

a second, arising out of the state and tone of English literature at the present time. I am not much of a philologist, and may not be able to make myself as fully understood as I would like, but certain it is that the tone of the English language at the present time seems to be peculiarly unsuited to the construction of a version which shall retain the rhythm and melody of the one which it is proposed to supersede. If any man be in doubt as to this defect in the tone of our literature to-day let him only take the most approved forms of prayer, that have appeared within the last generation and compare them with the liturgies of the Reformed Churches written centuries ago. Let him compare the most attractive marriage service with that found in the Book of Common Prayer. And when I have said this by way of preface, none will, I trust, accuse me of disparagement when I say that there is a fearful inequality in smoothness, elegance and sonorosity, between the sentences which have felt the touch of the revisers' hands and those which they have permitted to pass untouched. And yet in a version which is intended for public reading in the ears of the people, these qualities to which I have referred are by no means to be overlooked. And so I conclude that this homely and matter-of-fact age of ours, when men are accustomed to call a spade a spade, is not exactly the day for a revision which is to present us with a version that shall be good for generations to come. A third hampering cause, and the only other one to which I will allude, is that occasioned by the peculiar form which the movement for revision assumed. It must be remembered that this movement was not œcumenical as far even as the English-speaking churches are concerned. The revision was undertaken under the patronage of the English Church. Our American Revision Committee sustained only advisory relations. They did not make a constituent part of the Revision Committee itself. Their suggestions were many of them adopted, but they were adopted simply as suggestions *ab extra*. Our American Committee was not in the heart of the movement. The result is that many of the most valuable suggestions made by them remain simply as suggestions, constituting a valuable "Appendix" at the close of the volume, reminding one of the kangaroo, which is said to be strongest in its hindmost parts. Certainly for the American people at least, the version would have been more acceptable if the revision had proceeded upon a more Catholic plan.

II. But whilst we are not prepared to recommend the Revision as the standard version of Scripture, there is a duty which we owe to the Revisers which we should not be slow in recognizing, or remiss in discharging. We should always and everywhere bear cheerful testimony to the scholarliness and fidelity of the service which they so laboriously and generously rendered to the generation in which they live. It is only necessary to run over the list of Revisers either in