

vulgarity or baseness of other men,—He bore it all, even to the cross. That soft and tender child by whose cradle we stand to-day, the shadow of His cross falls even on His cradle, the crimson of His sunset flushes even His golden dawn; and, perfected by suffering, He would teach every one of us out of our sorrows to make springs of tenderness, and strength, and beauty. Ah! my friends, I know that by the Christmas firesides of some of you there will be vacant chairs and vanished faces. I know it, and my heart grieves for you; but forget not that the joy of the Incarnation is the joy of the Resurrection also, and that there is not one single innocent joy on earth that is not the shadow of a promise of the eternal joy in heaven. The end of our journey, and the end of their journey whom you loved, and have lost, was not here. In human life, at one time the wind blows, the rain falls, the frost is cruel; at another the sun shines, the birds sing, and all is May; but through shadow or through sunlight, we are travelling onward,—they have not changed the end of our journey. Was it not, then, to comfort us, both here, and in the thought of that end, that as you bend over the cradle you may hear, even from that cradle of the holy Child, the invitation which He uttered so divinely in His ministry, "Come unto Me, all ye that are weary and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest."

But, lastly, if some of you are rich, and some are poor, and many are sorrowful, all, all of you are sinners; and to you the news of that birth is, indeed, "Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace and goodwill towards men." While you may see there how much God hates the sin, you may see also how tenderly, how earnestly He loves the sinner. Let us come to His cradle and learn this lesson. Was there ever a sinner who came and was sent away? The publican came spurned by Jew and Gentile, a byword of contempt, and Jesus wrapped that poor despised man in His large sympathy. The harlots came weeping in their degradation, and their misery, and were not repulsed, but their shame was healed. The adulteress lay before Him, a dishevelled heap, sobbing on the temple floor, and even to her He said, "Neither do I condemn thee; go in peace and sin no more." Oh! if there be any here who think themselves to be righteous and despise others, if there be any who take the leprosy of their pride for the whiteness of their innocence, if you cannot learn at that cradle the perfect freedom, the absolute simplicity of the Gospel of Christ, I entreat you, at least, to stand aside to-day; lock not the open door of heaven, which needs not either your hindrance or your help. Not yours in anywise are the keys of the kingdom of God—they lie in the cradle of the holy Child.

Let us come to this cradle, let the lepers come, and let the outcasts come, and the mourners with their tear-stained cheeks, and the sinners with their broken hearts, and the young man with his self-will and his strong unconquered passions, and the poor with their struggling lives, and the rich with their many temptations, and let them kneel and drink freely of the waters of Siloam which flow softly, and let them bathe their sick and shivering souls in the golden tide of Heaven's beatitude, and stand in the circle of Heaven's own free light, undarkened by any shadow; let them escape the errors which darken the mind, the lusts which destroy the body, the sins which corrupt the soul; and so one and all wish to one another a happy Christmas time, as I do from my heart to all of you to-day. Let us stand, high and low, rich and poor, sinful or sorrowful, one with another, common brothers, equally guilty, equally redeemed, by the cradle of the Infant King, that in His light we may see

light, and may leave that cradle more wise and hopeful, more cheerful and undaunted, more pure and loving. "Arise, shine, for thy light is come and the glory of the Lord is risen upon thee; for behold the darkness shall cover the earth, and gross darkness the people, but the Lord shall arise upon thee, and His glory shall be seen upon thee."

THE REVISED VERSION.

No. 1.

The petition from the Synod of this Diocese to the Provincial Synod praying that the Revised Version of the Scriptures should be authorised for use in our churches, was to have been supported by the Rev. Professor Clark, of Trinity College, who would, doubtless, with his accustomed ability and skill, have done ample justice to the cause which he had undertaken to champion; but, unfortunately, he was obliged to leave before the subject came up, and no one was found to fill his place. Indeed the motion was presented by one who was really hostile to it, only that it might not lapse.

We have been able to secure a sufficiently full and correct report of the speech of the Rev. Dr. Carry against the motion, which we think will be of interest to our readers. It was heard with profound attention, and heartily applauded. The Reverend Doctor spoke substantially as follows:—

MR. PROLOCUTOR.—(1) A subject so important as this demands full consideration. I am sorry that I shall have to speak at length, but there is no help for it, and if the House does not desire the discussion I am ready to sit down without a word. I wish to say at the outset that I am not against any change in our Authorised Version, and never have been. I have been always in favour of that style of revision which we find in the Old Testament, and, in spite of some objections, I should gladly see this part of the work adopted.

(2) But against adopting the motion before us there lies on the threshold a most serious objection, viz., the Revised Version has not yet been accepted or approved by either Convocation at home, especially by that of Canterbury, though the work of their own sub-committee; while only by some finesse and through great respect for the Bishop of Durham, a reviser and a member of their House, was the York Convocation restrained from rejecting it contemptuously; and that House numbers some good scholars and clear heads. Our haste then in acting before the mother church would be unseemly and injudicious. There is also another preliminary objection, in which it is true all may not agree with me—the work is not yet completed; for the *Apocrypha* is not revised, and that is included in our English Church Bible.

(3) In the next place, it is not intended, I assume, to enforce the use of the Book, but only to authorise or allow it. But look at the natural consequences of this: you first of all set priests and people at logger-heads. Neither party may have much knowledge of the subject, but for that very reason there may be all the more bitter feeling, resulting in unknown mischiefs. Then if the book is merely allowed, there is nothing to hinder the preacher from attacking it, if he regards it with a hostile mind; and he will certainly be tempted to do this, if the sanction we are asked for be granted. For my own part, I use the book constantly in private and in the pulpit, I give it all the honour I can by always giving its renderings where their merit is apparent; but were it allowed in our churches I should certainly feel bound to assail its defects as often as opportunity was presented.

(4) Again, it is undeniable that, to speak within bounds, a large consensus of instructed opinion is found against the Revised New Testament, on a variety of grounds. The Revisers were charged to make only "necessary changes," and yet out of 8,000 verses but 800 are left untouched, while 86,191 actual changes are reckoned up! 16 verses wholly disappear; 122 sentences or parts of sentences, and 10 new passages are added. It is manifest that such a vast multitude of changes were not "necessary," and that the Revisers far outstripped their instructions, and probably this is a main reason of the coldness with which their labours have been received by Convocation. You may not perhaps be unaware that Luther's German New Testament has lately for some years been undergoing the process of revision at the hands of learned men in Germany, and yet the number of changes, I am told, amounts to no more than 200! Had our 86,000 been reduced to 1,000, there would have been more likelihood of cordial reception.

(5) Another alleged objection is that its scholarship, both Greek and English, is at fault. Let me quote some testimonies as to its English.

And first, *Matthew Arnold*. He was not a Christian, at least in our sense; but no one was a better judge of English. The *Guardian* in its obituary said, "He

was our greatest living critic." The *Standard* said "He was unquestionably a born critic." Now this is what Mr. Arnold wrote in the *Contemporary*: "If by an act of authority the new Version could be made to supersede the old, and the old to go out of use, a blow would be struck at religion in this country far more dangerous to it, than the hindrances with which it has to contend now—beer-shops, dissent, ritualism, the Salvation Army, and the rest of the long sad list."

As it is, they have produced a work excellently fitted to help and instruct one in reading the New Testament, and such corrections as seem to be urgently needed. But they have not done that which they were meant to do: they have not given us a Version improved, and which can take the place of the old."

Dr. Blackie, who was lately professor of Greek at Edinburgh, and who has successfully assailed the Revisers' pedantic treatment of the Greek Article, says of their work: "It is altogether out of the cards to imagine that a translation so largely disfigured by want of sense and want of taste should ever take the place of our Authorised Version as a whole."

Professor Sanday, the Ireland professor of Exegesis at Oxford, writing as a warm friend of the Revisers' complains that, as the criticisms of Canon Evans and Dr. Field have shewn, the Revisers had neither the best Greek or English scholarship available. "A great number of needless and on the whole detrimental changes" have been made "As a Bible for common use, it is nothing less than a failure. . . . They cannot be credited with a very fine discretion or with great dexterity in the handling of English."

Dr. Field has examined in the New Testament 104 changes, of which he pronounces 8 questionable; 13 unnecessary; 19 faulty, i.e. cases in which the Authorised Version required amendment, but which the Revised Version has not succeeded in amending; and 64 changes for the worse. Now hear what manner of judge Dr. Field was. The Dean of Canterbury, Dr. Payne Smith, as the spokesman of the Old Testament Company, in presenting their work to the Upper House of Convocation, said: "One of the most valuable and learned men in our church, Dr. Field. . . . We considered the suggestions of absent members, and none were so carefully discussed by the Company as those of Dr. Field. The assistance we had from him was very large indeed, and our confidence in his judgment made us feel that when we followed his suggestions we could not go far wrong. He has just passed away from us, and I am sure that the regret of the whole church will follow this vanished Nestor to his grave." The Dean then went on, not unnaturally, to speak of "the bad quarter of an hour we shall have when revisions are revised." I may add that the study of Greek was the passion of Dr. Field's life till past 80. Now hear what he says in his *Otium Norwicense*, a little book of 150 pages. I quote little more than single words scattered over a small space. "Quite inexplicable"—"simply intolerable"—"against the only true interpretation"—"quiequilia"—"quite inadmissible"—"preposterous"—"mere pedantry"—"no example of any such use forthcoming"—"against the only recognised meaning of the word"—"preposterous sticklers for uncial infallibility"—"ungrammatical"—"impossible to get over the palpable absurdity"—"the absurdity." Remember, these are not the words of a youthful partisan, but of the calm scholar of 80.

The *London Spectator*, long foremost in delicate discernment, under its distinguished Editor, Mr. R. Hutton, whose merit as an English essayist is universally acknowledged, says:—"English translators, with a few brilliant exceptions, fail because they are so tremendously to seek in their own tongue; and a long essay might be written on the fact that the translators of the Authorised Version of the New Testament made—speaking from a purely secular and literary point of view—one of the finest English classics out of a book that has not the shadow of a claim, *qua* style, to be called a Greek classic. Their successors, the men of the un-Authorised Version, went nigh to be thought to have brought the English classic down, or almost down, to the level of the original mediocrity, and the explanation is easy. The Authorised translators were masters of their native tongue; the revisionists had far more Greek than their predecessors, but their knowledge of English was insufficient."

Sir Edmund Beckett, now Lord Grimthorpe, though I am no admirer of his slap-dash style of criticism, says justly enough: "This, and a great deal more of the Revisers' work, is like pulling down a cathedral to build a square conventicle with the stones, and calling it restoration."

Dr. Fulton, a learned clergyman of the American Church, in his article in the *Forum* on "Why the Revised Version has failed," concludes as follows:—"The translators under King James retained the genius of our mother tongue in its sublime simplicity, and yet had learned that perfect art of composition which turns words to music in their flow; the nineteenth-century English of the Westminster revisers has an almost finical refinement which is wholly