

The following is information about the Bibles used in The Composite Bible, which I obtained from the internet. I have included information from <http://unbound.biola.edu/> where I downloaded the public domain Bibles (used by permission from unbound.biola.edu).

G.D.R.

=====

www.bible-researcher.com/basic.html

The Bible in Basic English

S. H. Hooke, ed., *The Basic Bible, Containing the Old and New Testaments in Basic English*. Cambridge: The University Press, 1949.

The New Testament was published in 1941. The vocabulary is limited to C. K. Ogden's Basic English vocabulary of 850 words proposed as an international auxiliary language, with an additional 150 biblical words.

The following is the Introduction as it appeared in a 1965 printing of the Bible in Basic English.

Introduction

The form in which the Bible is given here is not simply another example of the Bible story put into present-day English. The language used is Basic English.

Basic English, produced by Mr C. K. Ogden of the Orthological Institute, is a simple form of the English language which, with 850 words, is able to give the sense of anything which may be said in English. By the addition of 50 Special Bible words and the use of 100 words listed as giving most help in the reading of English verse, this number has been increased to 1000 for the purpose of putting the Bible into Basic.

Working with the Orthological Institute, a Committee under the direction of Professor S. H. Hooke, Professor Emeritus of Old Testament Studies in the University of London, has been responsible for a new English form of the Bible made from the Hebrew and the Greek.

In this undertaking, the latest ideas and discoveries in connection with the work of putting the Bible into other languages were taken into account, and when the Basic form was complete it was gone over in detail by a Committee formed by the Syndics of the Cambridge University Press.

The Basic Bible, which in this way was watched over by two separate groups of experts through its different stages, is designed to be used wherever the English language has taken root.

Frequently, the narrow limits of the word-list make it hard to keep the Basic completely parallel with the Hebrew and the Greek; but great trouble has been taken with every verse and every line to make certain that there are no errors of sense and no loose wording. It is only natural that, from time to time, some of the more delicate shades of sense have not been covered; on the other hand, it is well to keep in mind that in the

Authorised Version the power and music of the language sometimes take so much of the reader's attention that these more delicate shades are overlooked.

In fact, the Basic expert is forced, because of the limited material with which he is working, to give special care to the sense of the words before him. There is no question of the Basic work taking the place of the Authorised Version or coming into competition with it; but it may be said of this new English Bible that it is in a marked degree straightforward and simple and that these qualities give it an independent value.

Signs Used in the Bible in Basic English

... are used where it is no longer possible to be certain of the true sense of the Hebrew words, and for this reason no attempt has been made to put them into Basic.

*** are used as a sign that one or more Hebrew words, necessary to the sense, have been taken out at some time or other.

[] are used for marking additions made by later writers.

() are used for marking additions put in for the purpose of making the sense clear.

The numbers used for divisions of books and for verses are the same as in the Authorised and Revised Versions of the English Bible.

=====

www.bible-researcher.com

THE WEBSTER BIBLE

Webster's Revision (1833) Noah Webster, ed., *The Holy Bible, Containing the Old and New Testaments, in the Common Version. With Amendments of the Language.* New Haven: Durrie and Peck, 1833. Reprinted Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1987.

Webster's Preface

The English version of the sacred scriptures now in general use was first published in the year 1611, in the reign of James I. Although the translators made many alterations in the language of former versions, yet no small part of the language is the same as that of the versions made in the reign of Queen Elizabeth.

In the present version, the language is, in general, correct and perspicuous; the genuine popular English of Saxon origin; peculiarly adapted to the subjects; and in many passages, uniting sublimity with beautiful simplicity. In my view, the general style of the version ought not to be altered.

But in the lapse of two or three centuries, changes have taken place which, in particular passages, impair the beauty; in others, obscure the sense, of the original languages. Some words have fallen into disuse; and the signification of others, in current popular use, is not the same now as it was when they were introduced into the version. The effect of these changes is, that some words are not understood by common readers, who have no access to commentaries, and who will always compose a great proportion of readers; while other words, being now used in a sense different from that which they had when the translation was made, present a wrong signification or false ideas. Whenever words are understood in a sense different from that which they had when introduced, and different from that of the original languages, they do not present to the reader the *Word*

of God. This circumstance is very important, even in things not the most essential; and in essential points mistakes may be very injurious.

In my own view of this subject, a version of the scriptures for popular use should consist of words expressing the sense which is most common in popular usage, so that the *first ideas* suggested to the reader should be the true meaning of such words, according to the original languages. That many words in the present version fail to do this is certain. My principal aim is to remedy this evil.

The inaccuracies in grammar, such as 'which' for 'who', 'his' for 'its', 'shall' for 'will', 'should' for 'would', and others, are very numerous in the present version.

There are also some quaint and vulgar phrases which are not relished by those who love a pure style, and which are not in accordance with the general tenor of the language. To these may be added many words and phrases very offensive to delicacy and even to decency. In the opinion of all persons with whom I have conversed on this subject, such words and phrases ought not to be retained in the version. Language which cannot be uttered in company without a violation of decorum, or the rules of good breeding, exposes the scriptures to the scoffs of unbelievers, impairs their authority, and multiplies or confirms the enemies of our holy religion.

These considerations, with the approbation of respectable men, the friends of religion and good judges of this subject, have induced me to undertake the task of revising the language of the common version of the scriptures, and of presenting to the public an edition with such amendments, as will better express the true sense of the original languages, and remove objections to particular parts of the phraseology.

In performing this task, I have been careful to avoid unnecessary innovations, and to retain the general character of the style. The principal alterations are comprised in three classes.

The substitution of words and phrases now in good use, for such as are wholly obsolete, or deemed below the dignity and solemnity of the subject.

The correction of errors in grammar.

The insertion of euphemisms, words and phrases which are not very offensive to delicacy, in the place of such as cannot, with propriety, be uttered before a promiscuous audience.

A few errors in the translation, which are admitted on all hands to be obvious, have been corrected; and some obscure passages, illustrated. In making these amendments, I have consulted the original languages, and also several translations and commentaries. In the body of the work, my aim has been to *preserve*, but in certain passages, more clearly to *express* the sense of the present version.

The language of the Bible has no inconsiderable influence in forming and preserving our national language. On this account, the language of the common version ought to be correct in grammatical construction, and in the use of appropriate words. This is the more important, as men who are accustomed to read the Bible with veneration are apt to contract a predilection for its phraseology, and thus to become attached to phrases which are quaint or obsolete. This may be a real misfortune; for the use of words and phrases, when they have ceased to be a part of the living language, and appear odd or singular, impairs the purity of the language, and is apt to create a disrelish for it in those

who have not, by long practice, contracted a like predilection. It may require some effort to subdue this predilection; but it may be done, and for the sake of the rising generation, it is desirable. The language of the scriptures ought to be pure, chaste, simple and perspicuous, free from any words or phrases which may excite observation by their singularity; and neither debased by vulgarisms, nor tricked out with the ornaments of affected elegance.

As there are diversities of tastes among men, it is not to be expected that the alterations I have made in the language of the version will please all classes of readers. Some persons will think I have done too little; others, too much. And probably the result would be the same, were a revision to be executed by any other hand, or even by the joint labors of many hands. All I can say is, that I have executed this work in the manner which, in my judgment, appeared to be the best.

To avoid giving offense to any denomination of christians, I have not knowingly made any alteration in the passages of the present version, on which the different denominations rely for the support of their peculiar tenets.

In this country there is no legislative power which claims to have the right to prescribe what version of the scriptures shall be used in the churches, or by the people. And as all human opinions are fallible, it is doubtless for the interest of religion that no authority should be exerted in this case, except by commendation.

At the same time, it is very important that all denominations of christians should use the same version, that in all public discourses, treatises and controversies, the passages cited as authorities should be uniform. Alterations in the popular version should not be frequent; but the changes incident to all living languages render it not merely expedient, but necessary at times to introduce such alterations as will express the true sense of the original languages, in the current language of the age. A version thus amended may require no alteration for two or three centuries to come.

In this undertaking, I subject myself to the charge of arrogance; but I am not conscious of being actuated by any improper motive. I am aware of the sensitiveness of the religious public on this subject; and of the difficulties which attend the performance. But all men whom I have consulted, if they have thought much on the subject, seem to be agreed in the opinion, that it is high time to have a revision of the common version of the scriptures; although no person appears to know how or by whom such revision is to be executed. In my own view, such revision is not merely a matter of expedience, but of moral duty; and as I have been encouraged to undertake this work by respectable literary and religious characters, I have ventured to attempt a revision upon my own responsibility. If the work should fail to be well received, the loss will be my own, and I hope no injury will be done. I have been painfully solicitous that no error should escape me. The reasons for the principal alterations introduced, will be found in the explanatory notes.

The Bible is the chief moral cause of all that is good, and the best corrector of all that is evil in human society; the best book for regulating the temporal concerns of men, and the only book that can serve as an infallible guide to future felicity. With this estimate of its value, I have attempted to render the English version more useful, by correcting a few obvious errors, and removing some obscurities, with objectionable words and phrases; and my earnest prayer is that my labors may not be wholly unsuccessful.

N. W.

New Haven, September, 1833.

=====

e-bible.org

The World English Bible (WEB) FAQ

This Frequently Asked Questions document covers the following about the World English Bible (WEB):

Why create yet another English translation of the Holy Bible?

That is a good question. There are many good English translations of the Holy Bible. Unfortunately, all of them are either (1) archaic (like the KJV and ASV of 1901), or (2) covered by copyright restrictions that prevent unrestricted free posting on the internet or other media (like the NIV and NASB). The Bible in Basic English (BBE) was in the Public Domain in the USA (but not all countries) for a while, but its copyrighted status was restored by GATT. (The BBE used a rather restricted subset of English, anyway, limiting its accuracy and readability.) In other words, there is **NO OTHER** complete translation of the Holy Bible in normal Modern English that can be freely copied (except for some limited “fair use”) without written permission from the publisher and (usually) payment of royalties. This is the vacuum that the World English Bible is filling.

—

Why is the copyright such a big deal?

The copyright laws of most nations and the international treaties that support them are a mixed blessing. By granting authors and translators a legal monopoly (for a limited, but very long, time) on the right of copying and “first sale” of their works, the law makers have made writing and translating very profitable for some people whose works are in great demand. This has, no doubt, been a factor in the creation of many of the good Modern English translations of the Holy Bible that we now enjoy. The problem with this system, with respect to the Holy Bible, is that it has had the effect of limiting distribution of God’s Word in modern languages. For example, I cannot legally post copies of the entire New International Version of the Holy Bible on my web site in a downloadable, searchable, and readily copyable format without the permission of the International Bible Society and Zondervan (copyright owner and publisher). Zondervan won’t grant such permission unless they get a significant royalty (they quoted me \$10,000 + \$10/copy distributed) and unless I convince them that my Bible search software is “good enough” for them. Needless to say, the Bible search software that I am writing with the intention of distributing as donorware will not come with the NIV.

The problem of copyright protection of Modern English translations of the Holy Bible is not just significant on the Internet and various electronic information services. It also

affects people who want to quote significant portions of Scripture in books, audio tapes, and other media. This drives up the price of preaching the Gospel. Basic economics tells us that this is not a good thing when our goal is to fulfill the Great Commission (Matthew 28:18-20). For example, the “free” Bibles that the Gideons place cost more if they use a modern version, like Thomas-Nelson’s New King James Version, than if they use the (more difficult to read) King James Version.

Naturally, I’m not suggesting that we abolish the copyright law or that existing Modern English translations be immediately released to the Public Domain. I understand the way that the profits from the sales of the NIV, for example, help fund other language translations at the International Bible Society (as well as helping to enrich some folks at Zondervan). I also understand that the business of Bible sales has helped establish a good supply of Bibles in many parts of the world, in a variety of formats, sizes, styles, and colors. What we are doing is liberating at least one Modern English translation of the Holy Bible from all copyright restrictions -- a translation that is trustworthy, accurate, and useful for evangelism and discipleship.

Another concern where copyright restrictions come into play is in translation and creating derivative works. For example, the copyright notice of the NASB expressly forbids making translations or derivative works based on the NASB without getting permission from the Lockman Foundation. I don’t know if they would make this easy or hard, expensive or cheap, but I do know that there will be no need to even ask when using the WEB.

Isn’t it dangerous not to copyright the WEB?

No. Copyright protection is intended to protect the income of the copyright holder’s sales of a work, but we are planning to **GIVE AWAY** the right to make copies of this version of the Holy Bible to anyone who wants it, so we have nothing to lose that way. There is some argument for copyrighting a Bible translation just to retain some legal control against some evil, cultic revision of a translation. The *God’s Living Word* translations of John’s Gospel and John’s letters are copyrighted only for this reason, for example, even though blanket permission to make unlimited copies of that translation is published with them. This legal leverage is so much weaker than God’s protection of His own Word that it is of questionable value. (See Revelation 22:18-19.) One other major concern is that somebody might later claim a copyright on the WEB and remove it from the Public Domain. Because there is a timely and public declaration of the Public Domain status of the WEB by those who are working on it, that would not work, and they would not be able to defend such a bogus copyright claim.

With a Public Domain work, there is a hazard of confusion if many people start revising it or making derivative works from it and call it the same thing. For that reason, the name “World English Bible” is a trademark that may only be used to identify the World English Bible as published by Rainbow Missions, Inc., and faithful copies of that work. In addition, official distributions of the World English Bible are often digitally signed to provide a tamper-evident seal.

—

What is the WEB Revision?

The WEB Revision is an update of the [American Standard Version of 1901](#), which is in the Public Domain. The revision is also in the Public Domain, which sets it apart from other revisions of the American Standard Version, like the New American Standard Bible and the Revised Standard Version. The first pass of the translation, which has already been done, was to convert about 1,000 archaic words and word forms to modern equivalents using a custom computer program. The second through seventh phases consist of manual editing and proofreading. The initial manual pass is to add quotation marks (the ASV of 1901 had none), update other punctuation, update usage, and spot check the translation against the original languages in places where the meaning is unclear or significant textual variants exist. The subsequent passes are to review of the results of the previous pass. In each pass, volunteers read the current draft, looking for typos, unclear passages, etc., then report back to the senior editor (Michael Paul Johnson <mpj@ebible.org>), who checks the suggestions and merges the best suggestions into the master draft. As this is going on, the draft at the [WEB web page](#) is updated.

Who is behind the WEB Revision work?

Rainbow Missions, Inc., a Colorado nonprofit corporation -- and **many volunteers** who are born again and seeking to daily follow the leading of the Holy Spirit. If the Lord so moves you, tax-deductible financial gifts to help pay for WEB publishing and other costs associated with this project may be made to:

Rainbow Missions, Inc.
PO Box 1151
Longmont CO 80502-1151
USA

Rainbow Missions gets its name from the rainbow that is a sign of the covenant between God and Noah, the rainbow around God's throne, and the rainbow that suddenly appeared in the clear blue sky right after I asked God what to name this ministry.

Is the WEB a one-man translation?

Many people have been involved in the production and editing of the World English Bible from a variety of backgrounds. Because this is a revision of the American Standard Version of the Revised Bible, we start with the over 50 Evangelical scholars who worked on that project. They, in turn, relied on the work of those who had gone before them. We also rely on the work of many scholars who have found, compiled, combined, and published the excellent and highly accurate Hebrew and Greek texts from which we work. We also rely on the excellent lexicons of Hebrew, Chaldee, and Greek that are available to us.

In addition to these excellent references that represent literally hundreds of years of combined labor by many committed Christian men and women, we have access to the United Bible Society handbooks on Bible translation and a large number of other English translations to compare and consult.

Among the volunteers who have contributed to this project, we have people who attend various churches, including Baptist, Methodist, Pentecostal, non-denominational, and many more. This broad representation helps guard against introducing sectarian bias into the work. In addition, the novel technique of publishing draft copies of the World English Bible on the Internet provides additional protection against bias, because all serious comments are carefully considered and the wording compared to the original language. Although we don't demand credentials from people who comment on the translation by email, we do validate their comments before deciding what to do with them.

We do have one senior editor who is responsible for decisions regarding the text, but he is also accountable to several other Christians. Everyone who has authority to decide on the wording in the World English Bible believes in the inspiration by the Holy Spirit of the text as recorded by the original authors. In addition, we also believe that the Holy Spirit is still active in preserving the text and helps us in our work to the extent that we let Him.

What are your qualifications to do translation work?

Standing on the shoulders of giants - those mighty men of God who provided the critically edited original language texts, translated other English versions (especially the ASV), wrote the great translation guides available from the American Bible Society, and the writers of the Greek & Hebrew study materials I use - is the most obvious. Others include having studied the Bible for years, studying several languages, and earning a Master's degree. None of those matter as much as the next reason. God called me to do this, and I willingly answered His call. God would not call me to do something without enabling me to do so. Without God's call, I would drop this project like a hot rock. Although many people contribute suggestions and typo reports, they are all checked before editing the master copy of the [World English BibleWorld English BibleWorld English BibleWorld English Bible](#).

What is the WEB Translation Philosophy?

The WEB must

- be done with prayer -- specifically prayer for inspiration by the Holy Spirit.

be accurate and reliable (Revelation 22:18-19).

be understandable to the majority of the world's English-speaking population (and therefore should avoid locale-specific usage).

be kept in the Public Domain (and therefore be done by volunteers).

be made available in a short time, because we don't know the exact time of our Lord's return.

preserve the essential character of the original 1901 publication.

use language that is not faddish, but likely to retain its meaning for some time.
render God's proper Name in the Old Testament as "Yahweh."
resolve unclear passages by referring to the original Hebrew and Greek.
be done with utmost respect for God and His Word.
be done by Christians from a variety of denominations and backgrounds.
retain (at least for now) the ASV 1901's pronoun capitalization rules (lower case "he" referring to God).
retain (in most cases) the ASV 1901's use of "he" when that word might mean ("he and/or she").
restrict footnotes to those which clarify the translation or provide significant alternate readings

Bible translation (as with any natural language translation) is a balancing act, where the translators seek to preserve the following:

- The **meaning of each thought** or sentence.

The **meanings of individual words** in their context.

The **shades of meaning implied by word forms**, tense, etc.

The **impact and tone** of each passage.

The **style** of the original authors who were inspired by the Holy Spirit.

Faithfulness to the target language (English, in this case).

Note that some of the above goals are at odds with one another, like preservation of the original style vs. faithfulness to the target language, and expressing the last bit of the shades of meaning vs. preserving the impact. Still, it is possible to retain a good balance. Different balance points are chosen by different translation committees. Indeed, many translations can be characterized by the weight the translators gave to each of the above items. For example, *The Amplified Bible* excels at getting the meaning across, but falls down hard on impact, style preservation, and faithfulness to the target language. The *New Living Translation* excels at preserving the meanings of entire thoughts, impact, and faithfulness to the target language, but loses some of the style and shades of meaning. The *New International Version* excels at most of the above, but loses some elements of style and some of the subtleties of wording. The *World English Bible* attempts to **balance all of the above** with a fairly literal translation.

Some people like to use the terms "formal equivalent" and "dynamic equivalent." Neither of these exactly describe what we are doing, since we have borrowed ideas from both, but I suppose that we are closer to formal equivalence than dynamic equivalence.

What original language texts are you using?

Since this is primarily an update of the 1901 edition, the choices made by the original 50 or so Evangelical scholars that made this translation hold unless reference is made to the original languages to help with places where the Elizabethan English is not clear, or where major textual variants are known to exist. In this case, we are using the *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*, also called *The Stuttgart Bible*, in the Old Testament, and the *Byzantine Majority Text* as published for use with *The Online Bible* in the New Testament

(M-Text). This choice of Greek text is very close to what the KJV translators used, but does take advantage of some more recently discovered manuscripts. Although there are good scholarly arguments both for and against using the *Byzantine Majority Text* over the “Alexandrian” text based on the dating and critical editing work of Nestle and Aland and published by the United Bible Societies (UBS), we find the following to be compelling reasons:

- The UBS text has a lot of “dropout” errors relative to the M-Text. Diligent scribes with a respect for God’s Word are more likely to miss copying something (i.e. by skipping a line, etc.) than to make up a line to add in.

Different scribes copying the same passage aren’t all likely to make the same mistakes at the same places, even though some mistakes are likely to be copied over many times. When a scribe had a choice of manuscripts to copy, he would normally copy the one that he trusted the most, thus causing the most trusted text to be copied more often.

The UBS text relies heavily on the dating of the media upon which the text was written, but those texts that are used more and trusted more would both be copied more often and worn out from use sooner.

The UBS text is heavily weighted to a small number of manuscripts relative to those available to us, and relies heavily on one manuscript that was pulled from a trash can at a monastery.

The Holy Spirit takes an active interest in preserving what He has inspired.

In those few sections where the M-Text and UBS text differ significantly, I have taken my question of textual choice directly to God, and God chose to answer me by confirming in several different ways that reading which the M-Text rendered. The main passage in question is in Mark 16, but there are others, too. While I certainly don’t claim to be infallible, I do know when to say, “Yes, Sir” and follow the direction I see the Lord pointing me in.

How does the WEB compare to other translations?

The WEB is different enough to avoid copyright infringement, but similar enough to avoid incurring the wrath of God. By “different enough,” I mean that the wording is about as different from any one Modern English translation as the current translations differ from each other. By “similar enough,” I mean that the meaning is preserved and that the Gospel still cuts to the very soul. It is most similar to the ASV of 1901, of course, but I suppose that similarities will be found with other translations.

The WEB doesn’t capitalize pronouns pertaining to God. This is similar to the NRSV and NIV, and the same as the original ASV of 1901. Note that this is an English style decision, because Hebrew has no such thing as upper and lower case, and the oldest Greek manuscripts were all upper case. I kind of prefer the approach of the KJV, NKJV, and NASB of capitalizing these pronouns, because I write that way most of the time and because it is a way of offering greater honor to God. I admit that it is kind of a throw-back to the Olde English practice of capitalizing pronouns referring to the king. This is archaic, because we don’t capitalize pronouns that refer to our president. It is also true that choosing to capitalize pronouns relating to God causes some difficulties in translating the

coronation psalms, where the psalm was initially written for the coronation of an earthly king, but which also can equally well be sung or recited to the praise of the King of Kings. Capitalizing pronouns relating to God also makes for some strange reading where people were addressing Jesus with anything but respect. In any case, in the presence of good arguments both ways, we have decided to leave these as they were in the ASV 1901 (which also gives us fewer opportunities to make mistakes).

The WEB, like the ASV of 1901, breaks the KJV tradition by printing God's proper Name in the Old Testament with a spelling closest to what we think it was pronounced like, instead of rendering that Name as "LORD" or "GOD" (with all caps or small caps). The current scholarly consensus has shifted from spelling this Name as "Jehovah" to spelling it as "Yahweh." There are a couple of other English translations that use "Yahweh," so this is not new, per se, but it does set it off a little from other translations.

Because World English Bible (WEB) uses the Majority Text as the basis for the New Testament, you may notice the following differences in comparing the WEB to other translations:

- The order of Matthew 23:13 and 14 is reversed in some translations.

Luke 17:36 and Acts 15:34, which are not found in the majority of the Greek Manuscripts (and are relegated to footnotes in the WEB) may be included in some other translations.

Romans 14:24-26 in the WEB may appear as Romans 16:25-27 in other translations.

1 John 5:7-8 may read differently in some translations.

What about the King James Only movement?

May God open their eyes and give them a sound understanding.

If you prefer the King James Version of the Holy Bible, then, by all means, read it and do what it teaches. I think that the KJV was a wonderful Contemporary English translation of the Holy Bible when it came out. It has been mightily used by God and has had (and continues to have) a profoundly good impact. Unfortunately, the evolution of the English language continually erodes its value as time goes on. It is now outsold by the excellent New International Version, for many good reasons.

I guess that there are a few people that seem to believe that the KJV is more accurate than the original Hebrew and Greek of the Holy Bible, and that all the other versions are tainted with heresy and conspiracy. I've read some of their literature. I found it to be some of the most non-Christian and illogical literature that I have endured, thus further proving the claim that the KJV is the only valid Bible to be wrong, at least in my mind. I guess I've now put myself on record as being a heretic in their eyes, but I must follow God, rather than men.

What makes you think that you can compete with multi-million dollar publishers?

Indeed, throwing another Modern English translation into the "market" to "compete" with solid translations like the NIV and publishing giants like Zondervan sounds as silly. It

sounds like that, perhaps, until you consider that the primary target for the WEB is **royalty-free** distribution of the Holy Bible in **unlimited copies** made by many people using many computers, tape recorders, photocopiers, and presses all over the world. This is a “market” that the “giants” have excluded themselves from. Indeed, if they change that policy (don’t hold your breath waiting for them to), we win, anyway. If we win this area, that is enough to justify this effort. If we do an excellent job, the WEB might possibly start competing in more conventional areas (like printed Bibles in bookstores), but not because of any significant effort or marketing on our part. After all, the bookstores have lots of Bibles in Modern English, already.

Once you look at the whole picture of what is going on, the multi-million dollar publishers and Bible translators really don’t have much of an effect on us, nor do we have much of an effect on them. The result of the combined efforts of both is simply more complete availability of the Holy Bible in Modern English.

Of course, it does take considerable effort to pull off a decent Bible translation -- even a language update like the WEB. Fortunately, there are lots of people willing to volunteer some time to help with this cause, and the Internet helps bring those people together. The real bottom line, though, is that this is God’s project, and He is fully capable of providing everything that we need to accomplish His goals.

What kind of editing help do you want?

Specifically, we need people who will read drafts of WEB chapters carefully, checking the following things, and email suggestions for improvements in the following areas:

- Typos & spelling errors.

Punctuation errors.

Grammar & usage errors.

Unclear wording or wording that may be misunderstood.

Wording that varies in meaning from other good Bible translations (realizing that some will vary due to “textual variants” in the underlying original languages).

Wording that may inadvertently be “too close” to any copyrighted Modern English translation for too many verses in a row (thus risking charges of copyright infringement).

Questions that come up with respect to specific portions of the translation.

Inconsistencies in style, usage, or translation.

Note that all suggestions made in line with the above mentioned translation philosophy will be seriously considered. There is no guarantee, of course, that any suggestion will result in a change, especially in those areas that involve judgment calls, because we are likely to get conflicting suggestions for the same passage. If in doubt, suggest or ask, anyway. We want to eradicate as many of the above distractions as possible, so that the meaning and message of the Holy Bible come through clearly.

How do you publish draft portions of the WEB?

Draft portions of the WEB are published in the WEB mailing list and at <http://ebible.org/bible/web>, and in the unmoderated Usenet news groups alt.bible and alt.christnet.bible. Once the WEB translation is done, we plan to continue it as a daily Bible reading list.

How do I join the WEB mailing list?

There are actually three mailing lists that can properly be called the WEB mailing list:

- bible Daily World English Bible readings and some announcements
- hnv Daily HNV readings and some announcements
- webne News about status of World English Bible translation and publication.
ws

The easy way (if you have access to the World Wide Web) is to visit <http://ebible.org/subscribe.htm> and follow the instructions there.

If you can't do the above, send mail to majordomo@ebible.org with the single line in the body of the message (not the subject) with "subscribe" followed by the list name, like:
subscribe bible

Expect somewhere around 4 chapters of the Holy Bible per day, along with related material (like this FAQ, the glossary, and announcements).

How do I get off of the WEB mailing list?

Visit <http://ebible.org/subscribe.htm> and follow the instructions there, **or** send mail to majordomo@ebible.org with the single line in the body of the message (not the subject) saying "unsubscribe" followed by the list name, like:

unsubscribe bible

If you don't have access to the account you are unsubscribing from, then add your old email address to the line, like

unsubscribe bible user@host.domain

but substitute your own email address for user@host.domain. If that doesn't work, email mpj@ebible.org for help from a real person.

How do I change my address on the WEB mailing list?

Just unsubscribe from the old address and subscribe from the new address, using the instructions, above.

Is anyone else working on a public domain, Modern English translation?

Yes. Dr. Maurice Robinson is overseeing another project to revise the ASV into what he is calling the Modern American Standard Version (MASV). That project is not on quite as ambitious schedule, but it should be worth looking at when it is done. There are now some other works, too, like the Updated King James Version at <http://www.geocities.com/updatedkjv/>. People often ask if we are aware of the [New English TranslationNew English TranslationNew English TranslationNew English Translation](#) , and we are, but it is not Public Domain. They do allow free downloads for personal use, though, and there is a lot of scholarly work that went into that translation.

When will the WEB be completed?

The New Testament, Psalms, and Proverbs are finished (but we will still consider well-justified edits and typo corrections). We have no estimate of the completion date of the Old Testament, yet. You can see the current revision status at <http://eBible.org/web/>.

Can I get a printed copy of the WEB?

You can get a bound, printed copy of of the New Testament plus Psalms and Proverbs of the World English Bible by ordering it on line at <http://www.messianicbook.net/Scriptures.htm> or by ordering it from a book store. Order ISBN 0-9703344-2-7 (paperback), ISBN 0-9703344-5-1 (hardback), or ISBN 0-9703344-7-8 (case laminatecover).

Why the name WEB?

World: because God's Word is to the whole world, and this translation is to be read by English-speaking people all over the world.

English: a language spoken by about 10% of the people in the world.

Bible: God's Holy Book.

WEB: This translation of the Holy Bible travels by way of the World-Wide Web, aided by its copyright-free status.

Will any major publishers be interested in the WEB?

Several publishers that don't already own rights to another modern English translation of the Holy Bible are likely to be interested. Ask them.

Why do you use “Yahweh” for God’s name in the Old Testament?

“Yahweh” is the most probable best transliteration of this most holy proper name from the Hebrew consonants YOD HE WAW HE, or YHWH. This holy name is sometimes rendered “Jehovah” based on the mixture of the vowels for “Adonai” (Lord) with the consonants “YHWH” as it is written in some later Hebrew manuscripts. The original Hebrew manuscripts had no vowels, and we believe that the vowels for “adonai” were added to reflect the tradition of avoiding pronouncing God’s name, and saying “Lord” instead, and was not an indication of how the name should be pronounced by those so bold as to actually utter God’s name. This is a break from the tradition of the KJV and others that use “LORD” or “GOD” with all caps or small caps to translate “YHWH”, and use “Lord” (normal mixed case) to translate “Adonai” and “God” (normal mixed case) to translate “Elohim.” That tradition gets really confusing in some places, especially since “Yahweh” is used in conjunction with “Lord” and “God” in many places in the Old Testament. Since God’s proper name really is separate from the titles “Lord” and “God” in the original Hebrew, we wanted the English translation to reflect that fact, even when read aloud.

As a concession to strong tradition, the Hebrew Names Version of the World English Bible uses “LORD” or “GOD” (all capital letters) for “Yahweh.”

In some places, “Yah,” a shortened version of God’s Name is used. This is how it is written in the Hebrew manuscripts in those places.

As a concession to strong tradition, the Hebrew Names Version of the World English Bible uses “LORD” or “GOD” (all capital letters) for “Yahweh.”

—

Why don’t you capitalize pronouns referring to God?

In Hebrew, there is no such thing as upper and lower case. The original Greek manuscripts were written in all upper case letters. Therefore, this is mostly a question of English style more than a question of conforming to the original language texts. English style is a moving target, and there is not widespread agreement on capitalization of pronouns referring to God. A few hundred years ago, it was common practice to capitalize pronouns pertaining to any king or other national leader. Since God is the King of Kings, it only made sense to capitalize pronouns referring to God. In modern English, we don’t do that, even when writing very respectfully. In modern English, it is considered correct to either capitalize or not capitalize pronouns referring to God, but the practice should be consistent within a book. Other contemporary translations of the Holy Bible into English are pretty much evenly split between capitalizing and not capitalizing these pronouns.

There are three other translational issues involved. One is that it seems rather awkward to translate quotations of people who were deriding Jesus Christ, and who at that point didn’t believe that He was the spotless Son of God, capitalizing the pronouns they used to refer to Him. The New American Standard Bible handles this by putting in a footnote to explain that they capitalized the pronouns because of who Jesus Christ is, not who the speaker thought He was.

Another issue is that in some of the coronation psalms, it was clear that the psalm was originally written for the coronation of an earthly king (i. e. King Solomon), but the psalm applies and is used more often to sing praises to the King of Kings. In that case, it is difficult to choose which case to use for the pronouns. By not capitalizing pronouns pertaining to God, we as translators preserve the ambiguity of the original Scriptures and leave the application to the Holy Spirit and the reader.

The third translational issue is a more practical one. Because the World English Bible is an update of the American Standard Version of 1901, which does not capitalize pronouns referring to God, it would have required reviewing all pronouns in the Bible for capitalization, determining from the context which referred to God and which did not. Even when done carefully, there is a risk of making errors in the process, and in some cases (such as those mentioned above), footnotes would be in order to explain the ambiguities that would be totally unnecessary without the capitalization. Therefore, we have decided to retain the ASV's capitalization rules in the Bible text.

—

Why do you use contractions?

Because the Greek New Testament was written not in the formal written register of the language, but in the informal register of the language used by common people, we have decided to use the less formal spoken register of the English language. This sounds much more natural when read aloud. The primary difference noticeable between spoken or informal written English and formal written English is the greater use of contractions.

—

Does the WEB include the Apocrypha?

The World English Bible has a companion Apocrypha/Deuterocanonical section. This section is a revision of the KJV Apocrypha. (The ASV had no such section.) Opinions and teachings regarding these books vary from denomination to denomination and among Christians within those denominations. We believe that these books have value in helping people understand the context of the Old and New Testaments, and that they contain some godly wisdom. These books are also considered to be a part of the Bible by the Roman Catholic Church and some other denominations. Therefore, we believe that they are worth preserving. The World English Bible is an ecumenical work for both Catholic and Protestant use. We aren't going to pretend to resolve all doctrinal differences, but we are able to provide a translation that should be good for all believers in Jesus Christ who speak English.

—

Where can I get the WEB?

At <http://www.ebible.org/bible/WEB><http://www.ebible.org/bible/WEB><http://www.ebible.org/bible/WEB><http://www.ebible.org/bible/WEB><http://www.ebible.org/bible/WEB> or <http://WorldEnglishBible.org>.

—

How can I help support the WEB work?

1. You can pray for everyone who works on it, that they would be sensitive to the Holy Spirit and correctly handle God's Holy Word, and that God would abundantly provide everything needed for this work.
2. You can partner with us, helping us to make the World English Bible freely available by sending tax-deductible donations to:
RAINBOW MISSIONS
PO BOX 275
MESA CO 81643-0275
USA

—
Who Maintains this FAQ?

This FAQ is maintained by [Michael Paul Johnson](mailto:mpj@ebible.org)[Michael Paul Johnson](mailto:mpj@ebible.org)[Michael Paul Johnson](mailto:mpj@ebible.org)[Michael Paul Johnson](mailto:mpj@ebible.org) .
[Please mail comments or suggestions to mpj@ebible.org](mailto:mpj@ebible.org)mpj@ebible.orgmpj@ebible.orgmpj@ebible.org .
[This page is kept at http://ebible.org/bible/web/webfaq.htm.](http://ebible.org/bible/web/webfaq.htm)

=====

www.bible-researcher.com

THE DARBY BIBLE

John Nelson Darby's Version

1867. John Nelson Darby, The Gospels, Acts, Epistles, and Book of Revelation: Commonly called the New Testament. A New Translation from a Revised Text of the Greek Original. London: G. Morrish, 1867. Second edition 1872. Third edition 1884.

John Nelson Darby (1800-1882) was educated at Trinity College, Dublin, where he graduated in 1819 as Classical Medallist. He was ordained as a priest in the established church in Ireland in 1825, and ministered among country people in remote places. In 1827 he came to believe that the church to which he belonged was hopelessly corrupt; and, on the basis of his independent study of Scripture, he also came to believe that a Christian was obliged to separate himself from all corrupt organizations. So he resigned his position as a clergyman, and began to associate with certain "brethren" in Dublin who shared his views. Because he was unmarried and had inherited a large estate, he had no need of a salary. In Dublin he met Benjamin Wills Newton, who recognized Darby's gifts and invited him to minister among like-minded people in Plymouth, England. By the year 1832 a congregation was definitely formed there under Darby's leadership. This was the beginning of the so-called "Plymouth Brethren" movement, to which Darby would devote the rest of his life. In the year 1837 he went to the continent to promote his teachings among Methodists and Baptists there. By 1840 he had established several congregations in Switzerland and France. In 1853 he went on to Germany, where he established congregations in Dusseldorf, Elberfeld, and in other towns. He was dissatisfied with the existing Bible versions in French and German, and so he collaborated with German and

French followers in the creation of new versions in those languages. With some German associates he produced the "Elberfelder Bible," ¹ and with French-speaking followers he produced the "Pau Bible."

Darby did not feel such a need for a new translation in English, because he considered the King James Version to be adequate for most purposes, and he encouraged his followers to continue to use it. But, he decided to produce a highly literal English version of the New Testament for study purposes. This New Testament was first issued in parts, beginning with the Gospel according to Matthew in 1865. The New Testament was completed in 1867. The version is exceedingly literal, based upon modern critical editions of the Greek text, and abundantly supplied with text-critical and philological annotations. The annotations are by far the most comprehensive and detailed to be found in an English version. It was consulted by the translators of the [English Revised VersionEnglish Revised VersionEnglish Revised Version](#) of 1881 (see F.F. Bruce, *History of the Bible in English*, 3rd ed., 1978, p. 132).

After Darby's death in 1882, certain of his followers in England produced an English version of the Old Testament based upon Darby's French and German translations. In 1890 this was published as the Old Testament portion of *The Holy Scriptures. A New Translation from the Original Languages* by J. N. Darby (G. Morrish, 1890). A later edition with abridged annotations (omitting the references to Hebrew and Greek manuscripts) was published by Stow Hill Bible and Tract Depot in 1939, and reprinted by Bible Truth Publishers in 1961. The Morrish edition of 1890 (with unabridged annotations) was reprinted by Bible Truth Publishers (Addison, Illinois) in 1983.

¹ The Elberfelder Bibel has long been the most literal translation available in German. Whereas Luther used a mixed style of word-for-word and interpretive translation, the Elberfelder is strictly word-for-word, also trying to reflect tense, voice and moods of the underlying Greek verbs, etc. The NT was mainly based on critical texts available at that time, though the Textus Receptus was used in undecided cases. The impetus for the translation probably proceeded from J. A. von Poseck. In 1851 he had already translated some of the Epistles and sent these translations to Darby in England for review. In 1854 when Darby was in Germany for an extended visit he worked with J.A. von Poseck and Carl Brockhaus on the translation. At first they intended only to translate the Epistles, but finally decided to translate the entire NT. It cannot be determined which of the men translated any given portion of the work. The completed NT was first published (by Brockhaus) in 1855. This was followed by several editions (11 of them appeared between 1855 and 1901), in which the annotations were greatly expanded (showing many of the various readings of the manuscripts) and the text slightly revised in more natural German (e.g. replacing participles with more idiomatic relative clauses). Darby probably contributed to the first four revisions, which appeared before his death. Others also contributed to the revisions, principally Rudolf Brockhaus and Emil Doenges. The Old Testament was translated by Darby, Carl Brockhaus, and Hermanus Cornelis Voorhoeve (a Dutchman from Rotterdam). Work began in 1869, and was completed in 1871, when the entire Bible was published. The Old Testament was slightly revised in subsequent editions. More extensive updates and revisions of the Elberfelder Bible were published in 1960, 1975, and 1985, in which the NT is conformed to the current Nestle-Aland editions

of the Greek text. The Revidierte Elberfelder Bibel of 1985 (published by the R. Brockhaus Verlag) is an evangelical Protestant translation, and remains the most literal German Bible translation.

REVISED PREFACE TO SECOND EDITION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT (1871)

The original edition, in which each of the several books was published by itself (or two epistles together if there were two to the same assembly), and the reprints of several, which seem to have attracted more attention than others, being exhausted, I publish a new edition of this translation of the New Testament, as a whole, in a more convenient form.

It has been in no way my object to produce a learned work; but, as I had access to books, and various sources of information, to which of course the great mass of readers, to whom the word of God was equally precious, had not, I desired to furnish them as far as I was able with the fruit of my own study, and of all I could gather from those sources, that they might have the word of God in English, in as perfect a representation of it in that language as possible.

In the first edition I had made use of a German work professing to give the Textus Receptus, with a collection of the various readings adopted by all or any of the editors of most repute, Griesbach, Lachmann, Scholz, Tischendorf, and some others. But the Textus Receptus was itself often changed in the text of the work, and I found that several of these changes had escaped my notice. My plan was, where the chief editors agreed, to adopt their reading, not to attempt to make a text of my own. My object was a more correct translation: only there was no use in translating what all intelligent critics held to be a mistake in the copy. For, as is known, the Textus Receptus had no real authority, nor was indeed the English Version taken from it, -- it was an earlier work by some years. With some variations, which critics have more or less carefully counted, the Textus Receptus was a reprint of earlier editions. Of these Stephanus 1550 is the one of most note: there were besides this Erasmus and Beza. Erasmus was the first published; the Complutensian Polyglott the first printed: then Stephanus; and then Beza. The Elzevirs were not till the next century; and the expression in their preface of textus ab omnibus receptus led to the expression of 'textus receptus', or received text. The Authorised Version was mainly taken from Stephanus, or Beza. The reader who is curious as to these things may see a full account in Scrivener's Introduction or other similar Introductions. After this came, beginning with Fell at Oxford, various critical editions: Mill, Bengel, Wetstein (who greatly enlarged the field of criticism), then Griesbach, Matthei (the last giving the Russian Codices, which are Constantinopolitan so called), Lachmann, Scholz, Tischendorf, and quite recently Tregelles. I name only those of critical celebrity. We possess besides, in connection with commentaries, Meyer, De Wette, and Alford. In my first edition my translation was formed on the concurrent voice of Griesbach, Lachmann, Scholz, and Tischendorf: the first of soberer judgment and critical acumen and discernment; the next with a narrower system of taking only the very earliest MSS., so that sometimes he might have only one or two; the third excessively carelessly printed, but taking the mass of Constantinopolitan MSS. as a rule; the last of first-rate competency and diligence of research, at first somewhat rash in changing, but in subsequent editions returning more soberly to what he had despised. Still, if they agreed,

one might be pretty sure that what they all rejected was a mere mistake in copying. Scholz, in a lecture in England, gave up his system, and stated that in another edition he should adopt the Alexandrian readings he had rejected. That is the general tendency since: Tregelles laying it down strictly as a fixed rule.

Meanwhile, since my first edition, founded on the concurrent judgment of the four great modern editors, following the received text unchanged where the true reading was a disputed point among them, the Sinaitic MS. has been discovered; the Vatican published; Porphyry's of Acts and Paul's Epistles and most of the Catholic Epistles and the Apocalypse, and others, in the Monumenta Sacra Inedita of Tischendorf, as well as his seventh edition. These, with Alford and Meyer's (not yet consulted for the text), and De Wette, furnished a mass of new materials. Tregelles' too was published as a whole since my present edition was finished, though not printed.

All this called for further labour. I had to leave Scholz pretty much aside; (his work cannot be called a careful one, and he had left himself aside;) and take in Tischendorf's 7th ed., Alford, Meyer, De Wette. I have further, in every questioned reading, compared the Sinaitic, Vatican, Dublin, Alexandrian, Codex Beza, Codex Ephraemi, St. Gall, Claromontanus, Hearne's Laud in the Acts, Porphyry in great part, the Vulgate, the old Latin in Sabatier and Bianchini. The Syriac I had from others; it was only as to words and passages left out or inserted I used the book itself; not being a Syriac scholar, I could not use it for myself. The Zacynthius of Luke I have consulted; with occasional reference to the fathers; Stephanus, Beza, Erasmus. The labour involved in such a work those only know who have gone through it by personal reference to the copies themselves.

In the translation itself there is little changed. A few passages made clearer; small inaccuracies corrected, which had crept in by human infirmity; occasional uniformity in words and phrases produced where the Greek was just the same. In the translation I could feel delight -- it gave me the word and mind of God more accurately: in the critical details there is much labour and little food. I can only trust that the Christian may find the fruit of it in increased accuracy.

As the editors I have named had not the Sinaitic nor Porphyrian MSS., I have occasionally had to judge for myself where these authorities affected the question much, or have occasionally put the matter as questionable in a note, where I could not decide for myself.

I will now say a few words as to these authorities. As to the general certainty of the text, all these researches have only proved it. The meddling of ecclesiastics has been one chief source of questionable readings; partly wilful, partly innocently: the attempt to assimilate the Gospels, which was wilful; and then, more innocently, arising from the passages read in ecclesiastical services, such changes as 'Jesus' put for 'He' where it was needed, as in these services 'He' at the beginning referred to nothing; and 'Jesus' was then introduced by copyists into the text. The attempt to make the Lord's prayer in Luke like that in Matthew is another instance; so, if we are to believe Alford and most other editors, the leaving out 'first-born' in the Sinaitic and Vatican and some others, (which I note because it affects the oldest MSS.,) because it looked as if the mother of our Lord had other children; and such like instances. But these do not make any very great difficulty. Other MSS. and versions (which are earlier than all MSS.), with a little care, make the real state of the case plain; but no MSS. are early enough to escape these handlings. So that the system which takes merely the oldest MSS. as authorities in

themselves, without adequate comparison and weighing internal evidence, necessarily fails in result. Conjectures are not to be trusted, but weighing the evidence as to facts is not conjecture.

The three greatest questions are 1 Timothy iii. 16, the beginning of John viii, and the last verses of Mark xvi. In the first I pronounce no judgment, as full dissertations have been written on it by many critics. As to John viii, I do not doubt its genuineness. Augustine tells us it was left out in some untrustworthy MSS. because it was thought injurious to morality: and not only so, but in my examination of the text I found that in one of the best MSS. of the old Latin, two pages had been torn out because it was there, carrying away part of the text preceding and following. As to the end of Mark and its apparently independent form, I would remark that we have two distinct closes to the Lord's life in the Gospels: his appearance to his disciples in Galilee, related in Matthew without any account of his ascension, which indeed answers to the whole character of that Gospel; and at Bethany, where his ascension took place, which is the part related in Luke, answering to the character of his Gospel: one, with the remnant of the Jews owned, and sending the message out on earth to Gentiles, the other from heaven to all the world, beginning with Jerusalem itself; one Messianic, so to speak, the other heavenly. Now Mark, up to the end of verse eight, gives the Matthew close; from verse nine a summary of the Bethany and ascension scene, and facts related in Luke and John. It is a distinct part, a kind of appendix, so to speak.

I have always stated the Textus Receptus in the margin where it is departed from, except in the Revelation, Erasmus having translated that from one poor and imperfect MS., which being accompanied by a commentary had to be separated by a transcriber; and even so Erasmus corrected what he had from the Vulgate, or guessed what he had not. There was not much use in quoting this.

But it does not seem to me that any critics have really accounted for the phenomena of MSS. We have now a vast mass of them, some few very old, and a great many more comparatively modern. But it seems to me the oldest, as Sinaitic and Vatican, bear the marks of having been in ecclesiastical hands. I do not mean that the result is seriously affected by it, for their work is pretty easily detected and corrected, and thus is not of any great consequence; but, as it is easily detected, proved to be there. After all research, it cannot be denied, I think, that there are two great schools of readings. The same MS. may vary as to the school it follows in different parts. Thus Griesbach says A was Constantinopolitan in the Gospels and Alexandrian in the Epistles, to use conventional names. So Porphyrius (marked P), which I found in six or eight chapters of Acts so uniformly to go with the Textus Receptus, that I consulted it scarcely at all afterwards, does not do so in Paul's epistles. Still there are the two schools. Of the one, Sinaitic, Vatican, and Dublin (B Z) are the most perfect examples. For that in the main they are of this school, though with individual peculiarities, cannot, it seems to me, be questioned a moment. Of these, Dublin, marked Z, is by far the most correct copy: I remarked but one blunder in copying. The Vatican, as a copy, is far superior to Sinaiticus, which is by no means a correct one, in the Revelation quite the contrary, however valuable as giving us the whole New Testament and being the oldest copy perhaps we have. But we must remember that we have none until after the empire was Christian, and that Diocletian had destroyed all the copies he could get at. This Alexandrian text, so called, is the oldest we have in existing Greek MSS. The Alexandrian MS. (marked A) is

not uniformly Alexandrian in text. But, if Scrivener is to be trusted, the Peschito Syriac agrees much more with A than with B; yet it is the oldest version that exists, nearly two hundred years older than any MS. we have, made at the end of the first or the beginning of the second century. This is not the case with the old Latin. It cannot be said to be Alexandrian, but approaches nearer to it. But then even here is a singular phenomenon: one ancient MS. of it, Brixianus, is uniformly the Textus Receptus. I think I only found one exception. Where did this come from? The Vulgate is a good deal corrected from the Alexandrian text, though not always following it. Thus we may class them: , B, Z, L, which last follows B very constantly; then we have A and a long list of uncials going with it, not so ancient or much thought of; so that in Alford you will find 'A, &c.' There is another class of about the sixth century, to which date Z also is attributed, C which is independent, and P which in the epistles chiefly follows the Alexandrian but not unfrequently tends to T. R. and A. In the Acts it is, as far as I have examined it, T. R. {delta}, or St. Gall, is often T. R., though in many respects an independent witness. If in the Gospels A and B go together, we may be tolerably confident of the reading, of course weighing other testimony. D, it is known, is peculiar, though characteristically Alexandrian. The result to me is that, while about the text as a whole there is nothing uncertain at all, though in very few instances questions may be raised, the history of it is not really ascertained. I avow my arriving at no conclusion, and I think I can say no one can give that history: the phenomena are unsolved.

I have said thus much on the criticism of the text, and the MSS., that persons not versed in the matter may not hazard themselves in forming conclusions without any real knowledge of the questions. Such a book as Tischendorf's English Testament I think mischievous. You have the English Version questioned continually, and , B, A, given at the bottom of the page, for persons who know nothing about them to doubt about the text, and that is all. Thus, to say no more, the readings of A in the Epistles have a totally different degree of importance from that of its readings in the Gospels. And all becomes uncertain. In most of these cases the true reading is not doubted a moment by Tischendorf himself, yet it only makes people doubt about all. I have followed a collation of the best authorities, but where, though for trifling differences, you have , B, L, or B, L, on one side, and A, &c., on the other, I confess I have no entire certainty that B, L, are right.

In the next place the reader has not a revision of the Authorised Version, but a translation from the best Greek text I could attain to any certain knowledge of. I do not doubt a moment that numbers of phrases of the Authorised Version will be found in the translation. Filled as the mind is with it from constant use, it suggested itself naturally to the mind. I had no wish to reject it. But a revision of the Authorised Version, if desirable for ecclesiastical use, is not (I think) in itself a wise attempt. I rather doubt the justness of the taste which attempts to revise the Authorised Version. The new bit does not suit the old, and is the more distasteful from its juxtaposition. Imitation is seldom good taste, seldom undetected; it wants nature, and in these things nature is good taste, and attracts.

I have freely used every help I could. I do not mention Grammars and Dictionaries, as they are applicable to all books, and known; but I have used Meyer, whose continuators are very inferior, and from whom a large part of Alford is taken; but I have consulted Alford too, and De Wette. Ellicott is excellent in what he has done; Kypke most useful in

what he affords. I have used them for the exegesis of the text as Greek, not for any doctrine in any case. Fritzsche, who is grammatically very full; Bleek, who very much exhausts learning in his book on the Hebrews. Delitzsch and others I have occasionally referred to; there is Kuinoel on the historical books; but I did not find many of them of very great value, Calvin of less than I should have supposed. There are Bengel, Hammond, Elsley; Wolff and other German writers; and Stanley, Jowett, Eadie, &c. But I confess reference to the latter did not lead me to repeat it much. What I sought was the thorough study of the text; opinions were of little moment. Poole's Synopsis and Bloomfield have been at hand for older commentators.

Of translations, Diodati's Italian is the best of the old ones, then the Dutch, then the English. Bengel's German is a very good one, and there is, though tainted by their doctrine occasionally, a very literal one called Berleburger. Other translations are Kistemaker, Gossner, Van Ess, which are Roman Catholic; a corrected one of Luther by Meyer; the Swiss one by Piscator, far better than Luther's. These, though I referred to them in a translation made into German, I used comparatively little now or not at all. Of the French, Diodati's is literal, but hardly French; Martin and Ostervald, little to be trusted; and Arnaud's, I may say, not at all. Luther's is the most inaccurate I know. Besides this, there are in Latin the Vulgate and Beza. De Wette's German is elegant, but from excessive leaving out the auxiliary verbs, which is allowed in German, affected; and in the Old Testament, though a good Hebraist, not to be trusted, from rationalistic principles. His Isaiah is Gesenius's.

I have used all helps I could, but the translation is borrowed in no way from any; it is my own translation, but I have used every check I could to secure exactness. I believe the scriptures to be the inspired word of God, received by the Holy Ghost and communicated by His power, though, thank God, through mortal men: what is divine made withal thoroughly human, as the blessed Lord Himself whom it reveals, though never ceasing to be divine. And this is its unspeakable value: thoroughly and entirely divine, 'words which the Holy Ghost teacheth', yet perfectly and divinely adapted to man as being by man. My endeavour has been to present to the merely English reader the original as closely as possible. Those who make a version for public use must of course adapt their course to the public. Such has not been my object or thought, but to give the student of scripture, who cannot read the original, as close a translation as possible.

[The preface continues with detailed remarks on the translation. - M.D.M]

=====

Note: Darby's Translation Modified (DBM)

The modifications to Darby's Translation

Yahweh is substituted for Jehovah

Immerse is substituted for Baptize

Assembly is substituted for Church

Nations is substituted for Gentiles

Reform is substituted for Repent (except as applied to God)
Glad-tidings is substituted for Gospel
Favor is substituted for Grace
Messenger is substituted for Angel

G.D.R.
Dade City, Florida June, 2005

=====

www.bible-researcher.com

THE KING JAMES BIBLE

The following paragraphs are taken from the article "English Versions" by Sir Frederic G. Kenyon in the Dictionary of the Bible edited by James Hastings, and published by Charles Scribner's Sons of New York in 1909.

The Authorized Version (1611)

The version which was destined to put the crown on nearly a century of labor, and, after extinguishing by its excellence all rivals, to print an indelible mark on English religion and English literature, came into being almost by accident. It arose out of the Hampton Court Conference, held by James I in 1604, with the object of arriving at a settlement between the Puritan and Anglican elements in the Church; but it was not one of the prime or original subjects of the conference. In the course of discussion, Dr. Reynolds, president of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, the leader of the moderate Puritan party, referred to the imperfections and disagreements of the existing translations; and the suggestion of a new version, to be prepared by the best scholars in the country, was warmly taken up by the king. The conference, as a whole, was a failure; but James did not allow the idea of the revision to drop. He took an active part in the preparation of instructions for the work, and to him appears to be due the credit of two features which went far to secure its success. He suggested that the translation should be committed in the first instance to the universities (subject to subsequent review by the bishops and the Privy Council, which practically came to nothing), and thereby secured the services of the best scholars in the country, working in cooperation; and (on the suggestion of the bishop of London) he laid down that no marginal notes should be added, which preserved the new version from being the organ of any one party in the Church.

Ultimately it was arranged that six companies of translators should be formed, two at Westminster, two at Oxford, and two at Cambridge. The companies varied in strength from 7 to 10 members, the total (though there is some little doubt with regard to a few names) being 47. The Westminster companies undertook Genesis to 2 Kings and the Epistles, the Oxford companies the Prophets and the Gospels, Acts, and Apocalypse, and the Cambridge companies 1 Chronicles to Ecclesiastes and the Apocrypha. A series of rules was drawn up for their guidance. The Bishop's Bible was to be taken as the basis.

The old ecclesiastical terms were to be kept. No marginal notes were to be affixed, except for the explanation of Hebrew or Greek words. Marginal references, on the contrary, were to be supplied. As each company finished a book, it was to send it to the other companies for their consideration. Suggestions were to be invited from the clergy generally, and opinions requested on passages of special difficulty from any learned man in the land. "These translations to be used when they agree better with the text than the Bishops' Bible, namely, Tyndale's, Matthew's, Coverdale's, Whitchurch's (i.e. the Great Bible), Geneva." The translators claim further to have consulted all the available versions and commentaries in other languages, and to have repeatedly revised their own work, without grudging the time which it required. The time occupied by the whole work is stated by themselves as two years and three-quarters. The several companies appear to have begun their labors about the end of 1607, and to have taken two years in completing their several shares. A final revision, occupying nine months, was then made by a smaller body, consisting of two representatives from each company, after which it was seen through the press by Dr. Miles Smith and Bishop Bilson; and in 1611 the new version, printed by R. Barker, the king's printer, was given to the world in a large folio volume (the largest of all the series of English Bibles) of black letter type. The details of its issue are obscure. There were at least two issues in 1611, set up independently, known respectively as the "He" and "She" Bibles, from their divergence in the translation of the last words of Ruth 3:15; and bibliographers have differed as to their priority, though the general opinion is in favor of the former. [Some copies have a wood-block, others an engraved title-page, with different designs. The title-page was followed by the dedication to King James, which still stands in our ordinary copies of the Authorized Version, and this by the translators' preface \(believed to have been written by Dr. Miles Smith\), which is habitually omitted. \(It is printed in the present King's Printers' Variorum Bible, and is interesting and valuable both as an example of the learning of the age and for its description of the translators' labors.\) For the rest, the contents and arrangement of the Authorized Version are too well known to every reader to need description.](#)

Nor is it necessary to dwell at length on the characteristics of the translation. Not only was it superior to all its predecessors, but its excellence was so marked that no further revision was attempted for over 250 years. Its success must be attributed to the fact which differentiated it from its predecessors, namely, that it was not the work of a single scholar (like Tyndale's, Coverdale's, and Matthew's Bibles), or of a small group (like the Geneva and Douai Bibles), or of a large number of men working independently with little supervision (like the Bishops' Bible), but was produced by the collaboration of a carefully selected band of scholars, working with ample time and with full and repeated revision. Nevertheless, it was not a new translation. It owed much to its predecessors. The translators themselves say, in their preface: "We never thought from the beginning that we should need to make a new translation, nor yet to make of a bad one a good one, ... but to make a good one better, or out of many good ones one principal good one, not justly to be excepted against; that hath been our endeavor, that our mark." The description is very just. The foundations of the Authorized Version were laid by Tyndale, and a great part of his work continued through every revision. Each succeeding version added something to the original stock, Coverdale (in his own and the Great Bible) and the

Genevan scholars contributing the largest share; and the crown was set upon the whole by the skilled labor of the Jacobean divines, making free use of the materials accumulated by others, and happily inspired by the gift of style which was the noblest literary achievement of the age in which they lived. A sense of the solemnity of their subject saved them from the extravagances and conceits which sometimes mar that style; and, as a result, they produced a work which, from the merely literary point of view, is the finest example of Jacobean prose, and has influenced incalculably the whole subsequent course of English literature. On the character and spiritual history of the nation it has left an even deeper mark, to which many writers have borne eloquent testimony; and if England has been, and is, a Bible-reading and Bible-loving country, it is in no small measure due to her possession of a version so nobly executed as the Authorized Version.

The history of the Authorized Version after 1611 can be briefly sketched. In spite of the name by which it is commonly known, and in spite of the statement on both title-pages of 1611 that it was "appointed to be read in churches," there is no evidence that it was ever officially authorized either by the Crown or by Convocation. Its authorization seems to have been tacit and gradual. The Bishops' Bible, hitherto the official version, ceased to be reprinted, and the Authorized Version no doubt gradually replaced it in churches as occasion arose. In domestic use its fortunes were for a time more doubtful, and for two generations it existed concurrently with the Geneva Bible; but before the century was out its predominance was assured. The first quarto and octavo editions were issued in 1612; and thenceforth editions were so numerous that it is useless to refer to any except a few of them. The early editions were not very correctly printed. In 1638 an attempt to secure a correct text was made by a small group of Cambridge scholars. In 1633 the first edition printed in Scotland was published. In 1701 Bishop Lloyd superintended the printing of an edition at Oxford, in which Archbishop Ussher's dates for Scripture chronology were printed in the margin, where they henceforth remained. In 1717 a fine edition, printed by Baskett at Oxford, earned bibliographical notoriety as "The Vinegar Bible" from a misprint in the headline over Luke 20. [In 1762 a carefully revised edition was published at Cambridge under the editorship of Dr. T. Paris, and a similar edition, superintended by Dr. B. Blayney, appeared at Oxford in 1769. These two editions, in which the text was carefully revised, the spelling modernized, the punctuation corrected, and considerable alteration made in the marginal notes, formed the standard for subsequent reprints of the Authorized Version, which differ in a number of details, small in importance but fairly numerous in the aggregate, from the original text of 1611. One other detail remains to be mentioned. In 1666 appeared the first edition of the Authorized Version from which the Apocrypha was omitted. It had previously been omitted from some editions of the Geneva Bible, from 1599 onwards. The Nonconformists took much objection to it, and in 1664 the Long Parliament forbade the reading of lessons from it in public; but the lectionary of the English Church always included lessons from it. The example of omission was followed in many editions subsequently. The first edition printed in America \(apart from a surreptitious edition of 1752\), in 1782, is without it. In 1826 the British and Foreign Bible Society, which has been one of the principal agents in the circulation of the](#)

[Scriptures throughout the world, decided never in the future to print or circulate copies containing the Apocrypha; and this decision has been carried into effect ever since.](#)

So far as concerned the translation of the Hebrew and Greek texts which lay before them, the work of the authors of the Authorized version, as has been shown above, was done not merely well but excellently. There were, no doubt, occasional errors of interpretation; and in regard to the Old Testament in particular the Hebrew scholarship of the age was not always equal to the demands made upon it. But such errors as were made were not of such magnitude or quantity as to have made any extensive revision necessary or desirable even now, after a lapse of nearly three hundred years. There was, however, another defect, less important (and indeed necessarily invisible at the time), which the lapse of years ultimately forced into prominence, namely, in the text (and especially the Greek text) which they translated. As has been shown elsewhere [TEXT OF THE NEW TESTAMENT], criticism of the Greek text of the New Testament had not yet begun. Scholars were content to take the text as it first came to hand, from the late manuscripts which were most readily accessible to them. The New Testament of Erasmus, which first made the Greek text generally available in Western Europe, was based upon a small group of relatively late manuscripts, which happened to be within his reach at Basle. The edition of Stephanus in 1550, which practically established the "Received Text" which has held the field till our own day, rested upon a somewhat superficial examination of 15 manuscripts, mostly at Paris, of which only two were uncials, and these were but slightly used. None of the great manuscripts which now stand at the head of our list of authorities was known to the scholars of 1611. None of the ancient versions had been critically edited; and so far as King James' translators made use of them (as we know they did), it was as aids to interpretation, and not as evidence for the text, that they employed them. In saying this there is no imputation of blame. The materials for a critical study and restoration of the text were not then extant; and men were concerned only to translate the text which lay before them in the current Hebrew, Greek, and Latin Bibles. Nevertheless it was in this inevitable defectiveness of text that the weakness lay which ultimately undermined the authority of the Authorized Version.

Frederic G. Kenyon

=====

www.bible-researcher.com

American Standard Version (1901)

Bible, 1901. Philip Schaff, et al., The Holy Bible, Containing the Old and New Testaments, Translated out of the Original Tongues, Being the Version Set Forth A.D. 1611, Compared with the Most Ancient Authorities and Revised A.D. 1881-1885, Newly Edited by the American Revision Committee A.D. 1901, Standard Edition. New York: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1901.

The American Standard Version was a minor American revision of the [English Revised Version](#) of 1881. It became the foundation of several 20th century American versions, including the [Revised Standard Version](#) and the [New American Standard Bible](#). The history and principles of the revision are outlined in the [preface](#). The papers of the American committee are preserved at the library of the American Bible Society in New York City.

Literature (including the ERV of 1881-85)

- [Article on the version by F.G. Kenyon](#)

[History of the Revision](#), by Issac Hall.

[Biographical Sketches of Prominent Revisers](#), by Issac Hall.

[Burgon 1883](#). Adverse criticism of the underlying Greek text.

[Whitney 1892](#). Adverse criticism of the underlying Greek text.

- Frederick Field, Notes on the Translation of the New Testament. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, Philological criticism of the ERV.

Philip Schaff, ed., Anglo-American Bible Revision: Its Necessity and Purpose. By the Members of the American Revision Committee. Revised Edition. Philadelphia: American Sunday-School Union, 1879.

Philip Schaff, ed., The revision of the Old Testament: opinions of eminent German Hebraists on the revision of the Massoretic text. New York: Scribner's, 1886. A small (62 page) book containing "The present status of the revision, circular letter of Dr. Green and Dr. Schaff to the most eminent Old Testament scholars in Germany, Replies, Translations of the preceding letters, Concluding summary."

Philip Schaff, Historical account of the work of the American Committee of Revision of the Authorized English Version of the Bible. New York: Scribner, 1885.

Philip Schaff, ed., Documentary history of the American Committee on Revision. New York, 1883. Enlarged edition, 1885.

Klaus Penzel, ed., Philip Schaff: Historian and Ambassador of the Universal Church: Selected Writings. Macon, Georgia: Mercer University Press, 1991.

George H. Shriver, Philip Schaff: Christian Scholar and Ecumenical Prophet. Macon, Georgia: Mercer University Press, 1987.

David S. Schaff, The Life of Philip Schaff, in Part Autobiographical. New York: Scribners, 1897.

J. B. Lightfoot, Richard C. Trench, and C. J. Ellicott, The Revision of the English Version of the New Testament. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1873.

Matthew Brown Riddle, The Story of the Revised New Testament, American Standard Edition. Philadelphia: Sunday School Times, 1908.

Alexander Roberts, Companion to the Revised Version of the New Testament, Explaining the Reasons for the Changes Made on the Authorized Version. New York: I.K. Funk, 1881.

Isaac H. Hall, ed., The Revised New Testament and History of Revision, giving a literal reprint of the Authorized English Edition of the Revised New Testament, with a brief history of the origin and transmission of the New Testament Scriptures, and of its many

versions and revisions that have been made, also a complete history of this last great combined movement of the best scholarship of the world; with reasons for the effort; advantages gained; sketches of the eminent men engaged upon it, etc., etc. prepared under the direction of Professor Isaac H. Hall, LL.B.; Ph. D. Philadelphia: Hubbard Brothers; Atlanta: C.R. Blackall & Co.; New York: A.L. Bancroft & Co., 1881.

The parallel Bible. The Holy Bible, containing the Old and New Testaments: being the Authorized Version arranged in parallel columns with the Revised Version. Cambridge: The University Press, 1885.

The Holy Bible Two-version edition: being the Authorised version with the differences of the Revised version printed in the margins so that both texts can be read from the same page. Oxford University Press, 1899.

Geoffrey Cumberlege, ed., The Interlinear Bible: The Authorised Version and the Revised Version, Together with the Marginal Notes of Both Versions and Central References. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1906. A convenient comparison of the ERV with the KJV.

PREFACE TO THE AMERICAN EDITION

A few statements need to be made respecting the origin of this edition of the Revised Version of the English Bible.

In the course of the joint labors of the English and American Revisers it was agreed that, respecting all points of ultimate difference, the English Companies, who had had the initiative in the work of revision, should have the decisive vote. But as an offset to this, it was proposed on the British side that the American preferences should be published as an Appendix in every copy of the Revised Bible during a term of fourteen years. The American Committee on their part pledged themselves to give, for the same limited period, no sanction to the publication of any other editions of the Revised Version than those issued by the University Presses of England.

There still remained the possibility that the British Revisers, or the University Presses, might eventually adopt in the English editions many, or the most, of the American preferences, in case these should receive the approval of scholars and the general public. But soon after the close of their work in 1885 the English Revision Companies disbanded; and there has been no indication of an intention on the part of the Presses to amalgamate the readings of the Appendix, either wholly or in part, with the text of the English editions.

The American Revision Committee, after the publication of the Revised Version in 1885, resolved to continue their organization, and have regarded it as a possibility that an American recension of the English Revision might eventually be called for. Accordingly they have been engaged more or less diligently, ever since 1885, and especially in the last four years, in making ready for such a publication. The judgment of scholars, both in Great Britain and in the United States, has so far approved the American preferences that it now seems to be expedient to issue an edition of the Revised Version with those preferences embodied in the text.

If the preparation of this new edition had consisted merely in the mechanical work of transferring the readings of the Appendix to the text, it would have been a comparatively

easy task. But the work was in point of fact a much more elaborate one. The Appendix was itself in need of revision; for it had been prepared under circumstances which rendered fulness and accuracy almost impossible. This work could of course not be taken in hand until the revision was concluded; and since it required a careful consideration of discussions and decisions extending over a period of many years, there was need of many months' time, if the Appendix was to be satisfactorily constructed, especially as it was thought desirable to reduce the number of recorded differences and this required the drawing of a sharp line between the more and the less important. Manifestly such a task would be one of no little difficulty at the best. But when the time came for it to be done, the University Presses deemed that the impatient demand of the British public for the speedy publication of the Revision must be respected; and they insisted on a prompt transmission of the Appendix. Prepared under such pressure and in such haste, it was obviously inevitable that it should be marked by grave imperfections; and the correction of its errors and the supplementing of its defects has been a work of much time and labor.

When the Appendix was originally prepared, an effort was made to pave the way for an eventual acceptance of the American preferences on the part of the English Presses, by reducing the number of the points of difference to the lowest limit, and thus leaving out much the larger part of the emendations which the Revisers had previously by a two-thirds vote pronounced to be in their opinion of decided importance. In now issuing an American edition, the American Revisers, being entirely untrammelled by any connection with the British Revisers and Presses, have felt themselves to be free to go beyond the task of incorporating the Appendix in the text, and are no longer restrained from introducing into the text a large number of those suppressed emendations.

The remainder of this Preface has especial reference to the Old Testament. Nothing needs to be said about the various particular proposals which are found in the Appendix of the English Revised Version. But some remarks may be made concerning the General Classes of changes therein specified, and also concerning those emendations in this edition which are additional to those prescribed in the Appendix.

I. The change first recommended in the Appendix - that which substitutes "Jehovah" for "LORD" and "GOD" - is one which will be unwelcome to many, because of the frequency and familiarity of the terms displaced. But the American Revisers, after a careful consideration were brought to the unanimous conviction that a Jewish superstition, which regarded the Divine Name as too sacred to be uttered, ought no longer to dominate in the English or any other version of the Old Testament, as it fortunately does not in the numerous versions made by modern missionaries. This Memorial Name, explained in Ex. iii. 14, 15, and emphasized as such over and over in the original text of the Old Testament, designates God as the personal God, as the covenant God, the God of revelation, the Deliverer, the Friend of his people; -- not merely the abstractly "Eternal One" of many French translations, but the ever living Helper of those who are in trouble. This personal name, with its wealth of sacred associations, is now restored to the place in the sacred text to which it has an unquestionable claim.

The uniform substitution of "Sheol" for "the grave," "the pit," and "hell," in places where these terms have been retained by the English Revision, has little need of justification. The English Revisers use "Sheol" twenty-nine times out of the sixty-four in which it occurs

in the original. No good reason has been given for such a discrimination. If the new term can be fitly used at all, it is clear that it ought to be used uniformly.

The use of "who" and "that" for "which," when relating to persons, should commend itself to all as required by grammatical accuracy. The same remark applies to the substitution of "are" for "be" in indicative clauses, the omission of "for" before infinitives, and the change of "an" to "a" before "h" aspirated. The latter change was made in the English Revision of the New Testament, but not in that of the Old. Likewise we have uniformly adopted the modern spelling in place of antiquated forms. No one would advocate the resumption of the exact orthography of the edition of 1611. The mere fact that in a few cases an older form has happened to be retained constitutes no reason for its perpetual retention.

II. Inasmuch as the present edition differs from the English Revision not simply in presenting in the text the American preferences as given in the Appendix, a few remarks may be made with regard to the additional variations which will be found to exist.

1. As has already been intimated, this edition embodies a very considerable number of renderings originally adopted by the American Old Testament Company at their second revision (and so by a two-thirds majority), but waived when the Appendix was prepared. These represent the deliberate preference of the American Company; but, for reasons already assigned, they were not included in the Appendix.

2. Partly coinciding with the foregoing is a number of alterations which consist in a return to the readings of the Authorized Version. While in some cases the older readings, though inaccurate, seem to have been retained in the English Revision through an excessive conservatism, in others they have been abandoned needlessly, and sometimes to the injury of the sense and the sound. In such cases fidelity to the general principle that has governed us has required us to give the preference to the rendering of the Common Version. Among the many instances of these restorations we may note: Ex. xx. 4, 13; Lev. xix. 22; Ps. xlvi. 1; civ. 26; cxiv. 4; cxvi. 11; Prov. xiii. 15; Am. vi. 5.

3. Sometimes we have found occasion to recede from proposals originally made, when a more careful and mature consideration required us to do so. Besides individual cases, like S. of S. vi. 4, 10; Ezek. v. 13, may be mentioned the fact that the requirement of the Appendix, that "be ashamed" should everywhere be changed to "be put to shame," has been found to need qualification. While the change seems desirable in a majority of the instances, it is by no means so in all. We have therefore retained "ashamed" in a large number of passages; in some, however, we have preferred "confounded" as better suiting the connection.

4. Very many of the instances in which we have gone beyond the literal requirements of the Appendix are alterations demanded by consistency. Changes were originally proposed in certain passages only, though the reason for the changes equally requires them to be made in numerous others. Thus at Ps. xxxiii. 5, and in twenty-four other places, "justice" was to be put for "judgment." But it is manifest that in a multitude of other passages there is equal need of the same alteration. We have accordingly undertaken to introduce it wherever the Hebrew word plainly has this abstract sense. For the same reason we have substituted "ordinance" for "judgment" in the numerous passages, like Lev. xviii. 4, where the word denotes, not a judicial sentence, threatened or inflicted, but a law of action. This rendering of the Hebrew word is found in the Authorized Version in some instances, and has been introduced by the Revised Version in

a few more; but, since the English word "judgment" in common use never denotes a statute or command, it is manifestly desirable that "ordinance" should be used wherever the Hebrew word has this meaning.

Similarly, the English Revision in a few cases, and the Old Testament Appendix in a few more, put "despoil" for "spoil." But the same reason which holds for those few is equally good for the numerous others in which this word occurs. The word "spoil" in the Authorized Version represents a great number of Hebrew words, some of which denote "lay waste," "ruin," or "destroy," rather than "despoil"; and as "spoil" has nearly lost in popular use its original meaning, and is liable to occasion misconception, we have replaced it by "despoil," "plunder," "ravage," and other terms, each as best adapted to the connection.

In like manner we have carried out another alteration which was made to a limited extent by the English Revisers - the distinction between the words "stranger" ("strange"), "foreigner" ("foreign"), and "sojourner." These renderings correspond fairly well to three distinct Hebrew words; there is no good reason why the correspondence should not be made uniform throughout. Likewise we have carried out consistently the substitution of "false," "falsehood," and other terms, for "vain," "vanity," where the meaning of the original requires it. Here too a beginning was made by us in the Appendix. Many other examples might be adduced.

Here may be mentioned also that changes made for the sake of euphemism have been considerably increased. It has not been possible in every case to find an appropriate substitute for terms which in modern times have become offensive; but when it has been possible, we have deemed it wise to make the change. Some of the words, as, for example, "bowels," are tolerable when used in their literal sense, but offensive when employed in a psychological sense. Thus, no other word would be appropriate in 2 Sam. xx. 10; but in Jer. iv. 19 or Lam. i. 20 to retain that term would be both unpleasant and incorrect. The conception of the writer is not really reproduced by a literal translation. The Hebrews were accustomed to attribute physical action or emotion to various physical organs, whereas in English such a trope is limited almost entirely to "heart" and "brain." There is nowhere any occasion for using the latter of these in the Bible; consequently it is almost unavoidable that "heart" should often be used as the translation of different Hebrew words. All scholars know that the Hebrew word commonly rendered "heart" is used very largely to denote not so much the seat of the emotions, as the seat of thought. It is rendered in the Authorized Version more than twenty times by "mind," and might well be so rendered much oftener.

The word "reins" is one of those which in the Old Testament is used in a psychological relation. This word was retained by the English Revisers, and was also left without mention by the American Revisers when they prepared their Appendix. But if the synonymous word "kidneys" had been used in these passages, there would be an earnest and unanimous protest. In favor of the continued use of "reins," therefore, one can only urge the poor reason that most readers attach to it no meaning whatever. We have consequently regarded it as only a consistent carrying out of our general principle when we have uniformly substituted "heart" for it, whenever it is used in a psychological sense. In this connection it may be remarked that, while the English Revisers, yielding to the urgent representations of the Americans, voted to substitute "its" for "his" or "her" when

relating to impersonal objects not personified, the substitution was so imperfectly made that we have had occasion to supplement the work in some two hundred cases.

Furthermore, the general intention of the American Revisers to eliminate obsolete, obscure, and misleading terms, has been more fully carried out by replacing some expressions which were left unmentioned in the Appendix; *e.g.*, "bolled" (Ex. ix. 31), "in good liking" (Job xxxix. 4).

5. Closely connected with the foregoing are certain additional alterations which have seemed to be required by regard for pure English idiom.

We are not insensible to the justly lauded beauty and vigor of the style of the Authorized Version, nor do we forget that it has been no part of our task to modernize the diction of the Bible. But we are also aware that the rhetorical force and the antique flavor which we desire to retain do not consist in sporadic instances of uncouth, unidiomatic, or obscure phraseology. While we may freely admit that the English of the Scriptures can, as a whole, hardly be improved, yet it would be extravagant to hold that it cannot be bettered in any of its details. What was once good usage is often such no longer; and we can see no sound reason for retaining such expressions as "smell thereto" (Ex. xxx. 38), "forth of" (instead of "forth from"), "inquire at" (1 K. xxii. 5), "a fool's vexation is heavier than them both" (Prov. xxvii. 3), or "when... he be jealous over his wife" (Num. v.30). These are only a few of the many instances of phraseology which there is the best reason for amending. A change of a more general kind is the introduction of a greater degree of consistency and propriety in the use of the auxiliaries "will" and "shall." The latter is certainly used to excess in the Authorized Version, especially when connected with verbs denoting an action of the Divine Being; and the two are also often very inconsistently used, as may be observed in such a striking case as Ps. cxxi. 3, 4.

Again, the attempt to translate literally from the original has not infrequently led to Hebraisms which had better be avoided. Many of these have indeed become, as it were, naturalized in our language, and need not be disturbed. But others must be called bad and outlandish. Thus, in Ezek. xx. 17, we read, "mine eye spared them from destroying them," which is a very literal translation of the Hebrew, but very poor English. Scarcely more tolerable is the expression, "that they may be to do the service" (Num. viii. 11), which also comes from over-literalness. To the same class belongs the phrase "by the hand of," as used after such expressions as "Jehovah spake" (or, "commanded"), *e.g.*, in Num. xxvii. 23. This is indeed the literal rendering; but the Hebrew really means simply "through" or "by means of," and is in the majority of these instances in the Authorized Version rendered "by," but sometimes "by the hand of." Manifestly the simpler form is every way preferable; and the change, if any is made, should be in this direction, whereas in the English Revision "by" is, in nine cases out of forty-two, changed to "by the hand of." Similarly, "in the land," in Deut. v. 16 and in several other places, has been changed in the English Revision to "upon the land"; but as "land" is here equivalent to "country," "in the land" is clearly the most appropriate. In both these groups of cases we have everywhere adopted the idiomatic English, rather than the slavishly literal, rendering.

6. In introducing certain translations different from those of the English Revised Version, and also not directly or implicitly required by the Appendix, we have been governed by the conviction that, in cases where accuracy and perspicuity clearly required an emendation, we were fully warranted in resorting to it. We have been careful, in making

these alterations, to consult the best authorities, and especially the recent carefully revised versions of the German, French, Dutch, Danish, Swedish, and Norwegian Bibles. Few certainly will object to such alterations as are found in Dent. xxxii. 14; Judg. v.20; Is. xxx. 32; xxxv. 8; Hos. xi. 2; Mic. i. 6. We have also not hesitated to insert "the" before "Jordan" and other names of rivers. Likewise, as the English Revisers had with good reason removed the fabulous "unicorn" from the Old Testament, we have removed the equally fabulous "dragon," as also the "arrowsnake" of the English Revision (Is. xxxiv. 15) - an animal unknown to zoology, the term having obviously been adopted through a too literal translation of the German word "Pfeilschlange."

7. Another particular in which we have to some extent deviated from the requirements of the Appendix relates to our treatment of the references in the margin to the readings of ancient versions. On account of the extreme difficulty of correcting the Hebrew text by means of those versions, we originally decided that it would be better to make no reference to them at all. The case is radically different from that of the New Testament, where the variant readings are mostly found in Greek Mss. of the New Testament itself. The authorities referred to in the Old Testament are translations from the Hebrew; and though the date of these translations is more ancient than any extant Ms. of the Hebrew Bible, yet there is no means of verifying with certainty the text of these translations; and one can never get beyond plausible conjecture in attempting to correct the Hebrew text by means of these versions. It is one thing to admit that the Hebrew text is probably corrupt here and there; quite another, to be sure how to rectify it. In the English Revision there are frequent references in the margin to the ancient versions. The most of these seem to us at the best of trivial importance, and have been dropped. A few represent only a different vocalization of the Hebrew. A certain number, however, have to do with variations of some importance and such as may, with considerable probability, be conjectured to represent the original Hebrew. We have therefore retained a little more than one-sixth of the references given in the English Revision, but have been careful to designate which of the ancient versions contain a specified reading, instead of making the vague, and often inaccurate, statement that "some" or "many" ancient versions present the reading in question.

8. For the sake of facilitating the use of the Old Testament we have provided it with marginal references to parallel and illustrative passages, and with topical headings. In preparing the references we have been assisted by able scholars not connected with the Old Testament Company. The aim has been to illustrate and elucidate the meaning by referring to other passages which, either in word or in thought, bear a resemblance to the one under consideration. Previous lists have been consulted, but they have been carefully sifted, and the effort has been made to omit everything that is irrelevant or misleading. In preparing the headings we have intended, by means of brief but descriptive terms, to enable the reader to see at a glance what the general contents of each page are. Everything that might seem to savor of a questionable exegesis has been carefully avoided.

9. Considerable attention has been paid to the paragraph divisions and to the punctuation. While the English Revisers did well to abandon the older way of making a paragraph of each verse they often went to the opposite extreme of making the paragraphs excessively long, leaving in some cases whole pages without a break, as, for example, at Gen. xxiv. and Num. xxii.-xxiv. We have revised the paragraph divisions

throughout, making them generally shorter, and sometimes altering the place of the division.

In the matter of punctuation, we have aimed to remove many inconsistencies found in previous editions, and also, while retaining the general system adopted by our predecessors, to make the book conform somewhat more nearly to modern usage. One result is a considerable reduction of the number of colons, which are often replaced by semicolons, occasionally by periods or commas. In some cases a change of punctuation has modified the sense; as, *e.g.*, in Gen. ii. 5; xiv. 24; Ezek. xxix. 9, 10. We have also made much more frequent use of the hyphen than has been made in previous editions. In many instances we have recurred to the punctuation of the Authorized Version, especially where the English Revisers have departed from it out of an undue regard to the pausal accents of the Massoretic text; as *e.g.*, in Lev. vi. 7; Zech. xi. 16.

Further particulars respecting the points of difference between this edition and the English Revision of 1881-1885 may be learned from the Appendix found at the close of this Testament.

Earnestly hoping that our work may contribute to the better understanding of the Old Testament, we commend it to the considerate judgment of all students of the Sacred Scriptures.

New Testament

PREFACE TO THE AMERICAN EDITION

This edition of the Revised New Testament of 1881 embodies a purpose entertained by many members of the American Revision Committee almost from the publication of the work. The list of passages in which the New Testament Company dissented from the decision of their English associates, when it was transmitted to them, bore the heading, "The American New Testament Revision Company, having in many cases yielded their preference for certain readings and renderings, present the following instances in which they differ from the English Company, as in their view of sufficient importance to be appended to the revision, in accordance with an understanding between the Companies."

The knowledge of the existence of these suppressed deviations naturally stirred a desire that they should be made accessible to at least the American public. This desire, especially on the part of those whose generous interest in the work from its inception had enabled the American revisers to meet the pecuniary outlay its preparation involved, they were not unwilling to gratify. The obligation they felt, however, to guard as far as they might the purity and integrity of the version, led them to pledge their support for fourteen years to the editions issued by the University Presses of Oxford and Cambridge. But the reiterated suggestion to those Presses to publish an edition especially for American readers not having met with favor, they acceded to the overtures of the Messrs. Nelson and engaged in preparing gratuitously the desired edition, to be issued when the expiration of the period specified should open the way for its honorable publication. The publishers, on their part, agreed to protect the version in its integrity, and to sell the book at a price not exceeding a fair profit on its cost.

In the preparation of this edition no attempt has been made to preserve a full record of the other readings and renderings than those that appeared in the work as published in 1881 which were preferred by the American revisers. The Appendix of that edition,

however, was not only hastily compiled under pressure from the University Presses, but its necessarily limited compass compelled, as the original heading intimated, the exclusion of many suggestions that the American Company held to be of interest and importance. These, amounting in the aggregate to a considerable number, have been incorporated in the present edition. The opportunity has been taken also to introduce not a few alterations, individually of slight importance, yet as a body contributing decidedly to the perfection of the work. But the survivors of the New Testament Company have not felt at liberty to make new changes of moment which were not favorably passed upon by their associates at one stage or another of the original preparation of the work. The deviating readings and renderings preferred by the English revisers are exhibited in the Appendix to this edition.

Respecting details, but little need be added to the ample statements made in the [Preface prefixed to the work on its first appearance](#)[Preface prefixed to the work on its first appearance](#)[Preface prefixed to the work on its first appearance](#) **and reproduced in the present volume.**

In the delicate matter of rendering the names of several coins that occur in the New Testament, we have departed somewhat from our English brethren. For the Greek lepton the term “mite” has been retained, and for kodranthV the rendering “farthing” (see Mk. xii. 42). But assarion has been translated “penny” (Matt. x. 29; Lk. xii. 6); while in thirteen out of the sixteen instances where in the edition of 1881 the Greek dhnarion was represented by this English word, the term “shilling” has been substituted, not only as corresponding more nearly to the coin’s relative value, but also because “penny” according to its modern use, is in some cases highly inappropriate (see Matt. xx. 2; Lk. x. 35; Rev. vi. 6). In the three remaining instances (Matt. xxii. 19; Mk. xii. 15; Lk. xx. 24), the Greek name of the coin has been introduced, in order to meet the obvious requirement of the context. Where the English value of coins is given in the margin, we have added the equivalents in our national currency; but in the case of the talent (Matt. xviii. 24) what is believed to be a more accurate valuation has been given.

In formal particulars, this new edition will show but slight and infrequent deviations from its predecessor. The division of the text into paragraphs in that edition has not been often departed from; and then chiefly in cases where the same matter is found in more than one of the Gospels, and hence uniformity of division seemed desirable. Further, in the Epistles and the Revelation the more decided transitions to a new topic have been indicated by leaving a line blank. The somewhat ponderous and peculiar system of punctuation of the original edition has been in the main adhered to; although, pursuant to the principle there followed (see its Preface, [*paragraph d, paragraph d, paragraph d, paragraph d. p. xv.*](#)), [*a comma has here and there been dropped which seemed likely to obstruct the reader, and the gradations of thought have been occasionally indicated more distinctly by substituting a semicolon for the overworked colon. The titles of the books, which in the former edition were given as printed in 1611, have been somewhat abbreviated, at the dictate of convenience, and agreeably to usage, ancient as well as modern. They have been altered only in the few instances where the former heading was erroneous \(as in the case of the Epistle to the Hebrews\), or apt to mislead \(as in the case of the Book of Acts\), or hardly intelligible to the ordinary reader \(as the ^ugGeneral^h in the heading of some of the shorter Epistles\), or founded in a misapprehension \(as in the case of*](#)

the term "Saint" prefixed to the names of the Evangelists). Moreover, the alternate title of the New Testament, and the mode of printing the headings of the Four Evangelists' narratives, are designed to recall to mind the inherent signification and primitive use of the terms "Testament" (compare Hebrews ix. 15f.), and "Gospel." In the Book of Revelation, also, the "Glorias," "Trisagia," etc., have been marked typographically.

In dealing with language, the American revisers have endeavored to act with becoming deference and reserve. A few archaisms, such as "how that," "for to," "the which," "howbeit," etc., which are becoming uncouth to a modern ear, have been generally although not invariably discarded. Not a few of the instances of the superfluous use of "do" and "did" as auxiliaries, of "that" as equivalent to "that which," and the like, have also been removed; and current usage that has been recognized in the case of forms which King James' revision employed indiscriminantly, as "beside" and "besides" (see Mk. iii. 21; 2 Cor. v. 13). But in making these and other slight changes, the American editors have not forgotten that they were dealing with a venerable monument of English usage, and have been careful not to obliterate the traces of the historic origin and descent.

The two most obvious departures of this edition from that of 1881 consist in the addition of references to parallel and illustrative Biblical passages, and of running headings to indicate the contents of the pages.

The references have been selected in the main from a numerous collection provisionally attached to the text at one stage of the preparation of the original work, but withheld at the time of its publication. In selecting them, however, other similar collections and the better commentaries have not been neglected; but the aim has been to avoid multiplying them to such a degree as to embarrass or discourage a student. Accordingly, references which may be said to be of a hortatory or dogmatic character have been comparatively neglected, as belonging less to the study of Scripture than to its application, whether in the realm of thought or of life. On the other hand, prominence has been given to those which illustrate national customs, characteristic phrases, peculiarities of vocabulary or style, correspondences between different Biblical books, and the like. Some attempt has been made, also, to group references topically; as for example, in the case of Matthew's allusions to the "words" of Christ; of the "we" sections in Acts; of the use of "brethren" in addressing Christians on the one hand, and Jews on the other; of "Jews" as employed in a national and a hierarchical reference; and the like. In order further to lessen the number of "superiors" tending to distract a reader's eye, the different references belonging to a verse have often been consolidated, with the result occasionally that in a given group of passages one may illustrate one part of a verse, another another. References printed in italics designate parallel passages; in such cases the comprehensive reference is generally held to suffice for all details falling within the limits of the parallels, especially in the Gospels. In many cases, however, striking aphorisms, particularly when not found in all of the parallel narratives, have received a notation of their own. As the references constitute an apparatus mainly for Biblical study, and as their selection has been inevitably influenced somewhat by modern exegetical opinion, they have been separated from the citations and express allusions for which the sacred writer is responsible, by printing this latter class with Roman chapter-numerals and setting them in the outer margins of the page.

Notwithstanding the caution—as wise perhaps as prudent—which led the English Company wholly to omit the headings of chapters and pages (see their Preface, p. x.), and in spite of the disfavor which has been the fate of many attempts to furnish them from the days of Dr. Blayney who, with four assistants, produced a set which speedily fell into neglect, it has been deemed best to equip the present edition, at least experimentally, with running headlines, which may serve in some sort instead of a detailed Table of Contents, and as landmarks to a reader familiar with the text. In preparing them it has been the constant aim to avoid as far as possible pre-commitments, whether doctrinal or exegetical; and with this object in view, the forms of a statement employed have been drawn in the main from the Biblical text. Often a fragmentary quotation which might serve as a catchword or reminder of a well-known passage has been deemed sufficient. The limitations of space have frequently compelled a partial selection from the contents of a given page, the continuation of a heading from one page to the next, or even the entry of the kernel of a statement on a page adjoining that on which it appears in the text. Slight displacement in such a case seemed preferable to total omission.

It is not superfluous to mention expressly the fact that in this edition the variant readings and renderings are placed in the margin in close juxtaposition with the passages to which they relate. The reader's attention is thus drawn at once to the circumstance that some degree of uncertainty still cleaves, in the judgment of scholars, either to the text of the passage before him, or to its translation, or to both. Accordingly, when he remembers that, by the rule of procedure which the Committee followed, the translation of 1611 held its place in every instance until an alteration commanded the votes of two-thirds of the revisers, it will become evident to him that a rendering given in the margin may have commended itself to a majority, while still falling short of the degree of approval necessary to enable it to supplant the text. It is known that this was the case in a considerable number of instances, of which the established term "Comforter" as the appellation of the Holy Spirit in the fourteenth chapter of the Gospel of John is a notable representative.

The present volume, it is believed, will on the one hand bring a plain reader more closely into contact with the exact thought of the sacred writers than any version now current in Christendom, and on the other hand prove itself especially serviceable to students of the Word. In this belief the editors bid it anew God-speed, and in the realization of this desired result they will find their all-sufficient reward.

[Bible Research](#) > [English Versions](#)[English Versions](#)[English Versions](#)[English Versions](#) > [20th Century](#)[20th Century](#)[20th Century](#)[20th Century](#) > [ASV](#)[ASV](#)[ASV](#)[ASV](#) > [Preface](#)

=====

www.bible-researcher.com

Young's Literal Translation

Publishers' Note to the Third Edition

NOTWITHSTANDING the fact that the Revised Version of the Old and the New Testament has come into the field since the learned and lamented author first issued his Literal Translation of the Bible, the demand for it from year to year has continued remarkably steady. This indicates that it still fills a place of its own among helps to the earnest student of Holy Scripture. In 1887 Dr Young issued a Revised Edition, of which two impressions are exhausted. The work has been subjected to a fresh revision, making no alteration on the principles on which the Translation proceeds, but endeavouring to make it as nearly perfect in point of accuracy on its present lines as possible. The Publishers accordingly issue this new Revised Edition in the hope that earnest students of the Bible, by attaining to a clearer apprehension of the meaning of the inspired writer, may more clearly and fully apprehend the mind of the Spirit by whom all Holy Scripture has been given to us.

Edinburgh, January 1898.

Preface to the Revised Edition.

THE following Translation of the New Testament is based upon the belief that every word of the original is "God-breathed," as the Apostle Paul says in his Second Epistle to Timothy, chap. 3.16. That language is, indeed, applicable, in the first place, only to the Writings of the "Old Testament," in which Timothy had been instructed, but as the Apostle Peter, in his Second Epistle, chap. 3.15,16, expressly ranks the "Epistles" of his beloved brother Paul along with "the other Scriptures," as the "Gospels" and the "Acts" of the Apostles were undoubtedly written before the date of Peter's writing, by men to whom the Saviour promised and gave the Holy Spirit, to guide them to all truth, to teach them all things, and to remind them of all things that Jesus said and did, there can be no reasonable ground for denying the inspiration of the New Testament by any one who holds that of the Old, or who is willing to take the plain unsophisticated meaning of God's Word regarding either.

This inspiration extends only to the original text, as it came from the pens of the writers, not to any translations ever made by man, however aged, venerable, or good; and only in so far as any of these adhere to the original--neither adding to nor omitting from it one particle--are they of any real value, for, to the extent that they vary from the original, the doctrine of verbal inspiration is lost, so far as that version is concerned.

If a translation gives a present tense when the original gives a past, or a past when it has a present; a perfect for a future, or a future for a perfect; an a for a the, or a the for an a; an imperative for a subjunctive, or a subjunctive for an imperative; a verb for a noun, or a noun for a verb, it is clear that verbal inspiration is as much overlooked as if it had no existence. THE WORD OF GOD IS MADE VOID BY THE TRADITIONS OF MEN.

A strictly literal rendering may not be so pleasant to the ear as one where the apparent sense is chiefly aimed at, yet it is not euphony but truth that ought to be sought, and where in such a version as the one commonly in use in this country, there are scarcely two consecutive verses where there is not some departure from the original such as those indicated, and where these variations may be counted by tens of thousands, as

admitted on all hands, it is difficult to see how verbal inspiration can be of the least practical use to those who depend upon that version alone.

Modern scholarship is beginning to be alive to the inconsistency of thus gratuitously obscuring, and really changing, the meaning, of the sacred writers by subjective notions of what they ought to have written, rather than what they did write, for if we admit that in a single case it can be lawful to render a past tense by a present, where shall we end? who is to be judge? if we do so in one passage, to bring out what may appear to us might, could, would, or should, be the Scriptural meaning, we cannot deny the same privilege to others who may twist other passages in like manner. The alteration of an a for a the may appear a small matter not worth speaking of, but an attentive comparison of the following Translation with the common one will discover numerous passages where the entire force of the verse depends upon the insertion or non-insertion of the article. For example, in Mat. 2.4, Herod is represented as enquiring "where Christ ' should be born. But "Christ" is the surname of the man Jesus, who was quite unknown to Herod, who could not consequently ask for a person of whose existence he was ignorant. The true explanation is, that King James' Translators omitted the definite article which occurs in the original. The correct translation is, where "the Christ" should be born. Herod knew of "the Christ," the Messiah, the long promised Saviour and King of the Jews, and his enquiry was, where He was to be born, whose kingdom was to be over all. The simple article clears up the whole. There are about two thousand instances in the New Testament where these translators have thus omitted all notice of the definite article, not to say any thing of the great number of passages where they have inserted it, though not in the original.

The following translation need not, and ought not, to be considered, in any sense, as coming into competition with the Common Version, but as one to be used in connection with it, and as auxiliary to it; and not a few assurances have been received from clergymen and others that they thus use it, and find it at once interesting and profitable. The change of a single word, or collocation of words, is often found to throw an entirely new shade of meaning over the Scripture. This advantage is well known to all who have compared the various ancient versions, or even the English versions that successively formed what was popularly called "the authorized version," i.e., Tyndale, Coverdale, Geneva, Bishops, &c.

The Greek Text followed is that generally recognized as the "Received Text," not because it is thought perfect, but because the department of Translation is quite distinct from that of Textual Criticism, and few are qualified for both. If the original text be altered by a translator, (except he give his reasons for and against each emendation,) the reader is left in uncertainty whether the translation given is to be considered as that of the old or of the new reading. And, after all, the differences in sense to be found in the 100,000 various Greek readings are so trifling compared with those to be derived from an exact translation of the Received Text, that the writer willingly leaves them to other hands; at the same time, it is contemplated, in a future edition, to give, in an Appendix, all the various readings of the Greek MSS. that are capable of being expressed in English. With grateful thanks to the Father of Lights, this revised edition is presented to the friends of Divine Truth, with the hope that it may be a means, in the hands of the Divine Spirit, of quickening their faith, and encouraging their hearts, in the work of the Lord.
R.Y.

Preface to the First Edition

THE WORK, in its present form, is not to be considered as intended to come into competition with the ordinary use of the commonly received English Version of the Holy Scriptures, but simply as a strictly literal and idiomatic rendering of the Original Hebrew and Greek Texts. For about twenty years--fully half his life-time--the Translator has had a desire to execute such a work, and has been engaged in Biblical pursuits tending to this end more or less exclusively; and now, at last, in the good providence of God, the desire has been accomplished. How far he has been able to carry out the just principles of Biblical Translation, founded on a solid and immoveable foundation, time alone will tell, and for this he confidently waits. As these principles are to some extent new, and adhered to with a severity never hitherto attempted, and as the Translator has perfect confidence in their accuracy and simplicity, he proceeds at once to state them distinctly and broadly, that not merely the learned, but the wayfaring man need not err in appreciating their value.

There are two modes of translation which may be adopted in rendering into our own language the writings of an ancient author; the one is, to bring him before us in such a manner as that we may regard him as our own; the other, to transport ourselves, on the contrary, over to him, adopting his situation, modes of speaking, thinking, acting,--peculiarities of age and race, air, gesture, voice, &c. Each of these plans has its advantages, but the latter is incomparably the better of the two, being suited--not for the ever-varying modes of thinking and acting of the men of the fifth, or the tenth, or the fifteenth, or some other century, but--for all ages alike. All attempts to make Moses or Paul act, or speak, or reason, as if they were Englishmen of the nineteenth century, must inevitably tend to change the translator into a paraphrast or a commentator, characters which, however useful, stand altogether apart from that of him, who, with a work before him in one language, seeks only to transfer it into another.

In prosecuting the plan thus adopted, a literal translation was indispensable. No other kind of rendering could place the reader in the position contemplated, side by side with the writer--prepared to think as he does, to see as he sees, to reason, to feel, to weep, and to exult along with him. His very conception of time, even in the minor accidents of the grammatical past, present, future, are to become our own. If he speaks of an event, as now passing, we are not, on the logical ground of its having in reality already transpired, to translate his present as if it were a past; or if, on the other hand, his imagination pictures the future as if even at this moment present, we are not translators but expounders, and that of a tame description, if we take the liberty to convert his time, and tense--the grammatical expression of his time--into our own. King James' translators were almost entirely unacquainted with the two distinctive peculiarities of the Hebrew mode of thinking and speaking, admitted by the most profound Hebrew scholars in theory, though, from undue timidity, never carried out in practice, viz:--

1. That the Hebrews were in the habit of using the past tense to express the certainty of an action taking place, even though the action might not really be performed for some time. And
2. That the Hebrews, in referring to events which might be either past or future were accustomed to act on the principle of transferring themselves mentally to the period and

place of the events themselves, and were not content with coldly viewing them as those of a bygone or still coming time; hence the very frequent use of the present tense. These two great principles of the Hebrew language are substantially to be found in the works of Lee, Gesenius, Ewald, &c.; but the present writer has carried them out in translation much beyond what any of these ever contemplated, on the simple ground that, if they are true, they ought to be gone through with. While they affect very considerably the outward form of the translation, it is a matter of thankfulness that they do not touch the truth of a single Scripture doctrine--not even one.

Every effort has been made to secure a comparative degree of uniformity in rendering the original words and phrases. Thus, for example, the Hebrew verb *nathan*, which is rendered by King James' translators in sixty-seven different ways (see in the subsequent page, entitled 'Lax Renderings,') has been restricted and reduced to ten, and so with many others. It is the Translator's ever-growing conviction, that even this smaller number may be reduced still further.

It has been no part of the Translator's plan to attempt to form a New Hebrew or Greek Text--he has therefore somewhat rigidly adhered to the received ones. Where he has differed, it is generally in reference to the punctuation and accentuation, the division of words and sentences, which, being merely traditional, are, of course, often imperfect. For an explanation and vindication of these differences, the reader is referred to the "Concise Commentary," which is designed to supplement the present volume.

The Translator has often had occasion to regret the want of a marginal column to insert the various renderings of passages where he has been unable to satisfy his own mind--he has, however, cast the chief of these into an appendix, under the title, "Additions and Corrections." and still more elaborately in the supplementary volume.

EDINBURGH, 10th Sept. 1862

Style of the Sacred Writers, and of this Translation.

ONE of the first things that is likely to attract the attention of the Readers of this New Translation is its lively, picturesque, dramatic style, by which the inimitable beauty of the Original Text is more vividly brought out than by any previous Translation. It is true that the Revisers appointed by King James have occasionally imitated it, but only in a few familiar phrases and colloquialisms, chiefly in the Gospel Narrative, and without having any settled principles of translation to guide them on the point. The exact force of the Hebrew tenses has long been a vexed question with critics, but the time cannot be far distant when the general principles of the late learned Professor Samuel Lee of Cambridge, with some modification, will be generally adopted in substance, if not in theory. It would be entirely out of place here to enter into details on this important subject, but a very few remarks appear necessary, and may not be unacceptable to the student.

1. It would appear that the Hebrew writers, when narrating or describing events which might be either past or future (such as the case of Moses in reference to the Creation or the Deluge, on the one hand, and to the Coming of the Messiah or the Calamities which were to befall Israel, on the other), uniformly wrote as if they were alive at the time of the occurrence of the events mentioned, and as eye-witnesses of what they are narrating.

It would be needless to refer to special passages in elucidation or vindication of this principle essential to the proper understanding of the Sacred Text, as every page of this Translation affords abundant examples. It is only what common country people do in this land at the present day, and what not a few of the most popular writers in England aim at and accomplish--placing themselves and their readers in the times and places of the circumstances related.

This principle of translation has long been admitted by the best Biblical Expositors in reference to the Prophetic Delineation of Gospel times, but it is equally applicable and necessary to the historical narratives of Genesis, Ruth, etc.

2. The Hebrew writers often express the certainty of a thing taking place by putting it in the past tense, though the actual fulfilment may not take place for ages. This is easily understood and appreciated when the language is used by God, as when He says, in Gen. xv. 18, "Unto thy seed I have given this land;" and in xvii. 4, "I, lo, My covenant is with thee, and thou hast become a father of a multitude of nations."

The same thing is found in Gen. xxiii. 11, where Ephron answers Abraham: "Nay, my lord, hear me; the field I have given to thee, and the cave that is in it; to thee I have given it; before the eyes of the sons of my people I have given it to thee; bury thy dead." And again in Abraham's answer to Ephron: "Only--if thou wouldst hear me--I have given the money of the field; accept from me, and I bury my dead there." Again in 2 Kings v. 6, the King of Syria, writing to the King of Israel, says: "Lo, I have sent unto thee Naaman, my servant, and thou hast recovered him from his leprosy,"--considering the King of Israel as his servant, a mere expression of the master's purpose is sufficient. In Judges viii. 19, Gideon says to Zebah and Zalmunnah, "If ye had kept them alive, I had not slain you." So in Deut. xxxi. 18, "For all the evils that they have done"--shall have done.

It would be easy to multiply examples, but the above may suffice for the present. Some of these forms of expression are preceded by the conjunction "and" (waw, in Hebrew), and a very common opinion has been that the conjunction in these cases has a conversive power, and that the verb is not to be translated past (though so in grammatical form), but future. This is, of course, only an evasion of the supposed difficulty, not a solution, and requires to be supported by the equally untenable hypothesis that a (so-called) future tense, when preceded by the same conjunction waw ("and,") often becomes a past. Notwithstanding these two converting hypotheses, there are numerous passages which have no conjunction before them, which can only be explained by the principle stated above.

3. The Hebrew writers are accustomed to express laws, commands, etc., in four ways:

1. By the regular imperative form, e.g., "Speak unto the people."
2. By the infinitive, "Every male of you is to be circumcised."
3. By the (so-called) future, "Let there be light;" "Thou shalt do no murder;" "Six days is work done."

4. By the past tense, "Speak unto the sons of Israel, and thou hast said unto them." There can be no good reason why these several peculiarities should not be exhibited in the translation of the Bible, or that they should be confounded, as they often are, in the Common Version. In common life among ourselves, these forms of expression are frequently used for imperatives, e.g., "Go and do this,"--"This is to be done first,"--"You shall go,"--"You go and finish it." There are few languages which afford such opportunities

of a literal and idiomatic rendering of the Sacred Scriptures as the English tongue, and the present attempt will be found, it is believed, to exhibit this more than any other Translation.

The three preceding particulars embrace all that appears necessary for the Reader to bear in mind in reference to the Style of the New Translation. In the Supplementary "Concise Critical Commentary," which is now in the course of being issued, abundant proofs and illustrations will be found adduced at length.

The Battle of the Hebrew Tenses.

[Here Young enters upon a laborious treatise on the interpretation of Hebrew tenses, in which he argues that the so-called Waw Conversive of traditional Hebrew grammar is a mistaken notion. I have omitted the treatise up to the following summary. -- M.D.M.]

The result of the whole is: That the Waw Conversive does not exist in the Hebrew Bible, and is Unnecessary, Imperfect, and Unexampled in any language.

It has only a traditional existence, being the too hasty generalization of some ancient grammarians, who observed that the Septuagint Translators had--with the freedom which characterizes their whole work both in style and sentiments--deemed the Hebrew idioms too colloquial for the fastidious Greeks, and too simple for the dignity of literary composition; and as all succeeding translators, without an exception, were under the spell of the sacred character of that Version, it is no wonder, though much to be regretted, that their example was followed. Of late years there has been a very strong tendency in translators and expositors to adhere more than ever to the exact form of the Hebrew and Greek Tenses, but the present Translation is the first and only one in which it is carried out systematically.

Confused Renderings of King James' Revisers.

The English verb 'destroy' is, in the Common Version, the representative of not less than forty-nine different Hebrew words (as may be seen in the 'Englishman's Hebrew Concordance,' p. 1510 of second edition);-- the verb 'to set,' of forty, and 'to bring,' of thirty-nine, &c. It is evident, therefore, that the use of 'Cruden's Concordance,' and all others based on the Common Version, can only mislead the mere English reader.

The following list of words, with the number of their Hebrew representatives (according to the Common Version) expressed in numerals, will surprise all who have not hitherto attended to this subject; viz:--

To abhor 12, abide 13, abundance 11, affliction 12, to be afraid 22, after 13, against 13, among 11, to be angry 10, another 11, to appoint 24, appointed 10, army 10, at 13, to bear 13, beauty 15, before 22, beside 14, to bind 15, body 12, border 13, bough 13, branch 20, to break 33, bright 10, to bring 39, to bring forth 21, broken 12, to be broken 16, to burn 19, burning 12, but 15, by 14, captain 16, captivity 10, to carry away 10, to carry 12, to cast 19, to cast down 19, to cast out 15, to catch 12, to cease 21, chain 10, chamber 10, change 16, to be changed 10, chief 10, to cleave 15, coast 10, to come 32, commandment 12, companion 10, company 22, to consider 18, to consume 21, consumed 10, to continue 11, corner 10, country 10, to cover 21, covering 13, to cry 17, to cut down 10, to be cut down 13, to cut off 18, to be cut off 14, dark 11, darkness 10, to declare 11, decree 11, to be defiled 10, to deliver 26, to depart 18, desire 13, to desire

13, desolate 16, to be desolate 11, desolation 12, to despise 10, to destroy 49, to be destroyed 17, destruction 35, to divide 19, to draw out 10, dung 10, to dwell 14, dwelling 11, east 10, end 26, to establish 13, to be exalted 11, excellent 10, to fail 30, to faint 18, to fall 14, fear 16, to fear 10, flood 10, for 21, foundation 11, from 17, fruit 12, garment 14, to gather 23, to gather together 16, to be gathered 10, to be gathered together 14, to get 16, gift 12, to give 15, glorious 12, glory 10, to go 22, goodly 15, governor 12, great 24, grief 10, to be grieved 17, grievous 10, to grow 13, habitation 17, to harden 10, haste 11, to make haste 10, height 11, to hide 14, to hide self 12, high 18, to hold 12, hurt 11, idol 11, if 10, in 13, to increase 17, iniquity 11, to be joined 10, judgment 10, to keep 11, to kindle 15, knowledge 12, labour 10, to be laid 10, to lay 24, to lead 12, to leave 15, to be left 11, to lift up 15, light 13, to long 10, to look 16, to be made 11, majesty 10, to make 23, man 12, to mark 10, measure 13, meat 14, to meet 10, midst 10, might 12, mighty 26, to mourn 12, to move 15, to be moved 13, much 10, multitude 14, net 10, not 14, now 13, of 10, to offer 22, offering 10, old 13, only 11, to oppress 10, to ordain 12, over 10, to overthrow 11, palace 10, part 14, people 10, to perceive 10, to perish 13, pit 12, place 13, pleasant 17, pleasure 10, poor 10, portion 13, to pour out 12, power 17, to prepare 14, to prevail 15, pride 10, prince 11, proud 16, to put 28, to regard 17, rejoice 19, to remain 16, remnant 11, to remove 20, to be removed 11, to repair 10, to rest 17, reward 16, riches 10, right 16, river 11, ruler 13, to run 14, scatter 12, to be scattered 10, secret 12, to set 40, to be set 13, to set up 18, to shake 15, to shew 19, to shine 11, to shut 11, side 13, to be slain 14, slaughter 12, to slay 15, to smite 12, sorrow 28, to speak 22, speech 10, spoil 10, to spoil 16, to spread 15, to stay 14, to stop 10, strength 33, to strengthen 12, strong 26, substance 14, to take 34, to take away 24, to be taken away 10, to tarry 16, to teach 10, to tell 12, terror 10, that 16, these 16, think 12, this 20, thought 11, through 11, thus 10, to 12, tremble 13, trouble 14, to trouble 12, to be troubled 14, truth 11, to turn 15, to turn aside 10, to be turned 10, understanding 14, to utter 15, to vex 16, to wait 10, wall 13, waste 10, to waste 10, when 12, where 13, which 11, wisdom 12, with 18, within 12, without 12, word 10, work 15, wrath 10, yet 10, youth 11.

To make afraid 8, ancient 8, army 8, ask 8, assembly 8, back 9, band 9, battle 8, beat 9, because of 8, to behold 9, bottom 8, break down 8, to be brought 9, burden 8, to be burned 8, cast down 9, cause 9, to charge 8, chariot 8, clean 8, come upon 8, commit 8, to compass 9, confirm 9, cry out 8, to cut 8, to dance 8, deceitful 8, deep 9, defence 8, to be delivered 9, destroyer 8, devour 9, to direct 9, to do 9, to be done 8, to draw 9, to drive 8, drive away 8, dry 8, edge 8, enemy 9, even 8, ever 8, excellency 8, except 8, fair 8, fall down 8, fat 8, favour 8, to feed 9, fellow 9, first 9, flame 9, folly 9, foolish 9, form 9, friend 9, full 9, to gather selves together 8, be glad 9, going 9, be gone 9, goods 8, grieve 9, guide 8, heart 8, here 8, be hid 9, hole 8, honour 9, hope 9, image 9, increase 9, it 8, kill 9, lamb 9, to lament 9, to lay up 9, to leap 8, lift up self 8, to be lifted up 9, like 8, to be liked 8, line 8, little one 8, long 8, lord 8, lying 8, majesty 8, manner 9, to melt 9, mischief 8, to mock 8, mourning 8, none 8, officer 8, one 8, to open 9, oppressor 8, other 8, pain 9, to part 8, path 9, perfect 9, to perform 8, to pervert 8, piece 9, plain 8, pluck 8, polluted 9, possession 9, pray 9, precious 8, preserve 8, price 8, prison 9, prosper 9, pure 9, purpose 9, put away 9, put on 9, raise up 9, ready 8, receive 9, rejoicing 9, rest 8, return 8, ruin 8, to rule 9, to be sanctified 8, save 8, to say 8, search 8, see 9, shame 9, sheep 8, to shoot 8, to shout 8, shut up 8, sin 9, since 8, to sing 8, small 9, snare 9, son

8, sore 9, to sound 8, space 8, spring, 8, staff 9, step 8, stir up 8, stranger 9, stream 9, strike 8, strive 9, stronghold 9, subdue 8, such 8, surety 8, sweet 9, to be taken 8, tear 9, thick 8.

The above are taken from a most useful book, entitled 'The Englishman's Hebrew Concordance,' which only requires the insertion of the Hebrew Particles to make it a complete work.

'The Bible Student's Guide,' by the Rev. W. Wilson, D.D., cannot be sufficiently commended as an accurate and elaborate Key to the mixed renderings of King James' Revisers.

Lax Renderings of the King James Revisers.

NATHAN, 'to give,' is rendered (in the Kal conjugation) by such words as: to add, apply, appoint, ascribe, assign, bestow, bring, bring forth, cast, cause, charge, come, commit, consider, count, deliver, deliver up, direct, distribute, fasten, frame, give, give forth, give over, give up, grant, hang, hang up, lay, lay to charge, lay up, leave, lend, let, let out, lift up, make, O that, occupy, offer, ordain, pay, perform, place, pour, print, put, put forth, recompense, render, requite, restore, send, send out, set, set forth, shew, shoot forth, shoot up, strike, suffer, thrust, trade, turn, utter, would God, yield; besides seventeen varieties in idiomatic renderings=84!

ASAH, 'to do,' (in Kal) by: to accomplish, advance, appoint, to be at, bear, bestow, bring forth, bring to pass, bruise, be busy, have charge, commit, deal, deal with, deck, do, dress, execute, exercise, fashion, finish, fit, fulfil, furnish, gather, get, go about, govern, grant, hold, keep, labour, maintain, make ready, make, observe, offer, pare, perform, practise, prepare, procure, provide, put, require, sacrifice, serve, set, shew, spend, take, trim, work, yield; besides twenty idiomatic renderings=74!

DABAR, 'a word,' is rendered by: act, advice, affair, answer, anything, book, business, care, case, cause, certain rate, commandment, communication, counsel decree, deed, due, duty, effect, errant, hurt, language, manner, matter, message, oracle, ought, parts, pertaining, portion, promise, provision, purpose, question, rate, reason, report, request, sake, saying, sentence, something to say, speech, talk, task, thing, thought, tidings, what, wherewith, whit, word, work; besides thirty-one idiomatic renderings=84!

PANIM, 'face,' is rendered by: afore, afore-time, against, anger, at, because of, before, before-time, countenance, edge, face, favour, fear of, for, forefront, forepart, form, former time, forward, from, front, heaviness, it, as long as, looks, mouth, of, off, of old, old time, open, over-against, person, presence, prospect, was purposed, by reason of, right forth, sight, state, straight, through, till, time past, times past, to, toward, unto, upon, upside, with, within; besides forty-two idiomatic renderings=94!

SUM or SIM, 'to set,' is (in Kal) rendered by: appoint, bring, care, cast in, change, charge, commit, consider, convey, determine, dispose, do, get, give, heap up, hold, impute, be laid, lay, lay down, lay up, leave, look, be made, make, make out, mark, ordain, order, place, be placed, preserve, purpose, put, put on, rehearse, reward, set, cause to be set set on, set up, shew, take, turn, work; besides fourteen idiomatic renderings=59!

SHUB, (in Hiphil) 'to turn back,' is rendered by: to answer, cause to answer, bring, bring back, bring again, bring home again, carry back, carry again, convert, deliver, deliver again, draw back, fetch home again, give again, hinder, let, pull in again, put, put again,

put up again, recall, recompense, recover, refresh, relieve, render, render again, be rendered, requite, rescue, restore, retrieve, return, cause to return, make to return, reverse reward, send back, set again, take back, take off, turn away, turn back, cause to turn, make to turn, withdraw; besides fifteen idiomatic renderings=60!

NASAH, 'to lift up,' is (in Kal) rendered by: accept, arise, able to bear, bear up, be borne, bring, bring forth, burn, be burned, carry, carry away, cast, contain, ease, exact, exalt, fetch, forgive, go on, hold up, lade, be laid, lay, lift up, pluck up, marry, obtain, offer, pardon, raise, raise up, receive, regard, respect, set, set up, spare, stir up, suffer, take, take away, take up, wear, yield; besides four idiomatic renderings=46!

OBAR, 'to pass over,' is (in Kal) rendered by: to alienate, be altered, come, come over, come on, be delivered, enter, escape, fail, get over, go, go away, go beyond, go by, go forth, go his way, go in, go on, go over, go through, be gone, have more, overcome, overpass, overpast, overrun, pass, pass along, pass away, pass beyond, pass by, pass on, pass out, pass over, pass through, give passage, be past, perish, transgress; besides three idiomatic renderings=42!

RAB, 'many, much,' is rendered by: abound, abundance, abundant, captain, elder, common, enough, exceedingly, full, great, great multitude, great man, great one, greatly, increase, long, long enough, manifold, many, many a time, so many, have many many things, master, mighty, more, much, too much, very much, multiply, multitude, officer, plenteous, populous, prince, suffice, sufficient; besides seven idiomatic renderings=44!

TOB, 'good,' is rendered, by: beautiful, best, better, bountiful, cheerful, at ease, fair, fair word, to favour, be in favour, fine, glad, good, good deed, goodlier, goodliest, goodly, goodness, goods, graciously, joyful, kindly, kindness, liketh, liketh best, loving, merry, pleasant, pleasure, precious, prosperity, ready, sweet, wealth, welfare, well, to be well; besides four idiomatic renderings=41!

It would be easy to multiply examples of lax renderings did space permit. The following are some that have been marked; e.g. Ahad by 23, Altar 25, Ish 31, Al 36, Im 23, Amar 37, Aphas 23, Asher 27, Bo 32, Bin 20, Ben 20, Gam 20, Halak 36, Ze 21, Hul 27, Hazak 23, Hai 22, Hayil 26, Tob 37, Jad 36, Jada 36, Yom 32, Hatib 28, Yalak 24, Jatza 37, Ysh 31, Yashab 20, Ki 36, Kol 20, Kalah 21, Lakah 20, Meod 21, Moed 20, Matza 22, Maneh 20, Mishpat 27, Natah 21, Naphal 20, Nephesh 35, Sabab 20, Ad 22, Oud 26, Oulam 24, Al 34, Alah 37, Im 21, Amad 23, Anah 20, Arak 20, Pe 29, Panah 20, Pagod 25, Qum 27, Qarah 24, Raah 32, Rosh 21, Hirbah 30, Ra 37, Shub 35, Shalom 28, Shillah 27, Shillet 20, Shama 20.

=====

THE UNBOUND BIBLE/index.cfm?fuseaction=home&lang=English Bible Downloads

We believe that all of these Bibles are found in the Public Domain unless otherwise noted. Those which are found in our search but are not listed here are used with permission. Please see the [to learn more about the version you would like to acquire.](#)

[o](#)
[o](#)

English Versions

American Standard Version (ASV)

The American Standard Version of 1901 is an Americanization of the English Revised Bible, which is an update of the KJV to less archaic spelling and greater accuracy of translation. It has been called "The Rock of Biblical Honesty." It is the product of the work of over 50 Evangelical Christian scholars.

English Darby Translation

Darby's Holy Scriptures, A New Translation from the Original Languages was published originally in two parts: the New Testament (1884) and the New Testament (1890). These are English translations of a collation done on his earlier German and French translations. Both are posthumous, as John Nelson Darby himself died in 1882. This current e-text reflects the even more recent Guildford/London edition of 1961.

For a complete description: [English Darby TranslationEnglish Darby TranslationEnglish Darby TranslationEnglish Darby Translation](#)

Douay-Rheims Version

The Douay Version is the foundation on which nearly all English Catholic versions are still based. It was translated by Gregory Martin, an Oxford-trained scholar, working in the circle of English Catholic exiles on the Continent, under the sponsorship of William (later Cardinal) Allen. The NT appeared at Rheims in 1582; the OT at Douay in 1609. The translation, although competent, exhibited a taste for Latinisms that was not uncommon in English writing of the time but has seemed excessive in the eyes of later generations. The NT influenced the Authorized Version. This edition of the text was been converted from the 1899 edition of the John Murphy Company, Baltimore, Maryland.

For a complete description: [Douay-Rheims VersionDouay-Rheims VersionDouay-Rheims VersionDouay-Rheims Version](#)

King James Version (KJV)

"In 1604, King James I of England authorized that a new translation of the Bible into English be started. It was finished in 1611, just 85 years after the first translation of the New Testament into English appeared (Tyndale, 1526). The Authorized Version, or King James Version, quickly became the standard for English-speaking Protestants. Its flowing language and prose rhythm has had a profound influence on the literature of the past 300 years." - Gospel Communications Network

New American Standard Version

In the history of English Bible translations, the King James Version is the most prestigious. This time-honored version of 1611, itself a revision of the Bishops' Bible of 1568, became the basis for the English Revised Version appearing in 1881 (New Testament) and 1885 (Old Testament). The American counterpart of this last work was published in 1901 as the American Standard Version. The ASV, a product of both British and American scholarship, has been highly regarded for its scholarship and accuracy. Recognizing the values of the American Standard Version, the Lockman Foundation felt an urgency to preserve these and other lasting values of the ASV by incorporating recent discoveries of Hebrew and Greek textual sources and by rendering it into more current English. Therefore, in 1959 a new translation project was launched, based on the time-honored principles of translation

of the ASV and KJV. The result is the New American Standard Bible.

Translation work for the NASB was begun in 1959. In the preparation of this work numerous other translations have been consulted along with the linguistic tools and literature of biblical scholarship. Decisions about English renderings were made by consensus of a team composed of educators and pastors. Subsequently, review and evaluation by other Hebrew and Greek scholars outside the Editorial Board were sought and carefully considered.

For a complete description: _

World English Bible (WEB)

The WEB Bible as it might appear by the name is being translated specifically for the purpose of being distributed over the WEB. In the words of those working on the translation from the ASV 1901, "...there is NO OTHER complete translation of the Holy Bible in normal Modern English that can be freely copied (except for some limited "fair use") without payment of royalties. This is the vacuum that the World English Bible is trying to fill."

For a complete description: [World English Bible \(WEB\)](#)[World English Bible \(WEB\)](#)[World English Bible \(WEB\)](#)[World English Bible \(WEB\)](#)

Young's Literal Translation (YLT)

The Bible text designated YLT is from the 1898 Young's Literal Translation by Robert Young who also compiled Young's Analytical Concordance. This is an extremely literal translation that attempts to preserve the tense and word usage as found in the original Greek and Hebrew writings. The text was scanned from a reprint of the 1898 edition as published by Baker Book House, Grand Rapids Michigan. The book is still in print and may be ordered from Baker Book House. Obvious errors in spelling or inconsistent spellings of the same word were corrected in the computer edition of the text.

For a complete description: [Young's Literal Translation \(YLT\)](#)[Young's Literal Translation \(YLT\)](#)[Young's Literal Translation \(YLT\)](#)[Young's Literal Translation \(YLT\)](#)

Biblical Languages

Greek New Testament (NA26/27 - UBS3)

The Greek New Testament, Nestle-Aland 26th edition 1979. The UBS Greek New Testament, 3rd edition 1975. This text is based on the basic Greek text underlying most modern English translations since 1881, including the New American Standard and New International Versions. Certain words within the Nestle text proper are enclosed in square brackets [] or double brackets [[]]. These reflect those places where the critical text editors consider the inclusion or omission of such text to be in question.

This text is only available for NON-COMMERCIAL personal/scholarly and educational use.

Novum Testamentum Graece, Nestle-Aland 26th edition
(c)1979, Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, Stuttgart;
The Greek New Testament, 3rd edition
(c) 1975, United Bible Societies, London

—

Greek New Testament (Stephanus - 1550)

Stephanus (Robert Etienne's) 1550 edition, being an early and well-known Textus Receptus.

Greek New Testament (Scrivener - 1894)

Scrivener's 1894 edition, an attempt to reconstruct the Greek Vorlage for the KJV NT, insofar as this can be found in Greek MSS, without retranslating Vulgate readings back into unattested Greek.

Greek New Testament (Westcott-Hort)

Plain Westcott-Hort edition.

Hebrew Old Testament

This is the unpointed Tanach, from the Masoretic text. The word Tanach is a Hebrew acronym for Torah (Law), Neviim (Prophets), and Ketuvim (Writings), the three divisions of the Hebrew Bible. The base for this Tanach was Steve Gross' ASCII Transliterated Tanach, stored at israel.nysernet.org.

Transliterated Hebrew Old Testament

Thinking it might be helpful for those who cannot get the Hebrew fonts, I took the text for the Hebrew Old Testament (see above) and transliterated it into Roman characters, with a few extras.

Unicode Hebrew Old Testament

This can be used to view Hebrew next to other Unicode versions such as Gr. OT Sept. (Unicode), Russian(Unicode), etc. Users of Internet Explorer 5 should use Hebrew OT[IE5] (Unicode), since IE5 displays bidirectional text correctly. Other browsers should use Hebrew OT(Unicode).

Ancient Translations

Gothic Version

The Gothic version was produced in the mid-4th century by Ulfilas, a Christian missionary who also invented the Gothic alphabet. It constitutes practically all that is left of Gothic literature. The translation of the Old Testament has entirely disappeared except for fragments of Ezra and Nehemiah. Though a Greek base is certain, some scholars deny the attribution of these remnants to Ulfilas.

Cited from: "biblical literature" *Encyclopædia Britannica Online*

<http://www.eb.com:180/bol/topic?eu=119705&sctn=28>
[March 15, 1999].

The text is based on the authoritative edition of Wilhelm Streitberg and has been proofread once.

Die gotische Bibel: Herausgegeben von W. Streitberg. (= Germanische Bibliothek, 2. Abt., 3. Band)

1. Teil: *Der gotische Text und seine griechische Vorlage.* Heidelberg: Winters, 1919.

2. Teil: *Gotisch-griechisch-deutsches Wörterbuch.* Heidelberg: Winters, 1910.

The Gothic Bible was made available in electronic format for scholarly and non-commercial purposes by: [Project WulfilaProject WulfilaProject WulfilaProject Wulfila](#) .

(tom.deherdt@skynet.betom.deherdt@skynet.betom.deherdt@skynet.betom.deherdt@skynet.be)

Codex Ambrosianus A	Codex Ambrosianus B	Assorted Manuscripts	Codex Carolinus
Romans	1 Corinthians	Nehemiah	Romans
1 Corinthians	2 Corinthians	Matthew	
2 Corinthians	Galatians	Mark	
Galatians	Ephesians	Luke	
Ephesians	Philippians	John	
Philippians	Colossians	Philemon	
Colossians	1 Thessalonians		
1 Thessalonians	2 Thessalonians		
2 Thessalonians	1 Timothy		
1 Timothy	2 Timothy		
2 Timothy	Titus		
Titus			

Note: for optimal viewing of the Gothic Manuscripts, select a non-fragmentary version such as the King James Version or NASB, then select 'Gothic Ambr. A/Mss.' as Parallel 1 and 'Gothic Ambr. B/Car.' as Parallel 2.

Greek Old Testament (Septuagint/LXX)

This text was extracted from the morphologically analyzed text of CATSS LXX prepared by CATSS under the direction of R. Kraft (Philadelphia team).

[Original CCAT notice to this textOriginal CCAT notice to this textOriginal CCAT notice to this textOriginal CCAT notice to this text](#)

[CCAT's Archival HoldingsCCAT's Archival HoldingsCCAT's Archival HoldingsCCAT's Archival Holdings](#)

Latin Vulgate

The Latin Vulgate was translated by Jerome (c. 347-420), who began his work in 382. In 386 he moved to Bethlehem and worked on the Old Testament. He began on using the Greek LXX, but quickly decided to work directly from the Hebrew. In 405 the Old Testament, as well as the rest of the New Testament was completed. Due to older Latin texts in circulation, Jerome's work was not widely popular until the ninth century. The influence of Jerome's Bible was quite extensive. For instance, the first knowledge of the

Bible in the British Isles was from the Vulgate.

It should be noted Jerome translated Psalms from the Hebrew as well as the Greek. Accordingly, there were 2 Psalms texts. These can now both be viewed in parallel. Choose **Latin Vulgate** and **-Psalms from Hebrew** in the Versions and Parallel select boxes.

Other Languages

Bulgarian Bible

Bible text Copyright © 1924 Pridvorna Petchatnica

Chinese Bible

Chinese Union Version, Big5 encoding and Chinese Union Version, in GB encoding.

Cebuano Bible

This is the Bible in Cebuano, one of the languages spoken in the Philippines.

This Bible was originally found at: <http://members.xoom.com/kamakazikenz/bible.html>

[Project to put the Cebuano Bible in RealAudio format.](#)[Project to put the Cebuano Bible in RealAudio format.](#)[Project to put the Cebuano Bible in RealAudio format.](#)[Project to put the Cebuano Bible in RealAudio format.](#)

Croatian Bible

BIBLIJA Prijevod KS Stari i Novi Zavjet

Copyright by Kršæanska sadašnjost, Zagreb 1988.

Zahvaljujemo Kršæanskoj sadašnjosti što nam je ustupila svoj tekst.

This Bible was found at: <http://mypage.direct.ca/b/bibleman/Biblija.html>

Danish Bible

(C) 1931, 1933.

Denne elektroniske udgave af bibelen kommer fra den danske 1933 udgave. Det Gamle Testamente er en oversættelse fra 1931 og Det Nye Testamente er en oversættelse fra 1907.

The electronic edition of this Bible comes from the Danish 1933 edition. The Old Testament is an update from the 1931 edition, and the New Testament is an update from the 1907 edition.

Dutch Bible

Dutch Statenvertaling, published in 1750.

Finnish Bible

PYHŽ RAAMATTU

(C) 1933, 1938

Vanha Testamentti XI 1933 Uusi Testamentti XII 1938

French Bibles

Darby Version (French) Version DARBY Copyright (C) 1991

Bible et Publications Chretiennes, Valence FRANCE.

Darby's Holy Scriptures, A New Translation from the Original Languages, by John Nelson Darby (died 1882).

Louis Segond Version

La Bible de Jérusalem

Copyright (C) 1973 [Les Édition du Cerf](#)[Les Édition du Cerf](#)[Les Édition du Cerf](#)[Les Édition du Cerf](#)

Gaelic Scripture Portions (Manx Gaelic)

The Manx Gaelic Scripture portions were found at:

<http://www.smo.uhi.ac.uk/~kelly/menu.html#BIB><http://www.smo.uhi.ac.uk/~kelly/menu.html#BIB><http://www.smo.uhi.ac.uk/~kelly/menu.html#BIB><http://www.smo.uhi.ac.uk/~kelly/menu.html#BIB>

They include Esther, Jonah, Matthew, Luke, and John. This looks like it has been scanned in, so there are probably a few spelling errors. Manx was spoken on the Isle of Man in Great Britain. The Ethnologue lists Manx as having no native speakers.

[Ethnologue](#)[Ethnologue](#)[Ethnologue](#)[Ethnologue](#)

Gaelic Gospel of Mark (Scots Gaelic)

The Gospel of Mark in Gaelic is largely based on the Gospel of Mark in Ewen MacEachan's New Testament. The New Testament was produced in 1875 from a manuscript left by Father MacEachan. Archaic language has been replaced by modern words and idioms. We found the Gospel of Mark in Gaelic at: <http://dialspace.dial.pipex.com/town/avenue/pa44/mkg1.htm>

German Elberfelder Bible

Haitian Creole

This Haitian translation of the Bible is also available at: [Online Bible for Macintosh](#)[Online Bible for Macintosh](#)[Online Bible for Macintosh](#)[Online Bible for Macintosh](#)

[The Creolist Archive](#)[The Creolist Archive](#)[The Creolist Archive](#)[The Creolist Archive](#)

Spelling: IPA with the following modifications:

oral vowel + [n] = nasal vowel

[y] = /j/

[è] = front open-mid unrounded vowel

[ò] = back open-mid rounded vowel

[ou] = /u/

[u] = Voiceless labial-palatal approximant, i.e. semi-vowel corresponding to /y/

[ch] = Voiceless postalveolar fricative

[j] = Voiced postalveolar fricative

Indonesian Bibles:

These were found at: <http://www.bit.net.id/SABDA-Web/>.

Terjemahan Lama (TL)

Apparently an older version of the Terjemahan Baru.

Terjemahan Baru (TB)

Copyright (C) Lembaga Alkitab Indonesia (Indonesian Bible Society), 1994.

Released for non-profit scholarly and personal use. Not to be sold for profit.
When making formal public reference to the materials, please acknowledge The Indonesian Bible Society (Lembaga Alkitab Indonesia) as the copyright holder.

Bahasa Indonesia Sehari-hari (BIS)

Copyright (C) Lembaga Alkitab Indonesia (Indonesian Bible Society), 1994.

Released for non-profit scholarly and personal use. Not to be sold for profit.

When making formal public reference to the materials, please acknowledge The Indonesian Bible Society (Lembaga Alkitab Indonesia) as the copyright holder.

Maori Bible

Maori Bible prepared by Timothy Mora. Text reproduced by Dr. Cleve Barlow.

Norwegian Bible

NORSK BIBELEN 1906 / (C) 1930.

Portuguese Bible

João Ferreira de Almeida Atualizada

Rumanian Bible

Cornilescu Version

Russian Bible

_Shuar New Testament

Shuar of Equador, New Testament

Copyright (c) 1982

Prepared for Jim Hedlund, Casilla 7, Shell, Pastaza

ECUADOR South America

Translated by Gospel Missionary Union

Spanish Bibles

La Biblia Reina Valera

La Biblia de las Américas

Translated by the Lockman Foundation.

—
[Las Sagradas Escrituras Version Antigua](#)

[Copyright \(c\) 1999, Russell Martin Stendal](#)

[This Bible may be used freely provided that the contents are not altered.](#)

Swedish Bible

This version was first published in 1917.

Turkish New Testament

Copyright (C) The Translation Trust 1987, 1994

Permission should be obtained from the Trust if you propose to reproduce part or all of the enclosed text for purposes other than personal study. Write to:

The Translation Trust
38 Vancouver Road
Forest Hill
London SE23 2AF
England

Email: 100127.3375@compuserve.com

Ukrainian Bible

Ivan Ogienko Ukrainian Bible, 1930.

Uma New Testament

The New Testament in Uma. Central Sulawest, Indonesia.

Copyright (c) 1996, Wycliffe Bible Translators

Released for non-profit scholarly and personal use. Not to be sold for profit.

Vietnamese Bible

Published in 1934.