



'Advisers or Fellow-revisers': Recognition, Status and the Revised Version

Alan H. Cadwallader¹

alan.cadwallader@acu.edu.au

ABSTRACT

The Revised Version is recalled in the history of English language biblical versions because of the intense public debates over its potential to supplant the Authorized Version of 1611. These highly politicized contests over text and translation have continued through to the present day and have sidetracked attention from the deeper issues of identity and status associated with scholarship and national standing. Philip Schaff led a committed and ambitious group of American Protestant and Unitarian scholars in efforts to be credited as equal participants with the English Revisers in the massive project of the revision of the long-standing and much-loved English translation. The formation of the American Revised Version Committee within a year of the commencement of the work of revision by the two English Revision Companies ushered in an immense behind-the-scenes struggle over the requisite standing for decisions over the wording of the revised translation. Linguistics and text became the arena on which contests for recognition, national pride and scholarly achievement were fought. The choice of weapons of influence ranged from promotion of academic ability to rhetorical appeals to threats of commercial subversion. This paper explores the significance of American efforts to be involved credibly and influentially in the work that culminated in the Revised Version of 1881/1885 in England and (as a testament to the standing of American biblical scholarship and the failure of international cooperation) the distinct American Standard Version of 1901.

KEYWORDS: American Bible Society, Bible politics, King James Version, Philip Schaff, Revised Version, translation.

1. Alan Cadwallader is Senior Lecturer in Biblical Studies, Australian Catholic University, Canberra, Australia.

The Revised Version is recalled in the history of English language biblical versions because of the intense public debates over its potential to supplant the Authorized Version of 1611. These highly politicized contests over text and translation have continued through to the present day and have sidetracked attention from the deeper issues of identity and status associated with scholarship and national standing.² Sixty-six biblical scholars from the United Kingdom were involved;³ Philip Schaff led a committed and ambitious group of 35 American Protestant and Unitarian scholars in efforts to be credited as equal participants with the English Revisers in the massive project of the revision of the long-standing and much-loved English translation. The formation of the American Revised Version Committee within a year of the commencement of the work of revision by the two English Revision Companies ushered in an immense behind-the-scenes struggle over the requisite standing for decisions over the wording of the revised translation. Linguistics and text became the arena on which contests for recognition, national pride and scholarly achievement were fought. The choice of weapons of influence ranged from promotion of academic ability to rhetorical appeals about English-speaking family ties and manly honour to threats of commercial subversion. This paper explores the significance of American efforts to be involved credibly and influentially in the work that culminated in the Revised Version of 1881/1885 in England and (as a testament to the standing of American biblical scholarship and the failure of international cooperation) the distinct American Standard Version of 1901.

In the year that Philip Schaff assumed his position as Professor of Church History at Union Theological Seminary in New York, a Revision of the Authorized Version of the Holy Scriptures was announced in England. The Committee charged under the resolution of the Convocation of Canterbury on 6 May 1870 announced the division of the work of Revision into two companies (for Old Testament and New Testament), the members of the British Companies and the terms

2. The following abbreviations are used for archive holdings: *BL* = British Library; *CRO* = Cheshire Record Office; *CUL* = Cambridge University Library; *DDC* = Durham Dean & Chapter Library; *ACER* = Auckland Castle Episcopal Records (Durham University Library, Palace Green); *LPL* = Lambeth Palace Library; *MA* = Methodist Archives (John Rylands Library); *TCC* = Trinity College Cambridge; *WFA* = Westcott Family Archives; *WHA* = Westcott House Archives; *ABS* = American Bible Society.

3. This number includes those who died or resigned in the course of the 15-year project.

under which the revising would occur.⁴ Echoes of the announcement resounded in the United States.⁵ Particular warmth attached to convocation's announcement of names of scholars from the British Nonconformist churches who would serve on the companies. It was, repeated Philadelphia's *National Baptist*, noteworthy for the 'speed and ... spirit of equity which are wonderfully at variance with the customary proceedings of that body'.⁶ Hopes were indeed high.

It had become commonplace among Anglicans and Nonconformists in England and Protestant denominations in the United States to acknowledge mistakes in the foundation texts for and translation by the King James Version and to tie them to the growing scepticism about and scientific challenges to Christianity.⁷ 'If my Bible cannot stand the daylight I do not want it any longer', declaimed the Reverend Minot J. Savage. 'And if we will not let it be seen as it is, others will begin to entertain the same feelings.'⁸ Revision was held to be an apologetic and missionary necessity. No amount of nostalgia for the King James Version or the longevity of its use,⁹ or that it had even more formal authorization in the United States than in England,¹⁰ was deemed sufficient to thwart a revision.¹¹

4. The moves for revision had begun at an official level in the Church of England, in February of that year: C.J. Ellicott, 'Preface' to *The New Testament of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ* (Oxford: The University Press, 1881), p. ix.

5. The *New York Times* headlined the news 'Scriptural Revision' (13 June 1870) and reiterated the terms of the report that Convocation had adopted. Numerous denominational papers across the United States did the same, just as they had noted the first intimations of the project, several months earlier. It should be recognized that America was not alone in the excitement of anticipation of the coming revision. The newspaper of the remote country town of Mt Gambier in southern Australia carried the news as well: *Border Watch*, 18 June 1870.

6. *National Baptist*, 23 June 1870, quoting the English *Nonconformist* newspaper.

7. M.A. Crowther, 'Church Problems and Church Parties', in G. Parsons (ed.), *Religion in Victorian England*. IV. *Interpretations* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1988), p. 12.

8. *The Chicago Advance*, 18 August 1870.

9. Lord Shaftesbury led the charge on this front: G.B.A.M. Finlayson, *The Seventh Earl of Shaftesbury, 1801-1885* (Vancouver: Regent College Publishing, 2004 [1981]), p. 517.

10. See S.B. Frost, 'The English Bible', in H.N. Bream, R.D. Heim and C.A. Moore (eds.), *A Light unto my Path: Old Testament Studies in Honor of Jacob M. Myers* (Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press, 1974), pp. 208-09.

11. It was already well known that, even though dubbed 'the Authorized Version', there was no Act of Parliament so securing it. By contrast, with an embargo placed upon export to America of copies of the King James Version

Many individual new translations had been published in both countries. Baptists in the United States had already balked at the American Bible Society's commitment to publish only the King James Version and had formed two successive societies to execute a revision. The result gained approval as far afield as the 'South Australian Bible Translation Revision Society', formed in 1867,¹² indicating that the cry for a revision for 'English-speaking people' was more than empty rhetoric.¹³ Most recently in England, Henry Alford, the Dean of Canterbury, had published a revision of the King James Version New Testament.¹⁴ He refuted any suggestion that an individual's revision could replace the Authorized Version, holding that 'no new rendering is safe until it has gone through many brains, and been thoroughly sifted by differing perceptions and tastes'. This last observation was telling, for just as he recognized that the very act of individual revision, of which his was one among many, 'kept open the great question of an authoritative Revision',¹⁵ so also no authoritative Revision could be attempted without a broad range of contributions. How broad was to become the critical issue, even as, for some, it was,

(*F*'note continued)

during and after the War of Independence, the fledgling Congress of the United States had declared the 'use of the Bible is so universal and its importance so great' that a means of breaking the sanction was to be sought. Robert Aitken ultimately secured the formal rights (in 1782) to print the King James Bible in the United States, which unleashed a plethora of American printings. This would become critical at the business end of the new Revised Version when the delicacies of publication rights were again debated.

12. *South Australian Register*, 30 January 1869; *South Australian Advertiser*, 1 February 1869.

13. It should be noted here that the public discourse of 'English-speaking people' as a means of securing ties within and beyond the British Empire, predates William Gladstone's politicized use and is an important additional component to the influential note by Francis Herrick, 'Gladstone and the Concept of the 'English-Speaking Peoples', *JBS* 12 (1972), pp. 150–56.

14. H. Alford, *The New Testament of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, after the Authorised Version, Newly compared with the original Greek and revised* (London: Strahan & Co, 1869). The work completed a venture in which he had been involved: *The Gospel According to St John, after the Authorized Version, Newly Compared with the Original Greek and Revised by Five Clergymen* (London: John W. Parker, 3rd edn, 1863).

15. Alford, *New Testament*, p. vi. Alford was to live long enough to see the establishment of the two Revised Version companies formed by the RV Committee set up by Convocation, and to serve briefly on the New Testament Company. He died in January 1871.

in hope and execution, its greatest glory. Equally, as it turned out, the thwarting of American ambitions for the work was to prove the greatest barrier to future international cooperation on Bible revision.

In his public writings about the Revised Version, Schaff's enthusiasm for the undertaking and for the results was manifest. Before the final revision was published – the New Testament in 1881, the Old Testament in 1885 – the German Reformed scholar consistently spoke of the 'Anglo-American Bible Revision'. It was a phrase avoided in England, and certainly not used in official documents on that side of the Atlantic.¹⁶ He emphasized the work of Americans as a mirror of the British work – in the range of denominations represented in the work of revision, in the division into two companies (one for each Testament), and especially in the terms of reference adopted as principles guiding the work. These accented the selection of the ablest biblical scholars the country could offer and a commitment to the greatest accuracy in translation measured largely by lexical and grammatical equivalence. All in all, in Schaff's eulogy, this was a 'joint work of both committees ... among the two most civilized nations of the earth'.¹⁷ His hyperbole scaled more general political and economic aspirations as well: 'England and America have honoured themselves by thus honouring the Bible, and proved its inseparable connection with true freedom and progress.'¹⁸

Schaff was far from alone in this glowing avowal of cooperation, and its significance for the unity between England and America. The Episcopalian Bishop of Delaware, Alfred Lee, wrote, 'Measures were ... taken to obtain the cooperation of American scholars, in the hope of making the new version, like the old one, a bond of union between two great nations speaking the same language.'¹⁹ Isaac Hall wrote of the two Committees as 'virtually one organization'.²⁰

16. P. Schaff, 'Prefatory Note' to Members of the American Revision Committee, *Anglo-American Bible Revision: Its Necessity and Purpose* (Philadelphia: American Sunday-School Union, 2nd edn, 1879), p. ii. The phrase was quickly standardized as the American mode of referring to the venture: see Austin Allibone (Editor of Books for the American Sunday School Union), 'Origins of this Volume' in the same collection of essays (p. iv).

17. P. Schaff, *Companion to the Greek Testament and the English Version* (London: Macmillan, 1883), pp. 478, 404.

18. Schaff, *Companion*, p. 406.

19. A. Lee, 'Revision of the Scriptures', in *Anglo-American Bible Revision*, p. 180.

20. I. Hall, *The Revised New Testament and History of Revision* (Philadelphia: Hubbard Bros, 1881), p. 81.

The driving hopes for the Americans are revealed in such statements. The ecumenical vitality of Schaff, that extolled the unity that could be achieved by diverse confessions working on a common project, was certainly present.²¹

But this avowal of unity, implying a convivial ease of collegiality, actually screens the politically tense dimensions of the international project. There was the perceived need for recognition of intellectual and literary achievement, of a distinct yet related identity, of a religious vitality not without a scholarly foundation. Schaff himself used the language of 'mother-daughter' to describe the relationship of England and America.²² He was not the first to use the discourse of family ties in the pursuance of specific objectives even though such asymmetrical language was sometimes contested.²³ Nevertheless, such constant deferrals to and comparisons with England reinforced the imbalance and it gained effusive display in the outpourings of almost adulatory welcome to Arthur Stanley, Dean of Westminster Abbey and key player in the moves for revision, when he visited the eastern seaboard in 1878.²⁴ No such public extension for Philip Schaff's repeated visits to England mirrored the English churchman's welcome.²⁵ At one level this related to the nervousness amongst the Americans about the standing of their own biblical scholarship. The *National Baptist* reassured its American readers that 'The names of the English Churchmen who have this undertaking in charge, will inspire general confidence.'²⁶ Conversely, concern was expressed in England

21. See K. Penzel 'Philip Schaff: A Centennial Appraisal', *Church History* 59 (1990), pp. 207–21.

22. Schaff, *Companion*, p. 482. The rhetoric was used in an attempt to gain both English recognition of American scholarship in the undertaking and support for the product once published.

23. H.M. Carey, *God's Empire: Religion and Colonialism in the British world c 1801–1908* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), p. 93.

24. Reports covering arrival and departure and almost every step in between filled American newspapers. The newspapers also made constant reference to Stanley's work with the American Committee on the Revision: see, for three examples among many, *The Tribune*, 28 September 1878; *The Observer*, 3 October 1878; *The Evangelical*, 3 October 1878. For a partial insight into Stanley's view of the tour, see R.E. Prothero, *Life and Letters of Dean Stanley* (London: Nelson, 1909), pp. 525–46.

25. Schaff made more than half a dozen visits to England during the period of the revision project. See G. Pranger, *Philip Schaff (1819–1893): Portrait of an Immigrant Theologian* (New York: Peter Lang, 1997), p. 189.

26. *National Baptist*, 23 June 1870.

and reported in the United States that 'Biblical scholars are *few and far between in America* and ... the three or four whose services might be acceptable would by no means contribute to render the new version popular among their countrymen.'²⁷ Such a qualified view was not without American self-appraisal; even Episcopalian dignitaries avowed similar humble self-assessments.²⁸ However, it was clear also that American biblical authorities outside of the Episcopal Church were concerned both to test their own ability by reference to English scholarship and to make their own contribution. The American Committee on Revision later argued for equal authority over the resultant revised translation on the basis of 'the character and merits of our cooperation ... in the joint work' but even here this was laid as an appeal to English adjudicators.²⁹

Furthermore, the work of revision became a magnet of hopes for restoration of relations between Britain and America, grounded not merely in a common language but in the literary apex of the cultural and religious heritage of that language – the Authorized Version. It was less than one hundred years since the War of Independence. The coals of past tensions had recently been re-fired over the role of the British in the secreting of the ship *Alabama* to the Confederate side in the Civil War just concluded.³⁰ Schaff made great truck of this element of shared language and shared artefact, significant because English was not his native tongue. He recognized that it was clearly the unifying element in what later commentators have called 'Americanization'. So this unity, gathered around language and literary treasure, had more than ties with England in view; it was (to be) a means of unifying a nation, disparate in its migrant groups and in its politics. Language,

27. The *Philadelphian Evening Telegraph*, 30 June 1870, incorporating an editorial from the *London Standard*. The three or four in mind were not named and it is not quite clear whether the focus is the Episcopal Church or the sweep of Protestant churches.

28. *The Guardian*, 27 March 1872, a letter from 'A Clergyman of the American Episcopal Church'.

29. CUL Ms Add 9739, Robert Scott papers Folder 3. 'Resolution of the American Committee'.

30. Considerable tensions developed over the Union's claim for compensation for the *Alabama's* damage to the northern side. The matter was ultimately resolved by arbitration but it generated considerable public antagonism on both sides of the Atlantic. See M. Hall and E. Goldstein, 'Writers, the Clergy, and the "Diplomatisation of Culture": Sub-Structures of Anglo-American Diplomacy, 1820-1914'. in J. Fisher and A. Best (eds.), *On the Fringes of Diplomacy: Influences on British Foreign Policy 1800-1945* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2011), p. 128.

religion and nationhood were entwined through this project of translation for the shaping of identity. Edwin Gentzler's perceptive delineation of the importance of translation for the shaping of American identity is especially pertinent here, yet he omits any notice of the work of revision of the Authorized Version. This work encapsulated in a large-scale group process the very forces he has identified as operative in the role of translation in the shaping of America.³¹

The English revisers themselves were *almost* as effusive about the relationship as their American counterparts. In his carefully crafted preface to the Revised Version of the New Testament, the chair of the New Testament Company, Bishop Charles John Ellicott, wrote, 'We gratefully acknowledge their [i.e. the Americans'] care, vigilance and accuracy; and we humbly pray that their labours and our own, thus happily united, may be permitted to bear a blessing to both countries, and to all English-speaking people throughout the world.'³² Here again was the grand vision of ecumenical if not imperialist ambition.

Ellicott's portrayal of the relationship was at some remove from the historical reality though it has either been merely reiterated as the reality or ignored altogether. David Norton, for example, makes no mention of the work and contribution of the Americans in his study of the Bible as literature,³³ in fact, dismissing 'political and sectarian motives' from consideration in assessing the Revised Version.³⁴ The two assertions are far from unrelated. Melanie Hall and Erik Goldstein, even though accenting the developments of cultural exchange between the two countries, make no mention of the Revised Version at all, despite giving considerable attention to Dean Stanley's American visit.³⁵ The lode-stone of biblical revision does not figure in studies of the development of the concept of 'Greater Britain'³⁶ or expositions of the relations between the Established Church and the Episcopal Church of the United States of America.³⁷ Certainly, there is no recognition of the serious dent in the Episcopal Church's aspirations of engineering a

31. E. Gentzler, *Translation and Identity in the Americas* (London/New York: Routledge, 2008), pp. 31, 134.

32. Ellicott, 'Preface', p. xi.

33. D. Norton, *A History of the Bible as Literature: From Antiquity to 1700* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), ch. 6.

34. Norton, *A History of the Bible*, p. 218.

35. Hall and Goldstein, 'Diplomatisation of Culture', pp. 127–54.

36. See Carey, *God's Empire*, pp. 6–14 and generally.

37. So B. Kaye, *An Introduction to World Anglicanism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), pp. 46–49.

national ideal that the Revised Version delivered to the Episcopal Church. At the time, its barely concealed antagonism to the project inspired a polemical characterization of the church as that 'snug little American Zion',³⁸ a confirmatory tag-line for Kevin Ward's interpretation of the 'Olympian detachment' of the nineteenth-century Episcopal Church.³⁹

The revision of the Authorized Version was a major public contest from the time of its announcement until a decade or more after its two-part publication. Contemporary scholarship has delivered little more than repetitious reiterations of its failure to capture popular acceptance, largely because of the success in its avowed aim of literalism. The Revised Version was a lightning rod of national and international identities and ambitions. Most particularly, the rising American confidence in its literary (which demanded, in the nineteenth century, biblical) scholarship came up against the vigour of an English assumption of a linguistic hegemony to match its political power. This has remained a forgotten chapter of the history of the Bible in English.⁴⁰

There is more to the story of the relationship than utopian harmony and equality. The failure of English commentators to make any reference to an 'Anglo-American' edition, Ellicott's meticulous explanation that the Americans *responded* to the first and second draft revisions of the English RV Companies by sending back their criticisms and suggestions, and Schaff's determined efforts to place on the record the 'Documentary History of the American Committee of Revision' even if it could only gain a private printing,⁴¹ point to the struggles involved.

38. *The Guardian*, 27 March 1872. The description is included in quotation marks in a letter from an Episcopalian clergyman criticizing a previous letter from a supporter of Dean Burgon's opposition to the revision. This suggests that there was a battle waging within the Episcopal Church over the revision, just as there was in England.

39. K. Ward, *A History of Global Anglicanism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), p. 55. Again however, the Revised Version is not factored into the overview.

40. The only study of the political dimensions of the Revised Version concentrates on its significance within the American context and does not examine the complex dimensions of the interactions between the English and American committees. See P.J. Thuesen, *In Discordance with the Scriptures: American Protestant Battles over Translating the Bible* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), ch. 2.

41. Schaff wrote to other members of the American Bible Revision Committee (ABRC) in 1883 promoting the publication of the Documentary History which he had compiled. He received varying responses. The Revd Dr Conant agreed that 'Nothing else will show the true position taken by the American

Schaff encapsulated the conflict over the nature of the relationship in these terms: were the Americans to be 'advisers or fellow-revisers'?⁴² His efforts from the beginning clearly marked out a determined hope and argument that the Americans would take their place with the English Companies as 'fellow-revisers'; the resistance to those efforts by the English indicates that, on this score, anything but unanimity and equality was operative.

The question of the involvement of the Americans was obliquely anticipated in a resolution of a Joint Committee of the Convocation of Canterbury, but the wording was decidedly ambiguous:

that it is desirable that Convocation should nominate a body of its own members to undertake the work of revision, who shall be at liberty to invite the co-operation of any eminent for scholarship, *to whatever nation or religious body* they may belong.⁴³

Arthur Stanley had moved rapidly to interpret the resolution as meaning that the operations of revision should be done by Establishment and Nonconformist members in England, Ireland, Wales and Scotland, working together.⁴⁴ The application was early tested by the furore that broke out over the inclusion of an English Unitarian, G. Vance Smith, in the New Testament Company of Revisers. An accelerant was poured on the fire by the invitation extended to him to attend the Holy Communion that launched the work of the Company. Once the early crisis was resolved in favour of the inclusion of Smith in the decision-making processes of the New Testament Company,⁴⁵ the question of the involvement of other

(*F*note continued)

Committee, and their just grounds for that position', Conant to Schaff, 22 October 1883; Professor Dwight however urged reticence: Dwight to Schaff, 17 August 1883 (*ABS ABRC Correspondence Foreign and Domestic*, 1883) and he became involved in the final editing. Six months later it was still being debated 'whether or not and when the Documentary History is to be published' – roneoed Agenda sent out by Schaff and George Day (a member of the Old Testament Company), 14 April 1884 (*ABS ABRC Correspondence, Correspondence Foreign and Domestic*, 1884). It was finally printed (rather than published) a year later.

42. Schaff, *Companion*, p. 398 and see *infra*.

43. Resolution 5 of the Joint Committee Report, 24 March, 1870, submitted 3 May of the same year.

44. He hoped to include a Roman Catholic representative as well, namely John Henry Newman, but Newman declined. See my 'Star-Cross'd lovers: John Henry Newman and the Revision of the Bible' *AEJT* forthcoming.

45. See my 'The Politics of Translation of the *Revised Version*: Evidence from the Newly Discovered Notebooks of Brooke Foss Westcott', *JTS* 58 (2007), pp. 415–39.

nations seemed to follow naturally on its heels.⁴⁶ An indication of the importance of this move was that it became a matter of debate in the House of Commons. Charles Buxton moved for a Royal Commission to revise the Authorized Version. He believed that such a Commission should be executed by the combined action of 'Her Majesty' and 'the President of the United States'.⁴⁷ Various speakers opposed both the revision and the call for American involvement. When the Prime Minister, William Gladstone, finally joined the fray, his measured sidelining of the Government warrant for the revision made no mention of the Americans.⁴⁸ However, his diary entry revealed that there was more than a defence of the King James Version in his sights;⁴⁹ it was the 'American collaboration' that he specifically opposed in Buxton's motion.⁵⁰ Gladstone had shown a similar ambivalence towards admitting American leadership in democratic reform in the debates over the Reform Bill recently passed in 1867.⁵¹ There was no question that English leadership was to be asserted and retained.

This may have tailored, at least partially, the manner of Stanley's shepherding of American involvement. The resolution was completely capable of interpretation on an individualistic basis,⁵² wherein single

46. See my 'His Love Has Been our Banner on our Road': Identity Politics and the Revised Version', forthcoming in S. Elliot and R. Boer (eds.), *Ideology, Culture and Translation* (Semeia monograph; Atlanta, GA: SBL Press, 2012).

47. House of Commons debate, 14 June 1870, *Hansard*, vol. 202, p. 100. Matthew Arnold had already dismissed Buxton (the Liberal member for Wisley) as having 'a turn for swimming with the stream', by which, presumably, he meant, a penchant for pursuing the latest radical cause: *Culture and Anarchy: An Essay in Political and Social Criticism* (London: Smith, Elder and Co, 1869), p. xviii.

48. *Hansard*, vol. 202, pp. 112-17.

49. Gladstone's personal copy (held at the William Gladstone Library in Hawarden) of Edmund Beckett's pamphlet 'Should the Revised New Testament Be Authorized?' has a pronounced, capitalized 'No!' penciled onto the front page. This tallies with other notices of his 'hectoring' opposition to the revision, as one of the revisers, Charles Vaughan noted: C.J. Vaughan to Alex Macmillan (the publisher) in *BL Add Ms 55113*, f. 78.

50. Diary entry, 14 June 1870 (H.C.G. Matthew, *The Gladstone Diaries Vol. VII* [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990]).

51. R. Quinault, 'Gladstone and Parliamentary Reform', in D. Bebbington and R. Swift (eds.), *Gladstone Centenary Essays* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2000), p. 83.

52. This was the way Buxton understood it in his parliamentary speech when he advocated tapping into the learning of Jewish scholars on finer points of Hebrew: *Hansard*, vol. 202, p. 101.

American eminent scholars would be invited to cooperate, presumably on whatever *ad hoc* basis the English Committee decided. However, Philip Schaff took the invitation to provide names as an intention to form a *group* of scholars to cooperate,⁵³ in his mind on the entire project. Stanley acceded that it was a matter of American organization for which they alone, and not the English, were responsible. He carefully corrected Schaff's draft letter of invitation to various scholars making just this point:

Schaff's draft had read:

I have been requested and authorized by the British Committee for a revision of the Authorized Version of the Holy Scriptures, through the Dean of Westminster, to form an American Committee in co-operative union with the British, and to invite a select number of Biblical scholars from different denominations to assist in the proposed revision.

Stanley's corrections were telling, reflecting his own concern at making American involvement acceptable in England:

The British Committee for a revision of the Authorized Version have requested the Bishop of Winchester and the Dean of Westminster to communicate with the scholars of the United States of America with a view to inviting their co-operation in the work of revision.⁵⁴

The distinction between 'assist in the proposed revision' and 'Co-operation in the work of revision' was subtle, but would prove telling. It was clearer in Stanley's rejection of Schaff's use of 'fraternal equality' in his draft suggestions to Bishop Ellicott of the initiation of the American Revision Committee:⁵⁵ 'though doubtless most reasonable as regards the spirit in which it is made, [it] might mislead unless more carefully explained'.⁵⁶ Accordingly, from the English point of view, the Americans, however they might wish to organize themselves and on what principles they may wish to proceed, were viewed as little different in kind, though different in degree, from the eminent advisers on nautical matters sought out by the English Company for one-off assistance on how best to interpret terms for the shipwreck in Acts 27.⁵⁷ They were,

53. This executed a theological commitment as much as a political strategy; see H. Schwarz, *Theology in a Global Context: The Last Two Hundred Years* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2005), pp. 61–62.

54. Stanley to Schaff, 30 May 1871 (*Documentary History of the American Committee on Revision* [New York, 1885], p. 45).

55. Schaff to Dr Joseph Angus, 18 August 1870 (*Documentary History*, p. 31).

56. Stanley to Schaff, 30 May 1871 (*Documentary History*, p. 46).

57. W.G. Humphry, *A Word on the Revised Version of the New Testament* (London: Christian Knowledge Society, 1881), p. 34.

from Stanley's careful manoeuvring, not in the same position nor with the same authority as the English Revisers, though this remained to be clearly demarcated.

The issue was compounded by the separation of lines of approach to the Americans. Bishop Wilberforce of Winchester was to approach the Episcopalians; Dean Stanley was to contact the non-Episcopalians. This may have been Stanley's strategy to avoid sore memories. He had refused to allow Westminster Abbey to be used for a gathering of bishops that has become known as the first Pan-Anglican Conference.⁵⁸ The Bishop of Vermont, John Hopkins, accused Stanley of being 'an absolute autocrat' and breaching his vow of obedience to episcopal authority.⁵⁹ However, the situation was not helped by a difference in the timing in notification of the two American groups. Stanley had swung into action quickly, contacting Philip Schaff as the conduit to American scholarship.⁶⁰ Schaff had already become good friends with J.B. Lightfoot and B.F. Westcott. They had organized and overseen his contributions to Dr Smith's *Dictionary of Christian Antiquities*.⁶¹ Schaff had even stayed with Westcott, at the master's house at the Harrow School.⁶² He was known to others of the English revisers as well and his scholarship and amity were generally trusted.⁶³ He was, in many ways, leading the display of American scholarship in England – Protestant with catholic sensibilities, familiar with though critical of German scholarship, detailed in his investigations. He was suitably parallel to the revitalized Cambridge scholarship epitomized in the work of Lightfoot, Westcott and F.J.A. Hort – the Cambridge triumvirate. Stanley chose his American conduit well.

58. Stanley had feared that the conference was going to be directed towards reinforcing reactions against Bishop Colenso of Natal, thus inciting what he called 'party differences'; it was a fear that was realized: Prothero, *Stanley*, pp. 376–78.

59. Hopkins to Stanley, 9 November 1867 (Prothero, *Stanley*, pp. 379, 381).

60. Stanley to Schaff, 13 January 1871. This, however, was the formal contact; Stanley had already encouraged the Baptist member of the English New Testament Company of revisers, Dr Joseph Angus, to utilize his many American contacts to the advantage of the work of Revision six months earlier. Angus was then to be in the United States for a meeting of the Evangelical Alliance, with which Schaff was associated.

61. Letters Westcott to Lightfoot, 28 November 1867, 7 May, 1869 (*DDC Letters and Papers of Joseph Barber Lightfoot*). See, on Westcott and Lightfoot's involvement in the Dictionary, A. Westcott, *Life and Letters of Brooke Foss Westcott* (London: Macmillan, 1903), Vol. 1, pp. 319–20.

62. Letter Westcott to Lightfoot, 15 May 1869 (*DDC*).

63. Pragmatics also played a part – Angus was a frequent visitor to the United States for gatherings of the Evangelical Alliance.

Bishop Wilberforce by contrast made what some saw as a (or another?) fatal mistake in holding off any communication until the Episcopalians met as a group at their Convention,⁶⁴ which meant going through the Presiding Bishop. His formal correspondence came more than twelve months after Schaff had swung into action.⁶⁵ Whether simple procrastination, over-scrupulous concern that hierarchical protocols be observed or a surreptitious effort to derail the project in America (or as a whole) is difficult to discern.⁶⁶

The Episcopalians growled that the group of decidedly Protestant denominations – as distinct from ‘Churchmen’ as one Episcopalian bristled⁶⁷ – were already gathering as an organized unit for the revision; ‘the marked exclusiveness of the movement’ was the judgment of a resolution of the Diocese of Illinois.⁶⁸ However much they stood under the banner of Protestant the bishops were in no mood to have their Episcopal status undervalued. The resolution passed by the Second Congress of the Protestant Episcopal Church, despite the protests of the Bishop of Louisiana, was tart in its wording: ‘this House, having had no part in originating or organising the said work of revision, is not at present in a condition to deliver any judgment respecting it’.⁶⁹

It did not help that there had been vehement English reactions to the place accorded to the Unitarian, G. Vance Smith.⁷⁰ The appearance of the Unitarians, Ezra Abbot and Joseph Thayer, on the American

64. Angus to Schaff, 14 December 1871 noted the delay caused (*ABS Foreign Correspondence 1870–1881*, Letter 6).

65. The letter is dated 7 August 1871, reprinted as Appendix XIV in *Journal of the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church* (1871), pp. 615–16 (*ABS Foreign Correspondence*, Letter 148a).

66. Edward White Benson, long-time friend of Westcott and Lightfoot, recorded in his diary (8 June 1882) about Wilberforce’s ‘desire to have everything his own way’ (TCM Ms 147, Cornwall Record Office, The Benson Diaries). The assessment was not unique: see Bishop Ellicott to Lightfoot, 21 February, 1871 (DCC). Wilberforce had been working behind the scenes to engineer a narrower membership of the Companies, as well as a curtailment of the brief for revision. See R.G. Wilberforce, *Life of the Right Reverend Samuel Wilberforce* (London: John Murray, 1882), III, pp. 346–50). He early removed himself from chairing the New Testament Company, citing episcopal pressures. His death in 1873 precluded further concerns at his actions.

67. *The Guardian*, 23 November 1870, p. 1367.

68. *The Guardian*, 5 October 1870, p. 1179.

69. From *Journal and Proceedings of the Protestant Episcopal Church* (1872), p. 353.

70. These protests had a vociferous champion in John Burgon, Dean of Chichester Cathedral; see E.M. Goulburn, *John William Burgon, Late Dean of Chichester: A Biography* (2 vols; London: John Murray, 1892), II, p. 45. He was also

committee seemed to compound the mischief. The Bishop of West New York, A. Cleveland Coxe, made up in flourishing rhetoric what he lacked in biblical acumen: 'Who does not foresee what must follow? Here a text will be stigmatized as influenced by the Baptist Revisers; another will be credited to the Methodists; and another to those Socinian and semi-Arian helpers who are called in.'⁷¹

However, the upshot of these bruised feelings was that the American Committee initially found itself without Episcopal representation and this became another sore in England. As the Chair of the British Committee, Bishop Ellicott wrote to Schaff,

we have many violently opposed to us here at home who seek every opportunity against us. It, therefore, really would be imprudent for us to take any final step till your Committee is so constituted as to represent (with other Communities) the Episcopal Church distinctly and acceptedly. The presence of two Bishops or so would at once give the home-public of Church-people the needed confidence.⁷²

It seemed to Ezra Abbot, Professor at the Harvard Divinity School, that 'a man's official position in the Church' had taken precedence over scholarship, quite counter to any of the formal resolutions and regulations related to the projected Revision and a key motivation for American involvement in the project; but he restrained his public tongue, if not his private pen.⁷³ In the end, repeated pleas and increasingly high-ranking private representation forced the hand of the Bishop of Delaware, Arthur Lee, and he joined the American Committee. He was promptly given the task of opening deliberations with prayer at his first attendance, a responsibility noted in the minutes,⁷⁴ and passed in

(*F*'note continued)

soliciting Gladstone to the cause: Gladstone Diary entry, 24 April 1871 (Matthew, *Gladstone Diaries Vol. VII*).

71. *The Second Congress of the Protestant Episcopal Church* (1872), p. 198. Catholics had been carefully excluded from the beginning of the American venture by an accent on the use of the Authorized Version: Qualification 3 formulated by the Committee on New Members and adopted by the American Bible Revision Committee on 30 November 1872 (ABRC Minute Book, ABS Archives Box RG#86 0-3-6). Stanley had tried to persuade Schaff otherwise: Stanley to Schaff, 30 May 1871 (*Documentary History*, p. 46).

72. Ellicott to Schaff, 22 April 1872 (*Documentary History*, p. 59).

73. Abbot to Schaff, 14 March 1872 (ABS ABRC Correspondence - Philip Schaff Domestic 1871-81, Folder A); Abbot to Joseph Barber Lightfoot, 5 January 1872 (*DDC Lightfoot Papers*).

74. ABRC Minute Book, 4 October 1872 (ABS Committee and Sub-committee Records 1870-1887).

correspondence across the Atlantic,⁷⁵ doubtless to satisfy the 'needed confidence' that Bishop Ellicott had requested. Stanley's wit was wryly reported, 'One bishop is quite enough'.⁷⁶

Bishop Lee was clear, however, that all the fuss and pressure manifestly indicated a group, *not* separate individuals, a group carefully constructed to imitate in some measure the English Committee for Revision. As noted above, the English had earlier avowed that how the Americans chose to organize themselves was their affair,⁷⁷ and yet they soon began to be spoken of even by the English as a 'company'.⁷⁸ This communicated a decidedly unambiguous message to Schaff. He intended all along that the project be understood as an international project for English speakers by the two leading English-speaking nations.⁷⁹ The difficulty was that the authority for the two Companies of the English Committee was direct – the Convocation of Canterbury – and this was rehearsed often enough to make the point. But the same Convocation had not been as clear about specifically American appointment or involvement.

Much of the subsequent decade revolves around the effort to find a basis of authority that would carry similar if not equivalent weight for the Americans. Schaff and his Committee tried a range of possibilities. Schaff organized structures and procedures of operation to mirror the English Committee subdivided into two companies, one for the Old Testament, one for the New. He tirelessly promoted the work of revision by public lectures and media essays. He worked with Andrew Taylor to cultivate the monetary support of American subscribers, there being no arrangement with publishing houses to secure the finances. He accented the relative size of the American population and their interest in the Bible. He made constant reference if not deference to English advice. All these elements were tested as possible sources of authority for the work. The very introduction of such a range of conceivable anchors into the developing tensions in the American relationship with the English indicates the American sense of uncertainty about their own foundational authority for the enterprise.⁸⁰

75. Schaff to Ellicott, 12 October 1872 (*Documentary History*, p. 72).

76. *Documentary History*, p. 70.

77. Stanley to Schaff, 8 April 1871 (*ABS Foreign Correspondence*, Letter No. 112).

78. Ellicott to Schaff, 23 October 1871, conveying a resolution of the New Testament Company (*ABS Foreign Correspondence* Letter No. 42).

79. Stanley to Schaff, 13 January 1871 (*ABS Foreign Correspondence*, Letter No. 111).

80. See my 'Who Can Tamper with the Text? The Battles for Authority to Revise the KJV', forthcoming.

The fragility of the American position became devastatingly clear when the University Presses, who had since 1873 underwritten the costs of the project (to the tune of £20,000)⁸¹ in the United Kingdom, stepped in to prevent the English Companies sending any more of their drafts to the Americans for review.⁸² That the Companies meekly relayed this information to the Americans illustrates that their own authority was also being squeezed by the power of the purse – they had, as the return for the Presses' financial support, transferred copyright in the revision to the presses.⁸³ With the work of revision firmly into a review of the first draft, the University Presses had become concerned about the protection of their interests. Congressional legislation for copyright protection outlawing 'bootlegging' in the United States did not come in until 1891.⁸⁴

The festering sore of the level and status of the collaboration, which had begun in the lack of terminological clarity and was compounded by the different claims upon roles and functions, remained unresolved through to the end. Schaff's initial invitation to American scholars to an exploratory meeting in his Bible House study in late 1871 signalled *his* understanding or at least his intent. It was 'for the purpose of forming an *organization* to coöperate with the British Committee in the revision of the Authorised English Version of the Scriptures'.⁸⁵ The membership contained scholars from the sweep of Protestant denominations as in England, and added Reformed and Lutheran representatives as well.⁸⁶ Bishop Lee and the Revd Dr Washburn of Calvary Church, New York, made up the Episcopalian contingent.

The formalizing of the membership of the American Committee had barely been completed when serious dis-ease filtered through the ranks of the American scholars about the standing of their recommendations. Bishop Ellicott's letter of May 1873 announcing

81. F.C. Grant, *Translating the Bible* (Edinburgh: Thomas Nelson, 1961), p. 91. Schaff estimated the value of the University Presses' support in American money as \$100,000: Schaff, *Companion*, p. 402.

82. Letter of John Troutbeck, secretary to the New Testament Company, to Schaff, 14 June 1876 (*ABS Committee and Sub-Committee Records 1870–1887*).

83. 'University Press, Correspondence relating to the Revised Version', *CUL* Pr.B.4 ff. 1-18. This was in spite of an earlier resolution of the Companies themselves that they not alienate the copyright: 'Minutes and Related Papers of the Company for Revision of the Authorised Version of the New Testament', 13 July 1870, *CUL* Ms Add 6935, f. 10.

84. Hall and Goldstein, 'Diplomatisation of Culture', p. 131.

85. *ABRC Minute Book*, 7 December 1871 (my emphasis).

86. *Documentary History*, pp. 32–33, 54–55.

the intention of the English New Testament Company to begin work on the second revision of the Gospels in October of that same year made no reference to American suggestions nor, apparently, allowed sufficient time for the fledgling group to devise them. George Day, the American Committee's minute secretary, cryptically recorded 'some interchange of views'.⁸⁷ Schaff's forthcoming summer visit to England was, accordingly, given a *specific* brief to determine:

What weight shall the opinions of the American Committee have in determining the revision – and that he be authorised to intimate that we expect to have a positive and well defined weight in the decision; and further (if he shall find it necessary) that he request them to appoint those of their number who may come to America in October, to act with power as a committee of conference with us on this subject.⁸⁸

This 'weight' meant nothing less than a recognition that the biblical scholarship of the Americans had the same worth and ability as their English colleagues. The proof was to be found not in the discussions over various technicalities of text and translation but in the equal voting rights deciding the final wording.

Schaff brought back to the United States resolutions from each British Company. These introduced the mantra of English response that eventually began to irritate rather than placate, namely, they 'will give them the greatest possible weight'.⁸⁹ Matters came to a head with Schaff's next visit to England in 1875, fired as it was by the American Committee's resolve that they should be treated not as advisers but as fellow-revisers and fellow-authors. He mustered a range of arguments, of justice, honour and expediency designed ultimately to claim the moral authority of the American position, but with a tone designed to tweak English sensitivity:⁹⁰

1. The American companies mirrored the English organization; they contained leading biblical scholars from across the churches; they represented 40 million people; they were conscientious in their work and expected no payment; they had meticulously

87. *ABRC Minute Book*, 29 May 1873.

88. *ABRC Minute Book*, 31 May 1873.

89. The phrase comes from a later letter of Schaff to Dr James Cartmell, President of the Syndics of the Cambridge Press and clearly shows his frustration: Schaff to Cartmell, 5 May 1876 (*ABS RG#86 0-3-6 Reports, Papers, Correspondence, Letter books*).

90. A summary of his addresses to the two Companies was printed for private circulation: Robert Scott papers, *CUL Ms. Add. 9739*, folder 3. It is also found in the *Documentary History*, pp. 89–93.

authored their own work as a mature contribution to the process. 'It would be unreasonable', he said, 'to continue such an expensive machinery simply for giving advice.'

2. The honour of America was at stake, a 'spirit of self-respect and manly independence' that had been inherited from their British ancestors. This honour nevertheless carried economic consequences, with the prediction that continued liberality of support from American subscribers was dependent on recognition of the equality of labour from the American committee.⁹¹
3. Recognition of the American title in the work was critical to the acquisition of copyright to protect the resulting publication in America, crucial to avoidance of literary piracy.

Schaff went on to lay out some practical alternate measures that might be followed – joint conferences, select representatives of one nation sitting on the companies of the other – all designed to demonstrate the common authorship. Some on the English Companies had heard these arguments before. Schaff had already repeatedly raised the question of the quality and nature of the relationship between the Revision Companies of the two countries. But for this meeting, some English members had schooled him in the shaping of arguments. In the aftermath of a measure of success,⁹² when a revised printing of the abstract of Schaff's arguments and suggestions was being prepared for the English University Presses, Fenton Hort provided further refinements to the text, admitting 'I should not in any case have thought it right to criticise it as a document in which I had myself a responsibility'.⁹³

There was, however, one strategic mistake in Schaff's presentation. He raised for the first time in this larger theatre, the possibility of

91. Andrew Taylor was the financial secretary for the American Bible Revision Committee whose sole role was to garner contributions for the work (*ABS Taylor Schaff Correspondence*).

92. Both Companies agreed to a substantial modification of an earlier agreement, by looking to the appointment of certain members of each Company to serve on its parallel. The New Testament Company added a number of conditions, the most decisive being 'the express consent of the two University Presses' (*Documentary History*, p. 94).

93. Hort to Schaff, 14 July 1875 (*ABS Foreign Correspondence*, Letter No. 73). This was not the first time that a member of the Cambridge triumvirate had advised Schaff on the best approach to matters, mindful as they were of English sensitivities: Lightfoot to Schaff, 15 July 1872 (*ABS Foreign Correspondence*, Letter No. 78).

two editions, what later would be spoken of as two recensions, one for England and one for the United States. A particular consciousness of differences in the target audiences had been evolving touching on the acceptance of archaisms, the use of aoristic compared to perfect forms of verb construction, and this in spite of the avowed intent for greater literal accuracy in the Revision. This consciousness was compromising the repeated accents on a common tongue and a single Bible for English-speaking peoples.

But now the suggestion for two distinct editions became combined with a commercial difficulty, the details of which cannot be surveyed here. Suffice to say that in the long run, the decision was taken out of the hands of the Revision Companies by the University Presses who sensed that their hold on the commercial return for the new Revision, in both countries, might be devastated. Given that the University Presses were subventing most of the expenses of the British Companies (unlike the Americans who relied on private subscriptions from over 1200 people),⁹⁴ they began to call in the return on their investment. The English Companies found some of their organizational independence curtailed. The Presses also had an eye to the American market and extracted from the American Revision Companies a commitment to support the editions published by the University Presses.

In the end, the Americans adhered to their commitment to produce, as much as possible, a common Revision. Too much time and effort had been expended on the project and they settled for a narrower official recognition than that for which they argued. There was also the trust of many generous private contributors to be honoured. Certainly American public recognition abounded. Notice of the major unresolved differences in the rendering of the Revision between the American and British Companies was recorded in an Appendix.⁹⁵ This at least inferred the role the Americans had played in the final form of the revised text,⁹⁶ even if it also confirmed the fear-inducing polemics at the beginning of the project that the two nations would

94. The 'List of Contributors to the Fund for defraying the Expenses of the ABRC, October 1872 to Mar 1 1881' is found in the ABS 'ABRC Eng & Amer Comms and Directors of University Presses: Private and Confidential Documents 1873-1885'.

95. There were many more suggestions for changes made by the Americans: *List of Changes made in the Text of the Greek Testament by the Company of Revisers of the AV in CUL Ms Add 9739*, Scott papers, folder 6.

96. This seems to have been recognized in some quarters in England. A resolution of the Assembly of the Congregational Union of England and Wales,

produce different translations and thereby fuel uncertainty among ordinary Christian folk.⁹⁷ But the members worked assiduously to promote the official edition of the University Presses in the United States in the face of the predicted piracy and the irony of repeated substitutions of their own Appendix renderings into the main text, with the English wording transferred to the tail-end of the volume. The regularity with which this happened seems to indicate a matter of national pride as much as skill in translation.

The English Baptist, Joseph Angus, once confided to Schaff his own admiration of Schaff's work ethic.⁹⁸ This could have been extended in some measure to other members of the American companies who would even take a summer retreat together to catch up with the Revision drafts sent to them by the British Companies.⁹⁹ All the while there was a fastidious concern to accommodate the desires of the English Companies in their decisions about revisings and organization, in their helpfulness, in the courtesy of their correspondence and in a constant return to the discursive anchor of harmony, unity and cooperative achievement.¹⁰⁰ Attention to detail was paramount¹⁰¹ as was the accent on the credentials of those sitting on the American companies. One comment of an American reviser is revealing of motivation in all this. In 1874, Professor Joseph Packard of Virginia had been in England and he was invited to sit for half an hour with the British Old Testament Company at Westminster. He wrote to Schaff,

Judging from their discussions, our company would not at all suffer in comparison with them. Confidentially, I would say, that some of them seemed ignorant of a very plain construction in Hebrew.¹⁰²

(F'note continued)

carried on 4 October 1881 offered 'hearty thanks to the scholars of England and America' (*ABS Foreign Correspondence*, Letter No. 39, and attachment).

97. This was precisely the point made by J.W. Henley, the member for Oxfordshire, in the House of Commons debate in June 1870: *Hansard*, Vol. 202, p. 118.

98. Angus to Schaff, 8 February 1875 (*ABS Foreign Correspondence*, Letter No. 13). A similar acknowledgement from members of the American Companies was made at the conclusion of the privately distributed *Historical Account of the Work of the American Committee of Revision* (New York: Scribner, 1885), p. 56.

99. Schaff to Ellicott, 7 May 1872 (*ABS Papers and Correspondence*, Letterbook, p. 56).

100. See for example, Schaff to Ellicott, 24 November 1874.

101. See for last minute concerns that mistakes be corrected, Abbot to Schaff, 6 February 1876 (*ABS Schaff Domestic Correspondence*, 1871-1881, folder A).

102. Packard to Schaff, 8 July 1874 (*ABS ABRC Correspondence - Philip Schaff Domestic Correspondence*, 1871-1881, folder N-O-P).

Here we see a nation grasping the opportunity to display its growing confidence in its own biblical scholarship by involvement in the largest biblical project of the century. The belief that they were not to be patronized as advisers but were fellow-revisers was as much about national identity, the standing of American academia and the growing confidence before Old World scholars, as it was about authorial rights.

After publication, the English Companies disbanded,¹⁰³ leaving a preface to the Revised Version New Testament that could not, through the pen of Bishop Ellicott, find its way to acknowledging the Americans as fellow-revisers. An Appendix of alternate readings was tacked on to the translation, introduced with a heading that intimated patronizing largesse rather than recognition of equally valid renderings: 'List of readings and renderings preferred by the American Committee, recorded at their desire.' This was not the explanation Schaff had drafted.¹⁰⁴ The American Companies, however, voted to continue their work, breaking their English connection and turning to German scholarship for more advanced examination of the Hebrew text.¹⁰⁵ The 'Anglophile tendency' that Gary Pranger sees in Philip Schaff was now considerably dampened.¹⁰⁶ Once all obligations to the University Presses were fulfilled, the Companies produced the distinctive American Standard Version in 1901 – an event Schaff did not live to see.¹⁰⁷

Certain trans-Atlantic friendships, cooperation and respect survived the ruptured collaboration of the project, with Schaff introducing the

103. Strictly, work on the Apocrypha remained to be done but again the simmering conflict interfered with a cooperative venture. The revision of the Apocrypha (which was included in the first edition of the Authorized Version), was broached in November 1877, with the initial intent that, for the sake of 'uniformity of character ... the whole body of the Revisers' was to be involved 'as far as practicable' (*CUL Ms Add 9739*, Scott papers, folder 3). In the end, this was not adopted as a resolution (20 February 1878), and despite American enquiries, 'no cooperation is contemplated' (Troutbeck to Schaff, 20 August 1881; *ABS Papers and Correspondence*).

104. Schaff to Ellicott, 8 July 1881 (*ABS Papers and Correspondence*). The heading to the Appendix as sent by the American Committee read: 'The American NT revision Co having in many cases yielded their preference for certain readings and renderings, present the following instances in which they differ from the Eng Co as in their view of sufficient importance to be appended to the Revision, in accordance with an understanding between the Companies.'

105. *ABS Papers and Correspondence*, Letterbook, p. 587.

106. Pranger, *Philip Schaff*, p. 66.

107. Schaff died in 1893.

new Westcott and Hort Greek text to the American public. As the Unitarian, Ezra Abbot, confided to Philip Schaff,

If Canon Westcott or Bp Lightfoot had written the Preface we should have had, I believe, a frank and handsome acknowledgment not merely that the American suggestions had been 'closely and carefully considered' but that many of them had been found valuable, and adopted.¹⁰⁸

For the Cambridge triumvirate at least, nothing was to be lost to England's reputation by the acknowledgment of America's. But the intense political struggles locked into the international efforts for the revision of the Authorized Version, left a distinct shadow over Anglo-American relations for a considerable time to come, dark enough to ensure that future enterprises (such as the *Revised Standard Version* and the *New English Bible*) were distinctly national rather than international efforts.

108. Abbot to Schaff, 10 June 1881 (*ABS Domestic Correspondence* folder A). Abbot had maintained a friendship with Lightfoot from the beginning of the English revision: see Abbot to Lightfoot, 4 May 1870 (*DDC Lightfoot Papers*).