

this period. They had preferences for old texts and familiar forms of expression, and perhaps instinctively turned to these in times of perplexity or trouble, but the new were under examination, and decision was reserved in expectation of the result. For, after all, the degree of acceptance accorded to this great work, by the general reader, depends very largely upon the estimation put upon it by the few competent to judge of the work of the Revisers. If the verdict of these be favorable, the acceptance of the general body of Christians will follow.

These men are now expressing themselves, and, in most instances, favorably. A recent article in this connection appears in the January number of the *Presbyterian Review*, '86, from the pen of the Rev. Prin. Caven. The writer's reputation as an exegete will obtain for him a careful reading everywhere, but by those who have come under his influence while pursuing their theological studies, and who almost unconsciously yield to his fair and clear judgment, this article will be read with intensest interest.

The question the writer discusses is—"Does the Revised Version accomplish all that can be reasonably expected of a version executed at the present time?" In reference to what has been done for the text of the New Testament the answer is given in the affirmative. While open to criticism at some points, yet—"in textual revision everything has been done that could reasonably be expected"—and—"the results of the criticism of the last hundred years are faithfully represented in the text which underlies the revision."

But in regard to the text of the Old Testament regret is expressed that a more thorough revision of the Hebrew was not attempted. It is acknowledged that the materials were not immediately available for a thorough revision of the Hebrew text, but it is submitted that something more than has been done might in safety, and should in consistency, have been done.

Respecting the work of amending the translation of the New Testament, the opinion is expressed that "we should expect any competent judge to say that the work is well and thoroughly done." The work of translating the Old Testament text is treated at greater length, but the verdict is one of approval. In the removal of archaisms, in the emendation of the translation, in the more correct rendering of the grammatical forms, a decided advance is noted.

The English of the Authorized Bible has always been a subject of praise among literary men. This has not been impaired by the work of revision. It is not asserted that it is improved, but neither has it suffered. And, in regard to theological and ethical results, it is seen that,—“no reconstruction of theology is necessary, and the moral characteristics of the Bible are precisely what they were.”

In a sentence or two at the close we have the writer's position in regard to the question discussed:—"No service rendered to the Bible since 1611 can be regarded as transcending in importance the work of revision now completed. . . . The work is not perfect, but the Revised Version will certainly be placed at the head of all translations of the Scripture which have yet been made."