

# THE BIBLICAL RECORDER.

J. J. JAMES, Editor.

Devoted to Religion, Morality, Literature, Agriculture and General Intelligence.

G. HERBERT & Co., Proprietors.

VOLUME XIX. NO. 51.

RALEIGH, N. C., THURSDAY, DECEMBER 21, 1854

WHOLE NO. 1223

## THE BIBLICAL RECORDER.

A Religious and Literary Paper.

Published weekly at Raleigh, N. C., at \$2.00 per annum, payable in advance.

All letters on business should be directed to G. HERBERT & Co., Raleigh, N. C.

All communications, or in any way relating to the editorial department, should be addressed to Rev. J. J. JAMES, or "Editor of the Biblical Recorder."

All communications, to insure attention, must be directed to Raleigh, N. C.—post paid.

For further particulars see last page.

### THE LAW OF NEWSPAPERS.

1. Subscribers who do not give express notice to the contrary are considered as wishing to continue their subscription.

2. If the subscribers order the discontinuance of their papers, the publishers may continue to send them till all arrearages are paid.

3. If subscribers neglect or refuse to take their papers from the office to which they are directed, they are held responsible until they have satisfied their bill, and order their paper discontinued.

4. If subscribers remove to other places without informing the publisher, and the paper is sent to the former direction, they are held responsible.

5. The courts have decided that refusing to take a paper or removing it from the office, or removing and leaving it uncollected, is "prima facie" evidence of intentional fraud.

### COMMUNICATIONS.

For the Recorder.

#### Rev. Peter Doub on Communion and Baptism.

No. II.

Mr. Editor:—The Rev. author proceeds to answer "Some of the objections that may be brought against these views." "The most important of these I will now consider. It is objected,

1. That the scope of qualifications given above leaves out of the question the most important of all, namely, BAPTISM."

Mr. Doub does not say, who urges this objection, but from his subsequent mention of the Baptists in several places, in one of which he says—"The Baptist church has legislated on this subject," namely, qualifications for communion; we are led to the conclusion that he charges this objection to the Baptists. If this be the case, Mr. Doub exhibits either palpable ignorance of the views of the Baptist denomination—or sheer perverseness.

Every one who knows the views of the denomination, knows that the Baptists regard baptism in no such light. They regard baptism as a prerequisite to the communion because the sacred Scriptures have so placed it, and because they learn that the Savior and the apostles so regarded it. But that they regard it as "the most important of all qualifications," is a groundless charge. So far from it, they administer it only to such as profess the spiritual qualifications of repentance towards God and faith in Christ. Their practice is a complete refutation of the allegation. But who makes the charge? Those who regard baptism of little importance? Far from it. It is made by those very people who consider baptism so important that it must be administered, whether the subject have any qualifications for it or not, or can know what it is—even to infants—upon whom they sprinkle or pour water, and call it christian baptism—not only when the infant cannot understand the design, but cannot comprehend the name they give this ceremony. So important do they consider baptism that they administer a substitute for it, by force, upon an unconscious babe, while it by its cries expresses its disapprobation of such barbarity! So important a qualification do these people consider baptism, that they administer what they call baptism, before the child can have any other qualification, so much afraid are they that the child will die before it is forced to submit to this mockery. Yes, and those same people can blush at the baptism of a female, who in her baptism follows the example and obeys the command of her Lord, and yet can without a list of shame, reiterate such a groundless charge against those who by their practice and their declarations repeated again and again for centuries, have proven the charge groundless.

But to Mr. Doub's reasoning to meet this objection. He says:

"This objection is evidently the most important of any that can be produced, and, therefore, demands our serious and careful investigation. It does not appear to my mind that the New Testament has given us any thing by which we could be led to the conclusion that baptism, if it is a qualification at all, is indispensably required of men to qualify them for the sacrament. The reasons which operate strongly on my own mind, I shall now present:

"1. There is no precept or command requiring baptism as an indispensable qualification for the communion."

"This position is evidently a very strong and unobjectionable one; and if the truth of it can be sustained, it must at once decide the whole controversy."

Mr. Doub considers this "the most important" objection that can be produced, and therefore has given it his "serious and careful" attention. He has, doubtless, brought his heaviest artillery to bear upon this redoubt, and I dare say congratulates himself that it has been effectually silenced. I propose to take the measure and weight of his pieces. He cannot discover "that the New Testament has given us any thing by which we could be led to the conclusion, that baptism, if a qualification at all, is indispensably required of men to qualify them for the sacrament." If a qualification at all, says Mr. Doub, who can see this spiritual? Why does he

not say whether he believes it to be one or not? He expresses doubt, while admitting that it may be a qualification, but that it is dispensable. If language means any thing, this is the meaning of Mr. Doub's language. When and how did this divine learn a distinction in reference to God's commands and ordinances between dispensable and indispensable? Has Mr. Doub been up to the third heaven? Has he been so far initiated into the unrevealed mysteries of the Divine will, as to learn that of the duties revealed that some are dispensable and some indispensable? There is no such distinction taught in the Bible, nor is it even "warranted" by God's word. I should like to know whence cometh his knowledge about this matter. It appears "to my mind" that for a minister of the Gospel of Christ to hold up such a distinction is surpassingly strange—not to say unaccountably wicked.

If the "New Testament has given us any thing by which" we are led to the conclusion, that baptism is a qualification at all, who so bold as to say that it is dispensable? If it is a qualification at all, it is dispensable. If any thing is required of us by God as a duty, it is indispensable. God requires no dispensable duties, no dispensable qualifications. If an act is dispensable, then it cannot be a duty or qualification. If God has "given us any thing" in his word from which we learn that the performance of a duty or the submission to an ordinance, is a qualification for the privileges of another, I ask whether there be blasphemy, if it is not blasphemous to say that this qualification is dispensable. But were there a distinction between dispensable and indispensable qualifications—the scriptures have not marked out the distinction, from whom are we to learn the distinction? From Mr. Doub? This doctrine, intimated by Mr. Doub was born at Rome. It has the same parentage as the doctrine of the infallibility of the church. They are twin sisters. By these Antichrist has deluded many souls, and with them the Romish church assumes the authority to say that repentance is dispensable, that penance will do for repentance.

Is this doctrine of dispensables, one of the principles which Mr. Doub "believes to be warranted by the word of God?"

But he thinks baptism is not an indispensable qualification for the Communion because "there is no precept or command requiring baptism as an indispensable qualification for the communion."

Will Mr. Doub give us one single qualification that the Bible by "precept or command" requires as an indispensable qualification for the communion. Not one of his four, is thus given by "precept or command" as "indispensable." If we are to have only such qualifications as are commanded as "indispensable" for the communion, then Mr. Doub has not given us one, for the Bible has given no precept or command "requiring" any qualification as indispensable to prepare one for communion (not even in 1 Cor. xi. 29) according to this author's argument.

The Bible does not hold out, that the communion is the object of christian qualifications, or the end for which they live, but that God's glory is the object and end for which are given gifts and graces. TIMOTHY.

For the Recorder.

#### Gross Injustice to the Baptists.

Christian Editors, like preachers, should ever aim to teach the people the truth. Even in their controversial disputes they should abstain from the very slightest misrepresentation of the sentiments of others. True controversy is designed to elicit the truth, not to obscure it for the sake of effecting base party purposes. The man who enters into controversy with the first view is a public benefactor; but he who is impelled by the second is a contemptible party tool, unworthy the confidence or respect of any honest individual. Such *cut's pines*, such miserable hirelings, who prostitute their intellects to gain their bread, should be scouted and hooted out of virtuous society. They are a public curse, and do more harm in a short life-time than good men can undo in generations. We have been led to the reflections by reading an article in the 49th No. of the Richmond Christian Advocate; but of course no one will consider them *personal* unless they should chance to apply. The article referred to is copied, without dissent from its contents by the Richmond editor, from the Northern Christian Advocate, and is therefore endorsed as true. It contains two palpable falsehoods, coupled with a batch of false reasoning, and is calculated to do great injustice to the Baptists. The writer selects two extracts from Pado-baptists. He says:

"The first is from the Western Recorder, a Baptist paper published in Louisville, Ky. 'Of all the dramatic heresies in the black catalogue which has befouled the name of christianity, we consider infant baptism the most damnable. If other heresies have damned their thousands, this has damned its tens of thousands.' If this is not making eternal salvation depend on adult baptism, and that by plunging too, it is difficult to say what it means. It would be profitable for such writers to search the New Testament, which covers the space of some sixty years, for an instance of a child of christian parents that was baptized at any other period than infancy."

The Baptist editor's language, as admitted, is too harsh for a sacred subject; but how absurd the conclusion drawn from it! "If this is not making eternal salvation depend on adult baptism, and that by plunging too, it is difficult to say what it means." Can you see any connection between the premises and the conclusion? The quotation does not contain a single word about "adult baptism," or "plunging." It simply affirms the destructive tendency of infant baptism; and all know that the Baptists believe that it is destructive, because its subjects are often, when grown, led to base the hope of their salvation upon the facts that they were baptized in infancy and religiously educated. But this flippant scribbler sought to make the false impression that the Baptists regard baptism, and that by "plunging," as essential to salvation. This—if he is at all read in the Theology of the Baptist denomination—he must have known was a falsehood when he penned it, and Doctor Lee, we are sure, knew the same when he transferred the vile slander to his columns. The Baptists hold that *spiritual regeneration* is the indispensable qualification for baptism; agreeing, at the same time, with many eminent pedobaptist divines, that *willful* neglect of the ordinances of Christ disqualifies a man for heaven, inasmuch as it proves him to be destitute of that faith which is productive of love and obedience. Hence, as it is the duty of no one to be baptized unless he has evangelical faith, the necessity of baptism in order to salvation, constitutes no part of Baptist Theology.

But we are cautioned on an important point. "It would be profitable [says our extract] for such writers to search the New Testament, which covers the space of some sixty years, for an instance of a child of christian parents that was baptized at any other period than infancy!" Does the editor by contrasting infant with Adult Baptism mean to insinuate that the former is essential to salvation? He certainly seems to contest the claims of each on this very point. Whatever may be his design, the baptists must beg leave to disagree with him and decline to follow his advice; for very many of them, as well as many Methodists, have found it a very *unprofitable* task to search the New Testament for instances of infant baptism. In all the period which it covers they have failed to find a single example on record of an infant being baptized, who was the child of Christian, Jew or Heathen!

The second extract is in these words: "Alexander Carson, a leading Baptist minister, says: 'The Gospel has nothing to do with infants, nor have gospel ordinances any respect to them. The salvation of the soul depends almost exclusively on the baptism of the gospel itself. This writer, to overthrow infant baptism, is compelled to deny infant salvation. I have long believed that this is perfectly logical, and am not at all surprised at a new appearance of the "horrible decree." We may expect soon to hear it again declared that 'hell is paved with infants not a span long.'"

Now, out of his own mouth, let the Methodist editor stand condemned. He says that he has long been convinced that the *denial* of INFANT SALVATION follows as a logical necessity the denial of INFANT BAPTISM. According, therefore, to his logic, such is the relation of infant baptism to infant salvation that to deny the one is to overthrow the other. But this is only a reiteration of Mr. Wesley's version of the "horrible decree," put forth in the declaration that the water of baptism washes away from infants original sin, and is in all ordinary cases necessary to salvation. On the supposition of the truth of this dogma "we may expect soon to hear it again declared that 'hell is paved with infants not a span long!'"

Our principal design, however, was to call attention to the writer's misrepresentation of Dr. Carson. The impression which he seeks to convey is, that Dr. C. taught the doctrine of infant perdition. The extract taken from his work on Baptism is garbled and made to convey an idea which the Doctor never harbored. In the same connection he distinctly declares his belief that all infants are saved, but not by Gospel institutions; hence his remark that "the Gospel has nothing to do with infants, nor have Gospel ordinances any respect to them." The Methodist editor is either ignorant or dishonest;—either he never read Carson, and took his quotation at second hand, or else he has willfully and dishonestly so quoted him as to make him speak what he never believed or taught. But, what shall we say of Dr. Lee, who has by re-publishing, endorsed the slander! Not more than two years ago this same Dr. Lee published this same foul aspersion of Carson, and when corrected through the Religious Herald, acknowledged that he borrowed his quotation from a Presbyterian paper, and that, on examining Carson's work, he found he had been misrepresented.—This is our recollection of the facts. But, now, thinking that the matter has been forgotten, he takes the falsehood, as resuscitated by another, and heralds it forth a second time. Thus a deceased author is injured and a whole denomination of christians made to suffer on account of a false representation of his sentiments. Dr. Lee either has a bad memory or he is a very bad man. We incline to the opinion that the latter is the case. Dr. Lee knows that Dr. Carson, no where in his writings, teaches the horrible doctrine of infant damnation; and he knows also that the Baptist church holds no such dogma and that when the charge has been brought against her ministers they have denied it most positively. He is, therefore, guilty of "having false witness against his neighbor." Have our Methodist friends a

better weapon than falsehood and slander with which to fight the Baptists? If not, they had better give up the battle and retreat, for a righteous God will never allow such means to prosper.

Should our language seem too severe, we beg the reader to recollect for whom it is intended—men who have time and again proved themselves unworthy the confidence and respect of their christian neighbors, and who can only be reached by adopting our style in some measure to their own barbarous taste. W.

### Religious.

From the American Messenger.

#### Triumph of Grace.

Hannah Price had been instructed in a Sabbath-school. The serious impressions made upon her mind were soon visible, and led to her saving conversion to God. Her father had become the companion of the most profligate men in his native village, and, by insensible degrees the worst of them all. The alchouse usually received at night the earnings of the day. His wife never reproached him, and only endeavored to lure him from such society, and such practices by the comforts of home. But his home was the scene of his greatest misery; for there he had time to reflect, and there he was surrounded by his wife and children, whom he was daily injuring.

He had long pursued this wicked course, when one Sabbath evening, after drinking and gambling all day, and having lost the earnings of the week, he returned from his companions, and scarcely knowing what he did, took the road homeward. One of them called on him to return; entreated him to have one more game and added, "You will be sure to win it all back, you know."

He stopped—"Why, if I could get it back," said he to himself, "Come, come," said his companion, "one more game, only one."

"No," said Price, "I've lost all my money, and so I can't if I would." But at the moment it occurred to him that his quarter's rent, except what was to be made up out of his last week's work, had been put up in the cupboard in the kitchen at home; and if he could get that, he should be sure to win back all he had lost. The money was to be paid the next day; and hardened as he was, he trembled at what he was going to do, and was terrified lest his wife and children should see him.

He approached the house, then ventured to look in at the window, and perceiving no one, he entered the kitchen, and went hastily to the cupboard. It was locked; and he felt a momentary relief in the thought that he could not get the money. But again he said to himself, "I shall be sure to win; and hastened softly up stairs to look for the key, thinking he knew where his wife had put it. As he passed the room in which his children slept, he thought he heard a slight noise; and listening he heard sobs, and then a voice. It was poor little Hannah, praying that her father might see the error of his ways; that God would change his heart, and make him a comfort to her mother, and to them all. Her sighs and tears seemed almost to impede her utterance; and when he heard her call him dear father, and felt how ill he deserved such a name, he could scarcely forbear groaning aloud, in the anguish of his feelings. He forgot the key, crept to his bed room, and fell on his knees. He uttered not one word, but the language of the heart is audible in the cars of mercy; and that evening for the first time it might have been said of him, "Behold he prayeth."

After some time he went down stairs, where Hannah was rocking her little sister to sleep.—She started with astonishment. For many months, and even for years, she did not remember seeing her father at home on a Sabbath evening. He went to the children and kissed them both. This was a mark of affection they did not often receive, and Hannah was as much pleased as she was surprised.

"Dear father," said she, "mother will be so glad to see you at home, and we shall be so comfortable! You will not go out again to-night, will you father?" "No, dear," he replied. And as she went to lay the babe on the bed he heard her say to herself, "Father called me dear."

The return of his wife and boys from public worship, Price had been dreading. He knew not how to endure their looks of amazement; but it was soon over. The children at first looked fearfully at each other, as though their usual Sabbath evening's pleasure was over; for they always sat up later, and told their mother all that had happened at Sabbath-school, and what they could remember of the sermons they had heard during the day. Hannah had prepared supper, and there was a nice fire and clean hearth. Price felt at that moment, that if his own character was what it ought to be, he should indeed be happy.

"Father," said Hannah, as he entered the room, "here is a nice new laid egg. It is my own, and you shall have it, father." Price could not speak, but he kissed his child and he saw tears in her eyes. He thought that it was the nicest egg he had ever tasted. When supper was over, Hannah said, "Father, you have not heard the road in a long time." "Well," said he "will you read something to me out of your re-

ward book at the Sabbath school?" He knew that this was the Bible; but had not the courage to say so.

Hannah obeyed though not without trembling. She read the 51st Psalm. Price hid his face and wept. The first part seemed to be made on purpose for him. He restrained his feelings sufficiently to say, "Thank you, dear, you are very much improved. Read something else." She turned to the 103d Psalm. "Surely God made her choose those two," thought Price.—His wife beheld with astonishment the conduct of her husband, and the emotions which appeared to agitate him. "Hannah, my dear," said she, "you had better be taking the boys to bed." She kissed them, and told them that they had been good boys; and then they turned to Hannah, as if to ask if they should go to their father. "Come, dear," said she, "wish father good night." She kissed them, and they left the room.

"You'll have some additional refreshment, John?" said his wife. "You've had no beer to-night." "Oh," said he, "I hope I shall never taste beer again."

With unutterable joy she started from her seat, and throwing her arms around his neck, burst into tears. For some minutes they wept together. Price tried to speak, but could not. At length recovering some degree of composure, he seated himself beside her, and hiding his face, told her all the occurrences of the evening.

"Can you ever forgive such a wretch?" said he. "Oh, Hannah, can you?" "Forgive you I my dear husband," she replied; "I never loved you half so well, nor ever was half so happy before." "Don't ask me to forgive you; ask God to forgive you, and he will." And then she talked to him of the infinite mercy of God through Jesus Christ, and again begged him not to ask pardon of her, but of Him.

"I have, I have," said he; "but till I heard what our dear child read, I did not think he ever could forgive such a wicked sinner as I am."

"It is a faithful saying and worthy of all acceptance, that Jesus Christ came into the world to save sinners, even the chief," said his wife.

"Does the Bible say all that? Does it say the chief?" he asked. "Indeed it does," she answered. "Then that must mean me," said he. "Let us kneel down together, my dear John," said his wife, "and ask God to fulfil his promise to you." "I cannot pray," said he.

She took his hand, and made him kneel down beside her; and in the language of faith and affection, she commended him to the mercy of that God who had long been her Father and Friend. After thus engaging in prayer the mind of her husband became more composed; and he expressed the hope that he should never lose the remembrance of this evening.

The change was as permanent as it was remarkable. From this time his old companions were forsaken, and the alchouse abandoned.—To the former he only spoke, but to entrant them to turn from their wickedness; and the latter he never entered but once, and then it was with his wife, to pay the landlord a debt he had contracted, for some windows broken in an affray with one of his depraved associates in a state of intoxication.

From the Methodist Protestant.

#### The Revision Question.

Mr. Editor:—In reference to a late communication of your correspondence "Menno," it may be proper for me to make an observation or two.

I know not who was your "good authority," or who was Mr. Williams' authority, but you were both correct. Until with a few weeks I have refused to have any sort of connection with the Bible Union and its proceedings.

But affinity with the Bible Union, and a desire to see our noble English Bible expurgated of all known defects, are very different things. Your correspondent "does not believe" what is affirmed as to these defects. His unbelief will vanish if he will examine the subject. Nor would his discovery of inaccuracies lead him to "burn his Bible, and study only natural religion," nor to take "the Talmud or Koran," &c. This would be as if a man, because he detects imperfections in an only and beloved and beautiful child, should adopt a monkey. I presume both "Menno" and myself would cherish our child, and seek to correct our blemishes.

But are there inaccuracies in our received version? Let the following distinguished man, not a Baptist, testify:

Dr. Adam Clarke, in his commentary upon the 13th chapter of the 2d book of Samuel, says, "Though I believe our translation to be by far the best in any language, ancient or modern, yet I am satisfied it stands much in need of revision. Most of the advantages which our unbelievers have over certain passages of Scripture, have arisen from inaccurate or false translation of the terms in the original, and an appeal to this has generally silenced the gainsayers. But in the time in which our translation was made, biblical criticism was in its infancy, if indeed it did exist; and we may rather wonder that we find things so well, than be surprised that they are no better."

Bishop Lowth, a name high in honor among scholars, testifies in these words: "To confirm and illustrate the Holy Scriptures, to evince their truth, to show their consistency, to explain their meaning to make them more generally known and studied, more easily and perfectly

understood by all; to remove the difficulties that discourage the honest endeavors of the unlearned, and provoke the malicious cavils of the half-learned; this is the most worthy subject that can engage our attention, the most important end to which our labors in the search of truth can be directed. And here I cannot but mention that nothing would more effectually conduce to this end, than the exhibiting of the holy Scriptures themselves to the people, in a more advantageous and just light, by an accurate revision of our vulgar translation, by public authority."

Dr. Doddridge says, in the preface to his Family Expositor, that "the Old Testament has suffered more than the New in our translation."

Prof. Symonds, D. D., whom Dr. Newcome pronounces "a writer of real judgment and taste," published a work in 1789, on the "Expediency of Revising the present English Version," in which he says: "Whoever examines our version in present use, will find that it is ambiguous and incorrect, even in matters of the highest importance."

Anthony Blackwall, A. M. author of a celebrated work on "The Sacred Classics Defended and Illustrated," speaking of King James' version, makes the following remark: "Innumerable instances might be given of faulty translation of the divine original. An accurate translation, proved and supported by sacred criticism, would quash and silence most of the objections of pert and profane cavillers."

Daniel Waterland, D. D., a distinguished minister and scholar of the last century, says: "Our last English version is undoubtedly capable of very great improvements."

Archbishop Newcome, D. D., in his "Historical Views of the present English Biblical Translations, and Expediency of revising by authority our present Translation, and the means of executing such a revision," a work published at Dublin in a judicious and able manner. In one place, after speaking of the change which our language has undergone since 1611, the date of King James' version, the numerous faults of the additional light which has been shed on the sources of sacred learning, and the sciences of biblical criticism, he says: "With such an accession of helps, with light poured in from every part of the literary world, with such important principles, and with the advancement of critical skill to apply them, it is natural to conclude that many mistakes and obscurities may be removed from the present version, and that the precision, beauty and emphasis of the original may be communicated to it in various places." p. 240.

Archdeacon Hare, than whom no one is at present more distinguished in the Church of England, says, (see *Mission of the Comforter*, p. 224.) "When our church has the courage to undertake the task of revising the authorized version of the Bible, the account of the work of the Comforter, given in the 13th verse of our chapter will be corrected, along with a number of other inaccuracies arising from inattention to the force of the Greek article. The neglect of force is one among the many proofs that our version of the New Testament is too dependent on a Latin translation, probably that of Erasmus."

Now, if such inaccuracies exist, why should not all christians unite in correcting them?—God who gave the Scriptures, yet guards and preserves them; and in spite of erroneous translations here and there, we still have his holy word. But if a single mistranslation is admitted, it will prejudice the cause of the Bible by casting "ominous conjecture" on the whole.

In conversation, not long since, with one of our most esteemed and prominent christians, our attention was directed to Acts 12 c. 4 v. Here all admit a false and prejudiced translation.—The original is *Pascha* (Passover), the translation is "Easter!" Even Dr. Scott says, (see *Comm*) "It is therefore surprising that the venerable translators of the Bible should have used that word instead of 'the Passover' in this connection." When this was shown, the gentleman remarked, "How can I be sure that there are not other errors?—and why are they not removed?" This fear will insinuate itself wherever a single error is acknowledged.

Our society is organized to aid any competent body—Baptists or Pado-baptists—in purging any errors from the version we have; but not to supplant this version which is most dear to us. As no other body is engaged in this work, we are willing to try the "Bible Union." We are assured that they have enlisted at great expense, able men of six evangelical denominations to perform the task; to work under no sort of restriction; but faithfully to give the mind of the Holy Spirit. Their enunciation we, and all men, can examine for ourselves; for they give in notes the reasons of any changes.—And now, I ask, why should any one object to this?

Your correspondent wrongs me when he affirms that "Dr. Fuller (by his own authority) took the chair." Mr. Kelly made a motion, and the body voted, and the chair was taken in obedience to the call. This, however, is a small matter. The other objection of your correspondent is not a small matter. It is, that so many Baptists are officers. I have replied that, and wish now that some Pedobaptist party would take the Presidency. But as none such were present, what could have been done? Must we defer the discharge of duty because others will not co-operate?—

I made the motion, and Dr. Fuller took the chair in obedience to the call. A. D. Knapp, Jr.

understood by all; to remove the difficulties that discourage the honest endeavors of the unlearned, and provoke the malicious cavils of the half-learned; this is the most worthy subject that can engage our attention, the most important end to which our labors in the search of truth can be directed. And here I cannot but mention that nothing would more effectually conduce to this end, than the exhibiting of the holy Scriptures themselves to the people, in a more advantageous and just light, by an accurate revision of our vulgar translation, by public authority."

Dr. Doddridge says, in the preface to his Family Expositor, that "the Old Testament has suffered more than the New in our translation."

Prof. Symonds, D. D., whom Dr. Newcome pronounces "a writer of real judgment and taste," published a work in 1789, on the "Expediency of Revising the present English Version," in which he says: "Whoever examines our version in present use, will find that it is ambiguous and incorrect, even in matters of the highest importance."

Anthony Blackwall, A. M. author of a celebrated work on "The Sacred Classics Defended and Illustrated," speaking of King James' version, makes the following remark: "Innumerable instances might be given of faulty translation of the divine original. An accurate translation, proved and supported by sacred criticism, would quash and silence most of the objections of pert and profane cavillers."

Daniel Waterland, D. D., a distinguished minister and scholar of the last century, says: "Our last English version is undoubtedly capable of very great improvements."

Archbishop Newcome, D. D., in his "Historical Views of the present English Biblical Translations, and Expediency of revising by authority our present Translation, and the means of executing such a revision," a work published at Dublin in a judicious and able manner. In one place, after speaking of the change which our language has undergone since 1611, the date of King James' version, the numerous faults of the additional light which has been shed on the sources of sacred learning, and the sciences of biblical criticism, he says: "With such an accession of helps, with light poured in from every part of the literary world, with such important principles, and with the advancement of critical skill to apply them, it is natural to conclude that many mistakes and obscurities may be removed from the present version, and that the precision, beauty and emphasis of the original may be communicated to it in various places." p. 240.

Archdeacon Hare, than whom no one is at present more distinguished in the Church of England, says, (see *Mission of the Comforter*, p. 224.) "When our church has the courage to undertake the task of revising the authorized version of the Bible, the account of the work of the Comforter, given in the 13th verse of our chapter will be corrected, along with a number of other inaccuracies arising from inattention to the force of the Greek article. The neglect of force is one among the many proofs that our version of the New Testament is too dependent on a Latin translation, probably that of Erasmus."

Now, if such inaccuracies exist, why should not all christians unite in correcting them?—God who gave the Scriptures, yet guards and preserves them; and in spite of erroneous translations here and there, we still have his holy word. But if a single mistranslation is admitted, it will prejudice the cause of the Bible by casting "ominous conjecture" on the whole.

In conversation, not long since, with one of our most esteemed and prominent christians, our attention was directed to Acts 12 c. 4 v. Here all admit a false and prejudiced translation.—The original is *Pascha* (Passover), the translation is "Easter!" Even Dr. Scott says, (see *Comm*) "It is therefore surprising that the venerable translators of the Bible should have used that word instead of 'the Passover' in this connection." When this was shown, the gentleman remarked, "How can I be sure that there are not other errors?—and why are they not removed?" This fear will insinuate itself wherever a single error is acknowledged.

Our society is organized to aid any competent body—Baptists or Pado-baptists—in purging any errors from the version we have; but not to supplant this version which is most dear to us. As no other body is engaged in this work, we are willing to try the "Bible Union." We are assured that they have enlisted at great expense, able men of six evangelical denominations to perform the task; to work under no sort of restriction; but faithfully to give the mind of the Holy Spirit. Their enunciation we, and all men, can examine for ourselves; for they give in notes the reasons of any changes.—And now, I ask, why should any one object to this?

Your correspondent wrongs me when he affirms that "Dr. Fuller (by his own authority) took the chair." Mr. Kelly made a motion, and the body voted, and the chair was taken in obedience to the call. This, however, is a small matter. The other objection of your correspondent is not a small matter. It is, that so many Baptists are officers. I have replied that, and wish now that some Pedobaptist party would take the Presidency. But as none such were present, what could have been done? Must we defer the discharge of duty because others will not co-operate?—

I made the motion, and Dr. Fuller took the chair in obedience to the call. A. D. Knapp, Jr.