





# THE BAPTIST.

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 2, 1852.  
J. B. STITELER, Corresponding Editor.

**TRAVELLING AGENT.**—Williams E. Chambliss is the travelling agent for this paper, having full power to close its unsettled business in any manner usual to printing establishments. Should he call on any who have recently remitted us funds, it will be understood how the accident occurred—the accounts in his possession having been drawn off previous to the receipt of the money. All errors will be corrected with pleasure.

**A WORTHY EXAMPLE.**—An excellent brother who was in arrears with our paper, a few days since accompanied his subscription with the following note, which we commend to the imitation of others. It is short and sweet.

"Dear Bro. Chambliss:—I have been owing you long enough, and if you will pardon me for the past delay, I promise you it shall not be the case in future. I love to read the Baptist, and I love to pay for it. Enclosed you will find five dollars, which please place to my credit. You shall hear from me again in due time.

Yours in Christ. \*\*\*

**REV. J. Q. PRESCOTT.**—We have recently had several communications from Louisiana requesting a reference to some good minister to act as a General Agent for the Baptist Convention of that State. By a private letter we have just learned that the Rev. J. Q. Prescott of Mississippi, contemplates visiting that State in July, proximo, and will probably be at the Convention at Mt. Lebanon. We do not know, indeed, that brother P. has made up his mind to locate in Louisiana, but think it possible he might be induced to do so; and we can assure our brethren before hand, that if they can persuade him thus to fix his habitation, they will find in him a valuable accession to the number and strength of their ministry. He is an intelligent, amiable, and useful laborer in the vineyard of the Lord, and we know no man who could more safely recommend to the confidence and esteem of the churches.

**THE MEMPHIS CONVENTION, AGAIN.**—We commend the letter of brother Crane, in an another column, to the attention of our readers; and this we do without offering any reply, farther than to request that it be read in connection with Dr. Williams' letter on the first page. From the arduous with which our brother labors to vindicate himself and others in the Memphis Convention from suspicions of sympathizing with the theological opinions of Alexander Campbell and his followers, one might infer that he considered his orthodoxy in danger of being called in question. Now, so far as we are concerned, we can assure him that we never dreamed of any such thing; albeit for the very reason assigned by Dr. Williams, we considered it exceedingly unwise, and very dangerous to the enterprise contemplated by the friends of revision to fraternize with Campbellites in the manner of the Memphis Convention. This opinion we entertain still, after all that has been said about the extent of Mr. Campbell's co-operation in the matter of revision. If his connection and that of his co-workers was only nominal, as brother Crane insists, where was the use of filling the list of Vice Presidents with one to two, and the Board of Managers with one to three, with Campbellites; if their connection is more than nominal, why insist that it is otherwise. We have, however, an objection to the plan of revision adopted by the Convention, from the Bible Union, and stated by brother Crane, little less serious than to an open amalgamation with Campbellites. Brother Crane, and others deny that Mr. Campbell is to be a revisor of the Scriptures for the Convention; but he is equally careful not to inform us who are to do this important work.—What have we then gained by the information, on which to base our confidence that a version of the sacred oracles more reliable will be given to the world than what Mr. Campbell himself might produce? Mr. Campbell's co-operation in the work of revision will not be sought, on the ground, we suppose, that he is known to entertain erroneous views of the original; who, however, of the vast multitude of Baptists whose aid is sought in this work is yet able to say that each of the revisors that may be employed, will not be equally and in the same manner disqualified to furnish an acceptable version?—Now, we hold, that the Baptist denomination have a right to be informed on this point ere they are asked to contribute their funds to support the measure. We are not willing to commit ourselves to the dictation of this man or that, in such an exercise, on the ground of mere scholarship. Some of the best scholars in Christendom, have the most widely erred in the interpretation of scripture, and have interpreted them most contradictorily one to the other. Let us know more about the measure first, and then we shall be prepared to decide what we ought to do. But as we said, we shall offer no detailed reply to the aforesaid letter.

Our brother seems to feel that what we before wrote and what we now write on this subject is in opposition to him personally. We regret this. Certainly it was not so intended, and as we heartily sympathize in our brother's unwillingness that he and we should occupy different sides in this discussion, we shall forbear to say any thing more just now. For brother Crane, as a gentleman, a scholar, a Christian, and a theologian, we entertain even an exalted opinion, and if as he says we have spoken out our opinion plainly, we did so not in opposition to him, but to principles of action adopted by the whole Memphis Convention. *Satis sufficit.*

A movement has been made by the Board of Overseers and President and Fellows of Harvard College, for obtaining a judicial decision or separation in the Theological Department, or Divinity School from the University.

## Exegesis of Rom. 9: 3.

"For I could wish that myself were accursed from Christ, for my brethren, my kinsmen according to the flesh."

This passage has been the subject of much controversy on the part of Biblical critics, and is indeed at the first glance a passage of considerable difficulty.

We may be somewhat prepared for a proper understanding of this language, by remembering the warm devotion of this eminent Apostle, to the cause of his Master and the strong desire of his soul for the conversion of sinners, especially of the Jewish nation. It was his determination to glory in nothing save the cross of his crucified Lord, to count all things as lost for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus, and not even to count his life dear unto himself that he might be the means of saving immortal souls. The text then may be considered as a strong expression of the vehement desire of Paul that his brethren according to the flesh might come to a knowledge of the truth. He would be willing, if necessary, to suffer anything in behalf of those for whom his heart's desire and prayer to God was that they should be saved.

**Macknight**, who is at least an honest commentator, translated the verse as follows: "For I myself could wish to be separated from Christ, instead of my brethren, my kinsmen according to the flesh." By the word Christ he regards the church to be designated. Some have proposed to translate the passage, "I have wished," or "I did wish," and Scott regards this as the most "literal and natural construction of the clause," but advances the opinion with great hesitation because he can find "no support for the interpretation from more competent critics." Professor Hodge, however, in his very excellent commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, says, "The common interpretation, however, and that which seems most natural, is, 'I am grieved at heart for my brethren, for I could wish myself accursed from Christ, that is, I could be willing to be regarded and treated as anathema, a thing accursed, for their sakes.'" This it seems to me is the correct view of the passage, as it agrees with the whole spirit of the chapter, and consists with the enthusiastic devotion of Paul.

This is the language of *Emotion* and the difficulty in explaining it, arises from the disposition to press the words too far, and make them express definite ideas, instead of vehement and rather indefinite feeling.

By referring to the original, it will be seen that the whole force of the text depends upon the words *Ἐπιχριστῶν* and *ἀγαπῶντα*.

The correct construction of *Ἐπιχριστῶν* is not "I have wished," but *I could wish* as expressed in the English Translation. The expression is *hypothetical*, and hence the imperfect indicative is used, which implies a condition which is known to be highly improbable. Thus Moses (Ex. 32: 32) says to the Lord, "Yet now, if thou wilt, forgive their sin; and if not, blot me, I pray thee, out of thy book which thou hast written."

Moreover the object of Paul was not to inform the Romans what he used to feel with regard to his kinsmen, but his present strong desire for their salvation. Nor is it true that Paul ever did wish to be accursed by the Messiah, but he rejected all belief in Christ. He believed that he was a friend of the promised Messiah, but up to his conversion, he did not believe that Christ was the Messiah. Hence the words can only express a feeling interest which Paul possessed in the condition of the Jews. The general idea is that he considered himself as nothing, and even his happiness as a matter of very little moment, in comparison with the salvation of his nation.

To be anathema by Christ, *ἀναθεμα εἶναι ἀπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ*. The word *ἀναθεμα* rendered *accursed*, may be understood by reference to the instances in which it is employed in the New Testament. Gal. 1: 8, 9, "Let him be accursed." 1 Cor. 16: 22, "Let him be anathema maranatha." In these passages, it evidently refers to those who are exposed to the curse of God. In classic Greek it referred to whatever was separated or set apart for the gods. From this primary meaning, the word finally was used by the Jews to signify the devotion of an object to destruction. But it does not necessarily denote a separation to eternal death, although it has this force sometimes in the New Testament.

Paul evidently means to declare that he would be willing to suffer the bitterest woes, to forego all pleasure, and even to sacrifice life itself, if by his personal sufferings in their behalf, he could be the means of benefitting and saving his brethren. Such is the force of this much controverted passage. Paul does not say that he is willing to be damned, for the language has not necessarily that force, and such suffering could in no possible way benefit the Jews, and such a sacrifice could not be required.

Paul was a true moral hero. He thus expressed the truest patriotism and benevolence. There was no pain, privation nor toil that he would not willingly suffer, if it would benefit his kinsmen. Even death itself could not terrify him, but he would gladly endure it, to save souls from ruin. Sublime heroism! Noble Martyr, thou hast well said and nobly done, and art now wearing the martyr's crown! May thy spirit possess the hearts of all God's ministers?

J. B. S.

**THE REPUBLIC OF LIBERIA.**—We learn from the correspondence of the Journal of Commerce, that a large deputation of the American Colonization Society have had interviews with the President and Secretary of State, to urge the recognition by our Government of the Republic of Liberia. Both the President and Mr. Webster expressed themselves favorable to the recognition and to the cause of colonization.

A gentleman, "Punch" says, is one who has no business in the world.

## Revision Question.

NUMBER THREE.

I will now mention some of the special objections that have been made to the version of 1611. I can only allude to the more prominent, and those which have been chiefly insisted on, by the leading advocates of Revision. They object that the Greek verb *Baptizo*, has, by a slight change of termination, been rendered *baptize*, instead of *immerse* or *dip*; that Ecclesia has been rendered *church* instead of *congregation*; and that *Episcopos* has been rendered *bishop* rather than *overseer* or *superintendent*. So far as the word *baptize* is concerned, although I believe the Greek verb precisely equivalent to our English word, *dip*, yet I must honestly confess that I have never been able to see any force in the attacks that have been made upon the translators for *transferring* rather than *translating*.

I can not see one particle of justice in it. We know that it was the word used by Tindale in his translation of the New Testament, published about seventy-five years before the version of 1611, made under the authority of King James. Tindale certainly did not act by royal authority. So far from it, he suffered martyrdom, through the influence of Henry VIII. The same word was used in the first liturgy of King Edward VI, which expressly required *dipping*.—Tindale certainly did not retain it by the royal authority, as an *old ecclesiastical* word. Archbishop Cranmer, the author of the liturgy of Edward VI, certainly did not wish to *wrap up* the meaning, when he expressly required baptism to be performed by *dipping*. The truth is, there is not a particle of doubt, that *baptize* had been naturalized as an English word for many centuries before 1611, and very probably from the time of Augustin the monk, who with the assistance of 40 other monks, is said to have baptized, in the river Swale near York, ten thousand persons in one day. This was quite as great a feat as the baptism of three thousand on the day of Pentecost. It is well known that the Roman church has always used the Latin language in her religious services. Of course, the word *baptize*, transferred from Greek to Latin, was used by the priests of that communion, and thus the word *baptize*, in its English shape, was introduced into the vernacular language of the country. Thus, in all human probability, the word *baptize* had been a well known word in England for about a thousand years, a sufficient space, one would think to entitle it to all the rights of citizenship. It would not be more absurd for us to say that Arithmetic, Geometry, Geography and hundreds of other words of Greek origin are not now English words, than that *baptize* was not an English word, at the time that our present version of the Scriptures, was made. Neither was there any doubt about the meaning of the word. The book of Common Prayer, which had been compiled in the reign of Edward VI, expressly required *dipping*, "unless it be certified that it (the child) be weakly." Both Edward VI and Queen Elizabeth were immersed. The direction in the Prayer Book of the church of England remains unaltered to the present day. It was a fact just as well known as the Norman Conquest, that from the introduction of Christianity into Britain, immersion had always been considered as the proper and regular baptism. It was also well known, why in case of necessity, a substitute for immersion was allowed. It was simply because it was the belief of the times that an infant or other person dying without baptism would be damned, and of course as water was thought to have such a marvelous efficacy, it was thought advisable, in case of necessity, to pour water or even sprinkle it. That this was the notion that introduced sprinkling and pouring, any one may learn from so common a book as the Encyclopaedia Americana. Even a year or two ago, in the trial of the celebrated Gorham case, according to the testimony of the Westminster Review, "no doubt seems to have been entertained by disputants, judges or audience, that without it (washing or wetting, as the Reviewer contemptuously calls it) a child or other person dying, would fall into the hands of an angry Deity and be kept alive forever to be tormented in a burning cave." I repeat it, every person might then know, or every person may now know, the precise meaning of the word.—Jesus Christ did not, like the tyrant of antiquity, suspend his laws at so great an elevation, that people could not read them. If people choose to shut their eyes, or choose voluntarily to disobey, we have no responsibility in the matter; and we should not unjustly accuse the translators of not affording them sufficient light. Had the word *dip* or *immerse* been used, it would have been just as easy to quibble about it. Milton, in the Mark of Comus, applies the word *dip*, to a cold perspiration which had made an individual thoroughly wet. Walter Scott speaks of one as immersed, who had been thoroughly drenched with the sea-water spouted up by a whale. People attempt to throw doubt upon the Greek verb *Baptizo*, and its English derivative *baptize* by an appeal to just such loose, figurative and poetical language. Is there any use in reasoning with them? It does not require a scholar to know the meaning of the word baptism. The most ignorant who have ever seen any one buried, or seed planted in the earth, if they will give their understandings fair play, cannot possibly avoid knowing what the Apostle Paul meant by the word. I find upon examination, that I am not strictly and verbally correct in my references to the Encyclopaedia Americana, though substantially so. That work defines baptism by immersion, states that the Western church adopted sprinkling in the 13th century, and that the doctrine of Augustine that the unbaptized were irrevocably damned made the baptism of children general. Of course, the danger of damnation to the unbaptized, would tend to introduce a substitute for immersion where that was impracticable. But to return to our translators, when they have told us that John baptized in Jordan,—that Jesus when he was baptized went up

straightway out of the water—that John baptized in Enon near to Salim because there was much water there—that Philip and the eunuch went down both into the water and came up out of it—when they have told us of Paul's allusions to burial and to planting, they have told us enough to enable us to comprehend the last command of our ascending Lord. To attempt to make it any plainer, would be "to gild refined gold, to add a perfume to the violet." If men's interests or passions influenced them to do so, they would deny the truths of Geometry. It is exceedingly strange to me, that we are required to expel the words *baptize* and *baptism* from our language in which, for many centuries, they have had a peaceful home, because, forsooth, we do not attempt to introduce them into Burmese, Chinese or Sanscrit in which they would be treated as aliens and foreigners.

A BAPTIST MINISTER.

The Rev. J. R. Graves.

Referring some time since to the Memphis Convention, in relation to brother J. R. Graves of the Tennessee Baptist:

"Did not our brother, J. R. Graves, at the late Biennial Convention, at Nashville, publicly declare himself uncompromisingly opposed to this whole movement? We proposed this question at the present time, on account of his relation to the Southern Bible Board, located at that place. We were not indeed present on the occasion of that meeting, but a friend at our left, whispers that he also may be in a sort of transition state and ere long may find himself as far from his present position as he probably remembers himself to be on another subject, about which his conscience was once troubled."

To this paragraph brother Graves thus responds in his paper of the 22d ult.

"We answer brother Chambliss' question openly, frankly, and unequivocally, NO, as every member of the Convention knows, who heard us speak or converse. We are not, and never were, a Bible Union advocate—we have never approved of it as a Western or Southern movement. We have always thought that an independent Catholic association, like the one organized at Memphis, was the instrumentality through which to secure, from the lip of scholarship of Christendom, a revision of God's word. During the session of the Convention, we labored day and night to prevent the introduction of the Bible Union question into the debates of the body, believing division would inevitably result. In this with others, we succeeded, and those of us who thus saved the unity of the Convention, have ever since been looked upon by some few south and east who claim to be the special guardians of southern rights and interests, with an eye of suspicion. Oh! let for shame. Brother Chambliss is welcome to our seat in the Board if he thinks its interests are insecure in our hands—that we will betray the truth. We call upon him to explain himself, and the unwarrantable language he has seen fit to use with respect to us."

1. So then, at the Nashville Convention, bro. G. expressed no opposition to the revision of the Scriptures in the abstract. He does not, however, deny, that in opposing the only organized movement in existence at the time, looking to this object, he very naturally and truly left on the minds of many the impression that he was opposed to the measure *in toto*. We admit his explanation, only remarking that this thing of "mental reservation" is sometimes very convenient in getting men out of difficulties. On the same principle we suppose, none of our readers will suspect us of opposing a revision of the said Scriptures, however we may strenuously oppose the plans of both the Bible Union and the Memphis Convention. Will they be satisfied with this?

2. We thank, our brother very kindly, for the courteous manner in which he proffers to resign his seat in the Southern Bible Board at Nashville in our favor, though we regret that he should have felt it his duty thus to do, from any certain suppositions that we entertained doubts of his qualifications for the office. It will however be time enough for him to act in the premises whenever we express any misgivings on that subject; and until then, we hope he will allow us to follow his worthy example in the matter of "mental reservation," and say, that to this question we have uttered nothing. We honestly esteem our good brother's valiant labors in the cause of truth too highly, to wish to dispense with them in any department where he may be useful, so that we respectfully decline the honor of superseding him.

## Missionary Board, Alabama Association, April 24th 1852.

Brother J. S. Holmes was appointed Missionary by some of the members of the Board on the last Saturday in December last, at the rate of \$500 per annum, which appointment was ratified by the Board at its present session.

Bro. Holmes reports that he entered the field on the 28th January last, and has been actively engaged in the work up to this time. Bro J. U. Wilkes has since entered the field, agreeing to receive whatever we may be able to pay him. We hope that the churches of the Association will come to the aid of our brother by complying with the resolution of our last Association, that a collection should be taken up as soon as convenient in order to make up the deficit in the treasury.

Brethren Jesse Robinson and Dr. B. B. Randolph have been chosen to fill the vacancies caused by the removal of Elder H. Talbird and A. L. Haralson.

A committee has been appointed to make a selection of books, from the S. P. S., for distribution by the Missionary of the Alabama Association, to be paid for out of the funds in the hands of the Treasurer.

The Secretary of the Board was requested to correspond with the Secretary of the Bible Society, and to call his attention to the resolution of our Association, "that half the funds sent up for Bible distribution should be returned to us in Bibles." Will the brother attend to this matter, and send us the balance in Bibles and Testaments, containing the Psalms? Send them to D. P. J. Murphy, care of J. P. Streety, Hayneville, Alabama.

D. P. J. MURPHY, Secy. pro tem.

REV. J. F. HERRICK, late from Alabama passed St. Louis, Mo. on his way to Putnam County Mission, last week. Bro. Herrick is under the patronage of the Board of the Indian Mission Association, and will take charge of the Manual Labor School.

## For the South Western Baptist. Memphis Bible Convention, Again.

Dear Bro. Chambliss:—I have carefully read your comments, on my article, in your paper of May 5th, and beg permission to offer a brief reply.

1. You ask me "whether the comparative numerical strength of Baptists and Campbellites in this country would entitle the latter to the prominence and influence given them in the appointments of this meeting?" In answer to this question, I have simply to say, that is generally conceded, in all this region that Baptists conducted and controlled all the proceedings of this Convention, without the interference or dictation of Mr. Campbell and his associates. Every motion which was made, (except three,) was made by Baptists. In the arrangement of officers and managers, if there were more Reformers and Campbellites placed in important places, than their relative strength to the Baptist denomination would seem to justify, it was done without design and with no object to give them greater prominence than they merited.

2. It is by no means the case, that disclaiming all sympathy with Mr. Campbell's peculiarities, I justify co-operation with him and his friends, simply because, of a contribution to the Am. and For. Bible Society, a large donation, made wholly, as I understand it, to foreign versions. I justify no co-operation with him or any other party at the expense of any sentiment which either I, or any of my friends have ever maintained. This broad proposition we maintain, THAT THE SCRIPTURES SHOULD BE REVISED AND CORRECTED, AND MADE TO CONFORM STRICTLY TO THE INSPIRED ORIGINALS, NO MATTER WHAT SHOULD BE THE CONSEQUENCES. Are Baptists afraid of this? If so, I have mistaken, egregiously the people, in whose society I was born, educated and expect to die, and of whose communion I have been a member over twenty years. Can they be frightened by the declaration, "but Alexander Campbell and his associates are with you, in favor of revising the Scriptures, therefore, all good Baptists should drop this matter." Have Baptists, in the days of persecution, been influenced in this way? They have ever been distinguished for devotion to the fundamental principles of truth. In England, they make common cause with Methodists, Independents, Romanists and Infidels against a hierarchical establishment, and in our early colonial history, they made a common opposition with Quakers and Freethinkers to the intolerable oppressions of priests and tyrants. But now, in a holier cause, because there are some aiding us, with whom we do not agree, upon points in divinity, affecting the plan of salvation, which will not be mooted, in the question of revision, forsooth, we must be guilty of the pusillanimity of abandoning our positions and as ignoble cowards, slink away into merited contempt. The New York Recorder, furnishes argument number one, labelled, *Campbellism*. The Christian Chronicle, presents argument number two, *clept Campbellism*. "Tell it not in Gath, publish it not in the streets of Askelon, lest the daughters of the uncircumcised may rejoice." The Boston Reflector, reverberates in thunder tones, among the hills of New England, the same potent argument, *Campbellism*. And the South Western Baptist, edited by my noble hearted friend and brother Chambliss, takes up the web of this mighty array of dialectics, and this same all-powerful argument, *Campbellism* comes forth. It comes to this, therefore, that all the Baptists in the world would be for revision, if Mr. Campbell was not for it, and because he is for it, a part of them, are determinedly against it. Where, in all the range of logical postulates, can such a land of reasoning as this be found? A thing is thus right in itself, if one set of people do it right, but utterly wrong if the same people associated with another, happen to do the same thing right.

3. But why all this clamor and hurrah about *Campbellism*? Mr. Campbell, is not one of the translators. Why! indeed!! Our northern logicians and doctors fearing and knowing, the popularity of the revision movement among the masses are striving to paralyze the undertaking by crying out *Campbellism*. It is the cry of mad-dog, to run a good dog down. It is quite like the politician's tricks. It abandons the main issue. It concedes the argument. It surrenders the field, and hopes to cover the retreat by throwing dust in the eyes of the victorious occupants of that field. Timid and cowardly soldiers in the ranks will right—about—face, and take to their heels. If such an argument as this succeeds at the North, which I do not believe, although so intended, it will not succeed at the South. Southern Baptists are made of different metal.

4. But is it true, that any party, least of all the Memphis Bible Convention, is willing to take Mr. Campbell's version? In your last paragraph you say, "we, ourselves, desire a correct rendering of every word of God into our own tongue; but we know too well the views entertained of the original text by Alexander Campbell and some of his choice followers, to believe that he can ever give it to us, and of two evils—to receive such as (he?) will prepare or in any wise subscribe to, or to return our present version, we choose the latter." Is this the issue? Does the Bible Union furnish in its history any such issue? Does the Memphis Bible Convention present the slightest shadow for such a pretence. Mr. Campbell's version or King James'? It would go far towards stultifying Revisionists, to suppose that any such issue was ever contemplated. Indeed, it would be quite a stretch of human credulity to entertain such an opinion one moment. Why, we have at least, fifty better Hebrew and Greek scholars in our ranks than Mr. Campbell. The "Westminster Review" naming the scholars of the United States, especially theologians, puts Sears, Conant, Ripley and Hatchett, on the same list with Stuart, Robinson, Felton and Woolsey, (and might have added the peer of them all, A. C. Kendrick of

Rochester University,) not naming Alexander Campbell, at all. Although these may not be engaged in this work, there are many others who could be named, for instance Eaton, D. R. Campbell, A. Drury, W. C. Duncan and O. B. Judd, who are at least Mr. Campbell's equals in Biblical philology; and any of whom could have coped with Tyndale in Hebrew and Greek scholarship, and would have been the superiors of the forty-seven revisors of King James. But so far only Pædo-Baptists scholars have been considered, to undertake this great work. To set this matter perfectly at rest, I need only copy a few statements contained in the report of the committee appointed by the "Memphis Convention" on the plans of the "American Bible Union," (Thomas Armitage, N. Y., Chairman, S. W. Lynd, D. D., Ky.; D. E. Thomas, Ohio, and W. C. Crane, Miss., (Baptists,) and J. Challen, Ohio, Reformer or Campbellite, said committee.)

"Your Committee find that the plan of the 'American Bible Union' for the revision of the English Scriptures involves the following principles:

**Statement of the Plan.**—1. The version, in common use shall be made the basis of revision, and all unnecessary interference with the established phraseology shall be avoided; and only such alterations shall be made as the exact meaning of the inspired text and the existing state of the language may require.

2. The exact meaning of the inspired text, as that text expressed it to those who understood the original Scriptures at the time they were first written, must be translated by corresponding words and phrases, so far as they can be found, in the vernacular tongue of those for whom the version is designed, with the least possible obscurity or indefiniteness.

3. The revision of the New Testament shall be made according to the received Greek text, as recently published by Bagster & Sons, octavo edition, 1851.

4. Every Greek word or phrase, in the translation of which the phraseology of the common version is changed, must be carefully examined in every other place in which it occurs in the New Testament, and the views of the revisors be given as to the proper translation in each place.

5. Whenever an alteration from that version is made on any authority additional to that of the revisor, such authority must be cited in the manuscript, either on the same page or in an appendix.

6. As soon as the revision of any one book of the New Testament is finished, it shall be sent to the Secretary of the Bible Union, or such other person as shall be designated by the Committee on Versions, in order that copies may be taken and furnished to the revisors of the other books, to be returned with their suggestions to the revisor or revisors of that book. After being revised with the aid of these suggestions, a carefully prepared copy shall be forwarded to the Secretary.

II. Mode of executing this plan. For the execution of this plan, according to these principles and rules, a special committee, known as the committee on versions, has been appointed by the Board of the Union, subject entirely to their dictation and authority.

Through this committee an extensive correspondence has been held with the principal scholars in all directions of the United States and Great Britain, and in other foreign countries.—The result of this correspondence has been the recommendation and approval of the following plan:

1. The whole New Testament to be divided and apportioned among a large number of competent scholars of different religious denominations, acting individually or in companies, in all parts of this country and Great Britain.

2. When all the different parts assigned to the individuals or companies, respectively shall have been finished, the revisor of each, or the representative of the company of the revisor of each, shall meet together and go over the work conjointly.

3. The manuscript revisions are to be accompanied with the citation of authorities embracing the opinions of eminent critics and commentators, for every important variation from the commonly received version. Those authorities to be published in connection with the first edition of the work which may be done, without occupying much space so that the common reader may have the means of justifying these varieties as readily and satisfactorily as a man of learning.

4. The whole work thus brought to the highest state of perfection is then to be edited and published under the supervision of a competent scholar or scholars.

III. The advantages of this plan.

1. By the employment of a large number of scholars in different sections of this country and Great Britain, the several parts of the New Testament may be so apportioned as to prevent the Book from having a mere sectional or national reputation, and thus secure, for it, the most general favor.

2. By the employment of scholars belonging to different religious denominations, the work will be less liable to the charge of Sectarianism.

3. The citation of acknowledged authorities will disarm unjust criticism, as it must be directed against the authorities rather than the work itself.

Here is presented the endorsed plan of the American Bible Union, and the Bible Revision Association recently formed at Memphis. This plan, is enough of itself forever, to set at rest, the insinuations from any quarter, that Mr. Campbell is to furnish the revised copy of the Scriptures, which we all, so earnestly desire.

5. Who are the men, who are thus tamely surrendering themselves, to Alexander Campbell? Scan the list of Vice Presidents of the Bible Union,—and are we to suppose that Dr. Core, Dr. Maclay, Dr. Eaton, Wm. C. Duncan, William Crane, Rev. P. S. Gayle, Hon. Isaac Da-







