

Nick himself should take the lead. If the Gospel in its simplicity is preached by warm hearts—not learned heads—it must prove too powerful for sinners, for it is “God’s power to salvation.” Let us but venture with the untold tale, and God’s promise, and our hopes will not be put to shame.

That which now greatly retards a more speedy spread of the Gospel, is the want of plain places to worship in. I am anxious to raise (some new houses,) or purchase some old houses, which, with small alterations, may be used as chapels, thirteen in number, the expenses of which will be about \$40,000. Some brethren in Canada may perhaps be constrained to aid us in this work. If so, let them remit their gifts to me here, at the Mission Rooms, 33, Somerset Street; the amounts sent, to be designated, “in aid of building Chapels in Germany.”

If I can command the time, I hope yet to pay the brethren in Canada a visit. At present I must bid you farewell! If this reaches you in time for the Association, (Convention) I beg to present my affectionate brotherly salutation to all the brethren. That the Spirit of the Lord may be poured out on the churches in this land, on the churches of your Association, (Convention) and on your assembly, is the earnest prayer of

Dear Brother,

Yours in the best of bonds,

(In much haste.)

J. G. ONCKER.

Rev. J. Davis, Yarmouth, N. S.

[FOR THE CHRISTIAN VISITOR.]

Bible Errors.

DEAR BRETHREN,—Will you or some one of your able correspondents relieve my mind in relation to Dr. Maclay’s statements, of the thousand of errors in our precious Bible. I remember to have heard him say, on a former visit, (while preaching to a multitude at Brussels-street Church), that “our present version of the Scriptures contains more than four thousand errors.” On listening to him, at Germain-street Church a short time ago, I felt still more pained to hear the venerable Divine assert that, “twenty-four thousand errors have been detected in our Bible, by a certain Bible Society.”

I regard such statements as these, fraught with *immense evil*; especially, when it is born in mind, that the Doctor makes them without the least qualification. But will you apprise an anxious inquirer, whether any of these errors affect *seriously* a single passage of the word of God, as at present circulated among us?

INQUIRER.

Reply to an Inquirer.

Doctor Maclay, in his published addresses, has entered so fully into this subject of ERRORS OF TRANSLATION, that we will let him speak for himself in reply to an Inquirer.

Doctor Maclay in an address delivered before the Memphis Revision Convention, in the State of Tennessee, and published in that city by order of the Convention made the following remarks:—

I will not detain you with multiplied instances of inaccuracy in the version. I have, on former occasions, pointed out the more important, and doubtless many will be furnished by those who shall follow me. It is enough to say, that both in this country and in Great Britain, competent scholars of every denomination, and of no denomination, have shown its defects to be numberless, and no scholar has had the hardihood to affirm to the contrary.

Candor must at the same time compel the admission, that multitudes of these defects are comparatively trivial. Of the 26,000 errors enumerated by one critic, and the 24,000 errors, said to have been corrected in new edition by the American Bible Society, a vast number are typographical blunders in punctuation, orthography and syntax. But no man with a proper reverence for the word of God, and a proper sense of the preciousness of truth, will tolerate, in the Bible, errors, which in any other book might be regarded as trivial. The flaw which would be overlooked in an ordinary household utensil, would be regarded seriously in a costly vessel. No good excuse can be offered for neglecting to purge the version of every imperfection. But no error is trivial which affects in any degree divine truth.

A letter, or a comma, misplaced, may involve the sacred writers in a palpable blun-

der, and lead the reader into dangerous mistakes. There are also many errors of a much more flagrant character. Translators have furnished the quiver of infidelity with some of its keenest arrows. They lay stumbling blocks in the way of the weak—mislead honest inquirers after truth, and sometimes furnish heresy with its most effective arguments. If the defect is nothing more than the transference of a word without translation, it is impossible to calculate the mischief that may follow. Our translators were forbidden to translate the ecclesiastical terms, as they were called. Now the religious sects, both of Great Britain and America, are divided on questions affected by these terms. And it is impossible to say how far these divisions are influenced by the concealment of the meaning of these words.

If the passage, referring to the relations of pastors and churches had been fully and fairly rendered, Episcopacy and Presbytery might by this time have disappeared, and many abuses of our congregational system might never have existed. The whole aspect of Christendom would have been very different from what it is to-day, had King James permitted *baptizo* to be translated into English. Dr. Babcock, the Secretary of the American and Foreign Bible Society, has remarked with great propriety, “The colossal form of religious perversion and despotism, the pontifical power of the Roman church, grew up gradually and from small beginnings. The first wrong step may have been regarded as insignificant—certainly not more alarming than forbidding to translate a few words into the language of the people.”

But it is not only those who are called to a more exact and critical study of the word of God, who become sensible of these defects. Every reader of the Bible knows how much his understanding of it is hindered by obsolete and unintelligible words, and by antiquated and unfamiliar modes of expression. Every pious father has been pained to find that from the use of expressions, which doubtless were not offensive in a less refined age, he cannot read some passages in his family without wounding feminine delicacy. Every reader, however, is not aware to what an extent the difficulty, which he strives to surmount, and the seeming inconsistencies which he vainly strives to reconcile, belong to the TRANSLATION AND NOT TO THE TEXT.

That the commonly received English version has defects, many and momentous, is no recent discovery. Scarcely had it been received, when these defects began to be pointed out and acknowledged, nor is it any reflection upon the competency of the translators to say so. The control under which they executed their task did not permit them to make it perfect up to the measure of their knowledge and conviction. When they suggested new and varying translations, they were reminded that “*such was not the object of those who brought them together.*” The instructions under which they acted, virtually enjoined them to make an imperfect translation.

Their competency for the work is not a question which I here discuss. Their scholarship, if they possessed it, they were not allowed to use. They were tied down to previous translations which they were to alter as little as possible. And even where they made alterations they were often guided by defective Latin versions, rather than the original text.

But without entering upon discussions that do not belong to this place, regarding the scholarship of the translators, and the means and apparatus within their reach, or the use made of either, it is enough to say, that from the time, when it was published, to the present hour, there is a constant chain of proof of their inaccuracy.

Without mentioning the precision of new translations, which the defects of the present have called forth, you cannot open a Commentary or an exposition, without finding on almost every page, the proof that a full and correct knowledge of the Scriptures is not to be obtained from this version. Every Minister of the Gospel knows that he cannot with comfort and safety expound the Scriptures or apply a text without consulting the original.

We have affirmed that the English version is defective. But when we speak of its defects, it must not be thought that we are insensible to its excellencies.

We claim that none of the opponents of revision exceed us in an appreciation of its merits. The simple and severe beauty of its

nervous language, its fine harmony of tone and manner, its general fidelity to the great truths which God has given by inspiration for doctrine, reproof, correction and instruction in righteousness, to make the man of God perfect, thoroughly fitted to every good work—all this we admire and love.

I learned to love the language of that Bible from the lips of my mother. My ears were attuned to its melody, in the solemn tones of holy men who instructed my youth. It is endeared to me as the vehicle of the glad tidings of redeeming love which brought peace to my heart, as well as of the holy light which discovered to me my sin and danger. It sounds to me like the familiar voice of the bosom friend of a long life. It has brought consolation to me in my sorrow. It has been my meditation all the day, and my song in the watches of the night. When I have been consulted by the awakened sinner, I have found there the words which pointed him to the Lamb of God. When I have encountered the bitter enemies of our faith, I have found there the weapons by which I have put them to flight. When I have gone after the wandering sheep of my flock, I have found there the tender expostulations by which I have won them back to the shepherd and bishop of our souls. In my study, in my family, in the circle of my chosen friends, in the pulpit, in the solemn silence of the house of mourning, by the bedside of expiring saints, it has been constantly with me for more than half a century. I cannot but love the Bible, the old English Bible. I have not learned to love its blemishes; but I have learned to love it so, that I cannot willingly endure that anything should remain which mars its beauty or worth, and especially, when I have thought that the truth which its defects conceal, pervert, or obscure, is God’s truth, and that the defects themselves are MAN’S work. I cannot hesitate as to which demands my reverential love.

The Dardanelles.

The strait of the Dardanelles which divides Europe from Asia is upwards of fifty miles in length, with an average breadth of two miles. The shore on either side is fringed with cypress groves, and the strait itself presents a very animated appearance, thousands of white-sailed caiques gliding lightly over the waves, and coming and going incessantly from shore to shore. There is a strong current setting constantly from the Sea of Marmora into the Archipelago, and this, added to the defences of the place, render the forcing of the passage by armed vessels a very hazardous undertaking. The fortifications originally consisted of four castles, two on the Europeans, and two on the Asiatic side. Of these two stand at the southern extremity, and two about eight miles further up the strait. The name Dardanelles is now especially applied to some fortifications, erected in modern times between the new and the old castles, a short distance from the entrance of the straits. The number of guns mounted on these fortifications, and some others of lesser importance, is nearly seven hundred, besides eight large mortars for throwing shells. Among them are several immense guns, from which stone shot are discharged. The quantity of powder which these guns require is enormous; the largest is charged with 330lb. of powder, and throws a stone shot 800lb. or 1,000 lb. weight. They are more formidable in appearance than reality, and the firing of such large pieces of ordnance is not unattended with danger to their own artilleryman.

The old gates of Janus were opened when Rome was at war; and their modern prototypes, the Dardanelles straits, are open only when a state of war makes treaty stipulations void, and the Porte deems it to be necessary to admit his allies through them to protect his capital. The accounts we have are that they are now open for the passage of the British and French fleets.

The Dardanelles, from which the strait, or Hellespont, derives its name, are four strong castles built opposite to each on the European and Asiatic coasts, and are the keys to Constantinople. Two of these castles, the old castles, were raised by Mohammed II., soon after the conquest of Constantinople, in 1453; the other two, the new castles, were built in the middle of the seventeenth century, to protect the Turks against the Venetians. The latter command the entrance to the Hellespont, and the distance from each is about two miles and a quarter; in four hours’ sail up the strait are the old castles, which are about three quarters of a mile apart. These are well mounted with formidable batteries. All along the European shore to the Marmora the aspect of nature in its ruggedness corresponds with the frown of the guns; but the scenery on the Asiatic shore is beautiful. The region abounds too in places famous in classic story.—Here it was Leander paid his nightly visit to Hero; here the ill-fated hosts of Xerxes crossed a bridge of boats; here Solyman crossed on a bare raft; and in modern times, here Byron swam from Sestos to Abydos.

These famous straits have been more than once passed. In 1770 the Russian squadron, under El-

phinstone, appeared before the tower castles; and the admiral actually went by without damage.—But the other ships did not follow him, and he returned with drums and trumpets sounding. A British fleet, under Admiral Duckworth, forced their passage in 1807. Duckworth, in his despatch to his government giving an account of the fact, acknowledges that he ran a narrow chance. He set sail on the morning of the 19th of February. At a quarter before nine the whole squadron, under a tremendous fire, had passed the outer castle; at half-past nine the leading ship, the *Canopus*, entered the narrow passage of Sestos and Abydos, under a heavy cannonade from both castles, receiving stone shot of 800 pounds weight. Each ship, as it passed, had to endure this cannonade.—The admiral remained before Constantinople until the 3d of March, when his squadron of ten ships returned. In this interval the Turks had been so busy that the castles were made “doubly formidable.” The admiral weighed anchor in the morning of this day, and every ship was in safety outside the passage about noon. The admiral in his despatch, expressed his “most lively sense” of his good fortune, and admits that had the Turks been allowed a week longer, “it would have been a very doubtful point whether a return would lay open to him at all.” He lost 42 killed and 235 wounded. The Turks were so indignant at the escape of the British fleet that they believed the Governor of the Dardanelles was bribed by Duckworth, and beheaded him.

The Dardanelles are said to be in such a formidable condition as to be impregnable.

The Cossacks.

The organization of Cossack regiments is conducted in nearly a similar way as the regular service. All the Cossacks are soldiers born, their term of service being twenty years abroad or twenty-five at home; they pay no taxes, but are obliged to equip themselves at their own expense. Out of a population of little more than half a million there are 50 regiments of 850 men each, and nine companies of artillery, having each eight pieces of cannon. When troops are wanted for the Caucasus, each district receives notice of the number of soldiers and officers it is to supply, and the first names in the military books are selected without distinction. They are marched to the frontier, and when assembled, classed in squadrons, and officers appointed to command them. Recent attempts to subject them to European discipline have it is said, destroyed their valuable aptitude for acting as skirmishers. The rearing of cattle, particularly horses, is the chief source of gain to the Cossacks, and Count Platoff’s studs are in the highest repute. The vast herds are allowed to wander about the steppes without care or superintendence. They never enter a stable; summer and winter they are in the open air, and must procure their own food, and hence become extremely vigorous, supporting the most trying campaigns with remarkable hardihood. Nothing can be more simple and expeditious than the mode in which they are broken in. The horse is caught with a noose, he is saddled and bridled, the rider mounts him, and he is allowed to gallop over the steppe until he falls exhausted. From that moment he is perfectly tamed, and may be ridden without danger.—*N. Y. Illustrated Journal.*

The New Chinese Calendar.

The insurgents in China, among the other reforms they propose, have proclaimed a new method of computing time. A late manifesto is dated as the “Third year of the Celestial Dynasty of T’hai Ping,” and commences: “All high officers kneeling before our sovereign and elder brother, the Celestial King, whom we wish to live for myriads of years, added to myriad of years and myriad of years, report that we have prepared a calendar and fixed the seasons.” This calendar makes every year to contain 366 days, every odd month 31 days, and every even month 30 days. The seasons are: commencement of spring, beginning February 14th; clear and bright season, beginning April 5; period of bearded grain, beginning June 6; commencement of autumn, August 8; season of cold dew, date not given; and season of great snow, December 7.

The editor of the *North China Herald* remarks of this new calendar, that it is undertaken to form a solar division of the months, instead of that combination of solar and lunar which has existed from time immemorial. Each of their months consists of two solar terms, or one sign of the zodiac. They also make another error in making the solar year consist of three hundred and sixty-six days every year, instead of once in four years. They also make their Sabbath fall on Saturday.

Another part of the proclamation, relative to lucky and unlucky days, may be read with profit even by some in our civilized land:

“All the corrupt doctrines and perverted views of preceding almanacs are the result of the devil’s cunning devices to deceive and delude mankind; we, your Majesty’s servants, have therefore set them aside; for the years, months, days and hours are all determined by our Heavenly Father; thus every year is lucky and favourable, every month is lucky and favourable, and every day as well as every hour is lucky and favourable; how can they be classified under good and bad, and what can be the use of selecting one period above another?—Whoever truly venerates our Heavenly Father, the Supreme Lord and Great God, is under the protection of Heaven, and can engage in his duties whenever he thinks proper; every season, therefore, may be considered prosperous and favourable.”