

liveth," must unquestionably disappear; and there will be enough generally of verbal change to disturb the minds of those who have not only believed in verbal inspiration, but practically in the verbal inspiration of the authorized English version. The authorized version was, of course, itself a novelty when it appeared in the reign of James I.; but there were at that time so few readers that the shock must have been limited in its extent, and the period was not one fraught with danger from general scepticism as is ours. It will not be surprising if the minds of the unlearned are greatly bewildered by the conflict between the new version and the old. After all, the revision will amount to very little if, as is to be presumed, the titles of the books are to be left unrevised. The most momentous question is as to the authenticity of the writings which have hitherto been ascribed to Moses, Isaiah, and Daniel, in the Old Testament, and to Apostles in the New. Is it certain that the First and the Fourth Gospels are the works of the writers to whom in our Bible they are ascribed? If it is, we have the testimony of two eye-witnesses to the life and acts of Jesus. So important in this case is the question of authenticity which the titles raise, that it almost swallows up all the rest. It is singular that throughout the discussion, so far as we have observed, nothing has been said upon this vital point.