

errors of every one of the classes that were urged against the Authorized Version as reasons for its revision. If it be replied that the number of faults in the A. V. was a more potent reason for revising it, than their mere variety, I answer that I have not undertaken to show that the Revised Version is in need of revision to an equal extent, but only alike with the Authorized. And I am grateful for being led thus easily to the second assertion which I had in mind to make at the outset.

It is this: The Revised Version appears to me to be almost incomparably better than the Authorized Version. I desire to make this observation as pointedly as I made the former one. Some people seem to think that when they have collected and tabulated a number of petty faults (mixed often with a greater number of individual preferences) with the triumphant result of showing that the Revised Version is not perfect, they have settled everything. I beg leave, on the contrary, to remind the readers of this Review that the practical question before the English-speaking Christian world to-day concerns not absolute but relative perfection. It will not do to neglect to note, collect, appreciate (or try to get corrected, for that matter), the faults of the Revised Version; and I for one have no words but those of respect for the scholars who are doing this somewhat disagreeable work. But when they are collected and tabulated and tested and proved, they do not amount to a corporal's guard compared with the mixed multitude that rushes upon us from the noble and competently accurate but inexact version which we call the Authorized Version. And this fact it will not do to neglect either. The pity of the thing is that when the comparatively few and unimportant faults of the Revision are gathered together and spread out to view, many look upon them in so sadly one-sided a way that they never think of asking either of the two very important (or necessary, rather) questions: What proportion do these faults bear to the whole mass of matter in this version? and what proportion do they bear to the faults in other versions? I am not concerned nor inclined to minimize these faults; here they are and I am very sorry for every one of them, and would gladly see them removed. But it is quite impossible to overlook either of these two facts: they are inappreciable as compared with the great army of passages accurately and felicitously rendered, and there is no other version in any tongue that possesses so few of them. If on the one side, then, we must frankly own that the Revised Version is not perfect, on the other let us frankly own that it is the most perfect of versions.

As regards its purity relative to our Authorized Version, a very simple test suggested by the use I have made above of Bishop Lightfoot's treatise may be sufficient here. Dr. Schaff, in his valuable introduction to the volume there cited, gives, among other errors, twenty-one instances in which the A. V., to the hurt of the sense,