

Standard said
"Now this is
porary: "If by
ould be made to
it of use, a blow
untry far more
rith which it has
ritualism, the
long sad list.
work excellently
ading the New
m to be urgently
at which they
en us a Version
oe of the old."
sor of Greek at
y assailed the
Greek Article,
out of the cards
y disfigured by
d ever take the
whole."
sor of Exegesis
f the Revisers'
non Evans and
ad neither the
available. "A
whole detrimen-
Bible for com-
re. . . They
cretion or with
ish."

Testament 104
restorable; 18
in which the
ent, but which
l in amending;
ear what man-
of Canterbury,
the Old Testa-
rk to the Upper
the most valu-
Dr. Field. . .
sent members,
y the Company
e we had from
nfidence in his
e followed his
. He has just
bat the regret
anished Nestor
l, not unnatur-
hour we shall
may add that
Dr. Field's life
s in his *Otium*
I quote little
over a small
intolerable"—
—"quiescentia"
ous"—"mere
use forthcom-
eaning of the
uncial infalli-
ble to get over
ity." Remem-
thful partisan,

et in delicate
Editor, Mr. R.
yist is univer-
anslators, with
use they are
ongue; and a
fact that the
of the New
ly secular and
English clas-
ow of a claim.
Their succe-
ion, went high
nglish classic
f the original
easy. The
f their native
e Greek than
e of English

orpe, though
of criticism,
deal more of
a cathedral to
is, and calling

he American
n "Why the
as follows:—
retained the
re simplicity,
composition
w; the nine-
ster revisers
sh is wholly

foreign to the genius of the sacred writings. Is the Westminster revisers had confined themselves to the simplest interpretation of their task, that is to say, if they had been content to remove spurious passages, to adopt improved readings which were not known to their predecessors, to correct manifest mistranslations of the sense of the original, to insert modern forms for forms which have grown obsolete, and to substitute words which are universally understood for words which, through the lapse of time, are now liable to be misunderstood, they would not have offered us as substitute for the version of King James, but they would have given us a new edition of that version worthy of the present age. As they have interpreted their work, and as its projectors probably meant them to interpret it, (?) they have made a new version of undoubted value, but valuable only as a verbal commentary on the old. The fate of versions of Scripture does not rest exclusively with scholars and critics. The ear of the public is true to something more essential than the subtleties of the grammarian. The same instinct which rejected the elaborate version of Jerome and clung to the rude Italic Version till the tongue in which it had been written died; the same instinct which has made it impossible to substitute a modern version for the rude, strong German of Luther; and, we may add, the same instinct which made the people take to the Authorized Version in spite of the objections of scholars, will prevent the adoption of the Westminster Version as the Bible of the English-speaking world. 'The old is better.'

The Rev. S. C. Malan, perhaps the greatest linguist of the English Church, says: "In chap. i. (of St. Matt.) the Revisers have made 60 changes; of these one is good, and one admissible. All the rest appear either ill judged or unnecessary."

John Bright was recognised as a great master of English speech, and this is his judgment:—"I do not think the Revisers understood English as well as the translators of the Authorized Version, however much better they may have understood Greek."

I say nothing of the late Canon Evans's criticisms, or of the late Dean Burgon's, only that whatever his critical faults or mistakes, he has dealt the Revised Version a deadly blow, from which it will never recover.

And now may I not fairly affirm that no one in his sober senses can pooh-pooh these testimonies as to the imperfections of the Version we are asked to authorise?

(6) But as every tub must stand on its own bottom, I proceed to state some of the grounds of my own objections. And first, I seriously object to the Margins, as containing matter unsuitable or injurious. Take, for example, Rom. ix. 5, which is known to all believers as a most clear and explicit statement of the Godhead of our Lord and Saviour—"Christ, who is over all, God blessed for ever." The Revisers made no substantial change in the text, but the Margin gives three different pointings and renderings thus: "Some modern interpreters place a full stop after *flesh*, and translate, *He who is God over a lbe (is) blessed for ever*: or, *He who is over all is God, blessed for ever*. Others punctuate *flesh*, who is over all. God be (is) blessed for ever." The object of this variety is manifestly to get rid of this testimony to our Lord's Godhead, and the effect of this marginal note is a perpetual suggestion of heresy. Why should the unlearned children of the church have the Socinian heresy thrust before their eyes, and honoured with a standing place in our very Bibles? Of what consequence is it to have simple folks told the devices of "some modern" Socinian heretics, being as they are against sense, grammar, and Catholic tradition? Why not confine such things to books for the learned? What would Pearson, Bull, Waterland and Wordsworth say to this margin? For my own part, I solemnly declare that nothing less than the loss of my place in the communion of the Church would ever induce me to read this version at the sacred desk so long as this one note remains in it. I hope the time may not come again when St. Hilary's complaint shall have to be made—that "the ears of the people are holier than the hearts of the priests."

Another marginal note of frequent occurrence is open to the severest animadversion. For example, on Luke xxii. 43, 44, where we have the strengthening angel and the bloody sweat, a passage so dear to the heart of Christendom, and of such indisputable authority, the learned are angered and the simple troubled by the utterly impertinent marginal note, "Many ancient authorities omit verses 43, 44." Yes, vastly more authorities than sufficed the Revisers elsewhere. But here in spite of their authorities they must have felt what a storm they would have brought about their ears had they dared to make this omission in the text. But what are the facts? Why, the words so shaded with doubt in the margin are found in every existing manuscript but four, in every ancient Version, and in 80 famous fathers. And none of the four authorities which omit it is as ancient as Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Hippolytus, Dionysius of Alexandria, who all justify the reading of the Authorized Version, to whom must be added Arius himself!

This sort of information well befits critical editions for curious scholars; but it is worse than absurd—it is bewildering and cruel—to insert in the Church's Book the errors of scribes or critics. There is simply no excuse for it.

And this leads me to further observation on the oft-repeated "many ancient authorities." At St. Matt. xvi. 13, no very important alteration is made from the common text, but it will perhaps on that account all the better serve for illustration. In the Margin we find, "Many ancient authorities read that *I the Son of Manam*," i.e., as the common text. But what is the fact? The fact is that ALL the MSS. read so but two, the codex Sinaiticus and the codex Vaticanus? I ask, is this fair? Is it not rather monstrous that all *minus* two should be described as only "many"? What should we say of the report that "many" thought such a one guilty, when only two of the whole neighbourhood did? But Hooker the Judicious will furnish an exact illustration of this. In reference to the Puritan Cartwright he says: "To hide the general consent of antiquity agreeing in the literal interpretation (of John iii. 5), they cunningly affirm, that 'certain' have taken these words as meant of material water, when they know that of all the ancients there is not one to be named that ever did otherwise either expound or allege the place, than as implying external Baptism." You can readily apply the rebuke. Is not this Vatican rule with a vengeance? The Roman Bishop would rule our Bishops from the Vatican, and a MS. in the Vatican is, on almost, or altogether, its own authority to fashion our Bible! Chapter xvii. 21 in the same Gospel is ousted on the authority of the same two MSS. aided by codex 33, and yet the Margin is made quite shamelessly to say, "Many authorities, some ancient, insert verse 21. But this kind goeth not out save by prayer and fasting!" Thus "many" is made the equivalent of all but 3! If this is not *dishonest*—a hard word to use—will any one on the floor of this House give me a proper designation for it? I pause for an answer. (None). Again, at Rev. xiii. 18, where we have the number of the beast, 666, the margin informs us, "Some ancient authorities read 616." Would not most readers be surprised that those authorities are three in number, viz., C, II, and Tichorius an African Schismatic? Is this one of the readings which the Revisers think it would not be "safe" to be ignorant of? and of what "interest" can it be except to critics? In the people's Bible such marginal trivialities are only distracting and mischievous. And here I may say, after a good deal of minute examination, that in general "many" stands for *all minus B.*, the codex Vaticanus.

(7) I come next to translations. And if here we must confess, as I most gladly do, that very many changes are good, and necessary, and to be highly valued, a whole multitude of frivolous and unreasonable ones are to be put in the opposite balance. For example, in a really trivial instance, our common Bible reads "the daughter of Herodius danced before them." That is honest, idiomatic English, and liable to no misconception. Besides, as Dr. Field says, it exactly represents the Greek *en to meso*, which the acute Bengel represents by *inspectantibus omnibus*, while all looked on: and yet this is changed into the bald un-English literalism of "in the midst." Why? in the interests of uniformity, which they are far from having uniformly kept in view. Again, in Acts ix. 25, the perfectly clear and correct statement "they let him down by the wall in a basket," is changed into "through the wall, lowering him in a basket," which suggests a hole made in the wall, and is atrociously un-English. And yet they profess to have "rarely made any change wherever the true meaning of the original as expressed in the Authorized Version would be apparent to a reader of ordinary intelligence!" Their poor appreciation of the intelligence of English readers is likely to be amply repaid. Of Acts i. 16-20, Mr. Page, of the Charter-house, says in the *Expositor*, "It does not represent the Greek. It is not English. It is not sense. . . In the range of English literature is there a passage comparable to this?" Their own chairman, Bishop Ellicott, in his last published work, speaks of the "Fatal logical objection" to their rendering of 1 Cor. xv. 2.

(8) I must next give a couple of specimens out of many at hand of the *Various Readings* which they have adopted—the beauties they have given us. (Here was read St. John xii. 8-5, Mary therefore took a pound of ointment of spikenard, etc.) With this compare the new reading in verse 7, "Jesus therefore said, Suffer her to keep it against the day of my burying"—"to keep it" after she had wholly broken the box (suntripssasa) and completely poured out its contents (Katcheen)! I know Dr. Westcott's painful effort to get over this difficulty, but it would take a surgical operation to get it into a rustic or any sound head. And there it stands in the Revised New Testament a glaring contradiction in the Gospel narrative and a puzzle to all sensible folk who have to read it. Here is another case quite as bad. In St. Luke ix. 10, the Authorized Version reads, "and he took them, and went aside privately into a desert place belonging

to the city called Bethsaida." The Revised Version has, "and withdrew apart to a city called Bethsaida." There is much diversity of reading here in the MSS., but the most stupid of all is chosen, though there is overwhelming authority against it—and why? because it is the most difficult reading, and is in the *Codex Vaticanus*! Look at the results: Our Lord's action is directly against the very object of the retirement—He goes into a city. Jeremy Taylor ridicules the "man that retires into a battle to meditate, and sets up his closet on the out-quarters of an army, and chooses a frontier-garrison to be wise in." Then the new reading makes St. Luke directly contradict himself, for in verse 12 the Apostles say to the Lord, "Send the multitude away, that they may go into the villages and country round about, and lodge, and get victuals: for we are here in a desert place." Is it in the interests of piety that the Evangelists should be made to write nonsense? Are St. Luke himself and common sense together to be of no weight against the Vatican superstition? the folly that makes a fetish of an MS. in the Pope's library. I maintain that this is nothing but pure mischief, I may say madness.

(9) One other point must be noticed: the *Headings and arguments* of chapters in the Authorized Version are omitted, because as we are told, there was no agreement in interpretation among the discordant elements. Thus a great help to the young and the unlearned has been lost. I remember when in early youth I took to the diligent reading of the Bible what aid I found in the very head-lines, just as one finds in reading an ordinary book, and especially how I was guided by the arguments to the Christian understanding of the Old Testament. But it is no wonder that all this should be wanting and impossible where a Socinian and very liberal scholars had to be satisfied. But the Authorized Version is still the Bible of the English Church, and I hope it will long continue so.

(10) In conclusion, I make no appeal to any passion but the Passion for Truth.

Nullius addictus jurare in verba magistri,
Quo me cunque rapit tempestas, deferor hospes.

In other words, I am not given up to the worship of any leader, but there contentedly abide where reason and the stress of argument bring me. I follow neither Cambridge nor Chichester; I am neither Westcottian nor Burgonian; and this I know is enough to damn me with both sides. I absolutely refuse to be enslaved to the sole sovereignty of the Vatican Codex.

I hold then that greatly as the many improvements in the Revised New Testament are to be valued, and none value them more heartily than I do, they do not counterbalance the rude English; the school-miss's grammar; the unfair and foolish marginal notes; the unauthorised omissions; and the preposterous, absurd, and impossible Various Readings which oppress alike our reason and our faith: and therefore until the Revision be itself revised, and naturally accepted by the learned Mother Church,—God forbid that we should consent to its supplanting in our desks that venerable Version which is the Glory of our English tongue, a pillar of the Catholic faith, and the very joy of innumerable hearts.

Mr. Prolocutor, I have said my say; and for these reasons I oppose the prayer of the Petition.

Home & Foreign Church News.

From our own Correspondents.

DOMINION.

QUEBEC.

QUEBEC.—The Lord Bishop has left for Sherbrooke to attend the meeting of St. Francis Deanery and the anniversary of the Church Society at Sherbrooke. He will visit Lennoxville on Thursday next, where he intends to conduct a "Quiet Day" on Saturday, and on the Third Sunday in Advent he will hold an ordination at the same place, when the Revs. Rudd, of Randboro, and E. B. Husband, of St. Sylvester, will be advanced to the Priesthood; and Mr. Murray, a student, of Lennoxville, will be ordained Deacon.

The Cathedral.—The Freemasons of the city and district intend to attend a special service in the English Cathedral on the evening of St. John the Evangelist's Day, when a special masonic sermon will be preached by one of their chaplains, the Very Rev. Dean of Quebec. The collection is to be given to the Jeffrey Hale hospital, a very deserving and needy charity.

Trinity.—The Rev. A. Bareham, Incumbent of Trinity, who has been collecting in England for some months, returned home by S. S. "Oregon," which arrived at Halifax on Monday last.