tion, which we are contending for, beyond dispute. This reading, Olshausen says, is no doubt authentic. "It has perhaps been omitted," he adds, "merely in order to assimilate the narrative of St. Luke to the description given by both the other Evangelists" He gives the view, which we have done, of the passage in Luke. But with the lax views which he has of inspiration, he conceives the simile as given by Luke different in meaning from that given by Matthew and Mark. He says that the narrative of St. Luke appears somewhat modified, and that he prefers the representation of St. Matthew and St. Mark. This we regard as most irreverent language. Each of these Evangelists professes to record the sentiments of Jesus, and we shall now show, that though the words, or mode of expression, may be a little different, the meaning is precisely the same in all.

The Greek words, as they stand in Matthew, are as follows :- "oudcis de cpiballu epiblema, rakous agnaphou epi, himatio palaio airei gar to pleroma autou apo tou, himatiou, kai heiron, shisma ginetai." This we translate literally—" No one putteth a patch of a new fragment of a garment upon an old garment; for this takes away its completeness from the garment, and a worse rent is made." This we contend, is a much more literal translation of the passage than that contained in the authorised version. The word "rakous," translated in the authorised version cloth, signifies, according to Schleusner, "a part cut off, a rag, a particle of cloth, a torn garment." To translate "rakous agnaphou," therefore, "new cloth," is to mis-translate it; for it undoubtedly signifies " a fragment of a new garment." Our translation of the second clause-"for this takes away its completeness from the garment"-is perfectly literal and natural, whereas that in the authorized version is supplemental and inverted. The last clause, "and the tent is made worse," as it stands in our version, gives quite an erroneous view of the original. There is no definite article in the original; and it should have been translated, "and a worse rent is made;" that is, a worse rent is made in the new garment, than the rent in the old, which the new piece was cut out to mend. The verse in Matthew, then, may be thus freely translated—"No one puts a patch of cloth cut out of a new garment upon an old garment; for this takes away its completeness from the new garment, and a worse rent is made in a, than that which was in the old, to mend which the new was cut out.

In the parallel passage in Mark, the words are slightly different; but they admit of being translated in the same way. The second clause is a little difficult, whichever way it is translated; but we think the rendering we shall put upon it, is the most literal and natural. The second clause runs thus—"ei de me, arei to pleroma autou to kainon tou palaiou." These words we translate thus: "But if otherwise, the new of the old (that is, the new patch put upon the old) takes away its completeness (from the new garment.)" The whole text, as it stands in Mark, we would thus freely translate—"No one sews a patch composed of cloth taken from a new garment upon an old garment; but if otherwise, the new patch put upon the old takes away its completeness from the new, and a

worse rent is made."

We are satisfied that no scholar will dispute the general accuracy of the interpretation which we have given of the pas-age, as it stands in Luke; and we feel persuaded that the translation which we have given of the passage in Matthew, renders it not only consistent with Luke, but that it is more literal and natural than that usually given. We do not feel so thoroughly satisfied with our interpretation of the passage in Mark. The words there are not easily translated in any way. But it will be admitted that in difficulties of interpretation we ought to seek light from those passages which are plainer and more intelligible; and applying the light derived from the passage in Luke to the elucidation of the passage in Mark, we arrive at a consistent and legitimate interpretation, without doing violence to any rule of grammar.