John x. 16.—“And other sheep I have John x. 16. which are not of this fold: them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice, and *they* shall become *one flock, one shepherd*.” As the Revisers did not mean that the sheep would become a shepherd, as well as a flock, those learned men should have said that the sheep would become one flock, *having* one shepherd.

John x. 30.—“I and the Father are John x. 30. one.” In considering this text, as an evidence of the Deity of Jesus, we should not be forgetful of his own words respecting the nature of his oneness with THE FATHER; for, there could be no interpreter so competent to explain the statement of Jesus, as was Jesus himself. In his prayer for his disciples, John xvii. 11. he says, “Holy FATHER, keep through THINE own name those whom THOU hast given me, that they may be *one*,

John xvii.
20, 21.

even *as* we are." "Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on me through their word; that they all may be *one*; *as Thou, Father, art in me, and I in Thee*; that they also may be *one in us*." From this, it is evident that the oneness was not a oneness of essence, but of spirit, and of thought, and of purpose, and of affection. If we hold that the passage in John x. 30 proclaims the Deity of Jesus, we must, in very consistency, hold that the chapter xvii. 11-21 proclaims the Deity of his disciples; for, the oneness was the same.

John x. 30.

John xvii.
11-21

John xi. 23,
25; 34, 35.

John xi. 23, 25; 34, 35.—"Jesus *saith* unto her"; . . . "Jesus *said* unto her." "They *say* unto him"; . . . "The Jews therefore *said*." Why this constant "see-sawing" between the present and the past? The Revisers should have been consistent, and either have described the event historically in the past tense throughout; or, for dramatic effect, have narrated it in the present tense, as taking place before the eyes of those whom the

apostle addressed. To change the tense mars the effect of this most touching narrative.

John xii. 1.—“Jesus therefore six days before the passover came to Bethany.” John xii. 1. If the narrator was at Bethany, then it would have been correct for him to speak of Jesus as having *come* to Bethany; but if the narrator was elsewhere, then he should have said that Jesus *went* to Bethany. And, that the narrator was elsewhere, is evidenced by what is stated in the next verse respecting Jesus: *viz.* that “they made him a supper *there*.”

John xii. 18.—“They heard that he had *done* this *sign*.” John xii. 18. Why have the Revisers substituted the word “*sign*” for “miracle”? Did they not believe in miracles? How Hume and Bolingbroke would have chuckled over the alteration! And what did the Revisers mean by *doing* a sign? The Revisers employ the word “*miracles*” in Acts xix. 11. Acts xix. 11.

John xii. 27.—“What shall I say? Father, save me from this hour. But for” John xii. 27.

this cause came I unto this hour. Father, glorify thy name." In this verse we have a very good illustration of the importance of correct punctuation. The Revisers should have put a comma after the word, "*But.*" However, the substitution of "No!" for "*But*" would have made the meaning clearer. The passage would then have run thus:—"What shall I say, Father, save me from this hour? No! for this cause I came to this hour. Father, glorify Thy name." Notice the emphatic difference which is made by the change of position of the note of interrogation.

John xii. 40.

John xii. 40.—"He hath blinded their eyes and hardened their hearts." In Matt. xiii. 15, the same passage from Isaiah is quoted, but there it does not say that God had blinded their eyes; it says that the people themselves had closed their eyes. It is not probable that both versions are correct; and that which is in Matthew seems more like the truth concerning our Heavenly FATHER.

Matt. xiii.
15.

John xii. 44.—“And Jesus cried and said, He that believeth on me, believeth not on me, but on him that sent me.” John xii. 44.
As these words are a contradiction, it is not probable that they accurately represent what Jesus said. I think that the context shows his meaning to be this: —“He who believeth on me, believeth not on me *only*, but also on HIM who sent me.”

John xiii. 9, 10.—“Simon Peter saith *unto* him. . . . Jesus saith *to* him.” John xiii. 9,
10. Can the Revisers, or their advocate, Bishop Thornton, give a satisfactory reason for this change of the prepositions? What was there peculiar in Simon Peter's words to Jesus, which necessitated the narrator's saying that Simon Peter spoke *unto* Jesus, but that Jesus spoke *to* Simon Peter? And what difference did the Revisers consider there to be between “*unto*” and “*to*”? In the above sentence there is no difference; but the words are not synonymous: “*to*” is sometimes a prefix to a verb; as in the infinitive

mood; whereas "*unto*" is never that, e.g. "*Dying to sin*" means being consumed with a desire to commit a certain sin; but, "*dying unto sin*" means being dead to temptation. In Rom. vi. 2. "*died to sin*" should be "*died unto sin.*"

Rom. vi. 2.

John xiii.
23. 25.

John xiii. 23, 25.—"There was at the table *reclining in Jesus' bosom* one of his disciples, whom Jesus loved. . . . He *leaning back*, as he was, *on Jesus' breast.*" What change of attitude was there in the disciple who is first described as "*reclining in Jesus' bosom,*" and then as "*leaning back on Jesus' breast*"? And what difference did the Revisers conceive there to be between a man's "*breast*" and his "*bosom*"? I do not profess to be wise in such matters; but I thought that, in these days, only women have "*bosoms.*" The word "*bosom,*" when metaphorically used as synonymous with "*affection,*" cannot be objected to, even when applied to a man or to GOD; as when we speak of "*the bosom of THE FATHER.*" But, in actual description,

John i. 18.

the term *is* objectionable. Perhaps Bishop Thornton, to whom the Revisers' work is "*light in all its purity and clearness,*" will kindly explain to us the difference between "*breast*" and "*bosom*"; and, if he considers the words to be synonyms, give us his opinion as to why the Revisers varied their expression. It may assist the Bishop's profound investigation if I tell him, that the word "*bosom,*" being allied to the Sanscrit "*bujan,*" to curve, is more applicable to a woman's breast than to the breast of a man.

John xiv. 3.—"If I go and prepare a John xiv. 3. place for you, I [will] come again, and will receive you unto myself; that where I am, *there* ye may be also." The reader will observe that the word "*there*" is in italics in the N.T.; which circumstance shows that, in the Greek, there is no word corresponding to it. Consequently, its being in the R.V. is the Revisers' very own doing. But, let me ask, what *raison d'être* has it? What want does

it supply? What additional thought does it convey? What idea does it impart which is not in the word "*where*" that precedes it? The end of the R.V. verse, "ye may *be also*," should be "*ye also may be*."

John xiv.
19.

John xiv. 19.—"Because I live, ye shall *live also*." Adverbs should be placed as near as possible to the words with which they are most intimately connected, so that their reference may be unmistakable. In the sentence which we now have under consideration the adverb, "*also*," is not so placed; its reference is to "*ye*." Therefore the Revisers should have said, "Because I live, *ye also shall live*"; not, "ye shall *live also*."

John xiv.
28.

John xiv. 28.—"Ye heard *how* I said to you, I go away." "*How*" means "*in what manner*"; and the Revisers did not mean to speak of the *manner* in which Jesus spoke; but of the *fact* of his speaking, and therefore should have said, "Ye heard *that* I said to you, I go away."

John xv. 11.—“These things have I John xv. 11. spoken unto you, that my joy may be in you, and that your joy may be *fulfilled*.” Joy is not an emotion which can be said to be “*fulfilled*”: a *promise of joy* may be fulfilled, but not joy itself. Probably what Jesus said, was, “that your joy may be *complete*.”

John xvi. 1, 3, 4.—“*These things* have John xvi. 1, 3, 4. I spoken unto you. . . . And *these things* will they do. . . . But *these things* have I spoken unto you. . . . And *these things* I said not.” Four times in three verses, we have the words, “*these things*.” And the so-called “*things*,” are not always “*things*.” Three times out of the four, they are *sayings*. What dearth of resource as to language such tautology manifests!

John xvi. 27, 28.—“I *came forth from* John xvi. 27, 28. the Father. I *came out from* the Father.” Is not to “*come out from*” to “*come forth from*”? What, then, did the Revisers think would be gained by the change of expression, and the repetition of the idea?

John xvi.
16, 17, 19.

John xvi. 16, 17, 19.—“A little while, and ye *behold me* no more; and again a little while, and ye shall *see me*. . . . A little while, and ye *behold me* not; and again a little while, and ye shall *see me*. . . . A little while, and ye *behold me* not; and again a little while, and ye shall *see me*.” What is the meaning of this change from “*behold me*,” to “*see me*”? And why has the former been considered preferable in a negative clause of a sentence; and the latter in an affirmative clause; and that, three times over? A parallel passage occurs in Luke. xiii. 35.—“Ye shall *not see me*, till ye shall say, Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord.” If the word “*behold*” is preferable in the former sentences, why not in this? They both are negative assertions; and both refer to the same event.

Luke xiii.
35.

John xvii.
11, 12.

John xvii. 11, 12.—“Holy Father, keep them in thy name which thou hast given me, that they may be one, even as we are. While I was with them, I kept

them in thy name which thou hast given me : and I guarded them, and not one of them perished, but the son of perdition ; *that the scripture might be fulfilled.*" There must be some awful mistake here ! I do not say that the Revisers have mistranslated the Greek : the translation may be accurate ; but, in justice to Jesus, my soul revolts against attributing such words to him ; for they affirm that he guarded all the disciples except Judas ; and that he left him to perish, in order "*that the scripture might be fulfilled*" ! As if, in the estimation of him who came to seek and to save that which was lost, the fulfilling of a prophecy was a sufficient reason for leaving a soul to perish ! I have not so learned Christ. How can Bishop Thornton designate the Revisers' work as "*light in all its purity and clearness*" !

John xvii. 15.—"I pray not that thou shouldst take them from the world, but that thou shouldst keep them from the evil one." That which the Revisers have

Matt. vi. 13.

translated "*from*," is, in the Greek, "*out of*"; and the reason why they so translated it, is not far to seek. There is no word, in the Greek of this passage, corresponding to the word, "*one*," in the phrase "*the evil one*"; it is simply "*the evil*"; and, as the Revisers wished to make the expression agree with their version of The Lord's Prayer in Matt. vi. 13, they were obliged to alter the Greek, "*out of*" to "*from*"; as they could not speak of being kept *out of* the evil *one*. Neither in this passage, nor in the one in Matthew, is there in the Greek the word, "*one*": it is "*deliver us out of evil.*"

John xviii.
15.

John xviii. 15.—"That disciple was known unto the high priest, and *entered in* with Jesus *into* the court of the high priest." Did not the Revisers know that the word, "*enter*" embodies the idea of "*in*"? Why, then, did they say, "*enter in*"? "*In*" is superfluous; they could not "*enter out*"; nor could they enter otherwise than by going "*in.*" And what

on earth did they mean by the silly duplication of the error, saying they *entered in into* the court?

John xviii. 18.—“Now the servants and the officers were standing there, having made a fire of *coals*.” In the Greek it is “a fire of *charcoal*”; and why the Revisers did not leave it so, it is puzzling even to surmise. It is even questionable whether coal was used in Palestine in the time of Christ. But, when the Revisers had decided to make the alteration, they might at least have put it into good English. “*Coals*” for *coal* is simply a vulgar error. I wonder whether the Revisers and their friend the Bishop speak of lumps of sugar as “*sugars*.” See also John xxi. 9.

John xviii.
18.

John xxi. 9.

John xviii. 31, 32.—“*The Jews* said unto him, It is not lawful for us to put any man to death; *that the word of Jesus might be fulfilled*, which he spake, signifying by what manner of death he should die.” Did the Revisers themselves believe, and did they wish us to believe,

John xviii.
31, 32.

that *the Jews*, who sought to bring about the death of Jesus, did so in order *that the word of Jesus might be fulfilled?* The idea is absolutely incredible.

John xix.
18.

John xix. 18.—“They crucified him, and with him two others, on *either* side one, and Jesus in the midst.” *Either* means *one of two*, but not *both*; hence the inaccuracy of the Revisers’ expression: they should have said, “On *each* side one, and Jesus in the midst.”

John xix.
28.

John xix. 28. — “After this Jesus, knowing that all things *are now* finished, that the scripture might be accomplished, saith, I thirst.” In the first place, as the Revisers were recording a past event, they should have said, not, “all things *are now* finished”; but, “all things *were then* finished.” And if the Revisers did not mean that Jesus’s expression, “*I thirst*,” was said merely to fulfil a prophecy, they should have put into brackets, as a parenthesis, the words (“knowing that all things were then finished, that the Scripture might be fulfilled”).

John xx. 14, 15.—“When she had thus said, she turned herself back, and beholdeth *Jesus* standing, and knew not that it was *Jesus*. *Jesus* said unto her.” To make good English of the Revisers’ language is almost a hopeless task. Look at these two verses: “she turned” [*past tense*] “and beholdeth” [*present tense*] “*Jesus* standing, and knew not [*past tense*] that it was *Jesus*. *Jesus* saith unto her.” When the Revisers saw that they had the name “*Jesus*” three times in ten consecutive words, the substitution of a pronoun for the second time of the word’s occurrence should have been felt to be imperative. Then the passage might have stood thus:—“She turned herself back, and *beheld* *Jesus* standing, *but* knew not that it was *he*.” The same error occurs in verses 4 and 5 of the next chapter.

John xxi. 3.—“Simon Peter saith unto them, I *go* a fishing. They say unto him, We also *come* with thee.” The Revisers were right in representing Simon Peter

as saying, "I *go* a fishing"; but they should have reported the others as saying, "We will *go* with thee"; not, "We also *come* with thee." If Peter had to *go*, so likewise had the others who purposed accompanying him. This error is not found in the A.V.; there it is—"We also *go* with thee."

John xxi. 9. John xxi. 9.—"A fire of *coals*." Here is a repetition of the vulgar error occurring in ch. xviii. 18. The word "*coals*" is correct only when different kinds are spoken of.

There is one very strange error which occurs with remarkable frequency in the Gospels. I say, "*strange*," because its grossness is so palpable. I refer to the expression, "Verily I say unto you" where the adverb "*verily*" does not refer to the fact of Christ's speaking, but to that which he spoke: e.g. "Verily, I say unto you, They have their reward." This should be, "I say unto you, *verily* they have their reward"—Matt. vi. 2, and elsewhere.

Acts i. 8, 13.—“*Both* in Jerusalem, and Acts i. 8, 13. in all Judæa and Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth.” The word “*both*” correctly refers to *two only*; but the Revisers have here given to it an extended meaning which is inconsistent with its signification. See also v. 13, where the word “*both*” is used concerning *eleven* apostles!

Acts i. 12.—“Olivet, which is *nigh* Acts i. 12. unto Jerusalem a sabbath day’s journey *o*.” Better thus:—“Olivet, which is a sabbath day’s journey from Jerusalem”; we then avoid the solecism of “*nigh*” and “*off*”; the former meaning “*near*”; and the latter, “*distant*.”

Acts iii. 21.—“Even Jesus: whom *the* Acts iii. 21. *heaven* must receive until the times of restoration of all things.” “*The heaven*” is an expression employed by the Revisers to denote the firmament; (see Luke iv. Luke iv. 25. 25) therefore unless the Revisers meant that Jesus would be up in the clouds until the restoration of all things, the expression should have been, “whom *Heaven* must receive.”

Acts iv. 3.

Acts iv. 3.—“It *was now* eventide.” Why have the Revisers thus confused the past and the present? If the intention was to describe a *past* event, what business has “*now*” in the sentence? If the Revisers intended to speak of a *present* event, why put the verb in the *past*? The expression “*was*” [past], “*now*” [present] is wholly indefensible.

Acts iv. 18.

Acts iv. 18.—“And they called them, and charged them *not* to speak at all *nor* teach in the name of Jesus.” It is the word “*neither*” which is followed by “*nor*”; the word “*not*” is followed by “*or*.” Therefore the Revisers should have said, “They called them, and charged them *not* to speak at all *or* teach in the name of Jesus.” The word “*nor*” would be permissible after “*not*,” only in a sentence wherein the auxiliary verb were repeated: e.g. “They *were not* to speak; *nor were* they to teach in the name of Jesus.”

Acts iv. 32.

Acts iv. 32.—“Not one of them said that aught of the things which he pos-

essed was his own; but they had all things *common*." The expression "they had all things *common*," might mean that they did not indulge in luxuries; but as it is evident from the context that that was not the meaning intended to be conveyed; but rather, that "they had all things *in common*," the Revisers should have said so.

Acts v. 25.—"The men whom ye put Acts v. 25. *in* the prison are *in* the temple." The little word, "*in*" occurs twice in this short sentence; but being used in the first instance as a preposition of action, it is inaccurate there. The Revisers should have said, that the apostles who were "put *into* the prison are *in* the Temple." The words are not interchangeable; it is as incorrect to say that the apostles were "put *in* the prison," as it would be to say that they were found "*into* the Temple."

Here is another instance of erroneous spelling. In Acts v. 36, we read, "As Acts v. 36. many as obeyed him were dispersed, and

came to nought." It should be "naught," the negative of "*aught*," which means "anything." See Acts iv. 32. The Revisers might, with equal propriety, or rather, with equal impropriety, call a "draught" of water, its very opposite, a "drought." See also Luke xxiii. 11.

Acts iv. 32.

Luke xxiii.
11.

Acts vi. 1.

Acts vi. 1.—"There arose a murmuring of the Grecian Jews against the Hebrews because *their* widows were neglected in the daily ministration." Whose widows? The widows of the Grecian Jews, or of the Hebrews? Did the Grecian Jews, in a spirit of disinterested philanthropy, murmur that the Hebrews were neglecting their own widows? The construction of the sentence is very ambiguous, owing to the pronoun "*their*" which the Revisers have employed so injudiciously.

Acts vii. 6.

Acts vii. 6.—"And God spake on this wise, that his seed should sojourn in a strange land, and that *they* should bring *them* into bondage." Who should bring whom into bondage? Where is the noun to which the pronoun "*they*" refers?

Was it Abraham's seed who should bring into bondage the inhabitants of the strange land? Certainly not, though the sequence of the words makes the passage state so. Thus the Revisers' carelessness about pronouns has falsified history.

Acts vii. 25.—“He supposed [this should be “*believed*”] that his brethren understood how that *God* by *his* hand was giving them deliverance.” Here is another example of error as to the place which a pronoun should occupy in a sentence. The words, “by *his* hand,” in consequence of their immediately following the word, “*God*,” naturally makes the pronoun, “*his*” refer to *God*, whereas it really refers to *Moses*. The Revisers should have said, “He trusted that his brethren understood that, by his hand, *God* was giving them deliverance.” See Luke xix. 11.

Acts vii. 25.

Luke xix.

11.

Acts vii. 43.

Acts vii. 43.—“And ye *took up* the tabernacle of Moloch.” To *take up* a tabernacle is very like *taking it down*;

and that was the opposite of the meaning of Stephen, who, doubtless said, “Ye *raised up* the tabernacle of Moloch”; as

Amos ix. 11.

in Amos ix. 11, “I will raise up the tabernacle of David.”

Acts vii. 53.

Acts vii. 53.—“Ye who received the law as it was ordained by angels.” The Law was not an *ordinance* of the angels; it was an ordinance by God (see Luke i. 6); and was ministered by the angels (see v. 30, 35, 38 of this chapter). The difficulty would be obviated by transposing the words, “*by angels,*” and reading the passage thus, “*Ye who received, from angels, the Law as it was ordained.*”

Luke i. 6.

Acts vii. 30,
35, 38.

Acts viii.
14.

Acts viii. 14.—“The apostles which were *at Jerusalem.*” As previously remarked, we do not say *at* a city, but *in* a city; and *at* a town or a village; therefore the Revisers should have said, “The apostles *who were in Jerusalem.*” In ch. iv. 5 and 16 the Revisers have said, “*in Jerusalem*”; and in Acts ix. 21 and 28 they have said both “*in Jerusalem*” and “*at Jerusalem*”; and why, it would puzzle

Acts iv. 5,
16.

Acts ix. 21,
28.

anyone, except Bishop Thornton, to say. See also Luke ix. 31.

Luke ix. 31.

Acts viii. 20.—“Thy silver perish *with* thee, because thou hast thought to obtain the gift of God *with* money.” The word “*with*” has here two different significations. In the former clause, it means “*accompanied by*”; and if, as is only natural, it should be taken to mean the same in the latter clause, the true signification of the passage will thereby be perverted; for, the assertion will be, “Thou hast thought to obtain the gift of God *accompanied by* money.” The Revisers should have said, “Thou hast thought to obtain the gift of God *by means of* money.”

Acts viii.
20.

Acts viii. 31.—“How can I, *except* some one shall guide me?” The Revisers’ misuse of “*except*” for “*unless*” is very strange. Everywhere in the A.V. the word, “*unless*” is correct; but in 1 Cor. xv. 2, the Revisers have altered it to “*except*”; and yet, where the word, “*except*” is incorrect in the A.V. in 1 Cor. xiv. 6, 9; and 2 Cor. xiii. 5, the

Acts viii.
31.

1 Cor. xv. 2.

1 Cor. xiv.
6, 9.

2 Cor. xiii.
5.

Revisers have altered it to "*unless*." In Acts viii. 1; and xxvi. 29; the word, "*except*," is correct in both versions. In Prov. iv. 16, both words occur, in both versions; "They sleep not *except* they have done mischief; and their sleep is taken away *unless* they cause some to fall." It should be "*unless*" in both instances. For the rule as to the right use of the two words, see the criticisms on John viii. 24.

John viii.
24.

Acts viii.
32.

Isa. liii. 7.

Acts viii. 32.—"He was led as a *sheep* to the slaughter; and as a *lamb* before his shearer is dumb, so he openeth not his mouth." In both the A.V. and the R.V. this passage, from Isa. liii. 7, is misquoted; "*sheep*" being put for "*lamb*," and "*lamb*" for "*sheep*." It is surprising that the Revisers did not correct the error; for everybody (except, of course, the Revisers) knows that "*lambs*" are not shorn. What if the error is in the Greek; it is not, on that account, *inspired*. "GOD is not a God of confusion" He is the "true GOD."

1 Cor. xiv.
33.
Jer. x. 10.

Acts ix. 26. — “He *assayed* to join Acts ix. 26. himself to the disciples.” This should have been, “*essayed*”; i.e., attempted. “*Assayed*,” in that sense, is obsolete; and its use is restricted to the determining the quantity of metal in an ore.

Acts ix. 39.—“Shewing the *coats and* Acts ix. 39. *garments* which Dorcas made.” Is not a coat a garment? The Revisers should have said “coats and *other* garments.”

Acts x. 20. — “Arise, and get *thee* Acts x. 20. down.” This, unquestionably, should be, “Arise, and get *thou* down”; just as in Ruth iv. 11, “Do *thou* worthily.” “*Thee*” Ruth iv. 11. for “*thou*,” is an error which is common among the Society of Friends, and is thus spoken of by that greatest of English Grammarians, Gould Brown of Lynn, Mass. U.S.A; in his “Grammar of English Grammars,” Second ed. p. 320: “The religious sect that entertained a scruple about applying ‘*you*’ to an individual, fell for the most part into an ungrammatical practice of putting ‘*thee*’ for ‘*thou*.’” But how the Revisers

came to sanction the error is a mystery. The error occurs also in Acts xxii. 18. "Make haste, and get *thee* quickly out of Jerusalem."

Acts xxii.
18.

Acts xii. 10.

Acts xii. 10.—"And when they were past the first and *the* second *ward*." I am glad to find that the Revisers have left this passage unaltered, because it is correct; but many clergymen are puzzled by similarly constructed sentences, and do not know whether to say, "The Old and New *Testament*," or "The Old and New *Testaments*"; nor do they know whether to say, "The first and *the* second *verse*," or "The first and *the* second *verses*." But the rule governing such expressions is very simple; it is this: If you repeat the article "*the*" before the noun, then the noun must be in the singular; otherwise the noun must be in the plural. Thus: "The Old and New *Testaments*," or, "The Old and *the* New *Testament*"; and, "The first and second *verses*," or, "The first and *the* second *verse*."

Acts xiii. 25.—“Behold, there cometh Acts xiii. 25. one after me, the shoes of whose feet I am not worthy to *unloose*.” Why did the Revisers alter the word “*loose*” as it occurs in the A.V., to the vulgarism, “*unloose*”? *Un* is a particle signifying negation; therefore, if “*to loose*” is to liberate, “*to unloose*” must mean to bind fast; just as “*to bind*” and “*to unbind*” are the very opposites of each other, therefore they cannot be used interchangeably.

Acts xiv. 18.—“And with these sayings Acts xiv. 18. *scarce* restrained they the multitudes from doing sacrifice unto them.” As verbs should be qualified by adverbs, and not by adjectives, the Revisers ought to have said, “And with these sayings, *scarcely* restrained they the multitude.”

Acts xv. 4.—“And they rehearsed all Acts xv. 4. things that God had done *with* them.” In verse 12 of this chapter, we read of Paul and Barnabas “rehearsing what signs and wonders God had wrought

among the Gentiles *by* them." That which God does *with* a man, and that which God does *by* a man, are quite different. The former refers to the man as *passive*; the latter refers to him as *active*; and the reference in each of the verses being to Paul and Barnabas as *active* agents, the preposition in each case should have been, "*by*": not "*with*" in one instance, and "*by*" in the other.

Acts xv. 14. Acts xv. 14. — "Brethren, hearken unto me: *Symeon* hath rehearsed how first God did visit the Gentiles." To alter the spelling of a proper name in history is very objectionable; it is confusing. The person whose name the Revisers give here as *Symeon*, is apparently the same as he whose name they have spelled *Simeon* in the history to which this passage refers. See Luke ii. 25, 34. Or does the passage refer to *Simon* Peter's mission to the Gentiles as recorded in Acts xi. 18? Either way, the spelling is different.

Acts xv. 24. Acts xv. 24.—"Forasmuch as we have

heard that certain which went out from us have troubled you with words, *subverting your souls*." A perusal of the event referred to (*see verse 5*) will show that the teaching spoken of could not have *subverted their souls*, though it may have *unsettled their minds* respecting a certain ceremony.

Were the Revisers in a humorous mood when they penned this conundrum; for, it is nothing less? It occurs in Acts xvi. 22. "And the magistrates rent *their* garments off *them*, and commanded to beat *them* with rods." Acts xvi. 22. Query. Did the magistrates rend their own garments, or the garments of the prisoners? And were the garments to be beaten, or the men?

Acts xvii. 25, 27. — "Neither is he served by men's hands, as *though* he needed any thing." . . . "if haply they might feel after him, and find him *though* he is not far from each one of us." Here are two sentences in which the word, "*though*" is used; in the former, it is

used incorrectly; and in the latter, correctly. The meaning of the word, as I have previously stated, is, "*notwithstanding*"; and, having that negative signification, it is out of place in an affirmative phrase. The Revisers should have said, in verse 25, "as *if* he needed any thing." See criticism on Luke ix. 53.

Luke ix. 53.

Sometimes the Revisers (is it by way of relieving the monotony of their labours) play at "*see-saw*" with the language. In Acts xviii. 22, we read, "And when he had landed at Cæsarea, *he went up* and saluted the church, *and went down* to Antioch." Why could not the Revisers have said, "And when he had landed at Cæsarea, *and had gone* and saluted the church, *he went down* to Antioch"? The meaning is the same, and the "*see-saw*" is avoided.

Acts xviii.
22.

Acts xix. 11, 12.—"And God wrought special miracles by the hands of Paul: insomuch that unto the sick were carried away from his body *handkerchiefs* or *aprons*, and the diseases departed from

Acts xix. 11,
12.

them." If the Revisers did not mean that the diseases departed from the "*handkerchiefs or aprons,*" the sentence should have been arranged thus:—"And God wrought special miracles by the hands of Paul: insomuch that, from his body, handkerchiefs or aprons were carried away to *the sick,* and the diseases departed from *them.*"

Acts xix. 26.—"Paul hath persuaded and turned away much people, saying that they be no gods which are made *with hands.*" We may be sure that Paul never discriminated between idols "*with hands*" and idols *without hands,* as the Revisers' language seems to imply. What the Ephesians said, was that Paul affirmed that gods made *by hands* were not Gods. See criticism on Acts xv. 4.

Acts xix. 34.—"Great *is* Diana of the Ephesians!" As there is no verb in the Greek of this passage, the exclamation was not an assertion of the greatness of Diana; but was an invocation to her; "Great Diana of the Ephesians!" and the

Revisers ought to have given it as such.

Acts xx. 9.

Acts xx. 9.—“And there sat in the window a certain young man named Eutyclus, borne *down* with deep sleep; and as Paul discoursed yet longer, being borne *down* by his sleep, he fell *down* from the third *story*.” But a “*story*” is a tale: the floor of a house is spelled “*storey*.” How was it that the Revisers mistook the former for the latter? Did they, like Eutyclus, become drowsy, and think that Paul had been telling tales to the company, and that the young man fell asleep at the end of the “*third story*”? This error is not in the A.V. It is the Revisers' own invention. In the A.V. the word is “*loft*”; but that did not please the Revisers; they had no *lofty* ideas. Nor is it a unique example of their error. In Gen. vi. 16, they tell us that the ark had three “*stories*” in it; as if Noah had provided himself with a little light literature for rainy days! “*Stories*” is the plural of “*story*,”

Gen. vi. 16.

a tale. The Revisers should have known that the plural of "storey," the floor of a house, is "storeys." Where *y* at the end of a word is preceded by a *vowel*, the plural is made by simply adding *s*; it is when *y*, at the end of a word, is preceded by a *consonant* that the plural is made by changing the *y* into *ies*.

The Bishop describes the Revisers' work as, "*light in all its purity and clearness*"; but they were certainly very much in the *dark* in their knowledge of English.

Acts xxi. 4.—"And having found the disciples, we tarried there seven days: and these [i.e., the disciples] said to Paul *through the Spirit*, that he should *not set foot in Jerusalem*." This verse needs some explanation, seeing that, according to verse 17 of the same chapter, Paul *did* set foot in Jerusalem. Perhaps Bishop Thornton, to whom the R.V. is "*light in all its purity and clearness*," will clear up the difficulty for us.

Acts xxi. 20.—"And they said unto

him, Thou seest, brother, how many *thousands* there are among the Jews of them which have believed." It is evident that the Revisers did not believe in the verbal inspiration of the Scriptures; or they would not have interpreted as "*thousands*," the Greek word which signifies "*myriads*."

Acts xxi. 26. Acts xxi. 26.—“Then Paul took the men, and the next day purifying himself with them went into the temple, declaring the fulfilment of the days of purification, until the offering was offered for every one of them.” This is not correctly stated. Paul did not declare “the *fulfilment* of the days of purification”; for, those days had only just *begun*. He announced the period of the days of purification; and that an oblation would be offered for himself and for each of his companions.

Acts xxi. 30, 31. Acts xxi. 30, 31.—“And they laid hold on Paul, and dragged him out of the temple: and straightway *the doors* were shut. And as *they* were seeking to kill

him." Who were seeking to kill Paul? The passage says that "*the doors* were shut. And as *they* were seeking to kill him." When a pronoun is apt to lead to confusion of thought, even though that be only momentary, the noun, and not a pronoun, should be used. The Revisers should have said, "And as *the Jews from Asia* were seeking to kill him."

Acts xxiii. 2.—"And the high priest Acts xxiii. 2. Ananias commanded them that stood by *him* to smite *him* on the mouth." To whom does the first "*him*" refer? Does it refer to Ananias or to Paul? The second "*him*" doubtless refers to Paul; but the reference of the first is doubtful. As far as the construction of the sentence is any indication of its meaning, the word "*him,*" in each case, might refer to Ananias.

Acts xxiii. 10, and 27.—"Lest Paul Acts xxiii. 10, 27. should be torn in pieces *by* them." . . . "This man was seized by the Jews, and was about to be slain *of* them." Why have the Revisers made this ridiculous

difference in the prepositions? And what difference was there in the contemplated actions that justified it? See also comments on Luke iv. 1, 2.

Luke iv. 1,
2.
Acts xxiii.
15.

Acts xxiii. 15.—“And we, *or* ever he come near, are ready to slay him.” “*Or*,” for “*ere*,” is a vulgarism. Doubtless it has the sanction of antiquity; but that does not make it the less a very silly error. What possible meaning can attach to “*or*” in the above sentence?

Acts xxiv.
10.

Acts xxiv. 10.—“I know that thou hast been *of* many years a judge unto this nation.” The Revisers have strangely misused the little preposition “*of*.” In verse 27 of the previous chapter they used it for “*by*.” Here they have used it for “*during*.” We read, “I know that thou hast been *of* many years a judge unto this nation.” He may have been a judge of important cases brought before him; but certainly he never had to judge “years.”

Acts xxiii.
27.

Acts xxiv.
15.

Acts xxiv. 15.—“There shall be a resurrection both of the just and unjust.”

In sentences where the word "*both*" is followed by a preposition, the preposition should be repeated before the second part of the sentence referred to by the word "*both*," e.g. "There shall be a resurrection both of the just and *of the* unjust."

Acts xxv. 3. — "And *they* besought Acts xxv. 3. *him*, asking favour against *him*, that *he* would send for *him*." Oh! these pronouns, about which the Revisers boasted of having been so "*particularly careful*." Why did they not say, "And besought Festus, asking favour against Paul, that he might be sent to Jerusalem"?

Acts xxv. 26, and xxvi. 3. — "Wherefore Acts xxv. 26; xxvi. 3. I have brought him forth before you, and *specially* before thee, King Agrippa . . . *especially* because thou art expert in all customs." What difference in meaning is there between the words, "*specially*" and "*especially*"? And if there is no difference, why have the Revisers used both within four verses of each other?

Acts xxvii. 32, 33. — "Then the soldiers Acts xxvii. 32, 33.

cut away the ropes of the boat, and let her fall *off*. And while the day was coming *on*."

The Revisers appear not to have taken a comprehensive view of the sentences which they were writing; but confined their attention to the one on which they were then engaged, regardless of its surroundings. How else can we account for their saying that the soldiers let the boat fall *off*, while the day was coming *on* ?

Acts xxviii.
6.

Acts xxviii. 6. — "But they *expected* that he would *have swollen, or fallen down dead*." Expectation cannot refer to a past event. The inhabitants of Melita did not *expect* that Paul would *have swollen and fallen down dead*. That which they *expected*, was that he *would swell and fall down dead*.

Rom. i. 10.

Rom. i. 10.—"Making request, if by any means now *at length* I may be prospered." The use of "*at length*," for "*at last*," is a very common error; the expressions are not synonymous; the

former means "extended"; the latter, "*ultimately*."

Romans i. 22.—"Professing themselves Rom. i. 22. to be wise, they became fools, and changed the glory of the incorruptible God for the likeness of an image of corruptible man." The words "*incorruptible*" and "*uncorruptible*" have each a separate meaning and office: the former is used in reference to matter; the latter in reference to spirit. "*Incorruptible*" means "not liable to decay": its cognate word, "*incorruption*," is appropriately used in 1 Cor. xv. 54. 1 Cor. xv. 54. "So when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption," etc. The fact that the word "*uncorruptible*" refers to spirit, is seen in Titus ii. 7, Titus ii. 7. "In thy doctrine showing *uncorruptness*." And it is the word "*uncorruptible*," and not "*incorruptible*," which the Revisers should have employed in speaking of GOD, the GREAT SPIRIT. John iv. 24.

Romans iii. 12.—"There is none that Rom. iii. 12. doeth good, no, not so much as one." In the A.V. it is, "no, *not one*"; and, which

is the preferable expression, needs no indication; for, "not so much as one" implies that there may be *part of one* person, which is an absurdity.

Rom. iv. 17. Romans iv. 17. — "Even God, who quickeneth the dead, and called the things that are not, as *though* they were." Here the Revisers affirm something which is widely different from that which they intended to state. The expression, "*though* they were," is equivalent to, "*notwithstanding that* they were"; and brings before the reader an affirmation of existence; but the real meaning of the passage is, not an *affirmation* of existence, but a *supposition* of existence. Consequently, the Revisers should have said, "as *if* they were."

Rom. v. 7. Romans v. 7. — "*For* scarcely *for* a righteous man will one die: *for* peradventure *for* the good man some one would even dare to die." Passing over the inelegancy of "for,...for,...for,...for," I ask what is the difference between a "*righteous man*," and a "*good man*," that

some would even dare to die for the latter; but would hesitate to die for the former? Is it that a so-called "*righteous man*" is one whose life is given up to religious observances, fasting, making long prayers, giving tithes, etc.; and who regards selfish ceremonial as the acmé of duty, to the neglect of his fellow-creatures; whereas a "*good man*" is one who holds, and lives up to, the belief, that those who love God, should love each other also?

1 John iv.
21.

Rom. vii. 1.

Romans vii. 1. — "The law hath dominion over a man for *so long time as* he liveth." The rule respecting "*so—as*," and "*as—as*" is very simple; yet, simple as it is, it was evidently unknown to the Revisers and to their Right Reverend defender. The rule is this:—In an affirmative sentence, the correct phrase is "*as—as*"; but in a negative sentence, it is "*so—as*." The Revisers' sentence, then, being affirmative, should have been "*as long as* he liveth."

Romans viii. 38.—"I am persuaded Rom. viii.
38.

that *neither* death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor things present, nor things to come, nor powers, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creation, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord." "*Neither*" is "*not either*"; and "*either*" is "*one of two*"; yet "*neither*" is here applied to ten! The Revisers should have said, "I am persuaded that *not* death, nor life, nor angels," etc.

Rom. ix. 4. Romans ix. 4.—"Whose *is* the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises." How strange that the Revisers should say, of six things, they *is*! and then add, "whose *are* the fathers." And it is the stranger because, in the Greek, the verb in each instance is omitted; therefore the glory of the inconsistency belongs wholly to the Revisers.

Rom. ix. 17. Romans ix. 17.—"*For* the scripture saith unto Pharaoh, *For* this very purpose did I raise thee up." The

word "*for*" is sometimes used as a preposition, and sometimes as a conjunction; both uses occur in this verse. Now, when the word is used as a conjunction, and is that by which a reason is introduced for something previously stated, it should be followed by a comma. This has not been done in the passage which is under consideration. It should be,—“For [,] the Scripture saith.” But, in the following part of the sentence, the word "*for*" is a preposition, and does not require a comma after it. The error is of frequent occurrence in the R. V. See the first word in chapter x., verses 2, 3, 4, 5, 11, 12, etc.; and John iii. 16, 17, 24.

Rom. x. 2, 3,
4, 5, 11, 12,
etc.

John iii. 16,
17, 24.

Rom ix. 28.

Romans ix. 28.—“Finishing it, and cutting it short.” Events should be narrated in the order of their occurrence; and as “*finishing it*” must be subsequent to “*cutting it short*,” the latter should, in the narrative, have preceded the former.

Romans x. 9.—“If thou shalt confess with thy mouth Jesus as Lord, and shalt

Rom. x. 9.

believe in thy heart that God raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved."

What can the writer of this epistle have meant by this assertion? Is the essential of the soul's salvation a confession with the mouth that Jesus is Lord, combined with a belief that God raised him from the dead? Wherein does such a faith differ from that which is spoken of in

James ii. 19. James ii. 19, of which it is said,—
 "The devils also believe, and tremble" ?
 Surely, the faith which saves is, a loving trust of the heart; and of *that*, this passage says nothing. Still, it has Bishop Thornton's approval.

Rom. xi. 11. Romans xi. 11.—"By their fall salvation is come unto the *Gentiles*, for to provoke *them* to jealousy." Was that so? Certainly not! Salvation did not "come unto the *Gentiles* to provoke *them* to jealousy"; but to provoke *Israel* to jealousy; or, rather, to emulation. Again the Revisers have stumbled into error through a pronoun. And why did they say, "*for to* provoke them" ?

Concerning the expression, "*for to*"; this is the opinion of one of our best lexicographers, Dr Ogilvie, who, in his '*Comprehensive English Dictionary*'; Ed. 1879, p. 459, says, "*For to*, before an infinitive, denoting purpose, is now obsolete, *except in vulgar language.*"

Romans xi. 35.—"Who hath first given Rom. xi. 35.
to him, and it shall be recompensed *unto* him *again*?" Unless the giver had been recompensed *previously*, how could he be said to be recompensed *again*? And as the hypothesis named (our having *first* given to GOD) is an impossibility, there can have been no former recompensing; and consequently, no recompensing *again*. But Bishop Thornton does not see it; to him it is "*light in all its purity and clearness.*"

Romans xii. 19.—"Avenge not your- Rom. xii. 19.
selves, beloved, but give place unto wrath." This seems like a contradiction; but, of course, it is not intended to be such. It is simply a fault in the Revisers' English. Strange as it may

- appear, the true meaning of the passage would be better expressed by its very opposite. "Avenge not yourselves, beloved; *neither* give place unto wrath"; as it is in Eph. iv. 27,—"*Neither* give place to the devil." The margin reads, "*the wrath of God,*" i.e. "Avenge not yourselves, beloved, leave the matter in the hands of HIM who has said, 'Vengeance belongeth unto ME; I will recompense.'" This is certainly preferable to the text as the Revisers have left it.
- Eph. iv. 27.
- Heb. x. 30.
- Rom. xiii. 7. Romans xiii. 7.—"Render to all their dues: tribute to whom tribute is due; custom to whom custom; *fear to whom fear*; honour to whom honour." Fear is not due to any man; we are to love each other; and "perfect love casteth out fear." The word "*fear,*" in the Bible, often means "*reverence*"; and that, no doubt, is the word which the Revisers should have employed in this passage.
- 1 John iv. 18.
- Rom. xv. 18. Romans xv. 18.—"I *will not* dare to

speak." There are certain mental operations which are not under the control of the will; such as to *like*; to *believe*; to *dare*. To *like*, depends on taste; to *believe*, depends on evidence; to *dare*, depends on courage. Therefore the Revisers ought not to have said, "I *will not dare*"; for, to dare is not a matter of option.

Romans xiv. 22.—"Happy is he that *judgeth not* himself in that which he *approveth*." On the contrary; Happy is he who *does* judge himself in that which he *approveth*; for, "if we would judge ourselves . . . we should not be condemned with the world." It is the Revisers' fault that there is this apparent contradiction. They should have said, "Happy is he who *condemneth not* himself in that which he *alloweth*." Rom. xiv. 22.

1 Cor. xiv. 19.—"In the church I *had* rather speak." The Revisers have repeated this error through not discerning its erroneousness. The expression had 1 Cor. xi. 19.
31, 32, A.V.

its origin in the abbreviation, "*I'd rather speak.*" But, that the original of the abbreviation is not "*I had rather speak*" is seen by omitting the qualifying word, "*rather.*" We then have, "*I had speak,*" which is nonsense. The abbreviated expression, "*I'd rather speak,*" is from "*I would rather speak.*"

Eph. iii. 19. Eph. iii. 19.—“That ye may be filled *unto* all the fulness of God.” The A.V. says, “filled *with* all the fulness of God.” But how can a finite creature be filled, either “*unto*” or “*with,*” all the fulness of GOD? The less cannot contain the greater, or the finite contain the infinite, but we may be filled *from* the infinite; and that is what the Revisers should have said, instead of that which draws forth the scorn of scoffers.

Phil. 1. 16. — The Revisers, very properly, have transposed verses 16 and 17; but, very improperly, have not transposed, in like manner, the numbering of the verses; so verse 16 is numbered 17; and verse 17 is numbered 16; thus

making confusion when either has to be referred to, or to be quoted.

Heb. i. 3.—In the A.V., we read, Heb. i. 3. “The express image of his *person*.” The Revisers have altered this to, “The very image of his *substance*.” But how can God, a pure *Spirit*, have “*substance*”?

Heb. xii. 3. — “Consider him that Heb. xii. 3. endured such contradiction of sinners against *himself*.” The foregoing is from the A.V. But the Revisers have altered “*himself*” into “*themselves*.” Wherein, then, comes Christ’s *endurance*, if the contradiction of sinners was against “*themselves*” and not against “*himself*”?

Heb. xii. 12.—In the A.V. this passage Heb. xii. 12. reads, “Wherefore lift up the hands *which* hang down, and the feeble knees; and make straight paths for your feet, *lest* that which is lame be turned out of the way.” The Revisers have altered the wording thus, “Wherefore lift up the hands *that* hang down, . . . *that that* which is lame be not turned out of the way.” This is very much in the style of

the man who said, concerning the word "*that*," "*that that 'that' that that* man used, ought to have been '*which*'."

1 Tim. i, 20.

1 Tim. i. 20.—“Of whom *is* Hymenæus and Alexander; whom I delivered unto Satan, that they might be taught not to blaspheme.” Rather a bad schoolmaster for teaching *that* lesson: and it seems that Paul's own schoolmaster, in the matter of grammar, was no better, if he taught him to say, “Of whom *is* Hymenæus and Alexander”; for, so it is in the Greek, which has been servilely copied into the A.V. and thence into the R.V.

2 Tim. ii. 17.

The same error occurs in 2 Tim. ii. 17. “Of whom *is* Hymenæus and Philetus”; and yet, in the previous chapter, verse 15, we read, “Of whom *are* Phygellus and Hermogenes.” How is this? Was there something peculiar about Hymenæus, that, whenever he is mentioned in connection with another, the verb is put in the singular. Was he a “nobody,” and therefore ignored? If so, why was he mentioned?

1 Tim. iii. 16.—The A.V. reads, “*God*” ^{1 Tim. iii. 16.} was manifest in the flesh,” etc. The Revisers have very justly omitted the word “*God*,” and substituted for it the words, “*He who*”; in accordance with the original readings in the oldest MSS., and say, in a foot note, “The word ‘*GOD*,’ in place of ‘*he who*,’ rests on no sufficient ancient authority.” Some of the later MSS. have “*GOD*,” but it has been by a fraud. The MSS. are in uncial Greek letters; and the fraud has been this:—“*OC*” has been altered into $\overline{\theta\zeta}$; for, a microscopic examination of the writing reveals the fact that the transverse line across the *o*, and the abbreviation line above, have been made in comparatively recent times. Thus the *OC* becomes $\overline{\theta\zeta}$ = *Theos*, *GOD*. But not one of the ancient fathers can be certainly quoted in support of that reading: nor any of the very ancient versions. Therefore the reference is to Christ, not to *GOD*.

Another fraud, in connection with this subject, occurs in 1 John v. 7, where ^{1 John v. 7.}

we read words which have no counterpart in the Greek. They are, "*There are three that bear record in Heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost; and these three are one.*" This verse, by overwhelming testimony, is acknowledged to be an interpolation; and therefore the Revisers were compelled to strike it out. The verse is omitted also from an edition of the New Testament in Greek; a copy of which I possess. It was printed in Argentoratum (i.e. Strassburg) in 1524. So the Revisers were not the first to discover the imposition. But why did they not insert a foot note giving their reasons for the omission; and why did they try to conceal the omission by dividing v. 6 into two, calling the former part of it "*v. 6,*" and the latter part "*v. 7, which it is not, and never was?*" It has been part of v. 6 ever since the Scriptures were divided into verses, and each verse received its own distinguishing number, 350 years ago. How *could* the

Revisers do this, when the very verse which they have thus falsified contains the admonishing statement, "*The Spirit is truth*"?

2 Pet. iii. 1.—This verse contains a 2 Pet. iii. 1. good example of the Revisers' English; an example of their having "*revised*" the English of the A.V. by making it incorrect! The A.V. reads, "*In both which*"; this the Revisers have changed to, "*In both of them.*" They do not seem to have been aware that "*both*" means *all*, when it consists of two; and therefore, as "*of*" is partitive, and consequently cannot embrace the whole, it is as incorrect to say, "*both of them,*" as it would be to say, "*the whole of them*": it is sufficient to say "*both,*" or "*all.*"

Rev. xv. 6.—"There came out from Rev. xv. 6. the temple the seven angels that had the seven plagues, arrayed with [precious] *stone.*" Were the plagues arrayed with *stone*, or was it the angels? The Revisers justify their rendering of this verse, on

the ground that some Greek versions read λιθον, stone. But others read λινον, linen; and common-sense might have told the Revisers that "arrayed in *linen*," was much more likely to be correct than "arrayed with *stone*."

Rev. i. 6.

Rev. 1. 6.—"*For ever and ever*." This expression is objectionable because if "*for ever*" means eternally, how can any extension of time be added to it? The words, "*and ever*" are therefore meaningless. Nay, they are worse than meaningless; for, they negative the meaning of "*for ever*"; because their presence implies that the writer felt their addition to be needful. But if one "*ever*" does not mean "*eternally*," how can any number of "*evers*" mean "*eternally*," seeing that no number of finites can make an infinite? What persons mean when in the church service, they say, in the Lord's Prayer, "*for ever and ever*," I cannot imagine; and I do not think that they themselves know. No, nor the Revisers.

Well may GOD say, "My people do not consider." If any person, when using the form of words which is popularly called "*The Lord's Prayer*," wishes to dwell on the fact of the eternity of GOD's attributes, the *repetition* of the words, "*for ever*," is not objectionable; we may say, "for *Thine are* [not "*is*"] the kingdom, and the power, and the glory for ever:—for ever," but there must be no "*and*"; for, "*and*" means something *added*; and there cannot be any extension of the *infinite*.

There are Bibles to which, on account of certain peculiarities, distinctive titles have been assigned; such as "The '*Breeches*' Bible"; "The '*Vinegar*' Bible"; etc.: and there could not be assigned, to the Revisers' work, any more appropriate designation than,

THE REVISERS' UNGRAMMATICAL, IMMORAL,
AND BLASPHEMOUS VERSION.

CHAPTER V

DEALING PRINCIPALLY WITH THE BISHOP'S ERRORS IN GRAMMAR

THE Bishop's pamphlet, which, as far as I can ascertain, is all that he ever has published, is a little brochure in praise of the Revised Version of the Bible ; and his own English being on a par with that of the Revisers, his partiality for their work cannot be wondered at.

We will critically examine a few of his sentences ; and the result of the examination will enable us to determine his fitness, or otherwise, for speaking authoritatively on the comparative merits of the two versions of the Sacred Scriptures.

“By his words he shall be justified, or by his words he shall be condemned.”

His essay begins thus :—

“I hold, that it is not only allowable for, but has now become the duty of, the Clergy and Church Teachers, to discontinue the official use of the Unrevised Authorised Version, and to read to, and teach, both young and old out of the corrected form of it.”

Could any sentence of an educated man be more ungraceful, or any expressions of his be more infelicitous? In the first place, notice the inharmoniousness of the language. No one possessing an ear for musical cadence and rhythm would tolerate, much less speak or write, such a repetition of the same vowel sounds in words of close proximity as occur in the Bishop's first sentence: viz. “hold” and “only”; “allowable” and “now”; “Unrevised” and “Authorised”; and “read” and “teach.”

Although, in this quotation, the Bishop calls the A.V. the “*Unrevised*,” on p. 15, he speaks of it and others as “the six English *Revisions*.” Which statement

does he wish us to accept? Both cannot be true.

Notice next what grammarians severely reprobate under the definition of "*the sundering of particles.*" In this instance, the particle "*for*" is separated from its context, "*the clergy,*" by the insertion of seven other words; thus making most awkward reading. The punctuation, also, is redundant; no comma being needed after the words, "*I hold,*" and still less after the word "*Teachers.*" The Bishop says that it is the duty of "*Teachers,* to *discontinue,*" etc.

From the beginning to the end of the paragraph, there is no grace, or elegance, or forcibleness in it. The persuasiveness which results from a judicious collocation of words is wholly absent.

On the same page we have the word "*either*" (which means one of two) applied to three. The Bishop says:— "*Either by Sovereign, Convocation, or Parliament.*"

Then, lower down, the Bishop tells us

that printers have "*introduced*" . . . "*omissions*" into the text. How can that which has no existence be *introduced* into the text? What striking evidence of an illogical mind!

The next sentence begins thus:—"At any rate, Bishop Westcott publicly asserted," etc. What is meant by Bishop Westcott's making an assertion "*at any rate*"? Has the expression any reference to the Bishop's rapid utterance? On the following leaf the same three inappropriate words respecting "*rate*," again occur, and likewise on page 9.

On page 4 we have the expression "*for some 50 years*." The word "*some*" is indefinite, both as to quantity and to identity. It is vulgarly used to mean "*somewhere about*"; perhaps that was what the Bishop meant.

Immediately following the words, "*for some 50 years*," we have, "*for a long time*."

On the same page lower down, we read,

“A new form of medicine, though really valuable, *would* certainly be eschewed . . . until it *was* recommended by medical men.” In the first place, the word “*eschewed*,” because of its suggestiveness of “*chewed*,” is singularly unsuitable to be employed respecting anything which has to be put into the mouth. Moreover, the Bishop should have said, “until it *were* recommended”; “*was*” refers to the past; and the word “*would*,” in the early part of the sentence, shows that the Bishop was speaking of the future; therefore the verb should be in the subjunctive mood, as the statement is contingent. The same error occurs on page 6. There we read, “if it *was*,” though the reference is to the future. This error is by the Bishop of Southwell.

Then we come to the word “*suppose*,” which the Bishop has misused for “*believe*.” To *suppose* is to put a case hypothetically; but that was not what the Bishop meant when he said, “*May we not confidently suppose*,” etc. We may

“*confidently*” believe; but how does “*confidently*” apply in a supposititious case?

The Bishop writes, “*King James’ Version,*” “*King James’ Bible,*” “*King James’ Translators,*” and “*Moses’ Law.*” The Bishop evidently does not know that if, in speaking, we *pronounce* the additional *s* in the possessive case, we ought to write it; and therefore he should have written, not “*King James’ Version,*” but “*King James’s Version,*” etc. The expression, “*Moses’ Law,*” is correct, because as there are two *s*’s in the name, it is not customary to pronounce the other *s*, which is understood, but is not written.

The next error to be commented on is, “*so far as,*” in an affirmative sentence. “*So far as*” is correct in a negative sentence; but, in an affirmative sentence, we should say, “*as far as*”: *e.g.*, “*John is not so tall as William, but he is as tall as Robert.*” The error occurs on pages 8, 17, and 19.

We have seen that the Bishop uses

“so” where he should have used “as”; and, in the following sentences, he uses “such,” where he should have used “so.” “Such” means “of that kind”; but that is not what the Bishop meant when he said, on page 6, “It is *such* an improvement.” Judging from the context, the Bishop’s meaning was, “It is *so great* an improvement.” On page 12 we read of “*such* an unmitigated blessing,” instead of, “*so* unmitigated a blessing.” “*Such*” qualifies the “*unmitigated blessing*”; “*so*” qualifies the “*unmitigatedness*” of the blessing.

The Bishop of Southwell, as quoted by Bishop Thornton, on page 6, tells us that “The Epistles to the Romans, the Ephesians, and the Hebrews are entirely transformed,” in the R.V. This, in the face of Bishop Thornton’s statement that the R.V. “*is not, properly speaking, a new Version at all,*” certainly requires some explanation. In the same passage the Bishop of Southwell speaks of the three Epistles, as “*the three last books*”; but

how there can be "*three last*," he does not say.

On page 13 Bishop Thornton says:— "Does the book correctly present the utterances of the inspired writers of the original *or not*"? This is correct; but, on page 9, we read, "Whether the laity in a Parish have a statutory voice on such a point *or no*, it were well that it should be talked over with them."

"*Averse to*," instead of "*averse from*," is another of the Bishop's errors (page 12). I should have thought that the knowledge of the Latin derivation of the word, "*ab*," and "*verto*," would have guarded him from the error. Besides, in English, when we speak of a man's having "*averted*" his face, we do not mean that he turned it *to* us. Quite the contrary; he turned his face *from* us.

Here is an extraordinary blunder, the expression, "*a most*." The Bishop speaks of "*a most* compassionate nature" (page 14), and of "*a most* unhelpful and inaccurate summary" (page 19), and of "*a*

most puerile defence" (page 20). It is apparently a pet phrase of his; but notice its absurdity: "*a*" is indefinite, and means *one of several*; but "*most*" is superlative and exclusive; hence their incongruity. We may say, "*the most*"; but, "*a most*," never!

We next have to notice the Bishop's improper use of the expression "*differ from*." He says, on page 16, "In a very few places a few scholars still *differ from* the great majority of the learned Revisers on a textual detail." Does not the Bishop know that we "*differ from*" each other in whatever relates to the *body*; and "*differ with*" each other in whatever relates to the *mind*? We *differ from* each other in stature, or complexion, or agility, etc.; but we *differ with* each other in opinion, etc. In the former, we are passive agents; in the latter we are active agents. To *differ with* is to wrestle with mentally; to *differ from* is not to wrestle at all, but simply to *be* different.

On the same page, the Bishop makes

the very common error of employing the word, "*people*" for "*persons*." The words are wholly different in derivation, and also in meaning, except that the former signifies an aggregation of the latter. "*People*" refers to a community; "*persons*" to individuals. That the words are not interchangeable, can be demonstrated thus:—If you say that there were three *people* present at a meeting, and two of them departed, would you say that "*one people*" remained? Certainly not. Then why speak of the three as "*people*"? There were three "*persons*" present, not three "*people*." And the Bishop should not have said, "Again and again have *people* told me." He should have said, "Again and again *persons* have told me." The words are not synonymous; we speak of the American *people*; but never of the American persons, when referring to them as a nation.

The next error to be commented on is the Bishop's use of the word "*less*" for "*fewer*" (page 17). "*Less*" refers to

quantity *in bulk*; it is the word "*fewer*" which should be used when speaking of *numbers*. The Bishop employs the expression, thus:—"No *less* than 20 years," he should have said, "No *fewer* than 20 years"; or, "No *smaller a space of time* than 20 years"; but that would have been a very awkward periphrasis.

Then we have "*in*" for "*into*." The Bishop says (page 17):—"So soon as"; he should have said, "*As* soon as." Well, he says, "So soon as the book is introduced *in* our Churches." Here the word "*in*," which is a preposition of *rest*, should have been "*into*," which is a preposition of action, governed by the word "*introduced*." The book would be *introduced into* the Churches; and then it would be "*in*" the Churches.

The Bishop falls into the very common error of so framing his sentence that a pronoun occurs in it before there is any noun to which it refers. He says (page 18) "The advocates of this fail to see, that, in doing so at *his* own dis-

cretion, *each clergyman* would set up for being a Reviser himself." The Bishop should have put the noun first, and the pronoun afterwards, thus:—"The advocates of this fail to see, that *each clergyman*, in doing so at *his* own discretion, would set up for being a Reviser himself." The same error occurs on the next page, where we have the pronoun "*it*" fourteen words before we have the noun to which it refers. The sentence is as follows: "Is any one who has fully studied *it* prepared to deny the enormous superiority, upon the whole, in accuracy and instructiveness, of [the] *R. V.*"?

The same idea might have been much more succinctly expressed thus: "Is any one, who has fully studied *the R. V.* prepared to deny *its* very great superiority? etc." The word "*enormous*," which the Bishop has used, is wholly inappropriate in his sentence. "*Enormous*" means *out of the normal*, but what is the normal "*superiority*" of the *R. V.*? Is there such a state?

Now we come to the error of placing an adverb between the sign of the infinitive mood and the verb. The Bishop says, (page 20) "So careful were the Revisers, *only to finally* exclude readings which they felt sure did not represent the sacred writers' meaning." The Bishop should have said, "So careful were the Revisers *to exclude finally*, only those readings which they felt sure did not represent the sacred writers' meaning." The reader will see that, in the Bishop's sentence, there is another adverbial error; the word "*only*" is misplaced. It should always be as near as possible to the words which it is intended to qualify. The Bishop says that the Revisers were careful, "*only to finally exclude*," etc., whereas it is apparent that he meant the word "*only*" to apply to those "readings which the Revisers felt sure did not represent the sacred writers' meaning."

The same error is found on page 24. There we read respecting assaults on the Scriptures, "They can *only be met* by

accurate learning on the part of Bible-lovers"; instead of "They can be met *only by accurate learning*," etc. The same paragraph says, "I am persuaded that the assaults on *the Scriptures of the 'advanced criticism'* can be met," etc. Whatever are "the Scriptures of the 'advanced criticism' "? I never heard of them. Are they the works of Herbert Spencer, Huxley, and others? or have I, in consequence of the Bishop's faulty English, mistaken his meaning? It is very likely; and what he intended to say was, "I am persuaded that the assaults of the 'advanced criticism' on the Scriptures can be met," etc.

In the last paragraph of the Bishop's pamphlet, the word "*mistaken*" has been misused. He says, "The verdict of prominent newspapers, a few years ago, that [the] R.V. was 'dead,' has now been shewn to be *mistaken*." He should have said, "to be *a mistake*": "*mistaken*" means that *the readers of the newspapers* mistook the statement; whereas it was

the *editors* who made a mistake, if indeed any was made. But, if the R.V. is not dead, how is it that we have not heard of a second edition, though the R.N.T. has been published more than 20 years?

Rev. xxii.
14.

The Bishop thus misquotes Rev. xxii. 14 as it occurs in the A.V.: "Blessed are they *who keep His Commandments*, that they may have *a right* 'to the tree of life' (page 22). The italicised letters and words show the Bishop's errors. Then he tells us that *the true evangelic reading*" is given in the R.V., and is, "Blessed are they that wash their robes." How does the Bishop know which is the "*true*" reading, seeing that the most ancient MSS. differ? It would have been more modest to have said that ancient MSS. do not agree. *The Codex Vaticanus* says, "Blessed are they that do his commandments." The Bishop adds, "Which of us could hope for Heaven on those terms?" What has that to do with the correctness or the incorrectness of the text? The

passage, as in the A.V., is quite in accordance with the teaching of Christ: "*This do, and thou shalt live.*" Does Luke x. 28. the Bishop think that Christ was mocking the inquirer after salvation, by telling him to perform an impossibility? Christ was too honest a character to do that. He no more required then that which was impracticable, than he did when he said "Be ye perfect, even as Matt. v. 48. your Father in Heaven is perfect." Does the Bishop think that the finite is required to equal the infinite? Surely not. The obvious meaning of both passages is, that we are to keep the commandments of God, and to be perfect *to the extent of our limited capacity*, as God is perfect, according to His infinite capacity.

We are to do our "*best*"; though a sorry affair our "*best*" often is. But it will be accepted, as was the poor widow's offering of "two mites, which make a farthing," if, as in her case, it is our all. Therefore, despite the Bishop's teaching,

we will cling to the glorious truth, that "*Blessed*" are they who do His commandments, however feebly and imperfectly, if it is but with their whole heart; for, by the grace of God, they have right to the Tree of Life,—“The Tree of Life which is in the midst of the Paradise of God.”

Psa. cxix. 2.

Rev. ii. 7.

One word more. The Bishop, after eulogizing the Prelates, himself among the number (see pp. 8 and 13 of his pamphlet) dishonours himself and his Church by asking contemptuously, “Should the Church of England be content to be taught fidelity to the text of Scripture by *Rome and Dissent*?”

Is this the spirit which should actuate us? Has the Right Reverend Bishop wholly forgotten the large-hearted teaching of Christ, when it was said to him, “Master, we saw one casting out devils in thy name, and he followeth not us; and we forbad him, because he followeth not us. But Jesus said, *Forbid him not* . . . he that is not against us, is on our part”?

Mark ix. 38-40.

Christ's most scathing anathemas were hurled against those who "trusted in themselves that they were righteous, *and despised others*"; and one of the most powerful metaphors in the whole Bible occurs in Isaiah lxxv. 3-5, and is employed in expressing God's detestation of such characters:—"A people that provoked ME to anger continually to MY face . . . which say, 'Stand by thyself, come not near to me; for I am holier than thou.' *These are a smoke in MY nose, a fire that burneth all the day.*"

Isaiah lxxv.
3-5.

The Pharisaic Jews had no dealings with the Samaritans; but the noble-minded Jesus was actuated by a very different spirit. He spent two days in Sychar, a city of Samaria; and many believed in him there. (See John iv. 4-42.) A bishop should not speak evil of any man.

John iv. 4
42.

Titus iii. 2.

Bishop Thornton's contempt for Dissenters reminds me of a little book written by a Dissenting Minister, the Rev. Frank Ballard, M.A., Double Prize-

man in Hebrew and New Testament Greek, in the University of London. It is entitled, "*Which Bible to Read—Revised or Authorised*"; therefore it is on the same subject as the Bishop's pamphlet; but is a far abler work, and one from which he might learn many important lessons. I mention the little book because there is in it one matter which I cannot allow to pass unnoticed; on p. 79, the Rev. F. Ballard charges Dean Burgon and me with "*idolizing*" the A.V. That charge is untrue, and therefore the statement is unjust. See my opinion of the A.V. in the Preface to "*The Revisers' English*." There I say: "Language is the vehicle of thought; and, in the Bible, it is the vehicle of God's thoughts; therefore, if perfection in language ought to be looked for anywhere, it ought to be looked for, and found, in the Bible. I have looked for it in our translation, and have not found it."

PREPARING FOR PUBLICATION.

The "Revised English" Bible.

Hebrew and Greek Editor :

THE REV. CANON GIRDLESTONE,

Assisted by other Eminent Scholars.

English Editor :

GEO. WASHINGTON MOON, HON. F.R.S.L.

A Tentative Edition of Part I.,

The "Revised English"

New Testament,

WILL BE PUBLISHED SHORTLY

BY MESSRS BAGSTER & SONS, LONDON, E.C.

The fearful errors exposed in "The Bishop's English," "The Revisers' English," and "Ecclesiastical English," are evidence of the necessity for such a work.

Revision of MSS.

THE author of this work and of various other critical works on the English language (see p. 187), will be happy to correct the style, grammar, punctuation, and composition generally, of important private letters, essays, poems, sermons, or other addresses, or MSS. intended for publication.

TERMS.

Revision of MSS.—Prose,

A minimum charge of **20s.** for any number of words under 1000; over 1000 will be charged at the rate of 10s. per 1000 words, after the first thousand.

Revision of MSS.—Poetry,

A minimum charge of **20s.** for any number of lines under 100; over 100 will be charged at the rate of 20s. per 100 lines.

All Fees must be paid in advance.

7 PRINCE'S TERRACE,

SUSSEX SQUARE,

BRIGHTON.

APPENDIX

A LIST OF THE REVISERS OF THE SACRED SCRIPTURES

This includes all who accepted the appointment and have at any time taken part in the work of revision.

THE ENGLISH REVISION COMMITTEE

THE OLD TESTAMENT COMPANY

- Right Rev. EDWARD HAROLD BROWNE, D.D., Bishop of Winchester (Chairman).
Right Rev. Lord ARTHUR CHARLES HERVEY, D.D., Bishop of Bath and Wells.
Right Rev. ALFRED OLLIVANT, D.D., Bishop of Llandaff.
Right Rev. CONNOP THIRLWALL, D.D., Bishop of St. David's.
Right Rev. CHRISTOPHER WORDSWORTH, D.D., Bishop of Lincoln.
Very Rev. JOHN JAMES STEWART PEROWNE, D.D., Dean of Peterborough.
Very Rev. EDWARD HAYES PLUMPTRE, D.D., Dean of Wells.
Very Rev. ROBERT PAYNE SMITH, D.D., Dean of Canterbury.
Ven. BENJAMIN HARRISON, M.A., Archdeacon of Maidstone, Canon of Canterbury.
Ven. HENRY JOHN ROSE, Archdeacon of Bedford.
Rev. WILLIAM LINDSAY ALEXANDER, D.D., Professor of Theology, Congregational Church Hall, Edinburgh.
ROBERT L. BENSLEY, Esq., Fellow and Hebrew Lecturer, Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge.

168 NAMES OF THE REVISERS

- Rev. JOHN BIRRELL, Professor of Oriental Languages, St. Andrews, N.B.
- FRANK CHANCE, Esq., M.D., Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge.
- THOMAS CHENERY, Esq., Lord Almoner's Professor of Arabic, Oxford.
- Rev. THOMAS KELLY CHEYNE, Fellow and Hebrew Lecturer, Balliol College, Oxford.
- Rev. F. C. COOK, Canon of Exeter. Declined to serve.
- Rev. ANDREW BRUCE DAVIDSON, D.D., Professor of Hebrew, Free Church College, Edinburgh.
- Rev. BENJAMIN DAVIES, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Hebrew in the Baptist College, London.
- Rev. GEORGE DOUGLAS, D.D., Professor of Hebrew and Principal of Free Church College, Glasgow.
- SAMUEL ROLLES DRIVER, Esq., Regius Professor of Hebrew, Oxford.
- Rev. C. J. ELLIOTT, Formerly Fellow of St. Catherine's College, Cambridge.
- Rev. PATRICK FAIRBAIRN, D.D., Principal of the Free Church College, Glasgow.
- Rev. FREDERICK FIELD, D.D., Formerly Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge.
- Rev. JOHN DURY GEDEN, Professor of Hebrew, Wesleyan College, Didsbury.
- Rev. CHRISTIAN D. GINSBURG, LL.D., Editor of "*The Massorah*," etc.
- Rev. FREDERICK WILLIAM GOTCH, D.D., Principal of the Baptist College, Bristol.
- Rev. JOHN JEBB, D.D., Canon of Hereford.
- Rev. WILLIAM KAY, D.D., Honorary Canon of St. Albans.
- Rev. STANLEY LEATHES, D.D., Professor of Hebrew, King's College, London.
- Rev. JOSEPH RAWSON LUMBY, D.D., Norrisian Professor of Divinity, Cambridge.
- Prof. J. MCGILL, Professor of Oriental Languages, St. Andrews, N.B.
- Rev. Dr. PUSEY, Regius Professor of Hebrew, Oxford. Declined to serve.

- Rev. ARCHIBALD HENRY SAYCE, Deputy Professor of Comparative Philology, Oxford.
 Rev. WILLIAM SELWYN, D.D., Canon of Ely.
 Rev. WILLIAM ROBERTSON SMITH, LL.D., Lord Almoner's Professor of Arabic, Cambridge (formerly Professor of Hebrew in the Free Church College, Aberdeen).
 Rev. DUNCAN HARKNESS WEIR, D.D., Professor of Hebrew in the University of Glasgow.
 WILLIAM WRIGHT, LL.D., Professor of Arabic, Cambridge.
 WILLIAM ALDIS WRIGHT, Esq. (Secretary), Bursar of Trinity College, Cambridge.
The English Old Testament Company, 37.

THE ENGLISH NEW TESTAMENT COMPANY

- Right Rev. CHARLES JOHN ELLICOTT, D.D., Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol (Chairman).
 Right Rev. SAMUEL WILBERFORCE, D.D., Bishop of Winchester (formerly of Oxford).
 Most Rev. RICHARD CHENEVIX TRENCH, D.D., Archbishop of Dublin.
 Right Rev. JOSEPH BARBER LIGHTFOOT, D.D., LL.D., Bishop of Durham.
 Right Rev. GEORGE MOBERLY, D.C.L., Bishop of Salisbury.
 Right Rev. CHARLES WORDSWORTH, D.C.L., Bishop of St. Andrews.
 Very Rev. HENRY ALFORD, D.D., Dean of Canterbury.
 Very Rev. EDWARD HENRY BICKERSTETH, D.D., Prolocutor, Dean of Lichfield.
 Very Rev. JOSEPH WILLIAMS BLAKESLEY, B.D., Dean of Lincoln.
 Very Rev. CHARLES MERIVALE, D.D., Dean of Ely.
 Very Rev. ROBERT SCOTT, D.D., Dean of Rochester.
 Very Rev. ARTHUR PENRHYN STANLEY, D.D., Dean of Westminster.
 Very Rev. CHARLES JOHN VAUGHAN, D.D., Dean of Llandaff.
 Ven. WILLIAM LEE, D.D., Archdeacon of Dublin.
 Ven. EDWIN PALMER, D.D., Archdeacon of Oxford.

170 NAMES OF THE REVISERS

- Rev. JOSEPH ANGUS, D.D., President of the Baptist College, Regent's Park, London.
- Rev. DAVID BROWN, D.D., Principal of the Free Church College, Aberdeen.
- Rev. JOHN EADIE, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Biblical Literature in the United Presbyterian Church, Glasgow.
- Rev. FENTON JOHN ANTHONY HORT, D.D., Hulsean Professor of Divinity, Cambridge.
- Rev. WILLIAM GIBSON HUMPHRY, B.D., Vicar of St. Martin-in-the-Fields, Prebendary of St. Paul's Cathedral, London.
- Rev. BENJAMIN HALL KENNEDY, D.D., Canon of Ely, and Regius Professor of Greek in the University of Cambridge.
- Rev. WILLIAM MILLIGAN, D.D., Professor of Divinity and Biblical Criticism in the University of Aberdeen.
- Rev. WILLIAM FIDDIAN MOULTON, D.D., Master of the Leys School, Cambridge.
- Rev. SAMUEL NEWTH, D.D., Principal of the New College, Hampstead, London.
- Rev. ALEXANDER ROBERTS, D.D., Professor of Humanity in the University of St. Andrews, N.B.
- Rev. FREDERICK HENRY AMBROSE SCRIVENER, LL.D., D.C.L., Prebendary.
- Rev. GEORGE VANCE SMITH, D.D., Professor.
- Mr. SAMUEL PRIDEAUX TREGELLES, LL.D.
- Rev. BROOKE FOSS WESTCOTT, D.D., Canon of Peterborough and Regius Professor of Divinity, Trinity College, Cambridge.
- Rev. JOHN TROUTBECK, M.A. (Secretary), one of the Minor Canons of Westminster Abbey.

*The English New Testament Company, 30.
Members in both Companies, 67.*

A LIST OF THE AMERICAN REVISERS

GENERAL OFFICERS OF THE WHOLE COMMITTEE

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

GEORGE E. DAY, D.D., *Secretary.*

THE AMERICAN OLD TESTAMENT COMPANY

- Rev. WILLIAM HENRY GREEN, D.D., LL.D. (Chairman),
Professor of Hebrew in the Theological Seminary,
Princeton, N.J.
- Rev. GEORGE E. DAY, D.D. (Secretary), Professor of
Hebrew in the Divinity School of Yale College, New
Haven, Conn.
- Rev. CHARLES A. AIKEN, D.D., Professor of Old Test.
Criticism in the Theological Seminary, Princeton, N.J.
- Rev. TALBOT W. CHAMBERS, D.D., Collegiate Reformed
Dutch Church, N.Y., and Lecturer in the Theological
Seminary at New Brunswick, N.J.
- Rev. THOMAS JEFFERSON CONANT, D.D., Brooklyn, N.Y.,
formerly Professor of Hebrew in the Theological
Seminary at Rochester, N.Y.
- Rev. JOHN DE WITT, D.D., Professor of Hebrew in the
Theological Seminary, New Brunswick, N.J.
- Rev. GEORGE EMLEM HARE, D.D., LL.D., Professor of
Hebrew in the Divinity School, Philadelphia.
- Rev. CHARLES PORTERFIELD KRAUTH, D.D., LL.D.,
Vice-Provost of the University of Pennsylvania,
Philadelphia, and Professor in the Evangelical
Lutheran Theological Seminary in Philadelphia.
- Professor TAYLER LEWIS, LL.D., Professor of Greek and
Hebrew, Union College, Schenectady, N.Y.
- Rev. CHARLES MARSH MEAD, D.D., formerly Professor of
Hebrew in the Theological Seminary at Andover, Mass.
- Rev. HOWARD OSGOOD, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Hebrew
in the Theological Seminary, Rochester, N.Y.
- Rev. JOSEPH PACKARD, D.D., Professor of Hebrew in the
Theological Seminary, Alexandria, Va.

172 NAMES OF THE REVISERS

- Rev. CALVIN ELLIS STOWE, D.D., Hartford, Conn., formerly Professor of Hebrew, in Andover, Mass.
Professor JAMES STRONG, S.T.D., LL.D., Professor of Hebrew in Drew Theological Seminary, Madison, N.J.
Rev. CORNELIUS V. A. VAN DYCK, D.D., M.D., Professor in the American College at Beirut, Syria. Advisory Member on questions of Arabic.

The American Old Testament Company, 15.

THE AMERICAN NEW TESTAMENT COMPANY

- Rev. THEODORE D. WOOLSEY, D.D., LL.D. (Chairman), Ex-President of Yale College, New Haven, Conn.
Rev. J. HENRY THAYER, D.D. (Secretary), formerly Professor of New Test. Exegesis in the Theological Seminary at Andover, Mass.
Professor CHARLES SHORT, LL.D., Professor of Latin in Columbia College, New York.
Professor EZRA ABBOT, D.D., LL.D., Professor of New Test. Exegesis in the Divinity School of Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
Rev. J. K. BURR, D.D., Trenton, N.J.
President THOMAS CHASE, LL.D., President of Haverford College, Pa.
Rev. GEORGE R. CROOKS, D.D., Professor in Drew Theological Seminary, Madison, N.J. (Accepted the original appointment, but found it impossible to attend, and resigned.)
Rev. HOWARD CROSBY, D.D., LL.D., Ex-Chancellor of the University of New York.
Rev. TIMOTHY DWIGHT, D.D., Professor of New Test. Exegesis in the Divinity School of Yale College, New Haven, Conn.
Professor JAMES HADLEY, LL.D., Professor of Greek, Yale College, New Haven, Conn.
Rev. HORATIO BALCH HACKETT, D.D., LL.D., Professor of New Test. Exegesis in the Theological Seminary at Rochester, N.Y.
Rev. CHARLES HODGE, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Theology

NAMES OF THE REVISERS 173

in the Theological Seminary at Princeton, N.J. (Never attended the meetings, but corresponded with the Committee.)

- Rev. ASAHEL CLARK KENDRICK, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Greek in the University of Rochester, N.Y.
- Right Rev. ALFRED LEE, D.D., LL.D., Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Diocese of Delaware.
- Rev. MATTHEW B. RIDDLE, D.D., Professor of New Test. Exegesis in the Theological Seminary, Hartford, Conn.
- Rev. PHILIP SCHAFF, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Sacred Literature in the Union Theological Seminary, New York.
- Rev. HENRY BOYNTON SMITH, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Systematic Theology in the Union Theological Seminary, New York. (Attended one session, and resigned from ill-health.)
- Rev. WILLIAM FAIRFIELD WARREN, D.D., President of Boston University, Boston, Mass. (Accepted the original appointment, but found it impossible to attend, and resigned.)
- Rev. EDWARD ABIEL WASHBURN, D.D., LL.D., Rector of Calvary Church, New York.

The American New Testament Company, 19.
Members in both Companies, 34.

[A number of Bishops and Professors of sacred learning, who had been invited to join the American Committee at its first organization in 1871, declined, from want of time, or other reasons, but expressed interest in the work and confidence in its success. Among these may be mentioned Bishops McIlvaine, Whittingham, and Williams, Dr. Whedon (Methodist), Dr. Nevin (Reformed), Dr. Shedd (Presbyterian.)]

Number of English and American Revisers on the Old Testament Company	52
Number of English and American Revisers on the New Testament Company	49
Total number of Revisers	101

THE COMPANION VOLUME TO
"THE SOUL'S DESIRES BREATHED TO GOD."

THE SOUL'S INQUIRIES ANSWERED
FROM THE BIBLE,

"As if a man had inquired at the Oracle of God."

2 SAM. xvi. 23.

BY

G. WASHINGTON MOON, HON. F.R.S.L.

AUTHOR OF "THE SOUL'S DESIRES BREATHED TO GOD IN THE WORDS
OF SCRIPTURE,"

"ELIJAH THE PROPHET, AND OTHER SACRED POEMS,"

"POEMS OF LOVE AND HOME," ETC.

REVISED EDITION.

More than 100,000 copies of this little work have been sold.

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.

39 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON,

NEW YORK AND BOMBAY.

1900.

All rights reserved.

P R E F A C E
TO THE FIRST AMERICAN EDITION
OF
"THE SOUL'S INQUIRIES ANSWERED,"

BY
THE REV. THEO. L. CUYLER, BROOKLYN, N.Y.

ONE of the happiest and most encouraging symptoms in our churches—and in many households—is an increasing *hunger for the Word of God*. It has become a very interesting feature of social entertainment among some of the most refined and cultured families of Great Britain, to have "Bible readings," in which all the guests join, "hearing and asking questions." In all circles of Bible readers, this delightful little book will be a valuable acquisition.

It is the most ingenious little combination of inspired texts that has yet fallen under my eye. The Divine Spirit suggests to us the question. Such pithy, solemn, weighty questions, too, are suggested,—the very ones about which the soul of man has the deepest and most eager curiosity! and, to the inquiries thus raised, the Divine Spirit gives back the luminous answer. It is as if one had inquired at the oracle of God.

This volume is an exquisite spiritual *mosaic*. In looking at the wonderfully adroit and skilful manner in which Bible truths are "dovetailed" and fitted into each other, I was reminded of those brilliant pavements of minute bits of marble in Rome and Florence. And I rejoice to have the opportunity to commend this pocket-companion to our American readers. It may be carried on a journey, or be opened at a spare moment, amid the business of the shop, the counting-room, or the study. In the

morning, it furnishes a *key-note* for the day. At evening, it suggests a fitting theme for meditation on retiring to rest. No one can study it without being impressed anew with the wonderful richness and inexhaustible suggestiveness of God's glorious book.

"When you write to me," said the sainted McCheyne of Scotland, "tell me the meanings of Scripture: one gem from that ocean is worth all the pebbles of earthly streams." This is a volume in which such a soul as McCheyne's would have found great delight. It throws "cross-lights" on the grand canvas of Revelation, and brings out new and undiscovered beauties. To all who love the precious Book of God, this little volume will be both a prize and a surprise. May the Holy Spirit go with it into thousands of homes and hearts!

LAFAYETTE AVENUE CHURCH,
BROOKLYN, *October 1872.*

"THE SOUL'S INQUIRIES ANSWERED."

By G. WASHINGTON MOON.

"There are many books of motto texts from Holy Scripture or every day, but in our opinion this is among the very best. It has stood the test of many years. The present is a new and revised edition, demanded by the widening circle of readers who have found this little book a friendly and stimulating spiritual influence."—*The Churchman*, Sept. 1900.

OPINIONS OF
THE TWO ENGLISH ARCHBISHOPS
ON
"THE SOUL'S INQUIRIES ANSWERED."

FROM THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY.

LAMBETH PALACE, *23rd April 1875.*

DEAR SIR,—I have to thank you for sending me a copy of your work, entitled, "The Soul's Inquiries Answered in the Words of Scripture." I am glad to hear from your letter that it has had a successful sale.—Yours faithfully,

(Signed) A. C. CANTUAR.

GEORGE WASHINGTON MOON, Esq.

NOTE.—In another letter to me, His Grace orders a dozen copies to be sent to him at Lambeth Palace.

FROM THE ARCHBISHOP OF YORK.

38 QUEEN'S GATE, LONDON, S.W., *30th July 1875.*

DEAR SIR,—I have been very ungrateful in not acknowledging sooner your kind present of a work called "The Soul's Inquiries Answered." I have had occasion to examine it a good deal, and that with profit to myself, and I am glad to possess it.—Ever yours truly,

(Signed) W. EBOR.

G. WASHINGTON MOON, Esq.

COMPANION VOLUME TO
"THE SOUL'S INQUIRIES ANSWERED."

1 vol. 16mo, price 1s. 6d.

The Soul's Desires

*BREATHED TO GOD IN THE WORDS
OF SCRIPTURE :*

A Book of Prayers for Private or for Family Devotion,

CONSISTING OF
A SACRED MOSAIC OF OVER 2,000 QUOTATIONS ON
PRAYER AND PRAISE ;

By G. WASHINGTON MOON, Hon. F.R.S.L.

"Worship GOD."—REV. xxii. 9.

*"Teach us what we should say unto HIM ;
for we cannot order our speech by reason o' darkness."*

JOB xxxvii. 19.

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND COMPANY,

39 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON,

NEW YORK AND BOMBAY.

1901.

All rights reserved.

178

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

1 vol., 12mo, price 2s. 6d.

ELIJAH THE PROPHET
AND
OTHER SACRED POEMS.

FIFTH EDITION.

LONDON : LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.

UNIFORM WITH THE ABOVE.

1 vol., 12mo, price 2s. 6d.

POEMS OF LOVE AND
HOME.

WITH PORTRAIT OF AUTHOR.

LONDON : LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.

EXTRACTS FROM REVIEWS
OF
ELIJAH THE PROPHET
AND OTHER POEMS

“It is really a sacred epic of the highest order.”—*The Orb*.

“The poem is a noble effort to embody a noble theme.”—*The Advertiser*.

“It is a poem worthy of the subject and of the author.”—*The Christian Examiner*.

“The romantic history of the great prophet, told in Spenserian stanzas, is full of life and interest.”—*The London Literary World*.

“It is full of quiet beauty, and is specially remarkable for elegance of diction and purity of language.”—*The Freeman*.

“The story of the great Hebrew prophet is told in powerful and melodious verse.”—*The Hereford Times*.

“A work that may stand in a high place among the specimens of modern English classical literature.”—*The Court Circular*.

“Mr. Washington Moon’s ‘Elijah’ is an epic poem of great merit, finely conceived and vigorously expressed.”—*The Baptist Times*.

“It is an epic poem of great beauty and power, containing many a glorious stanza.”—*The Weekly Review*.

“‘Elijah the Prophet’ is the most noticeable poem of the season. It is poetical in the true sense of the term.”—*The Bookseller*.

EXTRACTS FROM REVIEWS 181

“In this beautiful volume there are many sweet thoughts and tender touches, and many highly finished passages.”—*The London Quarterly Review*.

“Mr. Washington Moon is aware of the difficulty of the task he has set himself, and he has gone about his work in a very fine and noble spirit.”—*New York Literary World*.

“This poem is one of unusual interest and beauty. It will find favour chiefly with persons of refined and cultivated taste, who can appreciate the nicer elegancies of composition.”—*Evangelical Christendom*.

“The title poem is a masterly rhythmical exposition, and many of the shorter selections which follow are precious gems of marvellous lustre.”—*The Philanthropic Review*.

“The sentiments of Mr. Washington Moon are exceptionally devout, and will win their way to the hearts of numbers of pious Christians who will find both comfort and solace in them.”—*The San Francisco Churchman*.

“There is evident, throughout, a remarkable command of language; but we attribute the unquestionable success of the epic to the devoutness of the mind which has conceived it, as well as to the imaginative faculty with which the author is so richly endowed.”—*The Edinburgh Daily Review*.

“Mr. Washington Moon must be congratulated on having made a contribution to sacred minstrelsy of which all religious classes ought to be proud. He has produced a sacred poem alike honourable to his heart and to his head; for, it reflects genuine piety and poetic genius.”—*Public Opinion*.

“Her Majesty has graciously been pleased to accept a copy of Mr. Washington Moon’s ‘Elijah the Prophet,’ an epic poem of great merit, exhibiting powers rarely equalled for sublimity and strength, and breathing a noble and an elevated spirit which deserves all praise.”—*The Court Journal*.

“Mr. Washington Moon is equal to great things, and is not afraid to grapple with them. There is much noble thought here, set forth in correct and brilliant diction. We are, indeed, some-

182 EXTRACTS FROM REVIEWS

what surprised that a gentleman of such ability in poetry has not written much more. The whole is nobly thought and marked by the dignity the subject demands."—*The British Standard*.

"This is a remarkable poem, and is from first to last worthy of its subject. We think that the extract which we have given [‘The Translation of Elijah’] will go far to prove that it deserves at least comparison with Milton’s ‘Paradise Lost.’ To say more of a modern poem would scarcely be tolerated, but we leave the extract to speak for itself."—*Our Own Fireside*.

"In this work the library has one of the most valuable additions that have for many years emanated from the press. Gifted with a master-mind—imaginative, penetrative, refined, and modest withal—the author of this poem has thrown the full force of his powers of expression into the accomplishment of a great end, namely, the effective rendering, with the aid of poetry, of one of the most sublime records in the Old Testament."—*The Oxford University Herald*.

"The magnificent epic poem before us is one of those rare issues which, like wandering comets, appear only at long intervals. Every page teems with high poetic beauty, often soaring to the sublime. The author has approached his subject with studied care, and has mastered it in a style so grand, that little is left to be desired further than that the poet may attain the position which his brilliant epic entitles him to hold."—*The Illustrated Weekly News*.

"The author has not only the attributes and qualifications of a poet in the true and highest sense, but a rare amount of varied knowledge, which he brings in the happiest manner to bear on the grand heads of his subject. We have not for many a day perused a volume of poetry that possesses so many attractive features. The book is one series of beautiful and brilliant gems and profound thoughts, set in pure and ornate language."—*The St James’s Chronicle*.

"Mr. Washington Moon must not be ranked among the ordinary poets of the present day. He has chosen, as his

EXTRACTS FROM REVIEWS 183

subject, the history of that prophet whom Dean Stanley has styled, 'The grandest and most romantic character Israel ever produced.' To relate the incidents of his life in the highest form of verse and the most intricate stanza was a difficult task : but the author has approached it with studied care, and mastered it in a style that entitles him to a high place as an epic poet."—*The Christian World*.

"'Elijah' is well calculated to add another laurel to Mr. Washington Moon's reputation. The grandeur of the subject is well-nigh unsurpassed, and perhaps the highest praise which could be bestowed on the poem is that it is not unworthy of the subject. The language is eminently simple, but, by its very simplicity, is commanding. Lofty thought and poetic imagination grace each page. The elegance, as well as the power of description which belongs to Mr. Washington Moon's language may be gathered from almost any part of 'Elijah.'"—*The North British Daily Mail*.

"We are bound to say that Mr. Washington Moon's poem is a great work, and has many passages of rare beauty and well-sustained sublimity—a grandeur and sublimity which remind one of Milton and of Young, even at their best, in the poet's description of the Day of Doom, and also of the Translation of Elijah. It is awarding no slight merit to the author to say that his whole poem breathes the purest morality and the loftiest devotion. Going through it is like going through a cathedral, where, as the grand music rolls on the ear, the eye is almost everywhere enchanted with visions of unearthly interest and scriptural beauty, breaking in richest colours from its storied windows, while the soul is touched and stirred with the deepest emotions of religion."—*The Church and School Gazette*.

"Mr. Washington Moon needs no introduction to those who are in any way acquainted with English literature. The feature of his poem which will appear most striking to many readers is the simplicity and purity of its diction. He has aimed at using simple terms, and he has accomplished his task in a manner rarely equalled, certainly never surpassed. We question whether there is anything more free from what may be called literary foppery within the compass of the English

language. There is a masculineness about the poem which indicates that the thoughts are those of a strong, stalwart mind ; a mind not in any degree gross ; but one, which, while it takes a firm grasp of material things, can relinquish that grasp at pleasure, and rise to the contemplation of the immaterial.”—*The Christian News*.

“‘Elijah the Prophet’ is a fine subject for a great poem. The deep religious mystery which pervades the whole story, the moral grandeur of the prophet’s character, its terrible power and its tender pathos, the superhuman and supernatural elements that interweave the whole texture of his mighty mission as an avenging prophet of ‘the living God’ all form a dramatic basis of the broadest kind on which to build a poem of more than ordinary interest ; and nothing is more worthy of praise than the manner in which our author has everywhere embodied in the substance of his poem the simple grandeur of the Bible narrative. The epic clings with loving fidelity to the divine record, and in sentiment breathes the very soul of humble piety and exalted faith. The whole tone and temper of the poem are not only religious but devotional in the highest degree.

“Mr. Washington Moon is equally successful in what may be fairly called the *earthly* element in his poem ; he has here shown that penetrating insight into the workings of the human will and human passion, without which no poet can hope to reach the highest department of poetry. The dramatic power severally shown in the evolution of the character of Ahab and of Jezebel, and of the sublime prophet who is the hero of the poem, is distinct evidence of Mr. Washington Moon’s capacity in this province of his art. His powers of imagination are worthy of an epic poet. His descriptions of nature are drawn with remarkable finish and taste. The night scene in the Invocation is an admirable picture.

“The metre adopted is that of the Spenserian stanza, with some slight alteration. With the exception of Lord Byron, no imitator of Spenser has shown a freedom and vigour in the handling of this graceful, but difficult measure, which can be compared with the mastery almost universally evinced by Mr. Washington Moon. We are bound to remark that, taken as a

EXTRACTS FROM REVIEWS 185

whole, it is by far the best poem on a sacred subject that has appeared for a considerable time.”—*The Imperial Review*.

“Mr. Washington Moon has reprinted his beautiful epic poem upon the life of Elijah, that first appeared in 1865. Poems rising to the dignity of epic form upon Old Testament subjects being somewhat rare, the work of Mr. Moon will be warmly welcomed by the present generation of lovers of poetry who have not yet made the acquaintance of this notable production. The story of Elijah’s life is narrated in powerful and melodious verse which is marked by deep religious feeling and high poetic genius. The other poems of the volume are all of a religious character that will appeal to the best instincts of both Jew and Christian.”—*The Jewish World*.

MINOR POEMS

“Mr. Washington Moon hopes, in a plaintive preface, that his poems, ‘sweeping in sympathetic tremulousness over the sensitive chords of other hearts, will awaken therein responsive emotions.’ The thing is so utterly [*sic*] impossible, and yet Mr. Moon has so longingly set his heart upon it that one has hardly the hardness to assure him that his trite and commonplace verses do not give the slightest ground for any such hope’—*The Daily News*.

“Mr. Washington Moon tells us, in his preface, that he publishes this little volume in the hope that his poems, ‘sweeping in sympathetic tremulousness over the sensitive chords of other hearts, will awaken therein responsive emotions.’ This we believe they are certain to do, as the poetic feeling must be very dull in the breast of any person who can read such utterances as ‘Love Seeketh not her Own’ or ‘That Heaven of Love—thy Dear Face,’ without being deeply touched by their pathos and naturalness.”
—*The Christian Advocate*.

“Mr. Washington Moon’s ‘Poems of Love and Home’ and ‘Elijah and Other Poems,’ will be heartily welcomed by lovers of true and deep sentiment couched in graceful and melodious phrase.”—*London Quarterly Review*.

186 EXTRACTS FROM REVIEWS

“The popularity of Mr. Moon’s poetry is evidenced by the fact that this is the fifth edition of ‘Elijah,’ and his devout and clever work deserves its success. His verse is of a high order and is always inspiring. There is a heartfelt ring about this little sheaf of poems. ‘Love and Home’ appeal to everybody, and Mr. Moon’s tender lyrics will find an echo in many a breast.”
—*The Publishers’ Circular*.

“Mr. Washington Moon’s two little volumes, ‘Elijah and Other Poems,’ and ‘Poems of Love and Home,’ are the work of a man of culture and a scholar; a deep religious feeling runs through them, and they are characterised by much grace and refinement.”—*The Court Circular*.

“All the sacred subjects of which Mr. Washington Moon treats, he touches with a spirit of reverence which elevates the mind to their level. By the simplicity and directness of their appeal to the affections, these lyrics will, perhaps, strike a chord in many hearts inaccessible to the more abstruse melodies of some latter-day poets. Love in its various phases, in youth and age, in life and death, is celebrated here in strains which express feelings common to humanity, and are uttered by the few for all.”—*The Dublin Review*.

“They are replete with amiable sentiments; and if a decidedly religious feeling pervades them, it is the emanation from a religion of love and charity in its widest acceptance.”—*The Kent Herald*.

“Mr. Washington Moon, mighty in prose, is still mightier in poetry; and these beautiful poems must touch the chords of the roughest heart with their plaintive notes.”—*The Cambridge Independent Press*.

“They are of elevated morality, of fervent devotion, and of fascinating eloquence in song.”—*The St. James’s Chronicle*.

“Their author is one of the most elegant writers in the English language.”—*Public Opinion*.

WORKS BY THE SAME AUTHOR,

BUT AT PRESENT OUT OF PRINT.

"THE KING'S ENGLISH."

"THE DEAN'S ENGLISH."

"THE REVISERS' ENGLISH."

"ECCLESIASTICAL ENGLISH."

"BAD ENGLISH EXPOSED."

"COMMON ERRORS IN SPEAKING AND
WRITING."

"THE MONOGRAPH GOSPEL."

"THE OLDEST TYPE-PRINTED BOOK IN
EXISTENCE."

LIBRARY USE

RETURN TO DESK FROM WHICH BORROWED

LOAN DEPT.

THIS BOOK IS DUE BEFORE CLOSING TIME
ON LAST DATE STAMPED BELOW

LIBRARY USE

JUN 26 1965

REC'D LD

JUN 26 '65 - 4 PM

YB 71245

221591

BS 188

M6

1904

