

"This gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world, for a witness unto all nations."

Published semi-monthly.

MATTHEW LYON, Editor and Proprietor.

{ One Dollar a Year, paid in advance.

VOL. III.

NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE.----APRIL 15, 1837.

NO. 8.

EDITORIAL.

THE BURMAN TRANSLATION.

The following article, which originally appeared in Zion's Herald, we find in the S. W. Advocate, of this city. Perceiving that the writer has, at the very threshold, misconceived the true nature of the question which he undertakes to discuss, and upon a false basis erected a fabric of sophistry, and aware that error is generally grasped with avidity at the expense of truth, we have thought it worth while very briefly to correct the mistakes in the article in question, and set the subject in a proper light. The Editor of the Advocate would oblige us, and perhaps do something in furtherance of correct bible translations, by re-inserting this piece, with the remarks here accompanying it.

From Zion's Herald.

BAPTIST BURMAN TRANSLATION OF THE BIBLE. MR. EDITOR—I am very sorry that our Baptist brethren are still disposed to justify themselves in translating in the Burman language the word, "baptize," by a word which signifies exclusively "to dip." There seems to be some good reason why they should not do this. In the first place, they acknowledge that the word "baptize" has different meanings, such as wash, cleanse, &c. as to immerse. Now, as this is true, would it not have been more consistent with this acknowledgement, to translate the word by one of similar import? Would it not have been more literal? Would it not have been a great deal better in view of the different opinions of the christian world?

In the second place, this translation of the word will open a wide door of evil. Other sects will doubtless occupy the same field, and this will be good ground of contention, strife, jealousies and evil speaking. Indeed, we have no reason to think it will be otherwise; for already has contention manifested itself there. The heathen tribes, instead of hearing a gospel of peace, will hear contention and rank dispute. How great an impediment to the gospel! What delicious food for cavillers and infidels! But do our Baptist brethren think to coerce, or force all other missionaries who may labor there of different denominations, to follow in their track, and

preach immersion! or do they think they shall thus shut the door and keep out all others? If they do, they have learnt human nature to little purpose. How much better it would be for themselves, how much more benefit would the heathen receive, how much more favorable, yea infinitely more, it would be for the spread of the gospel, generally, if they had pursued a different course.

PHILANTHROPIST.

Feb. 18.

Philanthropist might have spared himself a large share of his grief, if he had recollected that Mr. Judson, in rendering the scriptures into the Burman language, was not governed by the English, or any other version, but solely by the original text. If he consulted other translations, it was for the purpose of gaining what light they might afford in subordination to the sacred standard, and not by any means with the intention of giving precedence to any such assumed authorities.

It is plain, then, that the opening remark of the article under consideration results from a misconception of the nature of the question. This is not whether Mr. Judson has correctly translated the Græco-English word "baptize," (a term manufactured for a special exigency,) but whether he has correctly translated the pure Greek word "baptizo." The translator was as firmly bound by the principles of reason and faithfulness to consider the Greek text the sole paramount authority in this case, as if there never before had been a translation attempted. This complaint, then, against translating "baptize" by a word meaning to dip, is groundless, as Mr. J. has not been translating from the English version. Pedobaptists have long wanted to make that the standard, and by the recent harsh and unjust proceedings of the American Bible Society, have authoritatively, yet impotently, declared that it shall be, and this to the exclusion from their patronage of nearly all the versions in the world!

Let us now suppose that "Philanthropist" stands corrected in regard to the standard of translation, and examine his argument. "In

the first place," says he, "they [the Baptists] acknowledge that the word "baptize" [baptizo] has different meanings, such as wash, cleanse, &c., as to immerse." And this is a whole argument! Because baptizo has a secondary meaning, it would have been "more consistent" "more literal"! "a great deal better," to have given the secondary meaning than the primary! Verily, "Philanthropist" would improve on the original. But, whatever we may be willing to concede to the word "baptize"—which is in fact a mere arbitrary term, signifying any thing that may chance to suit the whim, the policy or the instructions of the translator, whether it be made to mean to dip, to sprinkle, to pour, to wash, "to cross!" "to perform a watering ceremony," or "to make a wash"—Baptists do not acknowledge that "baptizo" has any other meaning but to immerse. We may be permitted, in proof of this assertion, to quote the language of Mr. Carson of Edinburgh, whose authority we presume will not be lightly esteemed by those who are familiar with recent publications pertaining to the subject in hand. In a work on baptism which issued from the press a few years ago, (Boston edition, p. 13,) Mr. Carson remarks: "The primitive word baptizo," which is never used in relation to baptism in the New Testament, "has two significations, the primary to dip, the secondary to dye; but the derivative, baptizo," which alone is used to describe the action of baptism, "is formed to modify the primary only; and in all the Greek language, I assert," he continues, "that no instance is not to be found, in which it [baptizo] has the secondary meaning of the primitive word." Baptizo means primarily to dip, secondarily to dye, as an effect of dipping; baptizo means to immerse, and nothing else.

But there are very few, comparatively, at this day, who contend against the true meaning of this word. Pedobaptists have generally yielded the question, in various forms, and on different occasions; a signal instance

Extract from a letter dated

JACKSON, TEN. March 17.

"The people in this section of country seem very backward in encouraging religious papers, and especially those coming from the hands of a Baptist. I will, however, upon all proper occasions, use my feeble endeavors to advance the interest of your paper by procuring as many subscribers as I can.

"Religion is rather at a low ebb in this quarter of the earth. Baptists are few, and most of those are of the Patrick stripe—I mean those that oppose every thing in the shape of benevolence, and wish to draw the parse strings and bind the consciences of their fellow men, and thus strike a fatal blow at religious liberty. May the Lord be pleased to arrest them in their mad career, and bring them to see that they are warring against the sacred word of the immaculate Lamb of God, is my prayer."

SELECTED.

THE CHRISTIAN'S HOPE.

Air—(Auld Lang Syne.)

Hail sweetest, dearest tie that binds,
Our glowing hearts in one,
Hail sacred hope that tunes our minds,
To harmony divine:
It is the hope, the blissful hope,
Which Jesus' grace has given,
The hope when days and years are past,
We all shall meet in heaven:
We all shall meet in heaven at last,
We all shall meet in heaven,
The hope when days and years are past,
We all shall meet in heaven.

What though the northern wintry blast
Shall howl around thy cot,
What though beneath an eastern sun,
Be cast our distant lot:
Yet still we share the blissful hope,
Which Jesus' grace has given, &c.

From Barmah's shores, from Afric's strand,
From India's burning plain,
From Earepe, from Columbia's land,
We hope to meet again:
It is the hope, the blissful hope,
Which Jesus' grace has given, &c.

No lingering look, no parting sigh,
Our future meeting knaws,
There friendship beams from every eye,
And hope immortal grows;
O sacred hope, O blissful hope,
Which Jesus' grace has given, &c.

A faithful man's promise is his debt, which no fear of damage can dispense with.

From the Biblical Recorder.

A QUERY FOR THE ANTI-S.

Shall the following request be granted or not! Shall the imploring heathen have missionaries to teach them the way of salvation? or shall they be told that all missions are contrary to the scriptures—that God will do his own work in his own time—and that for the present they must be content to die in their sins and go to perdition! What would this simple hearted christian think, were he informed that there are men in this country calling themselves christians, who are employing all the means in their power, both fair and unfair, to close the door of salvation to the heathen? And all this, for sooth, because the mode of operation does not happen to suit their enlightened views of orthodoxy? APPEAL FROM A NATIVE OF INDIA.

The following paragraph is from the report of the English Church Missionary Society.—It is a touching appeal from a converted heathen, called William Churrun, to which Christians in England and America should respond.

Tell English Christians, says this native of India to Rev. Mr. Wilkinson—"tell them that William Churrun, by the Grace of God a servant of Jesus Christ, was once a servant of sin; and would have been a servant of sin now, had they not sent you to tell me of Christ crucified for sinners. Tell them my heart thanks them. Oh! when I think, that had not the English Christians sent Jesus Christ to me, I most have been forever lost, I cannot help loving them. Next tell them, we wonder much that they only send one or two missionaries.—What are one or two! Do they not know how many millions of my poor Himloo Brethren are yet without God! Oh! tell them that William, who thanks them for himself, blames them on account of others. I have heard you say there are many millions of people in England; and then I think—Well! many millions; and only one, two or three Missionaries come to India to save millions of those who are perishing in sin! Tell them we have three hundred and thirty millions of gods, whose slaves we are. And oh! tell them, that though these gods never spoke before, yet in the day of Judgement, the God of English Christians, who is the God of the whole world, will give them a tongue, to condemn them, for not sending them the gospel, and more Missionaries to India."

WOMAN.

BY N. P. WILLIS.

Oh! what is woman! what her smile!
Her look of love! her eye of light!
What is she, if her heart rovide
The lowly Jesus! Love may write
His name upon her marble brow,
Or linger in her curls of jet—
'The light spring-flower may soarcely bow
Beneath her step—and yet, and yet,
Without that meeker grace, she'll be
A lighter thing than vanity.

LETTERS RECEIVED.

From A. C. McCorkle, P. M. Jack's Creek, Ten. sent \$2—John Duffey and P. M. Duffey, Jackson, Ten. paper discontinued, owe \$2 25, besides making us pay the postage on their letter!—James M. Smith, P. M. Covington, Ten. 1 new sub.—John D. Coffee, P. M. Florence, Ala. 1 sub. discon.—Duncan Beathune, P. M. Fredonia, Ten. sent \$1—Thos. B. Jones P. M. Courtland Ala.—Simon Byram Hendersonville, Ten. discon.—W. Pepper, P. M. Mt. Reserve, Ten. 1 sub. discon.—Elder Samuel Love, Knoxville, Ten. sent \$5 and 3 new subs.—Elder B. S. Pant, Huntsville, Ala. sent \$5—James Jeffrey, Pine Bluff, Ark. discon.—N. J. Spillman, Mt. Vernon, T. 1 new sub.—Peter Williams, Thomas Pond &c., Marion, Weakly co. T., 3 subscribers who have made the prodigious discovery that The Baptist is published but once a month, and has become "a matter of speculation." What use do they make of their senses, not to know whether a paper comes to hand once or twice a month! Surely wisdom will die with this trio! due \$1 25 besides the postage—Clemon Hopper, Columbia, Ky new sub. postage 12¢—P. M. Louisville, Ky 1 sub. discon.—Wm. Leigh, Leighton, Ala. 2 subs.—C. W. Sayle, Springfield, Robinson co., sent \$3—Caleb T. Harris, Jackson, T. sent \$5—Jesse McElyea, P. M. Larkins' Fork, Ala. 1 sub.—Thomas M. Brunson, Rives' P. O. Ten. 1 sub.

SEMI-MONTHLY LIST.

The following persons have paid up to 1st January 1838: Peter Given, J. Ely, Rev. Mr. Ross, A. H. King, Wm. Cross, Andrew Milam, Wm. H. Hambler, Isham W. Parham, Eppy Cunningham, Jas. S. Hitt, Wm. Camrell, John Cunningham, Wm. Kirk, Isaac Walton, Alfred Ray, Mrs. Elizabeth Frazer, Elder Samuel Love, Rev. B. S. Fant, Mrs. Dolly Pryor, Joseph Barclay, Geo. W. Maples, C. W. Sayle, Thomas A. Simons, John Jones, Rev. John Wiseman, J. Anthony, John Ragland, Edmond Vinson, E. B. Bigley, R. B. Sybert, James Arrington, Miss L. E. Morton, George Roberts.—And the following have paid up to the dates respectively affixed: Samuel C. French to 1st July 1838, Elder Elijah Hickey, Levi McLoud and Joshua Tindall to 16th Jan. 1838, Dr. Jas. W. Hoggatt to 15th March 1837, Mrs. E. Clardy for 1830, Reuben Langley to 1st Feb. 1838, Joshua Bell and Alex. Turner to 1st July 1837, Edward Williams to March 1, 1838, John K. Bladec and Caleb T. Harris to Oct. 1, 1837.

PRINTED BY W. HASELL HUNT, NASHVILLE.

of which was afforded by a committee of the Board of Managers of the American Bible Society, to whom was referred the application of Messrs. Pearce and Yates, in 1839, for assistance in the publication of "their most excellent version of the New Testament in Bengalee, a version which is highly commended by many of the most learned pundits of India, as well as by the Professors in Fort William College, Calcutta, as being vastly superior to any version previously made." The committee made several successive reports, beginning with the declaration that our versions were *false* in translating baptizo to immerse and then modifying and changing until all they could say was that it was *inexpedient* to encourage Baptist translations. And the learned and respectable Board were quite satisfied with the conclusion: "Are not the Baptist translations correct?" was asked on our part. "No! cries one of the Secretaries of the Board, 'baptizo does not mean to dip or sprinkle either.'" "And, pray, Mr. Secretary, what does it mean?" No answer. Again it is asked, "Are not our translations correct?" "Yes! yes! yes!" resounds on all hands; "they are correct, but—but—it is *inexpedient* to circulate them!" "Inexpedient to circulate the acknowledged truth of God!! Why is it inexpedient to circulate Baptist translations? Because, when the heathen read, 'He that believeth and is immersed shall be saved,' they cannot be satisfied with sprinkling."

With regard to the apprehensions of "Philanthropist," that correct, faithful translations of the word of God "will open a wide door of evil," and generate "contention, strife," &c. &c., we think the force of the objection applies entirely to his own side. It is error, not truth, that produces evil. As for contention, we will doubtless have enough of that in defence of the faith once delivered to the saints. We do not expect that every caviller and infidel will cease opposing the gospel, because it is truly translated. There were revilers and objectors who opposed our Saviour to his face; and the earth has been burdened with persons of that character ever since, and probably will be to the end of time.

The question whether Baptists expect to "coerce or force" other denominations to practice immersion, is a very silly one, and deserves to be answered according to its folly. Baptists have ever been uncompromising enemies of usurpation, which cannot be shown of all their opponents; they do not interfere with the rights of other sects. They are de-

termined, however, to do their part in our great work *faithfully*—that of giving the unadulterated word of God to the whole world. If there be any who cannot bear this, and are too tenacious of their peculiar opinions to examine them impartially, and relinquish them if wrong, then let them quarrel with the bible if it suits them—but not with its conscientious followers.

When we shall be convinced that any other than a strictly faithful course on the part of our missionaries would have benefited the heathen more than the one they have pursued, we shall be prepared with "Philanthropist" to wish they had done differently. And when we can be persuaded that the American Bible Society has benefited the human race by cutting off nearly all the translations in the world from all hope of support from that institution—because their translations are not conformed to the errors and prejudices of the day—then will we be prepared to applaud the conduct of its managers.

In the mean time we rejoice that Baptists are becoming awake to their duty, and are endeavoring to retrieve the immense loss which they have sustained by their late unequal union; that they have formed an "American and Foreign Bible Society," have active agents abroad, and thousands of dollars already poured into the treasury and appropriated to the glorious enterprise.

GOOD AND EVIL.

In the following extract will be found some cheering news. In it will also be seen an extraordinary specimen of anti-effortism. A more consummate act of folly has seldom been committed. A more indecent outrage upon religion and civil liberty we have never had the pain to record. A more glaring violation of the principles of common sense we expect never to hear of. Talk of the Spanish Inquisition, indeed! What is worse than an *ex post facto* law! Admit the absurdity, and to what horrid results will it not lead! And these are Baptists!—From such Baptists, "Good Lord, deliver us!" Why did the prisoner plead guilty of an offence which our correspondent truly remarks was no offence, since the law was enacted after the commission of the deed to which it was to apply! Had he never read the Constitution of the United States! Had his accusers never read it! If they have not, we commend it to their perusal!

But what was the foul crime, for which our brother has been thus unceremoniously ejected from the church? "Why, murder, I presume," says the reader. No; not quite so

bad as that. "Then it was arson, or burglary." Oh, no! it was a lighter crime; guess again. "It must have been negro stealing, or horse stealing, at least." No, no, my friend, you are entirely too severe; it was nothing of the kind. "Well, what could have been the offence, drunkenness, or fighting, or cheating, or gambling!" Not at all; not at all. "Oh, I have it now!" say you; "I had forgotten the worst crime of all—blacker than any in the decalogue—shall I name the awful thing—it was for joining the Convention!" No, reader; you could never solve it; but I will tell you. It was for *speaking to a man!* "Speaking to a man!" Yes! for speaking to a preacher—a missionary—and saying to him, "Sir, I would thank you to come and preach at our church." This was the heinous sin. Tell it not in Bedford! Publish it not on the banks of Sugar Creek! What a brotherhood of—*heaven!* *enlightened christians!*

Extract of a letter from Rev. James H. Hall, dated

McLEMORESVILLE, March 20, 1837.

"My health has been bad through the winter, therefore my missionary labors have been quite limited. I shall commence operations again shortly, if Providence permit."

"Brother Browning and myself held a three days' meeting last November at Barre Fork in the Henry county, at which time and place the Lord was pleased to graciously smile and bless the administration of his word, and there were fifteen or twenty that appeared to be anxiously enquiring what they should do to be saved. This place of worship is occupied by the Antis. I must here relate a circumstance relative to this meeting. One of the members friendly to effort invited brother Browning and myself to hold the meeting. The church found it out; and after the meeting they made a rule that no member of that church should invite a missionary to preach in the m. h. They then inquired of this member if he was not guilty; to which enquiry he answered, yes; and O, lamentable to tell, they excluded him! Was this ever heard of before, in church or state, that after an offence is committed, then make a law to cover that particular case, by it try the offender, (though it can not be said offender in this case, because there was no law; and where there is no law there is no transgression;) and pronounce sentence of condemnation!"

GREAT REVIVAL.—More than 200 persons recently professed religion at Union village, Washington county, N. Y.

By a most singular oversight, the letter of Rev. John Rushing intended for the last No. was omitted. And we regret to say we have unfortunately lost or mislaid the manuscript, or it should have been published in the present No. If brother R. will send us another communication embodying the substance of the last, we will insert it with pleasure.

McMINNVILLE.

The interest manifested in this town on the subject of religion for some time past, is still increasing. The prayer meetings are crowded to excess. But they have no preachers. Cannot two or three ministers pay them a visit immediately? The protracted meeting is some six weeks off, and the interest may abate before that time.

BAPTIST STATE CONVENTION.

A meeting of the Board of the Convention took place in this city on Monday 27th ult.

Solomon G. Morton was chosen Treasurer. vice Dea. George Goodwin, deceased.

Brethren Whititt and Everett were appointed to assist brother Morton in a settlement with the executors of the late Treasurer.

Resolved that Elder Pickett of Statesville be requested to preach in destitute places according to his discretion for three months, in the employ of the Board, and report to the Corresponding Secretary before the next meeting of the Convention.

Adjourned.

THE BIBLE ASSOCIATION.

At a meeting of the Board on the 27th ult. it was

Resolved, that Rev. Bradley Kimbrough be requested to act as the Agent of the Bible Association, in receiving contributions.

By the following communication it will be seen that the little persecuted remnant of effort christians in Bedford county have made the best of their situation. The anti-effort majority could not suffer such *unholy* beings to dwell among *them*, and with pious horror cast them out. Very well; they have been the means of planting an effort church just by their side. We shall see which will prosper most.

For The Baptist.

On the first Lord's day in April, (the 2nd inst.) in the year of our Lord, 1837, after two sermons were delivered at Sugar Creek meeting house, Bedford county, Ten., an appointment was made for four o'clock, of the same day at Elder Melchizedek Brame's, for

the purpose of constituting a United Baptist Church. If the occasion of this constitution in the same neighborhood with the old church should be asked, we answer: A few members in said church would not let us live with them so long as we continued in union with the Missionary Baptists. We believing that the missionary Baptists possessed the essential character of the United Baptist Church of Christ, planted by the apostles on Christ the chief corner stone, from them we could not revolt and deny ourselves the high privilege of connection with them. We, therefore, for the purpose of being incorporated as a city set on a hill, to diffuse as much light as practicable in obedience to Christ's command, met our appointment.—The following members presented themselves, who wished to be constituted on the true principles of the United Baptists. A competent presbytery being present, viz: Elders Bradley Kimbrough and John B. T. Brame, brother John Scruggs of East Tennessee was appointed clerk pro tem., who enrolled the names of eight members. The services were opened with singing and prayer by brother Kimbrough. Appointed Elder John T. Muse speaker for the church. The Constitution or Covenant was read and received. Articles of faith were read and received.

Brother Kimbrough pronounced us a church in an official manner, giving us the right hand of fellowship.

Brother John B. T. Brame closed the solemnities of the constitution by singing an appropriate hymn and prayer. A short address was delivered to the church by brother Kimbrough, and a door was opened immediately for the reception of members. Brother John B. T. Brame united himself with us. Appointed our monthly meeting first Sunday in every month, and Saturday before. Concluded with prayer by brother John T. Muse. We ask the fervent prayers of our warm hearted brethren.

By order. JOHN SCRUGGS,
Clerk pro tem.

The following is a true copy of the church record of the exclusion of Elders Muse and Brame.

"United Baptist Church of Christ, met at Sugar Creek, Saturday before 3rd Lord's day in November 1836. And after divine service—proceeded to business as follows. 1st. The church appointed Bro: Yates Moderator. 2nd. Enquiry made for peace. 3rd. An allegation laid in by Bro: Benjamin Gambill, against Brethren John Muse and Melch Brame, from report, for becoming members

of the Convention party. 4th. Church took up the case, both the brethren present and acknowledged the fact. And gave no satisfaction. The Church therefore say they are excluded. And are no more of us.

"BENJAMIN GAMBILL, Clk."

The new church at Sugar Creek intend to hold a protracted meeting, to commence on Friday before the first Sunday in June next. Ministers and other brethren are earnestly requested to attend.

For The Baptist.

PREACHING TOUR.

Elders John Fite and John Borum intend to preach at the following places, on the days respectively announced:

At Saunders' Fork M. H. on the 2nd Sabbath in May;
At Smith's Fork M. H. on the day following;
At J. Bond's Union M. H. on the day following;
At Philadelphia M. H. on the day following;
At Providence M. H. on the day following;
At Brawley's Fork M. H. on Friday, Saturday and Sunday following;
At Barren Fork M. H. on Monday following;
At Pond Springs M. H. on Wednesday following;
At Biddad M. H. on Thursday following;
At Short Mountain M. H. on Sunday following.

For The Baptist.

LEXINGTON, TEN., March 20, 1837.

Dear Bro. LYON: I hoped to have had leisure before this time to visit Nashville, but like Martha find myself careful and cumbered about many things. In my last communication I made some mention of the sad and deplorable state of things that came under my observation in reference to intemperance. I wish now to address a few thoughts to the readers of your excellent paper on another subject, though perhaps not less important. In my visits and travelling in this Western District, I find a most lamentable and almost criminal apathy or negligence amongst the Baptists about the personal condition and standing of one another, and hence Baptists within a few miles of each other are perfect strangers. This is true in many cases in reference to preachers, as well as lay members. While this state of things continues what prospect can we have for union, brotherly love, and mutual sympathy? and how can we help to bear each others burdens, fulfilling the law of Christ, if we remain at so great a

distance from each other; are we not brethren? are we not children of the same great family? are we not all striving for the same glorious inheritance? are we not all soldiers of the same army? have we not all to combat the same common foe? Union is strength and we need all the strength that the whole church of God can put forth, for our enemies are mighty. We wrestle not, with an apostle, with flesh and blood, but with principalities and with powers. It is, how obvious the necessity of collecting the whole army of Christ in one solid column? But it may be asked, How is this to be effected? I answer, it must begin with the ministry. Let each seek an interchange of services with his neighbor, visit him at his house, converse with him freely in the spirit of meekness and fear; let the general topic be religion and the care of souls, carefully avoiding subjects of controversy, and especially let the strong man conceal his strength in the presence of his weaker brother, ever remembering that the strong must bear the infirmities of the weak, and that there are divers gifts all by the same Spirit. Next to this I would recommend frequent ministers' meetings. Let some brother appoint at his place of worship a 3 or 4 days' meeting, and write to or visit each minister within some 20 or 30 miles around him, and beg them to come up to the meeting, explain to them its objects and design, and while there if possible all lodge at the same house, eat at the same table, converse on the same subjects, breathe the same atmosphere, drink deep into the same spirit and let that be the spirit of Christ, and what kind of spirit this is we may easily gather from his word. Let His example be was rich, and became poor that we through his poverty might become rich. Truly, Paul claims to be less than the least of all saints, and exhorts that each esteem others better than himself. If this spirit could prevail universally, how soon would brotherly love abound and flow from heart to heart, from church to church, and from the rivers to the ends of the earth would we see the armies of Christ come forth, as bright as the sun, clear as the moon, and as terrible to the enemy as an army with banners.

With a view to this desirable event we have appointed a ministers' meeting in connexion with the Home Missionary Society, to commence on Friday before the 2nd Lord's day in May, at Hopewell, near Pleasant Exchange, Henderson county, and do most cordially invite and solicit the presence and counsels, not only of all ministers, but of all the dear brethren generally who heartily

love our Lord Jesus Christ. And in behalf of the church at this place I am authorized to say that not only their houses will be opened but their hearts and their hands to every lover of God. Brethren, we are too far apart, we must come together, we must compromise unimportant matters in order to be co-workers with God.

And now, may the God of all grace grant us the right spirit, and grant to be with us in all our deliberations, and overcome all to his glory and to the advancement of the Redeemer's cause, is my prayer for Christ's sake.

F. COLLINS

TO DR. JOHN M. WALES, JR.

KEETER, VI.

NASHVILLE, 12th April, 1847.

Dear Brother, I have taken your pleasure in reading your churches, in apostolic times, united to spread the gospel, as commanded by Jesus Christ.

Thanks be to God, says Paul, addressing the Corinthians, (2 Cor. xvi. 16 to 20), "who put the same earnest care in the heart of Titus for you." He went unto you. And we have sent (does not God send ministers?) we have sent with him the brother whose praise is in the gospel, throughout all the churches, and not that only, but who was chosen of the churches to travel with us.

That brother who was sent by the apostles, as the companion of Titus, on his visit to the Corinthians, you will please particularly to observe, "was chosen of the churches to travel." Chosen of the churches? Does not God choose ministers? You will please remember what I said to you in this point, in my last letter, illustrating the means by which God carries on his designs in the world. I need not repeat it now. He was chosen of the churches to travel. But could the churches—mark particularly my brother—the churches—there were several, we know not how many—could the churches have united in their choice, upon a specified individual, to travel as a minister, without concert or design? I ask you, as an intelligent man, if there must not have been consultation and agreement to secure united action? Evidently this concert, this consultation, this agreement by the churches in a specific appointment, could not have been had without either a miracle, which we have no reason to suppose was wrought in the case, or a Convention, or what is the same thing, a coming together of some kind. Can you deny it? I appeal to your own decision; am I not right? If "things equal to the same thing are equal to each other," then our Conventions have in apos-

tole institutions of the same kind, unquestionable authority.

One more example of the union of apostolic churches to send out and support missionaries in destitute places, shall for the present suffice.

Having occasion to write to the Corinthians, Paul referred to the circumstances respecting his support, under which he at first preached to them the gospel, and says—(2 Cor. xi. 8,) "I trodeth other churches, taking wages of them, to do you service." The apostles, you doubtless remember, went forth, taking nothing of the gentiles, for their subsistence. They, precisely as our missionaries do, labored among them in the gospel, and looked to the churches, under Christ, for the means of life. From his own statement, just now quoted, we learn that several churches, neither do we know in this instance how many, in some other part of the country, united in the support of Paul while he preached the gospel in Corinth, and they continued their efforts in that direction until the church there was planted and established. This fact is indisputable. Now an inquiry or two, if you please. Did this union of the churches in so laudable an object as that of supporting this distinguished missionary in the great city of Corinth, and which descended even to the particulars of fixing his wages (for Paul was one of those renegade hirelings who preached for money, who took a salary, (wages) all of which, in our day, among your associates in action, is so horribly sinful) did this union, which descended even to the minute particulars of fixing Paul's wages, take place among the churches without intention or design? Who will believe it? No man, certainly, who has intelligence enough to know that two and two make four. How then could this union and agreement have been secured without a Convention of the churches, such as we have seen did assemble on several other occasions, with special reference to the spread of the gospel?

I have now proved to you indisputably, and I could hope, if I had reason to believe that your mind was free from the mists of prejudice, satisfactorily, that in the days of the apostles, the first, and perhaps only perfectly pure age of christianity, unions; combinations; in other words, Conventions of the churches for missionary purposes, were held. Not as some of the sects around us imagine, and upon which they practice, Conventions of the churches assembled to sit as ecclesiastical courts, and ecclesiastical legislatures, as indeed some of our Associations, for example, the Cumberland, &c., have assumed the right

to do, to enact laws for their government and enforce regulations of polity. No, sir; they afford no instances of this kind. The apostolic churches, and ours at the present day, were, and are, voluntary bodies. This is true of each particular church, which is, in the nature of the case, in relation to all others, an independent body in every particular.

Let me lay before you a few plain facts on this point. A leading maxim of the gospel is, that every man must account for himself to God. The axe is laid at the root of the trees, every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit, is hewn down and cast into the fire. We learn from this statement, which is confirmed by the principles of common sense, and is directly the opposite of your doctrine, that all the duties of religion are binding upon us *individually*. The aggregate is made up of individuals. What is the duty, in this behalf, of one, is the duty of all, and what is the duty of all, is the duty, in his sphere, and in the measure of his ability, of every one.

You will no doubt meet me here with an objection. You distinctly remember having stated to me, in a private conversation some time since, as I remarked in my special address, as you acknowledge, at one of the last sessions of the Concord Association, that you were in favor of a General Association of the churches for missionary purposes. You may have changed your doctrine now, but this was your declared opinion some months ago. You object, however, that the churches in Tennessee, as such, do not all, nor even a majority of them, unite in the Convention, and unto them, you are not disposed to act. The melancholy fact of disunion among the churches on this subject, is granted. But, remember, it is their and your sin, not ours.

They have been under the influence of men who, as to the duty of spreading the gospel, have led them away from the truth. I rejoice, however, to see, that every where, throughout the State, brethren and countries are rallying, and retracing their steps, and I trust, and confidently believe, that the day is not distant, when they will all return, and marshalled side by side in the great conflict, shall go forward, and conquer the world.

I ask you, seriously, my brother, as a reasonable man, and a christian, if you really believe that no brethren, or churches, are justified in obeying the commandment of Christ to spread the gospel, until all the churches act? If none act until all do, it requires no great discrimination to perceive that we shall all be as still as the dead sea until the end of time. Shall we fold our hands, sit down, and see millions of heathen perish in their sins; and our own beloved country either the dupe of error or overrun with pollution, sink under the curse of God into the grave of nations, and not make a single effort to prevent it, nor to rescue a poor perishing soul who happens to live in a

destitute neighbourhood, until we can induce every straggling, sick and cowardly soldier in or about the camp, to fight. This is your doctrine, and surely I need not say a word beyond its mere statement, to convince all, and even you yourself, of its absurdity.

Let me lay before you a few plain facts on this point. A leading maxim of the gospel is, that every man must account for himself to God. The axe is laid at the root of the trees, every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit, is hewn down and cast into the fire. We learn from this statement, which is confirmed by the principles of common sense, and is directly the opposite of your doctrine, that all the duties of religion are binding upon us *individually*. The aggregate is made up of individuals. What is the duty, in this behalf, of one, is the duty of all, and what is the duty of all, is the duty, in his sphere, and in the measure of his ability, of every one.

These remarks are applicable to churches. If some churches, from whatever motive, will not act, it is not less obligatory upon all who will, to act, than if all did act. To them it declared opinion some months ago. You object, however, that the churches in Tennessee, as such, do not all, nor even a majority of them, unite in the Convention, and unto them, you are not disposed to act. The melancholy fact of disunion among the churches on this subject, is granted. But, remember, it is their and your sin, not ours.

They have been under the influence of men who, as to the duty of spreading the gospel, have led them away from the truth. I rejoice, however, to see, that every where, throughout the State, brethren and countries are rallying, and retracing their steps, and I trust, and confidently believe, that the day is not distant, when they will all return, and marshalled side by side in the great conflict, shall go forward, and conquer the world.

I ask you, seriously, my brother, as a reasonable man, and a christian, if you really believe that no brethren, or churches, are justified in obeying the commandment of Christ to spread the gospel, until all the churches act? If none act until all do, it requires no great discrimination to perceive that we shall all be as still as the dead sea until the end of time. Shall we fold our hands, sit down, and see millions of heathen perish in their sins; and our own beloved country either the dupe of error or overrun with pollution, sink under the curse of God into the grave of nations, and not make a single effort to prevent it, nor to rescue a poor perishing soul who happens to live in a

destitute neighbourhood, until we can induce every straggling, sick and cowardly soldier in or about the camp, to fight. This is your doctrine, and surely I need not say a word beyond its mere statement, to convince all, and even you yourself, of its absurdity.

Let me lay before you a few plain facts on this point. A leading maxim of the gospel is, that every man must account for himself to God. The axe is laid at the root of the trees, every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit, is hewn down and cast into the fire. We learn from this statement, which is confirmed by the principles of common sense, and is directly the opposite of your doctrine, that all the duties of religion are binding upon us *individually*. The aggregate is made up of individuals. What is the duty, in this behalf, of one, is the duty of all, and what is the duty of all, is the duty, in his sphere, and in the measure of his ability, of every one.

These remarks are applicable to churches. If some churches, from whatever motive, will not act, it is not less obligatory upon all who will, to act, than if all did act. To them it declared opinion some months ago. You object, however, that the churches in Tennessee, as such, do not all, nor even a majority of them, unite in the Convention, and unto them, you are not disposed to act. The melancholy fact of disunion among the churches on this subject, is granted. But, remember, it is their and your sin, not ours.

I ask you, seriously, my brother, as a reasonable man, and a christian, if you really believe that no brethren, or churches, are justified in obeying the commandment of Christ to spread the gospel, until all the churches act? If none act until all do, it requires no great discrimination to perceive that we shall all be as still as the dead sea until the end of time. Shall we fold our hands, sit down, and see millions of heathen perish in their sins; and our own beloved country either the dupe of error or overrun with pollution, sink under the curse of God into the grave of nations, and not make a single effort to prevent it, nor to rescue a poor perishing soul who happens to live in a

the firm conviction, that we should earnestly seek the action of our churches as a body, to sustain their own settled pastors, and assist in the support of others who go abroad over the face of the whole earth, to preach the gospel to every creature; but in default of success, and until this measure can be effected, we have scripture warrant and example for united individual action. A word or two more fully to prove this last assertion, and I shall close the present letter.

Paul *applied* to the Corinthians, in a letter addressed to the church, because they, as a church, neglected to supply him while he preached at Philippi, with the means of temporal support. Individuals, however, united for that purpose, and of them, for that very reason, he speaks in the highest terms—praises them for doing, what he blames the church for not doing. His words are these—(2 Cor. xvi. 17.) "I am glad of the coming of Stephanas, and Fortunatus, and Achaicus; for that which was lacking on your part they have supplied." The same Apostle says, in another place—(2 Cor. xi. 9.) "When I was present with you, and wanted, I was chargeable to no man, (that is, to no man of you,) for that which was lacking to me, the brethren which came from Macedonia supplied." In another place he speaks of women, who, by contributing to his support, labored with him in the gospel; he also mentions, in this connection, Clement, Gaius, and numerous others, upon whose labors I fear would indulge in some observations, but I am reminded that this letter is already sufficiently extended. Can any one who considers all these facts, doubt a moment longer, that to facilitate the dissemination of the gospel, united individual action is scriptural and right? Surely not. But let it be remembered that this united individual association is a *Convention*, like the State Convention of the Baptists of Tennessee.

The proof that it was the doctrine and practice of the Apostles and apostolic churches to unite the churches as far as possible, and where this could not be done to unite individuals, to spread the light of divine truth, I have now placed beyond the power of successful controversy. This is precisely the mode adopted by our State Convention. It is, therefore, scriptural and right. If you condemn us, you must, for the same reason, condemn the Apostles, and reject "the Word of God as the only rule of faith and practice."

In my next letter, I shall examine and refute several objections which I have heard urged against my conclusion on this subject. In the hope of eternal life, I remain your fellow servant in Christ.

ROBT BOYTE C. HOWELL.

The following communication, which contains important facts, we presume is from Rev. Daniel Sharp, of Boston. It appears in the Christian Watchman.

BIBLE TRANSLATIONS

MR. EDITOR,—In a communication which I sent to the "AMERICAN BAPTIST" about a year ago, I stated on information which I considered authentic, that in the early translation of the scriptures at Serampore the word baptizo was transferred. To my great surprise, my statement was contradicted. I say to my great surprise, because I supposed that my informants could not have been mistaken as to this fact.

Anxious to know the whole truth in the case, I addressed a letter to my highly esteemed brother, Mr. Yates, of Calcutta, requesting him to give me a history of the Serampore versions, so far at least as this subject was involved. He has kindly done so. I received his reply yesterday, and beg its insertion in the Christian Watchman. I find that I had been misinformed, and that my early and long continued impressions were incorrect. As I have no interest to promote that is not in alliance with truth, candor and fairness, you will oblige me by giving Mr. Yates' letter a place in your paper. It may also be proper to remark that a similar request was made by me to Mr. Eustace Carey now in England. His answer which has been received confirms the statements of Mr. Yates.

Yours respectfully,

D. S.

Boston, Feb. 11th, 1837.

Extracts of a letter from Rev. H. Yates, dated Calcutta, Sept. 12, 1836

My dear brother,—I received your letter of the 5th of April on the eighth of this month, since which I have had to prepare and preach three sermons, besides other work, so that I may say that I am replying to it with the least possible delay. We are very busy just now with our second edition of the Bengalee New Testament, wishing to get it through the press before the departure of our brother Pearce for England.

I am sorry to find that on the points you particularly mention you have been misinformed. Considering the sources of your information, I do not wonder at your relying upon it, and feeling certain that it must be correct. I shall now reply to your queries, and then give you my views on the subject.

Your first query is: Did the Serampore Missionaries from the first in their early translations of the Scriptures translate or transfer the words baptizo, &c.? They trans-

lated them. I have seen their first and their last edition, and in each the word is translated. I have been a reader of their versions now for three and twenty years, and I have never seen one yet in which the word was not translated.

Next, if they translated, was it by a word which signified exclusively to immerse? It was. The word used by Dr. Carey was *doob*, which has no other meaning than that of dipping. Have they ever varied from the first to the present time? I may confidently say, never. Attempts were made to induce Dr. Carey to alter and transfer the term. To whom he gave place by subjection, no, not for an hour.

Lastly, was it a matter of controversy between them and the Episcopalians? Mrs. Y. having been at Serampore from the commencement of the mission there, I have inquired of her and she informs me that previous to my arrival in the country, there were frequent discussions on the subject between them and Mr. Brown, the clergyman at the Mission Church. I am inclined, however, to think that these discussions were rather about translating than transferring the word, for since that time the Episcopalians have translated the word—Thomson in his Arabic, and Martin in his Hindostanee and Persian versions. With the exception of one version made by a gentleman who understood neither Latin nor Greek, it is a well known fact that every version, by every denomination here, had the word translated. With one solitary exception, therefore, the present resolution of the Bible Society will be the undoing of all that has been done from the beginning by all parties. When I was in England, after my visit to America, Mr. Hughes conversed with me on the subject, and wrote also upon it to Dr. Carey. In consequence of complaints sent home from Calcutta, he had come to the conclusion that it was our duty to be unfaithful even for the sake of peace! Dr. Carey would never listen for a moment to any proposals of the kind.

From what I have said, I think you will see that if the Bible Society at the first had any principle to guide them, that principle was the liberal one of leaving to any translators the same power over the word baptizo, as over the word bishop, elder, election, &c.—While this was done, we used each other's versions, making allowance for any rendering of a particular word. This appears to me the only principle upon which they could act consistently. If they dictate to translators on the word baptizo, they have the same right to dictate upon every other word—and

where will this end? Disputes have already commenced about the term bishop, &c., and they will have in a short time to edict that none of these terms shall be translated, and thus the word of God will be rendered unintelligible to the natives. As Baptists, I think we shall be gainers by the plan they have now adopted, providing we print Testaments with every word translated, and they print with the same transferred. But I clearly see that all depends upon these two points. Will the Baptists be faithful to their cause, and print at least the New Testament for themselves, and will the Pedobaptists be faithful in transferring the word, and not translating it. I have some fears on these points. My hopes prevail above my fears in regard to the Baptists, and I trust they will come forward with a noble determination "neither to add to nor take from" the word of the book of life, but give every word its faithful rendering. I am sure they are well capable of supplying the means. You may, perhaps, think it is uncharitable to me to doubt whether the Pedobaptists will be faithful in transferring the term baptizo, after having insisted upon it so much. I will state to you a fact, and leave you to judge whether there is not some ground for suspicion, without being uncharitable. You know the pains they have taken to prevail on us to transfer the word, and to accommodate them in the 5,000 copies printed for them; we agreed to do so. Well, at the very same time two gospels were ordered by the committee here to be printed in Hindostanee. On account of the delay which had taken place in the first, I was requested by the committee to read the proofs of the second. When I went into their office and asked for a copy of the gospel that had been printed, it was given me; and I found to my utter astonishment, that the word baptizo had not been transferred, but translated throughout by the term *ghosal* which signifies to wash. I make no comment on this, but leave the fact to speak for itself. If the Episcopalians, &c. had let things proceed in the same manner that they had done from the beginning, they would have been no losers. The greater number of missionaries belong to them, and the greater number of translations in extensive use would have been executed by men of their own views. In other cases, a plan of concession might have been adopted as in our Bengalee version, which would have met the views of all parties—it would have involved the necessity of printing in a version required by us, a few copies with the word translated; but the principle now adopted, if fully noted out,

will lead to as many bible societies as there are denominations. I have no doubt what has transpired will be overruled for good. In every age the church needs something to humble it; and something that will tend to humility in another world. This is the age of christian liberality, and yet in this age of boasted liberality it has so happened, that two of the largest societies in the christian world have refused to give their aid to the circulation of the word of God, because one word in it was translated according to the original sense, which the wisest and the best of men of all denominations have attached to it. Other serious objections may exist on words of infinitely more importance, but these can all be covered with the mantle of forbearance, and the version encouraged, printed and published; but to translate the word baptizo to immerse, which all acknowledge to be its first though not only meaning, is a crime of such magnitude even in this liberal and benevolent age, that the Baptists who have been guilty of it, are deemed worthy of excision! Well may it be said, What is man! Cease ye from man whose breath is in his nostrils, for wherein is he to be accounted of!

Yours affectionately,

W. YATES.

It is needless to offer an apology for occupying a page of our paper with the following effusion, which has been long a dreamy tenant of our copy drawer. We are aware that it is not altogether suited to the character of this journal, and yet there is nothing objectionable to the production. Besides, it is the first exclusively literary effort with which we have been honored, and it, in the view of the superficial reader it appears light as "airy nothing" it is also short "as a vision of the night"—and in truth, technically speaking, we have compressed our dreamer into a narrow bed of a single page, by the use of breviter type without leads.

FOR THE BAPTIST.

Couldst events cast their shadows before"

A DREAM.

Although I am no believer in the opinion, that every idle vision and morning vagary is truly portentous of coming events; yet to some extent, dreams are to myself, heralds, announcing facts by allegory, of what is yet to transpire. And so true are they sometimes in their fulfilment, that I wish I could find a Daniel to interpret the one I am now putting upon paper. I can not. Well then, I must to the authorities.

Nebuchadnezzar dreamed a dream, and you the readers of The Baptist are well acquainted with it. Still later down in chronological order, another Book or Testament says—Instructed is sealed to the hearts of men in dreams, and that certain characters shall dream dreams, &c. At this kind of authority you are not disposed to laugh; although you may at the next. However, I'll quote again from memory from another set of authors to strengthen my weakness; so that those who may pick up this No. of The Baptist may see, that others think as well as I, that dreams are the shadows of coming events.

The unhappy Ahasuerus had a dream of the fate of

his husband Ceyx, and Ovid thinks that Morpheus was sent to liar with it, as a deputation from the immortal gods, holding court celestial on "vast Olympus' height." Cæsar's wife dreamed; and was it not fulfilled by the assassination in the Senate?

So much did the ancients believe in them that they were considered of a substantive nature, and as standing by Morpheus, whose ministers conveyed them to his favorites upon earth. While others considered them as allegorical edicts, sent out from the archives of eternity, by which we might guess at the resolves of the Fates, seeing, as it were, our destiny, through a glass darkly.

You who are well read, know that the moderns too have taken this subject into serious consideration. Beattie, the author of the Essay upon Tragedy, wrote upon this subject. The English Pedestrian also. Some of our own authors have thought this subject worthy of consideration. Now, if the belief of ancient and modern great men, in the ominous nature of dreams, is not a sufficient apology for one who is less than the least, to believe in them also, I offer no other.

On the third day of the week, after the third watch of the night, I arose and set out for your city.

The firmament sparkled with 10,000 suns which hid their diminished heads at the dawn of day. The snow being thick upon the timber, every breeze brought it down, until the exposed parts of my saddle, covered with snow, under the rays of a rising sun, outshone even Santa Anna's. The glory of it, like his, soon departed. My course lay across the Cumberland, and pursuing it I was led NNW. until evening of the same day brought me to the house of my commercial friend with whom I transacted some business. I spent the night with him:—he accompanied me on my way a few miles and returned.—Other business, partly private, partly public, threw me in various directions—I travelled to all the points of the compass, and turned in for the night at— Here there was no company, and only a part of the family. The evening passed off pleasantly enough; at 8 I retired and slept soundly until 3, when light slammers fell upon me. In these, and at this time, "fancy knit her frostwork." I slept upon a high eminence, in a high house in the second story—and all alone. "The wind was high, and roughly rush'd upon the sky."

By an invisible power, I was carried many miles to an old and dilapidated building. Then lethargic slumbers came upon me. While sleeping I fell asleep, and in sleeping soundly I slept more soundly.

In this state, which is called Death's holy brother, I became conscious, and found myself in a low piazza opening to the rising sun. This was a fit residence of the bats and owls: but I heard no lonely midnight hootings. All was silent and solitary, desolate and deathlike. There was just "light enough to make darkness visible." I was on the ground floor, on a small pallet, and in a supine posture. I had been low, was coalescent; and with my head elevated, I cast my eye around upon the solemn scene—stillness—stillness prevailed.—I grew despondent—I sickened at the sight—I looked and looked for life and something living; "but naught of life appeared." Barely, though I, this is the vale of Gehenna, with the shadow of death resting upon it. Certainly some poison more deadly than that of the Hohno Upas exists all around; and from it how can I escape?

While contemplating this prison of Death—on the very suburbs of the eternal world; a hollow, howling blast of wind rattled through the ruined mansion. I attempted to arise, but did not; by this attempt some power was given; I used it, and turned me about to look into the eastern heavens to see if light appeared: It did. but it was of that yellow, sickly, sombre kind which was seen at noon day of the great eclipse of 1822. It gave me no comfort. For

the want of a more pleasant scene I let the eye rest upon it with a degree of suffering unpleasant to tell. While thus counting my moments as they moved heavily on, I heard the tread of human feet approaching. The sound was neither behind nor before, to the right nor to the left; but proceeded from the northern heavens in a line of 45 deg. as it appeared to my understanding. This trampling came on the old insanoo and into it, and approached my head. I looked out and saw a figure banding over me—of this I say nothing. I looked towards my feet and saw two; they claimed so sadience with me. I said nothing; they stood and looked eagerly on me; as if having much care about something, I spoke not. The anxiety depicted in their countenances became so intense I could not bear it; and amidst the silence, the solemn silence of a grave yard I arose—those spectres "dissolved in air away." I was here turned about and urged through long, dark and narrow passages leading to the west side of the fabric which I was anxious to leave. For in it I was dirty, blind and naked—in a great degree so. I passed out under a long shed, low and old. The listel touched my hair.

A long journey was now before me, I was compelled to travel it, although half clad. The first scene was a gently sloping landscape; the next was a multitude of human beings on my right, standing as if every instant expecting some high command; while on my left suddenly appeared a lone female without any head dress, clothed in a garment white beyond description. She was grave and silent, moving in the same direction with myself, and all towards the setting sun.

As we passed the multitude no eye was turned towards us: every one seemed wrapped up in his own contemplation. They were men. In the distance a broad stream appeared—a great river. We were to cross it; I knew not how, but was determined to meet the exigency. On this slope, and immediately opposite the multitude, this female (towards whom I gave attention on account of her singular outset upon the long journey together,) suddenly danced off from me, yet directing her attention towards me. I hastened my speed somewhat, but gained no distance.

As we came to the bank of the river she gradually approached my path; until we were presently in the cut leading down to the water. We descended together, and in passing over some of the inequalities of the bank; I ventured to extend some assistance which she declined; but on reaching the beautiful beach, she was athirst and called for water. This was the first word spoken. I immediately attempted to procure some, but before I could do so she was drinking by her own procurement and ready to pass the great river with me. It was clear, calm and shallow. I directed my eyes towards the other bank, and saw men furling. This gave me confidence that to cross was practicable. We however directed our course downward as the river appeared to narrow. At this moment a pilot voluntarily appeared in front, and without a word gave us a sign to follow. We did so. The stream grew narrow and more narrow; until the servant placing a timber upon the opposite beach we passed ever dry abod.

Being safely landed I stood still for some time, looking for the way. High table lands arose in the view, thickly covered with dry and tangled sedge. Here our pilot disappeared, and a cara came upon me for this strange yet interesting female. I cast about in my mind for means to convey her up this steep with the least inconvenience to herself. While thus deliberating, and not half prepared to start, I was moved off, feeling more concern for my companion than for myself. But onward was my fate; and an expressive silence seemed to intimate that a long and tedious journey was to be performed, and action was necessary.

