

Marx Hardy Machiavelli Joyce Austen
Defoe Abbot Melville Montaigne Cooper Emerson Hugo
Stoker Wilde Christie Maupassant Haggard Chesterton Molière Eliot Grimm
Garnett Engels Schiller Byron Maupassant Schiller
Goethe Hawthorne Smith Kafka
Cotton Dostoyevsky Dostoyevsky Smith Willis
Baum Henry Kipling Doyle Henry Willis
Leslie Dumas Flaubert Nietzsche Turgenev Balzac
Stockton Vatsyayana Crane
Burroughs Verne
Curtis Tocqueville Gogol Busch
Homer Tolstoy Whitman Twain
Darwin Zola Lawrence Dickens Plato Scott
Potter Freud Jowett Stevenson Andersen Burton Harte
Kant London Descartes Cervantes Voltaire Hesse
Poe Aristotle Wells James Hastings Cooke
Hale Bunner Shakespeare Chambers Irving
Richter Chekhov da Shaw Wodehouse
Doré Dante Pushkin Alcott
Swift Chekhov Newton



tredition was established in 2006 by Sandra Latusseck and Soenke Schulz. Based in Hamburg, Germany, tredition offers publishing solutions to authors and publishing houses, combined with worldwide distribution of printed and digital book content. tredition is uniquely positioned to enable authors and publishing houses to create books on their own terms and without conventional manufacturing risks.

For more information please visit: www.tredition.com

TREDITION CLASSICS

This book is part of the TREDITION CLASSICS series. The creators of this series are united by passion for literature and driven by the intention of making all public domain books available in printed format again - worldwide. Most TREDITION CLASSICS titles have been out of print and off the bookstore shelves for decades. At tredition we believe that a great book never goes out of style and that its value is eternal. Several mostly non-profit literature projects provide content to tredition. To support their good work, tredition donates a portion of the proceeds from each sold copy. As a reader of a TREDITION CLASSICS book, you support our mission to save many of the amazing works of world literature from oblivion. See all available books at www.tredition.com.



The content for this book has been graciously provided by Project Gutenberg. Project Gutenberg is a non-profit organization founded by Michael Hart in 1971 at the University of Illinois. The mission of Project Gutenberg is simple: To encourage the creation and distribution of eBooks. Project Gutenberg is the first and largest collection of public domain eBooks.

Addresses on the Revised Version of Holy Scripture

C. J. (Charles John) Ellicott

Imprint

This book is part of TREDITION CLASSICS

Author: C. J. (Charles John) Ellicott

Cover design: Buchgut, Berlin - Germany

Publisher: tredition GmbH, Hamburg - Germany

ISBN: 978-3-8472-1436-6

www.tredition.com

www.tredition.de

Copyright:

The content of this book is sourced from the public domain.

The intention of the TREDITION CLASSICS series is to make world literature in the public domain available in printed format. Literary enthusiasts and organizations, such as Project Gutenberg, worldwide have scanned and digitally edited the original texts. tredition has subsequently formatted and redesigned the content into a modern reading layout. Therefore, we cannot guarantee the exact reproduction of the original format of a particular historic edition. Please also note that no modifications have been made to the spelling, therefore it may differ from the orthography used today.

Addresses on the Revised
Version of Holy
Scripture.

by
C. J. ELLICOTT, D.D.,
bishop of gloucester,
and hon. fellow of st. john's college, cambridge.

published under the direction of the tract committee.

LONDON:
SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE,
northumberland avenue, w.c.; 43 queen victoria street, e.c.
Brighton: 129 North Street.
New York: E. & J. B. YOUNG & CO.
1901.

p. 3PREFATORY NOTE.

The following Addresses form the Charge to the Archdeaconry of Cirencester at the Visitation held at the close of October in the present year. The object of the Charge, as the opening words and the tenor of the whole will abundantly indicate, is seriously to suggest the question, whether the time has not now arrived for the more general use of the Revised Version at the lectern in the public service of the Church.

C. J. Gloucester.

October, 1901.

p. 5 ADDRESS I.

Early History of Revision.

As there now seem to be sufficient grounds for thinking that ere long the Revised Version of Holy Scripture will obtain a wider circulation and more general use than has hitherto been accorded to it, it seems desirable that the whole subject of the Revised Version, and its use in the public services of the Church, should at last be brought formally before the clergy and laity, not only of this province, but of the whole English Church.

Twenty years have passed away since the appearance of the Revised Version of the New Testament, and the presentation of it by the writer of these pages to the Convocation of Canterbury on May 17, 1881. Just four more years afterwards, viz. on April 30, 1885, the Revised Version of the Old Testament p. 6 was laid before the same venerable body by the then Bishop of Winchester (Bp. Harold Browne), and, similarly to the Revised Version of the New Testament, was published simultaneously in this country and America. It was followed, after a somewhat long interval, by the Revised Version of the Apocrypha, which was laid before Convocation by the writer of these pages on February 12, 1896.

The revision of the Authorised Version has thus been in the hands of the English-speaking reader sixteen years, in the case of the Canonical Scriptures, and five years in the case of the Apocrypha—periods of time that can hardly be considered insufficient for deciding generally, whether, and to what extent, the Revised Version should be used in the public services of the Church.

I have thus thought it well, especially after the unanimous resolution of the Upper House of the Convocation of Canterbury, three years ago [6], and the very recent resolution of the House of Laymen, to place before you the question p. 7 of the use of the Revised Version in the public services of the Church, as the ultimate subject of this charge. I repeat, as the ultimate subject, for no sound opinion on the public use of this version can possibly be formed unless some general knowledge be acquired, not only of the circumstances which paved the way for the revision of the time-honoured version

of 1611, but also of the manner in which the revision was finally carried out. We cannot properly deal with a question so momentous as that of introducing a revised version of God's Holy Word into the services of the Church, without knowing, at least in outline, the whole history of the version which we are proposing to introduce. This history then I must now place before you from its very commencement, so far as memory and a nearly life-long connexion with the subject enable me to speak.

The true, though remote fountain-head of revision, and, more particularly, of the revision p. 8of the New Testament, must be regarded as the grammar written by a young academic teacher, George Benedict Winer, as far back as 1822, bearing the title of a Grammar of the Language of the New Testament. It was a vigorous protest against the arbitrary, and indeed monstrous licence of interpretation which prevailed in commentaries on Holy Scripture of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. It met with at first the fate of all assaults on prevailing unscientific procedures, but its value and its truth were soon recognized. The volume passed through several successively improved editions, until in 1855 the sixth edition was reached, and issued with a new and interesting preface by the then distinguished and veteran writer. This edition formed the basis of the admirable and admirably supplemented translation of my lamented and highly esteemed friend Dr. Moulton, which was published in 1870, passed through a second edition six years afterwards, and has, since that time, continued to be a standard grammar, in an English dress, of the Greek Testament down to this day.

The claim that I have put forward for this remarkable book as the fountain-head of p. 9revision can easily be justified when we call to memory how very patently the volume, in one or another of its earlier editions, formed the grammatical basis of the commentaries of De Wette and Meyer, and, here in England, of the commentary of Alford, and of critical and grammatical commentaries on some of St. Paul's Epistles with which my own name was connected. It was to Winer that we were all indebted for that greater accuracy of interpretation of the Greek Testament which was recognized and welcomed by readers of the New Testament at the time I mention, and produced effects which had a considerable share in the gradual

bringing about of important movements that almost naturally followed.

What came home to a large and increasing number of earnest and truth-seeking readers of the New Testament was this—that there were inaccuracies and errors in the current version of the Holy Scriptures, and especially of the New Testament, which plainly called for consideration and correction, and further brought home to very many of us that this could never be brought about except by an authoritative revision.

This general impression spread somewhat p. 10rapidly; and soon after the middle of the last century it began to take definite shape. The subject of the revision of the Authorised Version of the New Testament found a place in the religious and other periodicals of the day [10a], and as the time went on was the subject of numerous pamphlets, and was alluded to even in Convocation [10b] and Parliament [10c]. As yet however there had been no indication of the sort of revision that was desired by its numerous advocates, and fears were not unnaturally p. 11entertained as to the form that a revision might ultimately take. It was feared by many that any authoritative revision might seriously impair the acceptance and influence of the existing and deeply revered version of Holy Scripture, and, to use language which expressed apprehensions that were prevailing at the time, might seriously endanger the cause of sound religion in our Church and in our nation.

There was thus a real danger, unless some forward step was quickly and prudently taken, that the excitement might gradually evaporate, and the movement for revision might die out, as has often been the case in regard of the Prayer Book, into the old and wonted acquiescence of the past.

It was just at this critical time that an honoured and influential churchman, who was then the popular and successful secretary of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, Rev. Ernest Hawkins, afterwards Canon of Westminster, came forward and persuaded a few of us, who had the happiness of being his friends, to combine and publish a version of one of the books of the New Testament which might practically demonstrate to friends and to opponents what sort of a revision p. 12seemed desirable under existing circum-

stances. After it had been completed we described it "as a *tentamen*, a careful endeavour, claiming no finality, inviting, rather than desiring to exclude, other attempts of the same kind, calling the attention of the Church to the many and anxious questions involved in rendering the Holy Scriptures into the vernacular language, and offering some help towards the settlement of those questions [12]."

The portion of Scripture selected was the Gospel according to St. John. Those who undertook the revision were five in number:—Dr. Barrow, the then Principal of St. Edmund's Hall, Oxford; Dr. Moberly, afterwards Bishop of Salisbury; Rev. Henry Alford, afterwards Dean of Canterbury; Rev. W. G. Humphry, Vicar of St. Martin's in the Fields; and lastly, the writer of this charge. Mr. Ernest Hawkins, busy as he was, acted to a great extent as our secretary, superintended arrangements, p. 13 and encouraged and assisted us in every possible manner. Our place of meeting was the library of our hospitable colleague Mr. Humphry. We worked in the greatest possible harmony, and happily and hopefully concluded our Revision of the Authorised Version of the Gospel of St. John in the month of March, 1857.

Our labours were introduced by a wise and attractive preface, written mainly by Dr. Moberly, in the lucid, reverent, and dignified language that marked everything that came from the pen of the late Bishop of Salisbury.

The effect produced by this *tentamen* was indisputably great. The work itself was of course widely criticized, but for the most part favourably [13]. The principles laid down in the preface were generally considered reasonable, and the possibilities of an authoritative revision distinctly increased. The work in fact became a kind of object lesson.

It showed plainly that there *were* errors in the Authorised Version that needed correction. It further showed that their removal and the introduction of improvements in regard of accuracy did not involve, either in quantity p. 14 or quality, the changes that were generally apprehended. And lastly, it showed in its results that *scholars* of different habits of thought could combine in the execution of such a work without friction or difficulty.

In regard of the Greek text but little change was introduced. The basis of our translation was the third edition of Stephens, from which we only departed when the amount of external evidence in favour of a different reading was plainly overwhelming. As we ourselves state in the preface, "our object was to revise a version, not to frame a text." We should have obscured this one purpose if we had entered into textual criticism.

Such was the tentative version which prepared the way for authoritative revision.

More need not be said on this early effort. The version of the Gospel of St. John passed through three editions. The Epistles to the Romans and Corinthians appeared in 1858, and the first three of the remaining Epistles (Galatians, Ephesians, and Philippians) in 1861. The third edition of the Revision of the Authorised Version of St. John was issued in 1863, with a preface in which the general estimate of the revision was discussed, and the probability indicated of some authoritative p. 15 procedure in reference to the whole question. As our little band had now been reduced to four, and its general aim and object had been realized, we did not deem it necessary to proceed with a work which had certainly helped to remove most of the serious objections to authoritative revision. Our efforts were helped by many treatises on the subject which were then appearing from time to time, and, to a considerable extent, by the important work of Professor, afterwards Archbishop, Trench, entitled "On the Authorised Version of the New Testament in connexion with some recent proposals for its revision." This appeared in 1858. After the close of our tentative revision in 1863, the active friends (as they may be termed) of the movement did but little except, from time to time, confer with one another on the now yearly improving prospects of authoritative revision. In 1869 Dean Alford published a small handy revised version of the whole of the Greek Testament, and, a short time afterwards, I published a small volume on the "Revision of the English Version," in which I sought to show how large an amount of the fresh and vigorous translation of Tyndale was present in the Authorised Version, and how little of this p. 16 would ever be likely to disappear in any authoritatively revised version of the future. Some estimate also was made of the amount of changes likely to be introduced in a sample portion of the Gos-

pels. A few months later, a very valuable volume ("On a Fresh Revision of the New Testament") was published by Professor, afterwards Bishop, Lightfoot, which appeared most seasonably, just as the long-looked-for hope of a revision of the Authorised Version of God's Holy Word was about to be realized.

All now was ready for a definite and authoritative commencement. Of this, and of the later history of Revision, a brief account will be given in the succeeding Address.

p. 17 ADDRESS II. Later History of Revision.

We are now arrived at the time when what was simple tentative and preparatory passed into definite and authoritative realization.

The initial step was taken on February 10, 1870, in the Upper House of the Convocation of Canterbury. The Bishop of Oxford, seconded by the Bishop of Gloucester, proposed the subjoined resolution, which it may be desirable to give in the exact words in which it was presented to the House, as indicating the caution with which it was framed, and also the indirectly expressed hope (unfortunately not realized) of the concurrence of the Northern Convocation. The resolution was as follows:

“That a committee of both Houses be appointed, with power to confer with any committee that may be appointed by the Convocation of the Northern Province, to report upon the desirableness of a revision of the Authorised Version of the New Testament, p. 18 whether by marginal notes or otherwise, in those passages where plain and clear errors, whether in the Hebrew or Greek text originally adopted by the translators, or in the translations made from the same, shall on due investigation be found to exist.”

In the course of the debate that followed the resolution was amended by the insertion of the words “Old and,” so as to include both Testaments, and, so amended, was unanimously accepted by the Upper House, and at once sent down to the Lower House. After debate it was accepted by them, and, having been thus accepted by both Houses, formed the basis of all the arrangements, rules, and regulations which speedily followed.

Into all of these it is not necessary for me to enter except so far as plainly to demonstrate that the Convocation of Canterbury, on thus undertaking one of the greatest works ever attempted by Convocation during its long and eventful history, followed every course, adopted every expedient, and carefully took every precaution to

bring the great work it was preparing to undertake to a worthy and a successful issue.

It may be well, then, here briefly to notice, p. 19 that in accordance with the primary resolution which I have specified, a committee was appointed of eight members of the Upper House, and, in accordance with the regular rule, sixteen members of the Lower House, with power, as specified, to confer with the Convocation of York. The members of the Upper House were as follows: the Bishops of Winchester (Wilberforce), St. Davids (Thirlwall), Llandaff (Ollivant), Salisbury (Moberly), Ely (Harold Browne, afterwards of Winchester), Lincoln (Wordsworth; who soon after withdrew), Bath and Wells (Lord Arthur Hervey), and myself.

The members of the Lower House were the Prolocutor (Dr. Bickersteth, Dean of Lichfield), the Deans of Canterbury (Alford), Westminster (Stanley), and Lincoln (Jeremie); the Archdeacons of Bedford (Rose), Exeter (Freeman), and Rochester (Grant); Chancellor Massingberd; Canons Blakesley, How, Selwyn, Swainson, Woodgate; Dr. Jebb, Dr. Kay, and Mr. De Winton.

Before, however, this committee reported, at the next meeting of Convocation in May, and on May 3 and May 5, the following five resolutions, which have the whole authority of Convocation behind them, were accepted p. 20 unanimously by the Upper House, and by large majorities in the Lower House:

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

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

3. That in the above resolutions we do not contemplate any new translation of the Bible, nor any alteration of the language, except where, in the judgement of the most competent scholars, such change is necessary.

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

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

These are the fundamental rules of Convocation, as formally expressed by the Upper and Lower Houses of this venerable body. The second and third rules deserve our especial attention in reference to the amount of the emendations and alterations which p. 21 have been introduced during the work of revision. This amount, it is now constantly said, is not only excessive, but in distinct contravention of the rules which were laid down by Convocation. A responsible and deeply respected writer, the late Bishop of Wakefield, only a few years ago plainly stated in a well-known periodical [21] that the revisers "largely exceeded their instructions, and did not adhere to the principles they were commissioned to follow." This is a very grave charge, but can it be substantiated? The second and third rules, taken together, refer change to consciously felt necessity on the part of "the most competent scholars," and these last-mentioned must surely be understood to be those who were deliberately chosen for the work. In the subsequently adopted rule of the committee of Convocation the criterion of this consciously felt necessity was to be faithfulness to the original. All then that can justly be said in reference to the Revisers is this, — not that they exceeded their instructions (a very serious charge), but that their estimate of what constituted p. 22 faithfulness, and involved the necessity of change, was, from time to time, in the judgement of their critic, mistaken or exaggerated. Such language however as that used in reference to the changes made by the Revisers as "unnecessary and un instructive alterations," and "irritating trivialities," was a somewhat harsh form of expressing the judgement arrived at.

But to proceed. On the presentation of the Report it was stated that the committee had not been able to confer with the Northern

Convocation, as no committee had been appointed by them. It was commonly supposed that the Northern President (Abp. of York) was favourable to revision, but the two Houses, who at that time sat together, had taken a very different view [22], as our President informed us that he had received a communication from the Convocation of York to the effect that—"The Authorised Version of the English Bible is accepted, not only by the p. 23Established Church, but also by the Dissenters and by the whole of the English-speaking people of the world, as their standard of faith; and that although blemishes existed in its text such as had, from time to time, been pointed out, yet they would deplore any recasting of its text. That Convocation accordingly did not think it necessary to appoint a committee to co-operate with the committee appointed by the Convocation of Canterbury, though favourable to the errors being rectified."

This obviously closed the question of co-operation with the Northern Convocation. We sincerely regretted the decision, as there were many able and learned men in the York Convocation whose co-operation we should have heartily welcomed. Delay, however, was now out of the question. The working out of the scheme therefore had now become the duty of the Convocation that had adopted, and in part formulated, the proposed revision.

The course of our proceedings was then as follows:

After the Report of the committee had been accepted by the Upper House, and communicated to the Lower House, the following resolution was unanimously adopted by the p. 24Upper House (May 3, 1870), and in due course sent down to the Lower House:

"That a committee be now appointed to consider and report to Convocation a scheme of revision on the principles laid down in the Report now adopted. That the Bishops of Winchester, St. Davids, Llandaff, Gloucester and Bristol, Ely, Salisbury, Lincoln, Bath and Wells, be members of the committee. That the committee be empowered to invite the co-operation of those whom they may judge fit from their biblical scholarship to aid them in their work."

This resolution was followed by a request from the Archbishop that as this was a committee of an exceptional character, being in fact an executive committee, the Lower House would not appoint, as in ordinary committees, twice the number of the members appointed by the Upper House, but simply an equal number. This request, though obviously a very reasonable request under the particular circumstances, was not acceded to without some debate and even remonstrance. This, however, was overcome and quieted by the conciliatory good sense and firmness of the Prolocutor; and, on the following day, the resolution was accepted by the Lower House, and the Prolocutor (Bickersteth) with p. 25 the Deans of Canterbury (Alford) and Westminster (Stanley), the Archdeacon of Bedford (Rose), Canons Blakesley and Selwyn, Dr. Jebb and Dr. Kay, were appointed as members of what now may be called the Permanent Committee.

This Committee had to undertake the responsible duty of choosing experts, and, out of them and their own members, forming two Companies, the one for the revision of the Authorised Version of the Old Testament, the other for the revision of the Authorised Version of the New Testament. Rules had to be drawn up, and a general scheme formed for the carrying out in detail of the whole of the proposed work. In this work it may be supposed that considerable difficulty would have been found in the choice of biblical scholars in addition to those already appointed by Convocation. This, however, did not prove to be the case. I was at that time acting as a kind of informal secretary, and by the friendly help of Dr. Moulton and Dr. Gotch of Bristol had secured the names of distinguished biblical scholars from the leading Christian bodies in England and in Scotland from whom choice would naturally have to be made. When we met together p. 26 finally to choose, there was thus no lack of suitable names.

In regard of the many rules that had to be made for the orderly carrying out of the work I prepared, after careful conference with the Bishop of Winchester, a draft scheme which, so far as I remember, was in the sequel substantially adopted by what I have termed the Permanent Committee of Convocation. When, then, this Committee formally met on May 25, 1870, the names of those to whom we were empowered to apply were agreed upon, and invitations at

once sent out. The members of the Committee had already been assigned to their special companies; viz. to the Old Testament Company, the Bishops of St. Davids, Llandaff, Ely, Lincoln (who soon after resigned), and Bath and Wells; and from the Lower House, Archdeacon Rose, Canon Selwyn, Dr. Jebb, and Dr. Kay: to the New Testament Company, the Bishops of Winchester, Gloucester and Bristol, and Salisbury; and from the Lower House, the Prolocutor, the Deans of Canterbury and Westminster, and Canon Blakesley.

Those invited to join the Old Testament were as follows:—Dr. W. L. Alexander, Professor Chenery, Canon Cook, Professor A. B. Davidson, Dr. B. Davies, Professor Fairbairn, p. 27Rev. F. Field, Dr. Gensburg, Dr. Gotch, Archdeacon Harrison, Professor Leathes, Professor McGill, Canon Payne Smith, Professor J. J. S. Perowne, Professor Plumptre, Canon Pusey, Dr. Wright (British Museum), Mr. W. A. Wright of Cambridge, the active and valuable secretary of the Company.

Of these Dr. Pusey and Canon Cook declined the invitation.

Those invited to join the New Testament Company were as follows:—Dr. Angus, Dr. David Brown, the Archbishop of Dublin (Trench), Dr. Eadie, Rev. F. J. A. Hort, Rev. W. G. Humphry, Canon Kennedy, Archdeacon Lee, Dr. Lightfoot, Professor Milligan, Professor Moulton, Dr. J. H. Newman, Professor Newth, Dr. A. Roberts, Rev. G. Vance Smith, Dr. Scott (Balliol College), Rev. F. H. Scrivener, the Bishop of St. Andrews (Wordsworth), Dr. Tregelles, Dr. Vaughan, Canon Westcott.

Of these Dr. J. H. Newman declined, and Dr. Tregelles, from feeble health and preoccupation on his great work, the critical edition of the New Testament, was unable to attend. It should be here mentioned that soon after the formation of the company, Rev. John Troutbeck, Minor Canon of Westminster, afterwards Doctor of Divinity, was appointed p. 28by the Company as their secretary. A more accurate, punctual, and indefatigable secretary it would have been impossible for us to have selected for the great and responsible work.

On the same day (May 25, 1870,) the rules for the carrying out of the revision, which, as I have mentioned, had been drawn up in

draft were all duly considered by the committee and carried, and the way left clear and open for the commencement of the work. These rules (copies of which will be found in nearly all the prefaces to the Revised Version hitherto issued by the Universities) were only the necessary amplifications of the fundamental rules passed by the two Houses of Convocation which have been already specified.

The first of these subsidiary rules was as follows:—"To introduce as few alterations as possible in the text of the Authorised Version consistently with faithfulness." This rule must be read in connexion with the first and third fundamental rules and the comments I have already made on those rules.

The second of the rules of the committee was as follows:—"To limit, as far as possible, the expression of such alterations to the language of the Authorised and earlier English versions." This rule was carefully attended to p. 29 in its reference to the Authorised Version. I do not however remember, in the revision of the version of the New Testament, that we often fell back on the renderings of the earlier English versions. They were always before us: but, in reference to other versions where there were differences of rendering, we frequently considered the renderings of the ancient versions, especially of the Vulgate, Syriac, and Coptic, and occasionally of the Gothic and Armenian. To these, however, the rule makes no allusion.

The third rule speaks for itself:—"Each Company to go twice over the portion to be revised, once provisionally, the second time finally, and on principles of voting as hereinafter is provided."

The fourth rule refers to the very important subject of the text, and is an amplification of the last part of the third fundamental rule. The rule of the committee is as follows:—"That the text to be adopted be that for which the evidence is decidedly preponderating; and that when the text so adopted differs from that from which the Authorised Version was made, the alteration be indicated in the margin." The subject of the text is continued in the fifth rule, which is as follows:—"To make or retain no change in the text on the second final revision p. 30 by the Company except *two-thirds* of those pre-

sent approve of the same, but on the first revision to decide by simple majorities."

The sixth rule is of importance, but in the New Testament Company (I do not know how it may have been in the Old Testament Company) was very rarely acted upon:—"In every case of proposed alteration that may have given rise to discussion, to defer the voting thereupon till the next meeting, whensoever the same shall be required by one-third of those present at the meeting, such intended vote to be announced in the notice for the next meeting." The only occasion on which I can remember this rule being called into action was a comparatively unimportant one. At the close of a long day's work we found ourselves differing on the renderings of "tomb" or "sepulchre" in one of the narratives of the Resurrection. This was easily and speedily settled the following morning.

The seventh rule was as follows:—"To revise the headings of chapters and pages, paragraphs, italics, and punctuation." This rule was very carefully attended to except as regards headings of chapters and pages. These were soon found to involve so much of indirect, if not even of direct interpretation, that p. 31 both Companies agreed to leave this portion of the work to some committee of the two University Presses that they might afterwards think fit to appoint. Small as the work might seem to be if only confined to the simple revision of the existing headings, the time it would have taken up, if undertaken by the Companies, would certainly have been considerable. I revised, on my own account, the headings of the chapters in St. Matthew, and was surprised to find how much time was required to do accurately and consistently what might have seemed a very easy and inconsiderable work.

The eighth rule was of some importance, though, I think, very rarely acted upon: "To refer, on the part of each Company, when considered desirable, to divines, scholars, and literary men, whether at home or abroad, for their opinions." How far this was acted on by the Old Testament Company I do not know. In regard of the New Testament Company the only instance I can remember, when we availed ourselves of the rule, was in reference to our renderings of portions of the twenty-seventh chapter of the Acts of the Apostles. In this particular case we sent our sheets to the Admiralty, and