

strong language of particular amusements. You know he never does, Emily. I suppose I used too strong language, for papa said I was very dogmatical, but he believed religious young ladies always were; and, in short, we had a disagreeable conversation, and it ended in mamma's saying she did not like my running after fanatics like Mr. Harvey, and she should expect me henceforth to stick to Saint Alphege's church. And so my one Sunday's comfort is taken from me!—that dear iron church to which I used to go with you, and be set up for the trials of the week!—and I am tied to that dreary parish church, with its old sleepy rector, and young Puseyite curate!"

Emily pitied her friend, and said all she could to comfort her.

"I suppose it was partly my fault, for saying too much," said Marion; "but it is very trying. Mamma has already put a stop to my having the little Greens and Joneses to read with me on a Sunday morning, which was the one little bit of good I could manage to do. And now I have nothing of that kind to look for, and a hard fight about the ball again in prospect— if indeed I can get off it."

A message from the servant that her mother was in the carriage waiting for her, obliged Marion to hurry away. We had only time to speak a few hasty words of heartfelt sympathy, and to remind her of the promise of "help in time of trouble." "A very present help."

"Yes; but for that confidence what should I do?" was Marion's parting word.

Correspondence.

For the Christian Messenger.

REVISION OF THE ENGLISH SCRIPTURES.

No. 9.

The subject of temptation by God has harassed many a pious soul, and urged on to scepticism many more that were not pious. The Common Version positively informs us, in Genesis, that "God tempted Abraham" (Gen. xxii. 1.) Yet the Apostle James declares that "God can not be tempted by evil, neither tempteth he any man" (James i., 13.) A wise commentator may explain such a palpable contradiction to an humble Christian; but, unfortunately, those persons who are most exposed to the arts of the sceptic do not read commentaries on the Bible.

The Revised Genesis sets this matter at rest by informing the reader that "GOD TRIED ABRAHAM." Here the palpable contradiction of the Common Version is entirely removed, and the Bible is made consistent with itself.

The Common Version, in very many instances, seems to utterly disregard the distinction between the historical or aorist tenses, and the perfect and present. By this, it obscures some of the most striking passages of Scripture. Let us take an example. In the description of our Saviour's crucifixion, at the ninth hour, when the atonement was finished and he was about to expire, the Common Version makes him exclaim: "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me." The Revised Testament has: "My God, my God, why didst thou forsake me." This is in strict accordance with the original.

The Common Version represents God as withdrawing the light of his countenance from the Mediator at the close of his expiatory sacrifice. The Revised Testament shows that this withdrawal was a constituent part of the suffering during those fearful hours of agony.

Another pertinent example involves the doctrine of prayer. We are taught that God hears his people when they pray. Zachariah had long lived childless. He had doubtless in early life prayed for offspring, but in advanced years he had ceased to indulge hope in the case. The Common Version represents the angel as announcing to him (Luke i., 13): "Thy prayer is heard." As though God had kept the matter in suspense for so many years, and at length had listened to the petition uttered so long before. This is not the revelation of God. The Revised Testament puts the matter in its true light: "Thy prayer was heard." When it was offered, it entered the ears of the Lord of Sabaoth. This is the teaching of Scripture. Why should not every reader of the Bible be permitted to understand it?

The treatment of words used as names of coins, is a marked feature of the Common Version. In Matt. xvii., 24, we find: "They that received tribute money came to Peter and said, Doth not your Master pay tribute?" The Revised Version translates the passage thus: "Those who received the half-shekel came to Peter and said: Does not your teacher pay the half-shekel?"

Again, in verse 27, the Common Version has: "Go thou to the sea, and cast an hook, and take up the fish that first cometh up; and when thou hast opened his mouth, thou shalt find a piece of money; that take and give unto them for me and thee." The Revised Testament says: "Go to the sea and cast a hook, and take the fish that

first comes up; and, opening its mouth, thou shalt find a shekel. That take and give to them for me and thee."

Here is a double miracle. Particulars like the ones here noted, fix attention and signalize the wonder. The rendering of the Common Version, "tribute money," "tribute," "a piece of money," is all general, indefinite, loose, compared with the "half-shekel" and the "shekel." And such a loose rendering gives no idea that the mouth of the fish contained the exact sum that was needed both for Peter and his Teacher. Nor does it connect the transaction with the "half-shekel" paid by every Israelite for the tabernacle and temple service. (Ex. xxx., 13 and 15.) And thus the force of our Saviour's reasoning, that He, the Son of God, was not required to pay custom, or tribute, for his Father's temple, is entirely lost to the ordinary reader.

So the Greek word, *denarion*, is translated in the Common Version "penny." With the same propriety, the translators might have rendered it "shilling." In fact, it comes much nearer in value to a shilling than to a penny. No coin among us is an equivalent to it. Its value is nearly fifteen cents. Therefore the Revised Testament anglicizes the word itself, making it "denary," and explains its value in a brief note. This is in exact accordance with the true rule of translation.

The rendering "penny" induces the most ludicrous ideas. Many readers of the Bible suppose that "a penny" was the full value of a day's work in the days of our Saviour. (Matt. xx., 2-13.) Others conceive a very low idea of the liberality of the good Samaritan in Luke x., 36, when he gave two pennies for the support of the man who had been wounded by the thieves.

In two cases, the Revised Testament properly uses the word, "penny." (Matt. x., 29, and Luke xii., 6.) Here it is the equivalent in value of the Greek word which it represents. But in these very cases, the Common Version most strangely employs the word "farthing," which is not the proper meaning, nor does it approach to that meaning. Yet in two other cases (Matt. v., 26, and Mark xii., 42), the Common Version uses "farthing" properly, as the translation of a very different word, and of course the Revised Version retains it.

This loose, irregular, and improper use of terms designating coins is a decided fault in the Common Version. That it should have been perpetuated through so many generations, in what was constantly represented to the people as the word of God, proves an extreme laxity of principle, or ignorance of fact, on the part of those on whom the responsibility rested.

WM. H. WYCKOFF,
Corresponding Secretary.
No. 32 Great Jones Street, New York.

We must apologize to M. A. H. for keeping his communication a week or two. We thought our readers were having the matter of "Swearing," &c., pretty largely placed before them. We think they will now be able to decide for themselves what is their duty in this matter. We are glad to believe that profane swearing is by far less common than formerly.

For the Christian Messenger.

REV. MESSRS. RAND AND HARLEY.

I. MR. RAND.

Brother Rand has raised the cry of "persecution" because I have declined discussing with him an important religious subject and given my reasons for it. Yet in connection with that very complaint, he has furnished illustrations of all those reasons which I assigned for my decision.

1st. His extreme eccentricity of opinion. In spite of the epistles to the Hebrews and Galatians and much more in the New Testament, he has a doubt whether the Jews are not still bound to observe the laws of Moses. He may have that doubt and many more of the same kind which I have no interest in learning and am under no obligation to discuss.

2nd. Extreme inaccuracy in his assertions and assumptions. For instance, he says, that it would be sinful for a Christian to observe the laws of Moses. Certainly not. He is forbidden the observance of them only as things essential to his salvation and acceptance with God. Surely it is not sinful for me to eat pork. Again he says, it was right and proper under the Jewish law to persecute heathens and heretics. Wrong as ever. The Israelites were commanded to inflict a divine judgment upon a limited list of heathen nations concerning whom God had long before declared that He was waiting till their iniquity was full. That time had arrived. The sentence was now to be executed. The Israelites were selected for that duty. In its performance they were no more persecutors than are the sheriffs' officers in hanging a criminal upon whom

the sentence of death has been pronounced by the judge. By the persecution of heretics I suppose Brother Rand refers to the judicial penalties inflicted upon idolators within the pale of the Jewish community. Without now waiting to say anything of the peculiar character of the Israelitish National Constitution and its voluntary and solemn acceptance by every Hebrew, a fact implied by his very presence in the community, it will be enough to say that none of those penalties designated by Brother Rand persecution, referred to matters of opinion, but to positive crimes which no civilized nation, not to say christian, would or ought to tolerate for one day within its precincts.

3rd. His irreverence. He says, God and angels (holy angels of course) persecute. It is a pity Brother Rand will not condescend to consult an English dictionary occasionally, and abide by its definitions of words. It would save him from writing some very great nonsense and some things much worse than nonsense. A Worcester or Webster, will inform him that persecute means to pursue with malignant hate, and that malignant means with malice and envy. Deliberately Brother Rand writes and publishes to the world that the God in whom he believes, pursues with malicious hate and envy. In charity, in shame and pity, some will say "Bro. Rand could not mean this." But there it is. Written by his own hand, published by his own request. He either did or did not know the meaning of his own words. On either supposition he is a most unsuitable person for discussing religious topics in the columns of a newspaper. Worse, if possible, is his remark that if the great body of christians have been right in the construction they have placed upon Christ's words in Matt. v. 33, then he spoke with what would be most unpardonable carelessness in an uninspired legislator. If such things as these are not profanity what is? Certainly nothing to be found in Strauss or Renan, Voltaire or Tom Paine.

4th. His utter incapacity for logical argument. The whole, not part, of his last article demonstrates this deficiency. One instance will be sufficient. Brother Rand takes the position that legal swearing is immoral. But it is proved that Christ took a legal oath and it is asked, did he do anything morally wrong? Brother Rand replies, No; because he was a Jew and acted in obedience to the ceremonial law. This is a double mistake. Both as to a fact and the inference to be drawn from it. There was no ceremonial law which required Jesus or any other "Jew" to take an oath or to give testimony upon oath, in the High-priest's court. If there had been such a law it could not make what was morally wrong, morally right. Where did Brother Rand learn that ceremonial law can change moral principle? not in the Bible. A higher law can and often does suspend a lower one, as in the case of David eating the bread, "which was not lawful for him to eat, only the priests." But a lower law cannot suspend a higher one. Now the moral is just as far above the ceremonial law as the infinite and eternal God is greater than anything he has created. Like himself it is perfect and incapable of change.

5th. Offensive personalities. I do not perceive Brother Rand's meaning, and I am utterly indifferent respecting it in his impertinence about "Baptist hornets" and the grossness of his last paragraph. With immense egotism there is sometimes small dignity. If it is not beneath his self-respect to write such things, it is very far beneath mine to reply to them. And as that, with much more equally objectionable is required for carrying on any discussion with him I decline taking part in such a controversy, and very much regret that I have had to do so even to this extent.

II. MR. HARLEY.

Our rather warm controversialist across the Bay must excuse my delay, in permitting his article to cool before I ventured to touch it. No doubt its wit, erudition and modesty demand all respect. Lest any one should have failed to detect it in these qualities, I would point out, that the wit is in the Mary Ann and Michael Angelo part; the erudition in the middle, and the modesty at the close. Ah well, we shall all be wiser one of these days. In the mean time, however, will friend Harley, inasmuch as he has denounced anonymous writing to be the wearing of an unchristian mask, have the kindness to take that mask off the authors of the book of Job and the epistle to the Hebrews? Will he also permit me to offer him a little advice? I will take the liberty of numbering the items for future reference. 1. Beware how you dogmatise. There may be more to be said on the other side than you suppose, and also some one who will prefer saying it to submitting to your

dictum. 2. Be sure you understand a quotation when you employ one. That which you make use of in the present instance, properly understood and qualified, as all such sweeping historical statements have to be, confirms and not refutes my remark as to the vast preponderance of the opinions of the wise and good respecting the matters in dispute. 3. Do not, at least when writing for the edification of Nova Scotia Baptists, use the sacred style, or what some deem such. We are not accustomed to it. Nor, I should presume are you, if I may judge by the manner in which you drop it in your second communication. The contrast really looked a little awkward. We are in the habit of taking so low an estimate of our piety that we hardly like to appropriate to ourselves what is specially addressed to "the saints." Like Paul we are more disposed to class ourselves with "the chief of sinners." We have not yet reached that state in which the ordinary forms of speech no longer suffice. We still employ the vernacular "says" and "does" in preference to the more antiquated and puritanical "saith" and "doth."

M. A. H.

For the Christian Messenger.

OUR FOREIGN MISSIONS.

The following letter from Burmah, just received by Rev. Dr. Tupper, Secretary of the Foreign Missionary Board, will interest the brethren:

RANGOON, Jan. 6th, 1869.

REV. C. TUPPER, D. D.

My Dear Brother,—Your letters of Sept. 7th, and Oct. 12th have both come to hand with memos of donations from different parties for native preachers and schools.

One year has not yet elapsed since the funds of the Nova Scotia churches have come into my hands. As you say, you wish an account to reach you before the 1st of August, I will endeavor to have such an one prepared and sent to you in season, rather than according to previous intention, to do it at present. We are in the midst of the travelling season—when that is over, the different Missionaries who have assistants under their direction, will, I trust, be able to send you interesting accounts of the labors of those whom you are aiding. Some statements made by Rev. Mr. Smith at Henthada, respecting a work of grace there within the last year, which will appear in the Report of the Bur. Baptist Missionary Convention, will show you, that the labors of those who have occupied that station have not been vain. If Bro. Crawley is with you he will be able to give you some particulars before hand, as some of them at least have been written to him, and have already gladdened his heart. Our earnest prayer is that our gracious Lord will open the way for his return to us. We can ill afford to spare him, a true hearted, thorough worker, whom we all, missionaries and natives, love exceedingly.

Moung Shan, who has been supported a year now from the funds of this society, is a Chinese, whose station is at Paroondoung, the Eastern suburbs of Rangoon. There are Chinese there and more in Rangoon proper, and the distance is not too great for him to have all the Chinese of Rangoon for his special field. He understands Burmese pretty well, as well as Chinese, so that he is prepared to work with profit in both languages. He is married to a christian girl, brought up in our Mission schools, and I trust is doing good. His abilities do not equal those of some others of the Chinese converts in this place, but more than any of them, he has from the date of his conversion, manifested the disposition to engage in this employment alone. He comes weekly with other preachers to report his work, and my conviction is, that the funds of the society are not misapplied on him. For the last month, I am sorry to say, he has not been able to do any thing from an attack of fever. He is, however, beginning to attend worship again.

When Bro. Crawley left, he gave me no instructions respecting the assistants supported by the society, further than specifying the amounts to be paid monthly to each. It has generally been understood by us, that the salaries allowed the preachers are only sufficient for their current expenses, without house rent, so that in many instances houses are provided for them by the society which supports them. With the amount, which they are accustomed to receive, I do not think that, as a general rule, they can furnish for themselves houses likewise. Please let me know the minds of your Committee on this point.

You are aware, no doubt, that Miss DeWolf has suffered a good deal of late from neuralgia in the face. She is now laboring in the Sgau Karen school in connection with Mr. and Mrs. Carpenter, and I doubt not is happy in her work.

This is the Week of Prayer—I trust you are praying for us.

Affectionately,
Yours in Christ,
E. A. STEVENS.