

The Sun. FRIDAY, JULY 1, 1891.

welfare of the State, that this foul pool of corruption should be soon and thoroughly cleansed?

Will the Revised Version be Accepted?

There is no doubt that the revisers of the authorized English translation of the New Testament have done their work reasonably well from the point of view of textual selection and Biblical learning. Such is the well-nigh unanimous verdict on the part of persons competent to express an opinion on the subject, but the critical result of their labors is one thing, the practical result another. The large company of erudite men who have been engaged for ten years in this work was not organized to enlighten scholars, who knew already how and where the old version was defective. Their new translation is intended not for the library, but for every-day use in the households of plain people.

A Shameful Spectacle.

There is no longer any doubt as to the official position of Judge ROBERTSON. It is now publicly given out from Washington that his commission as Collector of the Port of New York has been signed by the President, and forwarded to him.

Judge ROBERTSON knows very well that his longer acting as State Senator is in violation of the constitution of this country. His only defence is strictly technical, and consists in the fact that he has not formally accepted the appointment to the Collectorship. In truth and in fact, by implication and in reality, he has accepted.

One Lawyer Enough.

Our esteemed contemporary, the Cincinnati Commercial, occasionally devotes its thoughts to the Star route thieves.

In one of its recent discussions of the Commercial upon this subject, the remark is presented that "Gen. BRADY should not employ too many lawyers."

Now, this is the truth, but not the whole truth. In fact, Gen. BRADY does not now employ any new lawyer at all. He has enough legal help already. Long before the present curious crisis had been imagined, Gen. BRADY entered into an arrangement with one lawyer who is attorney sufficient. He does not need at present to trouble himself about retaining any other member of the profession.

Clear It Out!

First comes bribery at Albany, and then perjury. The one so often makes the other unavoidable that even the violated oath is beginning to pass without provoking more than a smile.

First we have SESSIONS. Even those who dispute his attempt to bribe BRADLEY, cannot have any doubt about his perjuring himself when he deliberately swore that he did not remember the name of a single person for whom he had lobbied, or the character of a single bill that during nine years he had tried to put through.

Then there is EDWARDS.

Four Assemblymen testified that he had approached them with corrupt proposals to vote for CHASEY M. DEWEY, and one that he had actually offered an envelope containing money as a reward for a vote on a railroad bill. But EDWARDS was examined before the Grand Jury of Albany County the other day, and is reported to have made a sweeping denial of the charge. Does anybody believe his denial? Yet Mr. EDWARDS continues to ply his vocation of lobbying about the capital, and meets Senators SESSIONS, WOODIN, and WAGNER, Mr. CHANCEY M. DEWEY, and other Half Breed leaders at the rooms of A. D. BARBER, the chief lobbyist, and is hailed there as the same old man.

Then there are A. D. BARBER, and E. R. PHILIPS, lobbyists.

BARBER'S rooms form a pleasant place of entertainment for men who possess the power of voting in the Legislature, and for those who know how to influence votes, and for those who are willing to pay for votes. Gentlemenly games of cards are played there. Why does BARBER go to the expense of keeping up this place of entertainment? Who pays him for it? Between the 24th of May and the 8th of June, at a time when bribes were being offered right and left, we find this man with EDWARDS and PHILIPS, and with TILGHMIST and several Senators, resorting to the suspicious action of getting checks for large amounts converted into currency. Yet when BARBER and PHILIPS are called before the Grand Jury, they, too, swear that they know nothing incriminating about anybody. But they go on as before with their business, and BARBER'S rooms are as much a place of resort as ever.

Then there is TILGHMIST, Vice-President of the New York Central Railroad Company.

Does any man possessed of common sense believe that TILGHMIST took to Buffalo the \$20,000 in currency that he obtained upon the Albany? Yet he thins himself safe enough to swear that he did not. He was not willing to confess and consign various friends and confederates to the penitentiary. He met the emergency very coolly, and seems none the worse for it in the estimation of his confederates.

Then, too, we have WILLIAM A. GRAYES, of SPENCER, TRASK & Co., bankers.

To get SESSIONS out of difficulty, he testified that he had recognized a week after they had been paid out, the identical bank notes constituting a sum of \$6,000 down to SESSIONS on the 7th of June. But a disinterested reporter who has been in Albany, and who has seen the money, and the untruthfulness of the testimony was demonstrated by an experiment before the investigating Committee. Thus, even a man not himself implicated in any bribery, and of previously good reputation, appears to think it necessary to perjure himself because bribery had been attempted by others.

As to the bribery prevalent at Albany, a remarkable commentary was furnished by Assemblyman ALBERTSON'S testimony.

When EDWARDS offered him an envelope containing money to pass him for a vote, he carried away one of the envelopes, systematically arranged in the envelope, and distributed on pay day to the employees in large mercantile houses.

To such a pass have things come in our Legislature and capital city. No shadow rests upon the higher and purer. The only man who is assailed and described is he who does his duty and manfully exposes the bribe.

It is not time, for the credit and for the

revised English version of the New Testament, whatever its scholastic merits, will have in the end a larger measure of practical success than it has in Germany, the west-most and the best-cultivated efforts to displace LUTHER'S translation?

Gen. Merritt Goes to London.

Judge ROBERTSON was appointed Collector of this port several months ago, but was allowed to remain in the Senate at Albany leading the Half Breed campaign against Mr. ROBERTSON.

Gen. MERRITT was at first disconcerted by the peculiar sort of civil service reform illustrated by his removal to London, and inclined to rebel against it. He had not been consulted. He was acceptable to the business men of the community. His commission had two years to run. He believed in the President's professions, and thought himself secure for that time. Suddenly, he found himself transformed from Collector into a Consul, supplanting Biographer BARDEAU.

Gen. MERRITT went to Washington to inquire the meaning of this transformation. It is said that he found out some things that are not known to the public, one of them being that the exchange to London would prove of advantage to his pocket. The regular salary of that office, as of the Consulates at Paris, Havana, and Rio de Janeiro, is \$6,000 a year. No perquisites are supposed to exist. This is a mistake, for between agencies, fees not returnable under the regulations, and a return of \$7,000 or \$8,000 a year to the incumbent.

No wonder that Gen. BARDEAU, military historian, should give to give up the pleasant place in which his life has been cast for nearly twelve years. No wonder he should complain of the ingratitude of the Republic.

He Saw Light Suddenly.

All the official reports made by THÉOPHILE FRENCH, Auditor of Railroad Accounts, and all the official action based upon these reports, have been uniformly adverse to the Central Pacific corporation. He charged the owners of that road with intentional evasion of the TRUMAN act, and with a policy intended to defraud the Government.

According to FRENCH'S statements, that corporation owed the sinking fund \$3,000,000 for the two and a half years under the TRUMAN act ending Dec. 31, 1880, and had only paid of that sum \$775,000. In the face of this default, it had assumed to declare dividends contrary to the law.

At the instance of the Auditor, suit was brought by the United States in the Circuit Court of New York to protect the Treasury against these violations of the TRUMAN act. Recently, District Attorney WOODFORD asked for instructions, and then it appeared that FRENCH had advised that the case be dropped. That suit involved something far more important than the sum due to the sinking fund, or the right to declare dividends when an apparent default forbade it. The Central Pacific corporation has constantly and arbitrarily refused to reckon among its liabilities more than twenty million dollars contrary to the law.

It is curious how imperfectly the graduates of our colleges learn to write the English language. We find in a series of school assignments published this week that a Harvard graduate who has taken honors "wishes to secure a position as instructor. Another who has done well in his college work, and who has studied several years abroad, "desires a position as professor," and so on. Some half dozen of these learned gentlemen all announce in this way that their education has not been sufficient to inform them of the truth, that a situation, an office, or a post, is not to be secured by any different method. They should be sent to school again.

If the friends of the American collegians at Harley yesterday indulged at all in the cry, "Cornell is a disgrace," they were not far from the mark. The spirit of the college is not ascribed to a date earlier than the middle of the sixth century, manifestly reproduces not JEROME'S, but the older Latin version. Such was the slow and difficult progress made by a revision accredited by the name of one of the most eminent of the Christian fathers, and backed by the authority of the Church of Rome.

Scarcely less discouraging is the opposition which seems to have been encountered by the authorized or King JAMES'S version itself for many years after its publication. We must bear in mind that this did not purport to be an entirely new translation, but merely a revision of the so-called Bishops' Bible, which prepared in the reign of Queen ELIZABETH (1558-72), was extensively employed by the Anglican clergy. The Geneva Bible, on the other hand, which King JAMES denounced for its "seditious and traitorous notes," and declared "the worst ever made," was very much preferred by the Puritan party in the Church and the bulk of the English laity. The fact that his revisers had been ordered to make the Bishops' Bible the basis of their work affixed a stigma on their performance, and for many years after the completion of their task, many more editions of the Geneva Bible were published in England than of the so-called authorized version. It was the Geneva translation, and not that discredited by the detested name of JAMES, which Presbyterians and Independents carried with them into battle under FAIRFAX and CROMWELL. Nor can we doubt that had the revolution which culminated in the Commonwealth and the Protectorate been permanently successful, one of its results would have been the complete eclipse of the version of 1611 by the Geneva Bible. Nor should we have lost anything by that event. It is a mistake to credit the distinctive merits of King JAMES'S translation to the revisers. It was the Geneva Bible, which prepared in the reign of Queen ELIZABETH (1558-72), was extensively employed by the Anglican clergy. The Geneva Bible, on the other hand, which King JAMES denounced for its "seditious and traitorous notes," and declared "the worst ever made," was very much preferred by the Puritan party in the Church and the bulk of the English laity. The fact that his revisers had been ordered to make the Bishops' Bible the basis of their work affixed a stigma on their performance, and for many years after the completion of their task, many more editions of the Geneva Bible were published in England than of the so-called authorized version. It was the Geneva translation, and not that discredited by the detested name of JAMES, which Presbyterians and Independents carried with them into battle under FAIRFAX and CROMWELL. Nor can we doubt that had the revolution which culminated in the Commonwealth and the Protectorate been permanently successful, one of its results would have been the complete eclipse of the version of 1611 by the Geneva Bible. Nor should we have lost anything by that event. It is a mistake to credit the distinctive merits of King JAMES'S translation to the revisers. It was the Geneva Bible, which prepared in the reign of Queen ELIZABETH (1558-72), was extensively employed by the Anglican clergy. The Geneva Bible, on the other hand, which King JAMES denounced for its "seditious and traitorous notes," and declared "the worst ever made," was very much preferred by the Puritan party in the Church and the bulk of the English laity. The fact that his revisers had been ordered to make the Bishops' Bible the basis of their work affixed a stigma on their performance, and for many years after the completion of their task, many more editions of the Geneva Bible were published in England than of the so-called authorized version. It was the Geneva translation, and not that discredited by the detested name of JAMES, which Presbyterians and Independents carried with them into battle under FAIRFAX and CROMWELL. Nor can we doubt that had the revolution which culminated in the Commonwealth and the Protectorate been permanently successful, one of its results would have been the complete eclipse of the version of 1611 by the Geneva Bible. Nor should we have lost anything by that event. It is a mistake to credit the distinctive merits of King JAMES'S translation to the revisers. It was the Geneva Bible, which prepared in the reign of Queen ELIZABETH (1558-72), was extensively employed by the Anglican clergy. The Geneva Bible, on the other hand, which King JAMES denounced for its "seditious and traitorous notes," and declared "the worst ever made," was very much preferred by the Puritan party in the Church and the bulk of the English laity. The fact that his revisers had been ordered to make the Bishops' Bible the basis of their work affixed a stigma on their performance, and for many years after the completion of their task, many more editions of the Geneva Bible were published in England than of the so-called authorized version. It was the Geneva translation, and not that discredited by the detested name of JAMES, which Presbyterians and Independents carried with them into battle under FAIRFAX and CROMWELL. Nor can we doubt that had the revolution which culminated in the Commonwealth and the Protectorate been permanently successful, one of its results would have been the complete eclipse of the version of 1611 by the Geneva Bible. Nor should we have lost anything by that event. It is a mistake to credit the distinctive merits of King JAMES'S translation to the revisers. It was the Geneva Bible, which prepared in the reign of Queen ELIZABETH (1558-72), was extensively employed by the Anglican clergy. The Geneva Bible, on the other hand, which King JAMES denounced for its "seditious and traitorous notes," and declared "the worst ever made," was very much preferred by the Puritan party in the Church and the bulk of the English laity. The fact that his revisers had been ordered to make the Bishops' Bible the basis of their work affixed a stigma on their performance, and for many years after the completion of their task, many more editions of the Geneva Bible were published in England than of the so-called authorized version. It was the Geneva translation, and not that discredited by the detested name of JAMES, which Presbyterians and Independents carried with them into battle under FAIRFAX and CROMWELL. Nor can we doubt that had the revolution which culminated in the Commonwealth and the Protectorate been permanently successful, one of its results would have been the complete eclipse of the version of 1611 by the Geneva Bible. Nor should we have lost anything by that event. It is a mistake to credit the distinctive merits of King JAMES'S translation to the revisers. It was the Geneva Bible, which prepared in the reign of Queen ELIZABETH (1558-72), was extensively employed by the Anglican clergy. The Geneva Bible, on the other hand, which King JAMES denounced for its "seditious and traitorous notes," and declared "the worst ever made," was very much preferred by the Puritan party in the Church and the bulk of the English laity. The fact that his revisers had been ordered to make the Bishops' Bible the basis of their work affixed a stigma on their performance, and for many years after the completion of their task, many more editions of the Geneva Bible were published in England than of the so-called authorized version. It was the Geneva translation, and not that discredited by the detested name of JAMES, which Presbyterians and Independents carried with them into battle under FAIRFAX and CROMWELL. Nor can we doubt that had the revolution which culminated in the Commonwealth and the Protectorate been permanently successful, one of its results would have been the complete eclipse of the version of 1611 by the Geneva Bible. Nor should we have lost anything by that event. It is a mistake to credit the distinctive merits of King JAMES'S translation to the revisers. It was the Geneva Bible, which prepared in the reign of Queen ELIZABETH (1558-72), was extensively employed by the Anglican clergy. The Geneva Bible, on the other hand, which King JAMES denounced for its "seditious and traitorous notes," and declared "the worst ever made," was very much preferred by the Puritan party in the Church and the bulk of the English laity. The fact that his revisers had been ordered to make the Bishops' Bible the basis of their work affixed a stigma on their performance, and for many years after the completion of their task, many more editions of the Geneva Bible were published in England than of the so-called authorized version. It was the Geneva translation, and not that discredited by the detested name of JAMES, which Presbyterians and Independents carried with them into battle under FAIRFAX and CROMWELL. Nor can we doubt that had the revolution which culminated in the Commonwealth and the Protectorate been permanently successful, one of its results would have been the complete eclipse of the version of 1611 by the Geneva Bible. Nor should we have lost anything by that event. It is a mistake to credit the distinctive merits of King JAMES'S translation to the revisers. It was the Geneva Bible, which prepared in the reign of Queen ELIZABETH (1558-72), was extensively employed by the Anglican clergy. The Geneva Bible, on the other hand, which King JAMES denounced for its "seditious and traitorous notes," and declared "the worst ever made," was very much preferred by the Puritan party in the Church and the bulk of the English laity. The fact that his revisers had been ordered to make the Bishops' Bible the basis of their work affixed a stigma on their performance, and for many years after the completion of their task, many more editions of the Geneva Bible were published in England than of the so-called authorized version. It was the Geneva translation, and not that discredited by the detested name of JAMES, which Presbyterians and Independents carried with them into battle under FAIRFAX and CROMWELL. Nor can we doubt that had the revolution which culminated in the Commonwealth and the Protectorate been permanently successful, one of its results would have been the complete eclipse of the version of 1611 by the Geneva Bible. Nor should we have lost anything by that event. It is a mistake to credit the distinctive merits of King JAMES'S translation to the revisers. It was the Geneva Bible, which prepared in the reign of Queen ELIZABETH (1558-72), was extensively employed by the Anglican clergy. The Geneva Bible, on the other hand, which King JAMES denounced for its "seditious and traitorous notes," and declared "the worst ever made," was very much preferred by the Puritan party in the Church and the bulk of the English laity. The fact that his revisers had been ordered to make the Bishops' Bible the basis of their work affixed a stigma on their performance, and for many years after the completion of their task, many more editions of the Geneva Bible were published in England than of the so-called authorized version. It was the Geneva translation, and not that discredited by the detested name of JAMES, which Presbyterians and Independents carried with them into battle under FAIRFAX and CROMWELL. Nor can we doubt that had the revolution which culminated in the Commonwealth and the Protectorate been permanently successful, one of its results would have been the complete eclipse of the version of 1611 by the Geneva Bible. Nor should we have lost anything by that event. It is a mistake to credit the distinctive merits of King JAMES'S translation to the revisers. It was the Geneva Bible, which prepared in the reign of Queen ELIZABETH (1558-72), was extensively employed by the Anglican clergy. The Geneva Bible, on the other hand, which King JAMES denounced for its "seditious and traitorous notes," and declared "the worst ever made," was very much preferred by the Puritan party in the Church and the bulk of the English laity. The fact that his revisers had been ordered to make the Bishops' Bible the basis of their work affixed a stigma on their performance, and for many years after the completion of their task, many more editions of the Geneva Bible were published in England than of the so-called authorized version. It was the Geneva translation, and not that discredited by the detested name of JAMES, which Presbyterians and Independents carried with them into battle under FAIRFAX and CROMWELL. Nor can we doubt that had the revolution which culminated in the Commonwealth and the Protectorate been permanently successful, one of its results would have been the complete eclipse of the version of 1611 by the Geneva Bible. Nor should we have lost anything by that event. It is a mistake to credit the distinctive merits of King JAMES'S translation to the revisers. It was the Geneva Bible, which prepared in the reign of Queen ELIZABETH (1558-72), was extensively employed by the Anglican clergy. The Geneva Bible, on the other hand, which King JAMES denounced for its "seditious and traitorous notes," and declared "the worst ever made," was very much preferred by the Puritan party in the Church and the bulk of the English laity. The fact that his revisers had been ordered to make the Bishops' Bible the basis of their work affixed a stigma on their performance, and for many years after the completion of their task, many more editions of the Geneva Bible were published in England than of the so-called authorized version. It was the Geneva translation, and not that discredited by the detested name of JAMES, which Presbyterians and Independents carried with them into battle under FAIRFAX and CROMWELL. Nor can we doubt that had the revolution which culminated in the Commonwealth and the Protectorate been permanently successful, one of its results would have been the complete eclipse of the version of 1611 by the Geneva Bible. Nor should we have lost anything by that event. It is a mistake to credit the distinctive merits of King JAMES'S translation to the revisers. It was the Geneva Bible, which prepared in the reign of Queen ELIZABETH (1558-72), was extensively employed by the Anglican clergy. The Geneva Bible, on the other hand, which King JAMES denounced for its "seditious and traitorous notes," and declared "the worst ever made," was very much preferred by the Puritan party in the Church and the bulk of the English laity. The fact that his revisers had been ordered to make the Bishops' Bible the basis of their work affixed a stigma on their performance, and for many years after the completion of their task, many more editions of the Geneva Bible were published in England than of the so-called authorized version. It was the Geneva translation, and not that discredited by the detested name of JAMES, which Presbyterians and Independents carried with them into battle under FAIRFAX and CROMWELL. Nor can we doubt that had the revolution which culminated in the Commonwealth and the Protectorate been permanently successful, one of its results would have been the complete eclipse of the version of 1611 by the Geneva Bible. Nor should we have lost anything by that event. It is a mistake to credit the distinctive merits of King JAMES'S translation to the revisers. It was the Geneva Bible, which prepared in the reign of Queen ELIZABETH (1558-72), was extensively employed by the Anglican clergy. The Geneva Bible, on the other hand, which King JAMES denounced for its "seditious and traitorous notes," and declared "the worst ever made," was very much preferred by the Puritan party in the Church and the bulk of the English laity. The fact that his revisers had been ordered to make the Bishops' Bible the basis of their work affixed a stigma on their performance, and for many years after the completion of their task, many more editions of the Geneva Bible were published in England than of the so-called authorized version. It was the Geneva translation, and not that discredited by the detested name of JAMES, which Presbyterians and Independents carried with them into battle under FAIRFAX and CROMWELL. Nor can we doubt that had the revolution which culminated in the Commonwealth and the Protectorate been permanently successful, one of its results would have been the complete eclipse of the version of 1611 by the Geneva Bible. Nor should we have lost anything by that event. It is a mistake to credit the distinctive merits of King JAMES'S translation to the revisers. It was the Geneva Bible, which prepared in the reign of Queen ELIZABETH (1558-72), was extensively employed by the Anglican clergy. The Geneva Bible, on the other hand, which King JAMES denounced for its "seditious and traitorous notes," and declared "the worst ever made," was very much preferred by the Puritan party in the Church and the bulk of the English laity. The fact that his revisers had been ordered to make the Bishops' Bible the basis of their work affixed a stigma on their performance, and for many years after the completion of their task, many more editions of the Geneva Bible were published in England than of the so-called authorized version. It was the Geneva translation, and not that discredited by the detested name of JAMES, which Presbyterians and Independents carried with them into battle under FAIRFAX and CROMWELL. Nor can we doubt that had the revolution which culminated in the Commonwealth and the Protectorate been permanently successful, one of its results would have been the complete eclipse of the version of 1611 by the Geneva Bible. Nor should we have lost anything by that event. It is a mistake to credit the distinctive merits of King JAMES'S translation to the revisers. It was the Geneva Bible, which prepared in the reign of Queen ELIZABETH (1558-72), was extensively employed by the Anglican clergy. The Geneva Bible, on the other hand, which King JAMES denounced for its "seditious and traitorous notes," and declared "the worst ever made," was very much preferred by the Puritan party in the Church and the bulk of the English laity. The fact that his revisers had been ordered to make the Bishops' Bible the basis of their work affixed a stigma on their performance, and for many years after the completion of their task, many more editions of the Geneva Bible were published in England than of the so-called authorized version. It was the Geneva translation, and not that discredited by the detested name of JAMES, which Presbyterians and Independents carried with them into battle under FAIRFAX and CROMWELL. Nor can we doubt that had the revolution which culminated in the Commonwealth and the Protectorate been permanently successful, one of its results would have been the complete eclipse of the version of 1611 by the Geneva Bible. Nor should we have lost anything by that event. It is a mistake to credit the distinctive merits of King JAMES'S translation to the revisers. It was the Geneva Bible, which prepared in the reign of Queen ELIZABETH (1558-72), was extensively employed by the Anglican clergy. The Geneva Bible, on the other hand, which King JAMES denounced for its "seditious and traitorous notes," and declared "the worst ever made," was very much preferred by the Puritan party in the Church and the bulk of the English laity. The fact that his revisers had been ordered to make the Bishops' Bible the basis of their work affixed a stigma on their performance, and for many years after the completion of their task, many more editions of the Geneva Bible were published in England than of the so-called authorized version. It was the Geneva translation, and not that discredited by the detested name of JAMES, which Presbyterians and Independents carried with them into battle under FAIRFAX and CROMWELL. Nor can we doubt that had the revolution which culminated in the Commonwealth and the Protectorate been permanently successful, one of its results would have been the complete eclipse of the version of 1611 by the Geneva Bible. Nor should we have lost anything by that event. It is a mistake to credit the distinctive merits of King JAMES'S translation to the revisers. It was the Geneva Bible, which prepared in the reign of Queen ELIZABETH (1558-72), was extensively employed by the Anglican clergy. The Geneva Bible, on the other hand, which King JAMES denounced for its "seditious and traitorous notes," and declared "the worst ever made," was very much preferred by the Puritan party in the Church and the bulk of the English laity. The fact that his revisers had been ordered to make the Bishops' Bible the basis of their work affixed a stigma on their performance, and for many years after the completion of their task, many more editions of the Geneva Bible were published in England than of the so-called authorized version. It was the Geneva translation, and not that discredited by the detested name of JAMES, which Presbyterians and Independents carried with them into battle under FAIRFAX and CROMWELL. Nor can we doubt that had the revolution which culminated in the Commonwealth and the Protectorate been permanently successful, one of its results would have been the complete eclipse of the version of 1611 by the Geneva Bible. Nor should we have lost anything by that event. It is a mistake to credit the distinctive merits of King JAMES'S translation to the revisers. It was the Geneva Bible, which prepared in the reign of Queen ELIZABETH (1558-72), was extensively employed by the Anglican clergy. The Geneva Bible, on the other hand, which King JAMES denounced for its "seditious and traitorous notes," and declared "the worst ever made," was very much preferred by the Puritan party in the Church and the bulk of the English laity. The fact that his revisers had been ordered to make the Bishops' Bible the basis of their work affixed a stigma on their performance, and for many years after the completion of their task, many more editions of the Geneva Bible were published in England than of the so-called authorized version. It was the Geneva translation, and not that discredited by the detested name of JAMES, which Presbyterians and Independents carried with them into battle under FAIRFAX and CROMWELL. Nor can we doubt that had the revolution which culminated in the Commonwealth and the Protectorate been permanently successful, one of its results would have been the complete eclipse of the version of 1611 by the Geneva Bible. Nor should we have lost anything by that event. It is a mistake to credit the distinctive merits of King JAMES'S translation to the revisers. It was the Geneva Bible, which prepared in the reign of Queen ELIZABETH (1558-72), was extensively employed by the Anglican clergy. The Geneva Bible, on the other hand, which King JAMES denounced for its "seditious and traitorous notes," and declared "the worst ever made," was very much preferred by the Puritan party in the Church and the bulk of the English laity. The fact that his revisers had been ordered to make the Bishops' Bible the basis of their work affixed a stigma on their performance, and for many years after the completion of their task, many more editions of the Geneva Bible were published in England than of the so-called authorized version. It was the Geneva translation, and not that discredited by the detested name of JAMES, which Presbyterians and Independents carried with them into battle under FAIRFAX and CROMWELL. Nor can we doubt that had the revolution which culminated in the Commonwealth and the Protectorate been permanently successful, one of its results would have been the complete eclipse of the version of 1611 by the Geneva Bible. Nor should we have lost anything by that event. It is a mistake to credit the distinctive merits of King JAMES'S translation to the revisers. It was the Geneva Bible, which prepared in the reign of Queen ELIZABETH (1558-72), was extensively employed by the Anglican clergy. The Geneva Bible, on the other hand, which King JAMES denounced for its "seditious and traitorous notes," and declared "the worst ever made," was very much preferred by the Puritan party in the Church and the bulk of the English laity. The fact that his revisers had been ordered to make the Bishops' Bible the basis of their work affixed a stigma on their performance, and for many years after the completion of their task, many more editions of the Geneva Bible were published in England than of the so-called authorized version. It was the Geneva translation, and not that discredited by the detested name of JAMES, which Presbyterians and Independents carried with them into battle under FAIRFAX and CROMWELL. Nor can we doubt that had the revolution which culminated in the Commonwealth and the Protectorate been permanently successful, one of its results would have been the complete eclipse of the version of 1611 by the Geneva Bible. Nor should we have lost anything by that event. It is a mistake to credit the distinctive merits of King JAMES'S translation to the revisers. It was the Geneva Bible, which prepared in the reign of Queen ELIZABETH (1558-72), was extensively employed by the Anglican clergy. The Geneva Bible, on the other hand, which King JAMES denounced for its "seditious and traitorous notes," and declared "the worst ever made," was very much preferred by the Puritan party in the Church and the bulk of the English laity. The fact that his revisers had been ordered to make the Bishops' Bible the basis of their work affixed a stigma on their performance, and for many years after the completion of their task, many more editions of the Geneva Bible were published in England than of the so-called authorized version. It was the Geneva translation, and not that discredited by the detested name of JAMES, which Presbyterians and Independents carried with them into battle under FAIRFAX and CROMWELL. Nor can we doubt that had the revolution which culminated in the Commonwealth and the Protectorate been permanently successful, one of its results would have been the complete eclipse of the version of 1611 by the Geneva Bible. Nor should we have lost anything by that event. It is a mistake to credit the distinctive merits of King JAMES'S translation to the revisers. It was the Geneva Bible, which prepared in the reign of Queen ELIZABETH (1558-72), was extensively employed by the Anglican clergy. The Geneva Bible, on the other hand, which King JAMES denounced for its "seditious and traitorous notes," and declared "the worst ever made," was very much preferred by the Puritan party in the Church and the bulk of the English laity. The fact that his revisers had been ordered to make the Bishops' Bible the basis of their work affixed a stigma on their performance, and for many years after the completion of their task, many more editions of the Geneva Bible were published in England than of the so-called authorized version. It was the Geneva translation, and not that discredited by the detested name of JAMES, which Presbyterians and Independents carried with them into battle under FAIRFAX and CROMWELL. Nor can we doubt that had the revolution which culminated in the Commonwealth and the Protectorate been permanently successful, one of its results would have been the complete eclipse of the version of 1611 by the Geneva Bible. Nor should we have lost anything by that event. It is a mistake to credit the distinctive merits of King JAMES'S translation to the revisers. It was the Geneva Bible, which prepared in the reign of Queen ELIZABETH (1558-72), was extensively employed by the Anglican clergy. The Geneva Bible, on the other hand, which King JAMES denounced for its "seditious and traitorous notes," and declared "the worst ever made," was very much preferred by the Puritan party in the Church and the bulk of the English laity. The fact that his revisers had been ordered to make the Bishops' Bible the basis of their work affixed a stigma on their performance, and for many years after the completion of their task, many more editions of the Geneva Bible were published in England than of the so-called authorized version. It was the Geneva translation, and not that discredited by the detested name of JAMES, which Presbyterians and Independents carried with them into battle under FAIRFAX and CROMWELL. Nor can we doubt that had the revolution which culminated in the Commonwealth and the Protectorate been permanently successful, one of its results would have been the complete eclipse of the version of 1611 by the Geneva Bible. Nor should we have lost anything by that event. It is a mistake to credit the distinctive merits of King JAMES'S translation to the revisers. It was the Geneva Bible, which prepared in the reign of Queen ELIZABETH (1558-72), was extensively employed by the Anglican clergy. The Geneva Bible, on the other hand, which King JAMES denounced for its "seditious and traitorous notes," and declared "the worst ever made," was very much preferred by the Puritan party in the Church and the bulk of the English laity. The fact that his revisers had been ordered to make the Bishops' Bible the basis of their work affixed a stigma on their performance, and for many years after the completion of their task, many more editions of the Geneva Bible were published in England than of the so-called authorized version. It was the Geneva translation, and not that discredited by the detested name of JAMES, which Presbyterians and Independents carried with them into battle under FAIRFAX and CROMWELL. Nor can we doubt that had the revolution which culminated in the Commonwealth and the Protectorate been permanently successful, one of its results would have been the complete eclipse of the version of 1611 by the Geneva Bible. Nor should we have lost anything by that event. It is a mistake to credit the distinctive merits of King JAMES'S translation to the revisers. It was the Geneva Bible, which prepared in the reign of Queen ELIZABETH (1558-72), was extensively employed by the Anglican clergy. The Geneva Bible, on the other hand, which King JAMES denounced for its "seditious and traitorous notes," and declared "the worst ever made," was very much preferred by the Puritan party in the Church and the bulk of the English laity. The fact that his revisers had been ordered to make the Bishops' Bible the basis of their work affixed a stigma on their performance, and for many years after the completion of their task, many more editions of the Geneva Bible were published in England than of the so-called authorized version. It was the Geneva translation, and not that discredited by the detested name of JAMES, which Presbyterians and Independents carried with them into battle under FAIRFAX and CROMWELL. Nor can we doubt that had the revolution which culminated in the Commonwealth and the Protectorate been permanently successful, one of its results would have been the complete eclipse of the version of 1611 by the Geneva Bible. Nor should we have lost anything by that event. It is a mistake to credit the distinctive merits of King JAMES'S translation to the revisers. It was the Geneva Bible, which prepared in the reign of Queen ELIZABETH (1558-72), was extensively employed by the Anglican clergy. The Geneva Bible, on the other hand, which King JAMES denounced for its "seditious and traitorous notes," and declared "the worst ever made," was very much preferred by the Puritan party in the Church and the bulk of the English laity. The fact that his revisers had been ordered to make the Bishops' Bible the basis of their work affixed a stigma on their performance, and for many years after the completion of their task, many more editions of the Geneva Bible were published in England than of the so-called authorized version. It was the Geneva translation, and not that discredited by the detested name of JAMES, which Presbyterians and Independents carried with them into battle under FAIRFAX and CROMWELL. Nor can we doubt that had the revolution which culminated in the Commonwealth and the Protectorate been permanently successful, one of its results would have been the complete eclipse of the version of 1611 by the Geneva Bible. Nor should we have lost anything by that event. It is a mistake to credit the distinctive merits of King JAMES'S translation to the revisers. It was the Geneva Bible, which prepared in the reign of Queen ELIZABETH (1558-72), was extensively employed by the Anglican clergy. The Geneva Bible, on the other hand, which King JAMES denounced for its "seditious and traitorous notes," and declared "the worst ever made," was very much preferred by the Puritan party in the Church and the bulk of the English laity. The fact that his revisers had been ordered to make the Bishops' Bible the basis of their work affixed a stigma on their performance, and for many years after the completion of their task, many more editions of the Geneva Bible were published in England than of the so-called authorized version. It was the Geneva translation, and not that discredited by the detested name of JAMES, which Presbyterians and Independents carried with them into battle under FAIRFAX and CROMWELL. Nor can we doubt that had the revolution which culminated in the Commonwealth and the Protectorate been permanently successful, one of its results would have been the complete eclipse of the version of 1611 by the Geneva Bible. Nor should we have lost anything by that event. It is a mistake to credit the distinctive merits of King JAMES'S translation to the revisers. It was the Geneva Bible, which prepared in the reign of Queen ELIZABETH (1558-72), was extensively employed by the Anglican clergy. The Geneva Bible, on the other hand, which King JAMES denounced for its "seditious and traitorous notes," and declared "the worst ever made," was very much preferred by the Puritan party in the Church and the bulk of the English laity. The fact that his revisers had been ordered to make the Bishops' Bible the basis of their work affixed a stigma on their performance, and for many years after the completion of their task, many more editions of the Geneva Bible were published in England than of the so-called authorized version. It was the Geneva translation, and not that discredited by the detested name of JAMES, which Presbyterians and Independents carried with them into battle under FAIRFAX and CROMWELL. Nor can we doubt that had the revolution which culminated in the Commonwealth and the Protectorate been permanently successful, one of its results would have been the complete eclipse of the version of 1611 by the Geneva Bible. Nor should we have lost anything by that event. It is a mistake to credit the distinctive merits of King JAMES'S translation to the revisers. It was the Geneva Bible, which prepared in the reign of Queen ELIZABETH (1558-72), was extensively employed by the Anglican clergy. The Geneva Bible, on the other hand, which King JAMES denounced for its "seditious and traitorous notes," and declared "the worst ever made," was very much preferred by the Puritan party in the Church and the bulk of the English laity. The fact that his revisers had been ordered to make the Bishops' Bible the basis of their work affixed a stigma on their performance, and for many years after the completion of their task, many more editions of the Geneva Bible were published in England than of the so-called authorized version. It was the Geneva translation, and not that discredited by the detested name of JAMES, which Presbyterians and Independents carried with them into battle under FAIRFAX and CROMWELL. Nor can we doubt that had the revolution which culminated in the Commonwealth and the Protectorate been permanently successful, one of its results would have been the complete eclipse of the version of 1611 by the Geneva Bible. Nor should we have lost anything by that event. It is a mistake to credit the distinctive merits of King JAMES'S translation to the revisers. It was the Geneva Bible, which prepared in the reign of Queen ELIZABETH (1558-72), was extensively employed by the Anglican clergy. The Geneva Bible, on the other hand, which King JAMES denounced for its "seditious and traitorous notes," and declared "the worst ever made," was very much preferred by the Puritan party in the Church and the bulk of the English laity. The fact that his revisers had been ordered to make the Bishops' Bible the basis of their work affixed a stigma on their performance, and for many years after the completion of their task, many more editions of the Geneva Bible were published in England than of the so-called authorized version. It was the Geneva translation, and not that discredited by the detested name of JAMES, which Presbyterians and Independents carried with them into battle under FAIRFAX and CROMWELL. Nor can we doubt that had the revolution which culminated in the Commonwealth and the Protectorate been permanently successful, one of its results would have been the complete eclipse of the version of 1611 by the Geneva Bible. Nor should we have lost anything by that event. It is a mistake to credit the distinctive merits of King JAMES'S translation to the revisers. It was the Geneva Bible, which prepared in the reign of Queen ELIZABETH (1558-72), was extensively employed by the Anglican clergy. The Geneva Bible, on the other hand, which King JAMES denounced for its "seditious and traitorous notes," and declared "the worst ever made," was very much preferred by the Puritan party in the Church and the bulk of the English laity. The fact that his revisers had been ordered to make the Bishops' Bible the basis of their work affixed a stigma on their performance, and for many years after the completion of their task, many more editions of the Geneva Bible were published in England than of the so-called authorized version. It was the Geneva translation, and not that discredited by the detested name of JAMES, which Presbyterians and Independents carried with them into battle under FAIRFAX and CROMWELL. Nor can we doubt that had the revolution which culminated in the Commonwealth and the Protectorate been permanently successful, one of its results would have been the complete eclipse of the version of 1611 by the Geneva Bible. Nor should we have lost anything by that event. It is a mistake to credit the distinctive merits of King JAMES'S translation to the revisers. It was the Geneva Bible, which prepared in the reign of Queen ELIZABETH (1558-72), was extensively employed by the Anglican clergy. The Geneva Bible, on the other hand, which King JAMES denounced for its "seditious and traitorous notes," and declared "the worst ever made," was very much preferred by the Puritan party in the Church and the bulk of the English laity. The fact that his revisers had been ordered to make the Bishops' Bible the basis of their work affixed a stigma on their performance, and for many years after the completion of their task, many more editions of the Geneva Bible were published in England than of the so-called authorized version. It was the Geneva translation, and not that discredited by the detested name of JAMES, which Presbyterians and Independents carried with them into battle under FAIRFAX and CROMWELL. Nor can we doubt that had the revolution which culminated in the Commonwealth and the Protectorate been permanently successful, one of its results would have been the complete eclipse of the version of 1611 by the Geneva Bible. Nor should we have lost anything by that event. It is a mistake to credit the distinctive merits of King JAMES'S translation to the revisers. It was the Geneva Bible, which prepared in the reign of Queen ELIZABETH (1558-72), was extensively employed by the Anglican clergy. The Geneva Bible, on the other hand, which King JAMES denounced for its "seditious and traitorous notes," and declared "the worst ever made," was very much preferred by the Puritan party in the Church and the bulk of the English laity. The fact that his revisers had been ordered to make the Bishops' Bible the basis of their work affixed a stigma on their performance, and for many years after the completion of their task, many more editions of the Geneva Bible were published in England than of the so-called authorized version. It was the Geneva translation, and not that discredited by the detested name of JAMES, which Presbyterians and Independents carried with them into battle under FAIRFAX and CROMWELL. Nor can we doubt that had the revolution which culminated in the Commonwealth and the Protectorate been permanently successful, one of its results would have been the complete eclipse of the version of 1611 by the Geneva Bible. Nor should we have lost anything by that event. It is a mistake to credit the distinctive merits of