

The Translation of the Word

By: Bobby Graham

1977

The Revised Standard Version

The New English Bible

Today's English Version

The Living Bible

The New American Standard Version

The New World Translation

The New International Version

The Amplified Bible

New Testament in Modern English

The Translation of the Word

If people are to have access to the Word of the Lord, then it must be accurately and faithfully translated - that is, it must be conveyed from the languages in which it was originally written by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit (1 Cor. 2:10; Eph. 3:3-5; 2 Tim. 3:16; 2 Pet. 1:20, 21) - Hebrew for the Old Testament and Greek for the New Testament. If the Word is not translated correctly, then there is no Word of God, but the twisting and perversion of the so-called translator.

The translator, then, must himself be an honest individual, willing to place principle ahead of personal belief so that the Word of God might always show through. If he places his own ideas ahead of principles of correct translation, then his work will become a hodgepodge of false and distorted notions, capable of misleading people into the belief and practice of error. It is important, therefore, to learn about the translator as well as the translation, lest his own ideas take us unaware through his faulty work.

Some principles for determining the worthiness of a particular version of the Scriptures are timely: (1) Not every translation is correct, and no translator is inspired of God to do his work. (Any version claiming inspiration or special guidance for the translator bears watching.) (2) If translation is done accurately, we do not lose the original meaning, as some claim, but rather gain it! (3) Though clear, understandable English is desirable, it should not be gained at the expense of truth, as has been done with most modern versions. What good is clear, understandable English that does not translate the truth? (4) All words added as thought necessary by the translator should be italicized to signal their addition. This is violated by the Revised Standard Version and the New English Bible. (5) Group translations are much more preferable than one-man translations because the one man would be more likely to impose his ideas, doctrines, and comments upon his work, not being restrained or checked by the group. Most modern versions are the work of one man - for example, Today's English Version (Good News for Modern Man) and The Living Bible.

The chief reason for alarm and concern over the modern versions of the Bible is that their producers, almost to a man, do not believe in the inspiration of the Bible or the deity of Jesus Christ. We can not, therefore, expect them to handle God's Word carefully or to present Jesus as the Son of God. Those who do hold to the verbal inspiration of the Word and the deity of Jesus have, in many cases, pushed some false notion through their work: original sin, salvation by faith alone, the miraculous work of the Holy Spirit today, premillennialism, etc.

It is with these thoughts in mind that we appeal for concern on the part of the reader for a correct version. To this end we shall be exploring the different versions that have flooded the market in recent years.

The Revised Standard Version

This version, a purported revision of the American Standard Version of 1901, has served as a vehicle for modernism since its publication. Its appearance in 1947 was the result of an effort on the part of liberals, especially the liberal National Council of Churches. Its translators were extremely modernistic, denying the inspiration of the Bible and the deity of Jesus Christ.

One of the major faults of this version is its omission of italics whenever words have been supplied by the translators, thus giving no indication of where the sacred text spoke or where the translators spoke.

Another of its major faults is its attack on the miraculous conception of Jesus in the womb of Mary

by the Holy Spirit by means of its faulty rendering of "virgin" in Isaiah 7:14 as "young woman" and its change of Mary's "I know not a man" in Luke 1:34 to "I have no husband." Another area of the modernistic attack is the deity of Jesus, His being the only begotten Son of God. In John 3:16 and in five other verses the expression "only begotten" is mishandled in such a way as to cast doubt on the deity of Christ and to verify the deliberate attempts of the unbelievers on the translating committee. The New English Bible, the British counterpart in the liberal movement of the Revised Standard Version in the United States, does the same damage in the area of Jesus' miraculous conception and His being the only begotten Son of God. That pernicious paperback perversion, Good News for Modern Man, does the same thing to Jesus' deity.

This RSV also butchered Jesus' avowed relationship to the Law and the prophets in Matthew 5:17 by having Him say that He came not to abolish, but to fulfill. To the contrary, He did come to abolish it according to God's eternal purpose and to enact a better covenant to take its place. Paul even said that the Old Law had been abolished by Jesus' death on the cross. (Eph. 2:15.) Yes, the same version has Jesus doing exactly what they have Him saying He did not come to do! The point of Matthew 5:17 is not the abolishment of the Law, but Jesus' attitude and action toward it. He meant that He did not come to destroy it, to run roughshod over it and to disregard it, but rather to respect it, to observe it, and by so doing to fill it full or to complete it; and that means abolish it!

The final area of fault in the Revised Standard Version that we shall concern ourselves with in this brief study is its omission of the final paragraph of Mark 16, for which there is completely adequate evidence that it was a part of Mark's original record of the life of Christ. The RSV, however, leaves it out of the text and relegates it to the position of a footnote.

On the basis of these and other glaring weaknesses, the RSV does not deserve a place with the King James Version and the American Standard Version. Its poisonous parts are enough to render it unusable for teaching the whole gospel and for propagating New Testament Christianity.

The New English Bible

This product of the 1960's was to England what the Revised Standard Version was to United States, a vehicle for modernism. Its producers were not men of faith in the inspiration of the Bible; their product bears out their lack of faith.

The absence of italics to mark additions by the translators is one of the chief weaknesses. A host of passages become unclear as to speaker because of the missing italicized letters. This version throws the word Christian around with abandon, using the word some 32 times; the fact is that it appears only 3 times in the Word of God.

Peter receives special emphasis as the rock in Matthew 16:18 through the capitalization of the word Rock. The fact is, of course, that the word did not refer to Peter at all, but to the fact of truth just confessed by Peter, as 1 Corinthians 3:11 also indicates.

A serious mistake appears in Matthew 1:18, where the translators rendered "before they came together" (what the text really says) as "before their marriage." Such inexcusable rendering provides something of a basis for the idea that Jesus was the illegitimate child of Mary and Joseph, an idea held to by many modernists.

The doctrine of justification by grace alone gets some support from this version's wording of Romans 3-24, where the word alone was added to the verse.

The miraculous conception of Jesus and His deity come into doubt if one accepts the mistranslations of Isaiah 7:14, Luke 1:34, and the six "only-begotten" passages in the writings of John.

The role of the Holy Spirit in creation is denied in Genesis 1:2, where this version has "the wind swept."

According to this version's rendering of Matthew 5:17, Jesus did not come to abolish the Law and the prophets. Though the word here can mean abolish, such is not the idea in this passage: Jesus was stressing His respect for the Law so that He might fulfill it. He did abolish the Law, according to Ephesians 2:15.

Acts 20:7 says Saturday night instead of the first day of the week; Mark 1:4 speaks of baptism as a token of repentance; Matthew 16:22 has "Heaven forbid" for Peter's "Be it far from thee, Lord"; Romans 11:26 aids premillennialism with "when the whole of Israel shall be saved" instead of showing how Israel could be saved with the word so; 1 Corinthians 2:14 offers help to the idea of the miraculous work of the Spirit in conversion when it says "unsaved man can't understand"; it has Paul stating his opinion in 1 Corinthians 7:25, 40; the mystery of godliness in 1 Timothy 3:16 is "our religion"; spirit is breath in James 2:26; "the language of ecstasy" appears in 1 Corinthians 14:2; Paul "sponged on no one" in 2 Corinthians 11:9; 1 Corinthians 16:8 puts Whitsuntide, a religious festival of the Church of England, for Pentecost. 1 Corinthians 5:9, 10, speaks of loose livers; and the popular (not true) saying of 1 Timothy 3:1 is related to aspiring to leadership.

Such a perversion is not worthy of the name Bible.

Today's English Version

This abominable product of one man, one of the darling productions of denominationalists, makes every effort to write the denominational creeds into a so-called Bible. In this one, there is a deliberate effort on the part of Mr. Bratcher to eliminate the idea of atonement by the blood of Christ and all idea of blood by changing the word blood to other words - 16 times in reference to the blood of Christ and 20 times in reference to other blood than Christ's.

Along with the Revised Standard Version and the New English Bible, this unwarranted piece of literature removes the word begotten in John's writings, as in John 3:16; and it has Jesus disavowing any intent to abolish the Law and the prophets, but "to give them real meaning" in Matthew 5:17; puts Peter as the rock in Matthew 16:18, although Jesus did not say that Peter was the rock; says Saturday night in Acts 20:7, as well as referring to the fellowship meal instead of breaking bread, as it also does in Acts 2:42.

The doctrine of faith alone gets its share of support in Romans 1:17 and 3:27, 28, by the addition of the words only and alone.

Romans 3:25; 5:9; Ephesians 1:7; and 1 Peter 1:18 are just four passages where the word blood was removed as uncultured and repugnant to the mind of Mr. Bratcher.

1 Corinthians 2:14 refers to "the man who does not have the Spirit," instead of the natural man as in the Greek text; 1 Corinthians 14:2 lends aid to the current error on tongues by speaking of "strange sounds" rather than unknown tongues.

Acts 2:1 supports the idea that all believers received the baptism of the Holy Spirit.

Galatians 1:22 refers to Christian churches, inserting the word Christian where there is no

justification for doing so.

The TEV has Jesus saying in Matthew 9:13 that He came not to call "respectable people, but the outcasts," but such wording does not even come near the idea Jesus meant to convey, though it does express the social gospel view of Jesus' mission.

The language of inspiration was overlooked in order to talk about certain ones going to hell in Acts 8:20; Galatians 1:8, 9.

Matthew 3:11 sets baptism forth as a means of showing that repentance has already taken place, but John's statement spoke of baptism unto repentance.

1 Corinthians 16:2 talks of putting something aside, as if it could be a private action performed at home, but the verse really speaks of putting something into a common treasury to prevent a later collection.

Such disrespect for the Word of God is intolerable, especially in a so-called Bible!

The Living Bible

An admitted paraphrase (putting what the author thought the verses mean rather than what the original text says), this book was composed by Kenneth Taylor for his children on his way to work. A simple reading is enough to convince the reader that, after all, not much time or thought was required to produce this one! The book has slang and curse words; two picture editions of the Living Bible, The Jesus Book and Reach Out, use pictures of trances, rock music groups, and couples in embrace to illustrate (imagine it!) the inspired Scriptures. Outright vulgarity appears in the Old Testament section of this "children's book."

At least two errors appear in Genesis 1: verse one has "when God began creating" and later in the chapter we find "period of time" used to explain the days of creation. A later Genesis passage, 6:2, says, "Evil beings from the spirit world became sexually involved with human women."

The plan of salvation could not be learned from this perversion. It speaks of Abraham finding favor with God by faith alone in Romans 4:12; says that trusting (faith) is a gift from God in Ephesians 2:8; words Romans 8:3 thusly: "We aren't saved from sin's grasps by knowing the commandments of God, because we can't and don't keep them"; and Romans 6:3 like this: "We became Christians and were baptized."

Instead of maintaining Paul's contrast between the partial information available to any one person under the administration of the miraculous and the full knowledge under the completed revelation of God's Word, 1 Corinthians 13:10 says, "When we have been made perfect," without any warrant whatsoever.

The false idea of inherited sin is taught in Ephesians 2:3 ("being born with evil natures") and in Psalms 51:5 ("born a sinner").

Romans 8:16 talks about the Spirit speaking to us in our hearts and telling us that we are God's children, is a real distortion of what the verse really says. "Only those who have the Holy Spirit within them can understand what the Holy Spirit means," according to 1 Corinthians 2:14 - another twisting to teach the direct operation of the Holy Spirit.

Premillennialism comes in for its share of help in 2 Timothy 4:1, which speaks of Christ appearing to set up His kingdom; Isaiah 2:2, in speaking of Jerusalem and the Temple becoming the world's greatest attraction in the last days; and Revelation 7:14, where special emphasis is given to the Great Tribulation by

means of its capitalization.

The crude language of the gutter, not what the text says, is found in 1 Samuel 20:30; Genesis 19:5; 2 Samuel 11:4; and John 9:34.

Such flippancy as to be absurd occurs in Isaiah 5:14; Ecclesiastes 10:11; 1 Kings 20:11; and Acts 23:3.

It should be obvious that genuine respect for the Word of God is just as lacking among those who claim to be giving the world a more readable Bible as it is among unbelievers and agnostics.

The New American Standard Version

This was a purported effort to revise the American Standard Version of 1901, because of the conviction of the members of the revising committee that the American Standard Version was valuable and deserving of perpetuation. While the purpose of the committee might be recognized by many as noble and commendable, the end product is inferior to the version of 1901 because the principles and procedures used are, to some extent, faulty.

The "Principles of Revision" noted at the beginning of the NASV state that "a change was made in the direction of a more current English idiom" (manner of speaking is what they mean, B.L.G.) when the committee felt that the literal translation of the American Standard Version was not acceptable to the modern reader. It would be interesting to know those literal passages that were thought unacceptable to the modern reader and the reasons why they were so judged. This very principle of getting away from literal translation is justified only when the literal translation does not carry the thought of the original into the English language. Where was this the case in the American Standard Version of 1901? This faulty principle of revision is possibly responsible for the bad rendering of 1 Peter 3:20, "brought safely through the water," instead of "saved through [or by, B.L.G.] water." The rendering of the NASV makes it appear that the water was not God's means for saving Noah and his family from the destruction, but rather the thing they needed to be saved from. This is not the point of this passage in its context!

The premillennial bias of the revision committee shows through in Revelation 11:17 ("has begun to reign") and possibly other passages.

Just as the producers of the Revised Standard Version, the New English Bible, and Today's English Version (also called Good News for Modern Man), so do these ruin Matthew 5:17 by having Jesus say that He did not come to abolish the Law and the prophets, although Paul said that He did do this very thing in Ephesians 2:15.

A grave mistake occurs in Acts 10:43, where the idea of salvation or forgiveness even before believing finds support ("every one who believes in Him has received forgiveness of sins"). Acts 15:11 puts eternal salvation too soon through the rendering "are saved," for the text reads "to be saved" or "shall be saved."

Acts 15:14 indicates that God's first concern was for the Gentiles, whereas the text actually says that God at first (of the events being rehearsed) visited the Gentiles with salvation.

Romans 4:9 aids the idea of salvation by faith alone in its use of the word as, instead of the actual word unto. Abraham's faith was counted to him unto (in order to obtain) righteousness, not as righteousness. God's justification of him did not coincide with his faith, but followed it.

1 Corinthians has at least three faulty passages: 5:1, 9-11 (immorality, not the equivalent of

fornication); 7:25, 40, (opinion, not the same as judgment); and 16:2 (put something aside, not the same as "lay by in store," especially in view of Paul's stated purpose).

Other bad renderings include 1 Peter 3:19 (unjustified addition of the word now, though it is italicized); 2 John 9 ("goes too far"- permits going beyond but not too far beyond); and Revelation 1:1 (communicated instead of signified, meaning "to set forth in symbols," as the word really means).

Even this version is undesirable.

The New World Translation

This abominable work of the Watchtower Society, first published around 1950 and revised since that time, does a first-class job of butchering the Biblical text in an effort to pave the way for many of the erroneous views of the Jehovah's Witnesses. In many cases it becomes evident to a knowledgeable person that the translators knew precious little about what they were supposed to be doing: it is no wonder that the Watchtower Society refuses to reveal the names of the so-called translators.

Their denial of the personality and spiritual nature of the Holy Spirit starts off their work in Genesis 1:2, where they have "active force," and that is what they believe Him to be. One of their books even explained Him to be something like a radar beam.

Their false idea concerning the nature of man - that he is totally physical, having no spirit - shows through in Matthew 27:50, for there they said that Jesus "yielded up his breath." In a parallel account, Luke 23:46, it would have been absurd to translate breath, and they gave us spirit. This is a clear case of their doctrine driving them to mistranslate God's Word to support their idea, but not being able to do the job consistently.

The Witnesses' denial of the deity of Jesus finds expression in John 1:1; "a god" is what they call Him. Here again, they were driven by doctrine; but in John 1:6, 12, 13, and 18, they did not give the same treatment to the same identical words in the original language because in these verses the reference is not to Jesus (whose deity they deny), but to the Father (whose deity they accept). Their inconsistencies occur in numerous other verses. In Colossians 1:16 and other verses of that context, the Witnesses added the word other in an effort to substantiate their view that Jesus was a created being, not a divine being. Try beating that one for unscrupulous mishandling of God's Word!

They tried to remove the idea of existence after death for the spirit of man in their rendering of Philippians 1:23. Instead of putting depart, they put releasing, even as they did in 2 Timothy 4:6 and even explained this in the appendix at the back of the book.

In another assault on Christ's deity, Philippians 2:6 says that Christ "gave no consideration to a seizure, namely that he should be equal to God." Imagine such a mistranslation! Why, it forces the verse to say exactly the opposite of what the text really teaches. The truth of the passage is that Jesus did not think the being on an equality with God was a thing to be grasped or held on to, even though He existed in the form of God. He was willing to lay His heavenly rank, position, and glory down that He might come to earth to die for man.

Anointing, to them, is "greasing" in James 5:14, in a somewhat humorous rendering.

Reflecting their view that Jesus came in 1914, though the coming was invisible, 2 Thessalonians 2:1 speaks of His presence and urges the people not to be upset by any message to the effect that the day of the Lord is at hand.

These are some of the "abominations of desolation" in the NWT.

The New International Version

This recent version seems at first examination to be a commendable effort, having several advantages to commend it. The belief of the translators in the authority and trustworthiness of the Bible, the techniques of translation detailed in the "Introduction," and the dubious distinction of having a member of the church of Christ on the committee, albeit the church was represented as a denomination in the same paragraph. These considerations have made some enthusiastic concerning this work.

Upon closer examination, however, the work itself fails to fulfill our hopes. Its failings are numerous. The first inadequacy, we think, is the omission of italics from the text, thus leaving the reader without any indication of words thought necessary by the translators. Furthermore, in spite of the Introduction's admission that the precise meaning of some passages could not be ascertained, this version fails to translate the exact words of the original text. If there is ever a need for such translation, it is especially needed in those passages. We surely do not need the theological ideas of the translating committee. The value of truth and our need for it demand that we have the words of the original writers to make a determination of what they meant, in correspondence with other passages. What the translators thought they meant is without value in a translation. Witness 1 Corinthians 15:29 ("Why are people baptized for them?") as an example. Here the mistranslation points in the wrong direction of thought. A correct rendering of the words of Paul, on the other hand, lets the reader draw his own conclusion in keeping with truth.

The content of the version manifests that the cloak of Calvinism has been wrapped around the effort, particularly the pernicious poison of inherent total depravity, with which the epistles reek. Ten times in Romans (7:5, 18, 25; 8:3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 12, 13), once in 1 Corinthians (5:50), six times in Galatians (13, 16, 17, 19, and 24 in chapter 5, and 6:8), once in Ephesians (2:3), twice in Colossians (2:11 and 13), and twice in 2 Peter (2:10 and 18) the word "flesh" is rendered "sinful nature."

This version has Jesus disavowing any intent to abolish the law and prophets in Matthew 5:17, but Paul said that was the very thing He accomplished in Ephesians 2:15. The word abolish does not convey the idea of Jesus in this passage; He meant He did not come to be destructive toward. Abolishment was necessary after His fulfillment of the law.

Mark 16:9-20 is classified as second rate Scripture when completely adequate evidence for it exists. Romans 4:3 mistranslates "as" instead of "for" or "unto," as it should be a word looking toward Abraham's justification. The "man without the Spirit" in 1 Corinthians 2:14 is not what Paul said, nor is "perfection" in 1 Corinthians 13:10 ("the perfect thing" or "that which is perfect" in the text). Such instances make learning the truth without the poison of error almost impossible with the sole use of some of the newer versions. Those of us who know the truth need to consider those who do not and point them to a correct version.

The inadequacy of the word stands out in 1 Thessalonians 1:5 ("not simply in words"), and "with deep conviction" is not the assurance Paul provided by means of the miraculous powers he worked in Thessalonica. Nor is "become" the same either in idea or in doctrine as "begotten" in Hebrews 1:5.

Can we not see the inferiority of this version?

The Amplified Bible

The Amplified New Testament was published in 1958, with the Amplified Old Testament coming in two parts in 1962 and 1964. The whole Bible in this series is a product of the middle 1960's. The Lockman Foundation, responsible for the New American Standard, is also the instigator of this book. The original intent of the Amplified Bible was a good one. It was to make the meaning of various words and expressions of the Biblical text clearer to the reader. If such had been carried out without bias, strictly according to the meanings of words, who could fault such a purpose? The doctrinal bias, however, was not discarded; and the strict meanings of words were not adhered to. The consistent use of brackets for the explanations and elaborations was not even maintained. Read John 17 and 1 Corinthians 2 to see examples of amplifications not inserted in brackets.

The Calvinistic assumptions of the committee definitely show through in Psalms 51:5, where the idea of inborn sin is sometimes asserted; but in this version it is written into the verse in the brackets. It is easy to see this idea, for the cross references accompanying this verse are Romans 5:12 and Ephesians 2:3, two other passages used to support the same false doctrine. Romans 4:3-6 has three significant errors: (1) the translation of "unto" as "as," leaving the impression that there is an exchange of justification for faith, when the original actually places justification after ("unto" or "in order to") the believing; (2) the equating of justification, or righteousness, as "right living," whereas the original word involves a legal declaration of a verdict - not guilty; and (3) its invalidation of any effort of man in verse 7, where works designed to earn justification were in view in the context; but the committee put "the works he does."

In a passage contrasting flesh and spirit, the Amplified Bible places "Holy Spirit," not just "spirit" as the original had it.

1 Corinthians 7:2 renders "fornication" as "immorality," a term with too much latitude and not enough specificity. Verse 25 of the same chapter has Paul giving his "opinion." This is far different from the inspired judgment or conclusion that he was giving.

Ephesians 5:19 renders "singing" as "offering praise with voices and instruments." It is true that the word psallo (making melody) involved plucking the strings of an instrument (in this case the heart, as named in the verse), but ado (singing) does not. This version is based on poor Greek and poor English.

The signs and symbols of Revelation are lost sight of in the rendering "communicated" of Revelation 1:1.

As is evident and will become even more obvious from detailed study of this version, in some places it over-amplifies while in others it is not ample.

New Testament in Modern English

The Revised Edition of this book by J. B. Phillips makes some changes in his earlier edition, especially omitting his earlier interpolated remarks that he now recognizes as unjustified. We can appreciate his admission and yet point out some other areas in which improvements are mandatory if his book be correct.

The Introduction, however, serves notice of the essential weakness of the author's work - a weakness spelled m-o-d-e-r-n-i-s-m. He does admit paraphrase in places. He likewise expresses doubt of Paul's concern that he be consistent in his writing, obviously excluding any possibility of Divine inspiration. Notice how inconsistent his view is with Paul's insistence on consistency found in 1 Corinthians

7:17. His introduction to the Book of Matthew also includes the liberal view of the source from which the author, "whom we can still conveniently call Matthew," gained his information. The same liberalism and anti-supernaturalism is also evident in the introduction to the Book of John. We need not get overjoyed and expect too much from a man with such a low view of Scripture. He will not approach his work with the respect and care needed, will he?

Notice the following mistakes, only a beginning of the complete list that could be given:

(1) Matthew 16:18 - He calls Peter the rock, "and it is on this rock that I am going to found my church."

(2) Luke 1:34 -He has Mary avowing the impossibility of her being with child because "I am not married."

(3) John 1:1 - Instead of affirming that Jesus was in the beginning, he says, "In the beginning God expressed himself."

(4) John 1:14 and 3:16 -He removes the word "begotten" and the idea of Jesus' being the begotten Son of God.

(5) Acts 8:20 -In crude language he has Peter saying, "To hell with you and your money!" Peter did not say that!

(6) Romans 1:16 - "I see it as the very power. . . ." (Emphasis mine, B.L.G.)

(7) Romans 11:26 - ". . . all Israel will be saved."

(8) 1 Corinthians 11:4, 5 - Propheying is "preaching" to him.

(9) Galatians 3:1 - The foolish Galatians become "dear idiots."

(10) Galatians 3:27 - He omits "for," an important word introducing the cause of their sonship and changes "Christ" to "family likeness of Christ."

(11) Hebrews 9:15 - The testament is weakened to an "argument."

(12) Hebrews 10:9 - He has the old order of sacrifices being removed and the Lord establishing a new order of obedience. This is downright perversion!

(13) 1 Peter 3:20 - Noah and family were saved "from the water," destroying the analogy to baptism so beautifully pictured in the passage. It compares their delivery from destruction by means of water to our salvation from sin by the water of baptism, by Jesus' resurrection.

Such wanton disregard for inspired Scripture as is manifested in Phillips' additions, deletions, and changes leaves little doubt concerning the reliability of this version.

Concluding Statement

While this material does not discuss all versions or any one version in exhaustive detail, it does give the reader an idea of the areas in which several versions are weak and erroneous. The versions considered, like all others, are not all wrong; but they do have enough error in them as to render them unusable except in very close connection with a more reliable one, such as the American Standard Version (1901) or the King James Version (1611). This effort should not be interpreted to mean that either of the versions just named is completely free of mistakes, but their errors are not so numerous or so damaging as most of these considered here.