

THE BAPTIST.

NASHVILLE, SEPTEMBER 26, 1857.

TRUTH AGAINST THE WORLD.

EDITORIAL TELEGRAMS.

The church should do everything best in its might, but let us not forget to hand to nothing.

Johnson of Atlanta, Ga. He will see that his article makes three instead of two columns, which we offered him. We must have a point to make. His article is courteous & scholarly. We shall make little progress in the cause of the issues, which are:

That McLain's translation is not justified.

Whether to convert Benedict of Fructuaria as a competent historian.

That the English Baptists believe in a validity of baptism, until

A. D. 1050.

That they never became dissatisfied with their narrow views about that period.

That there is no proof that all of them repudiated it even.

We now request the Rector to proceed directly to his work or abandon it. We will play it by ear.

He does not wait for us but concerns himself about his own strange assertions.

We have been so pressed with our editorial duties, sampling the Southern Register and our word for it, a most malignant one it will be—finishing our new, not tract, but little book, Trials and Sorrows, and the history of the planning of the First Baptist Church, in connection with the paper and Review, that it has been impossible for us to get out to the Churches and Associations that have met this month, as we intended.

Rev. M. P. Harkley, of Salisbury, Ill., writes a most encouraging letter of appreciation, and reminds us that the influence of our publications is being more and more steadily taken up by the State. Such letters are welcome.

Bethel will find those remonstrances in this paper a large mass of matter had got about them. All right. We take all right in money sent to the *Review*, and will not touch the passage of the book back. We can't afford to ride both ways. When the money leaves the office, when the time is mailed, there is but little risk, and so of the books.

Who will answer us Tennessee? Will Rev. Mr. Clements send us a Minnie of Booth, for 1850? Is Freedoms Association, or the larger part of it, in Tennessee? Will Rev. Samuels answer? Is the Jefferson Association in Tennessee? Who will send a reply to the Minutes? Where is the Lebanon Association and the Iowans—are they missionaries? Who will send a Minnie? Will you not aid us to get Tennessee perfect?

See Special Requests in another column.

We re-invest this article, since a portion of it was left out last week.

Bearers of Death-bed Repentance.

Mrs. A. — suddenly prostrated with the typhoid fever. She had no saving knowledge of Christ, although she repented herself to give her heart to God. The physician pronounced her case hopeless; and she was assured of the fact by the pastor, who had been sent for. She was alarmed, dismied, agitated. But the pastor labored with her, prayed for her, and she found peace in his thoughts. Her mind was no longer agitated, but apparently calm, rested, peaceful. She gave directions about the disposition of her wardrobe, and the service of her family. She talked much and benevolently with friends and relatives after her death. The pastor was present at the conclusion of her conversation with God, ordered her recovery; and when she awoke from the delirious swoon of the above sufferings, she was evidently suffering with mortal sickness, but was recovered.

Her son answered clear at the time; and had died, her pastor and others, would have rejoiced over her as saved.

This is the testimony of one, to the salvation of death-bed repentance. The thousands and tens of thousands who are around us to-day, are making no immediate effort to secure an interest in Christ, when they can, at any time—ever during their last moments, and find a Savior. They believe this because it is preached to them, and they hear that it occurs almost daily; and when they hear the moral sermon preached of one occurrence, they remember nothing that occurred in the day of their sickness, when all thought their minds perfectly clear. We refer the Christian and impudent reader to a few facts we have noted, concerning this subject:

Mr. Booth, of ——

"I pay more attention to people's lives than to their deaths. In all the visits I have paid to the sick during the course of a long ministry, I never met with one who was not previously serious, that ever recovered from what he supposed the brink of death, who afterwards, in his room, or became re-susceptible without understanding the very great importance thereof, when they thought they could not recover."

An Eastern Physician.—A plain English physician once stated that he had known some three hundred sick persons, who soon expected to die, had been led as they supposed to the gates of their sins, and saving faith in Christ had eventually been restored to health again. Only ten of this number, so far as he knew, gave any evidence of being really regenerated. Soon after their recovery, they plunged, as a general thing, into the follies and vices of the world. Who would trust them in such a condition?

Mr. Campbell's rule is false and absurd, you no support. Mr. Campbell has himself exploded it:

"In the commission which Moses gave to me a power for converting an atheist, he commanded three things to be done, indicated by three very distinct and intelligible terms, viz.: *missiones*, *discipulatus*, *instructionis*. Comp. on page, p. 112.

You heard Mr. Campbell repeat the fallacy of his rule, in Debate. Turn to your *Leading Debate*, page 267, where Mr. Campbell says:

"The great God, in his humility, distinguished man from the beasts, and man from the angels, as much as any animal distinguished, if literally understood, from man a little, from the rest of the creation."

With his compeer Jonathan Edwards, Vetus, Tarrington, Benson, and Common Sense.

Here is the Commission as the language of both Matthew and Mark—translated according to the above rules of translation and interpre-

tation—the variations from our present version, justified by Dr. Geo. Campbell, Calvin, Luther, and Barnes, and the almost unanimous voice of all acknowledged scholars of all denominations—

COMMISSION.

AN AUTHORITY IS GIVEN ME OF HEAVEN AND EARTH: GO, THEREFORE, CONVERT [OR MAKE DISCIPLES OF] ALL NATIONS; BAPTIZE THEM IN THE NAME OF THE FATHER, AND OF THE SON, AND OF THE HOLY SPIRIT. TEACH THEM TO OBEY ALL THINGS WHATSOEVER I HAVE COMMANDED YOU, SC. MATTHEW.

ON THIS SAME AUTHORITY WHICH I GIVE YOU, GO TO THE WHOLE CREATION: HE WHO CALLS RELAYE'S AND DAIRIES, SHALL BE SAVED; BUT WHO WILL NOT BELIEVE RELAYE OR DAIRIES."

Mark 16: 15, 16.

I have adopted the translation of that eminent Presbyterian, D. Dr. George Campbell, whose authority you will not question. There are only three important variations from our English version, which becomes me to justify, since they bear upon the issues before us.

"MATERIALS—Convert—or make disciples of."

To this rendering you cannot well object, since it is your Book of Baptism, you say:

"Our opponents agree with us, that the first word translated *convert*, in the Commission, signifies *to change*; they say, the apostles were made *disciples of nations*. We are agreed also, that a *scripturary* use loves to sit at the feet of Jesus to learn heavenly wisdom, that may obey the commandments."

All acknowledged scholars render the term substantially above.

Murdock's translation of the Syriac—"Instruct all nations." So Heyl and Worley. Wynn says, "Mak discipulus in all nations." Wakefield, "Mak discipulus of all nations." Scott and Wesley, "Disciple all nations." Doddridge, proclaims all nations.

Jacobs, "Teach literally, make disciples of."

Burke, "This word [matheteutac] properly means *disciple*, or *mak discipulus of* &c." All Baptists agree with all Pedobaptist scholars in this rendering.

But strange as it may appear, you raise a question in your work on baptism, how the nations are to be made converts to Christianity, or disciples of Christ, as though the definition of the term admitted of a question! I must believe that such a question would never have been raised unless there was some idea to be foisted into the Commission, which the plain and obvious language of it expressly forbids.

Alexander Campbell, seeking to revive one of the exploded dogmas of the Romish Apostasy, advocates the baptism of unregenerated, professing sinners—provided they admit that Jesus is the Son of God—upon the ground that remission and regeneration can be found alone in baptism, and by baptism they are disciplined to Christ, and he presents a specious argument from the language of the Commission, i. e.:

"That the active participle always, when connected with the imperative mood, expresses the manner in which the thing commanded is to be performed," and Mr. Campbell affirms: "to furnish the soldiers, arming them, and converting the nations, baptizing them, are exactly the same forms of speech."—Christian Baptist, page 630.

And so Mr. Campbell construes the Commission to authorise him to convert wicked, prayerless men, and make them scriptural disciples of Christ, as the encroaching heret and unfeeling children and servants of Satan?

The hearing of the discussion of the Commission upon one of the issues between us is very evident and the settlement of the above questions is conclusive of that issue. You affirm that there was not a Baptist in the first four centuries. If I satisfactorily sustain the affirmative of the last proposition, then will I conclusively have proved that all the Apostles and the severity, and all those disciplined to Christ during his ministry, and, also, all those baptized and baptized during the ministry of the Apostles, were, in one great disgruntled principle, Baptists, and conclusively, that there could not have been one Pedobaptist, much less a Presbyter, in the first four centuries. If I satisfactorily sustain the affirmative of the last proposition, then will I conclusively have proved that all the Apostles and the severity, and all those disciplined to Christ during his ministry, and, also, all those baptized and baptized during the ministry of the Apostles, were, in one great disgruntled principle, Baptists, and conclusively, that there could not have been one Pedobaptist, much less a Presbyter, in the first four centuries. If I satisfactorily sustain the affirmative of the last proposition, then will I conclusively have proved that all the Apostles and the severity, and all those disciplined to Christ during his ministry, and, also, all those baptized and baptized during the ministry of the Apostles, were, in one great disgruntled principle, Baptists, and conclusively, that there could not have been one Pedobaptist, much less a Presbyter, in the first four centuries.

That the active participle always, when connected with the imperative mood, expresses the manner in which the thing commanded is to be performed," and Mr. Campbell affirms: "to furnish the soldiers, arming them, and converting the nations, baptizing them, are exactly the same forms of speech."—Christian Baptist, page 630.

And so Mr. Campbell construes the Commission to authorise him to convert wicked, prayerless men, and make them scriptural disciples of Christ, as the encroaching heret and unfeeling children and servants of Satan?

The hearing of the discussion of the Commission upon one of the issues between us is very evident and the settlement of the above questions is conclusive of that issue. You affirm that there was not a Baptist in the first four centuries. If I satisfactorily sustain the affirmative of the last proposition, then will I conclusively have proved that all the Apostles and the severity, and all those disciplined to Christ during his ministry, and, also, all those baptized and baptized during the ministry of the Apostles, were, in one great disgruntled principle, Baptists, and conclusively, that there could not have been one Pedobaptist, much less a Presbyter, in the first four centuries.

That the active participle always, when connected with the imperative mood, expresses the manner in which the thing commanded is to be performed," and Mr. Campbell affirms: "to furnish the soldiers, arming them, and converting the nations, baptizing them, are exactly the same forms of speech."—Christian Baptist, page 630.

And so Mr. Campbell construes the Commission to authorise him to convert wicked, prayerless men, and make them scriptural disciples of Christ, as the encroaching heret and unfeeling children and servants of Satan?

The hearing of the discussion of the Commission upon one of the issues between us is very evident and the settlement of the above questions is conclusive of that issue. You affirm that there was not a Baptist in the first four centuries. If I satisfactorily sustain the affirmative of the last proposition, then will I conclusively have proved that all the Apostles and the severity, and all those disciplined to Christ during his ministry, and, also, all those baptized and baptized during the ministry of the Apostles, were, in one great disgruntled principle, Baptists, and conclusively, that there could not have been one Pedobaptist, much less a Presbyter, in the first four centuries.

That the active participle always, when connected with the imperative mood, expresses the manner in which the thing commanded is to be performed," and Mr. Campbell affirms: "to furnish the soldiers, arming them, and converting the nations, baptizing them, are exactly the same forms of speech."—Christian Baptist, page 630.

And so Mr. Campbell construes the Commission to authorise him to convert wicked, prayerless men, and make them scriptural disciples of Christ, as the encroaching heret and unfeeling children and servants of Satan?

The hearing of the discussion of the Commission upon one of the issues between us is very evident and the settlement of the above questions is conclusive of that issue. You affirm that there was not a Baptist in the first four centuries. If I satisfactorily sustain the affirmative of the last proposition, then will I conclusively have proved that all the Apostles and the severity, and all those disciplined to Christ during his ministry, and, also, all those baptized and baptized during the ministry of the Apostles, were, in one great disgruntled principle, Baptists, and conclusively, that there could not have been one Pedobaptist, much less a Presbyter, in the first four centuries.

That the active participle always, when connected with the imperative mood, expresses the manner in which the thing commanded is to be performed," and Mr. Campbell affirms: "to furnish the soldiers, arming them, and converting the nations, baptizing them, are exactly the same forms of speech."—Christian Baptist, page 630.

And so Mr. Campbell construes the Commission to authorise him to convert wicked, prayerless men, and make them scriptural disciples of Christ, as the encroaching heret and unfeeling children and servants of Satan?

The hearing of the discussion of the Commission upon one of the issues between us is very evident and the settlement of the above questions is conclusive of that issue. You affirm that there was not a Baptist in the first four centuries. If I satisfactorily sustain the affirmative of the last proposition, then will I conclusively have proved that all the Apostles and the severity, and all those disciplined to Christ during his ministry, and, also, all those baptized and baptized during the ministry of the Apostles, were, in one great disgruntled principle, Baptists, and conclusively, that there could not have been one Pedobaptist, much less a Presbyter, in the first four centuries.

That the active participle always, when connected with the imperative mood, expresses the manner in which the thing commanded is to be performed," and Mr. Campbell affirms: "to furnish the soldiers, arming them, and converting the nations, baptizing them, are exactly the same forms of speech."—Christian Baptist, page 630.

And so Mr. Campbell construes the Commission to authorise him to convert wicked, prayerless men, and make them scriptural disciples of Christ, as the encroaching heret and unfeeling children and servants of Satan?

The hearing of the discussion of the Commission upon one of the issues between us is very evident and the settlement of the above questions is conclusive of that issue. You affirm that there was not a Baptist in the first four centuries. If I satisfactorily sustain the affirmative of the last proposition, then will I conclusively have proved that all the Apostles and the severity, and all those disciplined to Christ during his ministry, and, also, all those baptized and baptized during the ministry of the Apostles, were, in one great disgruntled principle, Baptists, and conclusively, that there could not have been one Pedobaptist, much less a Presbyter, in the first four centuries.

That the active participle always, when connected with the imperative mood, expresses the manner in which the thing commanded is to be performed," and Mr. Campbell affirms: "to furnish the soldiers, arming them, and converting the nations, baptizing them, are exactly the same forms of speech."—Christian Baptist, page 630.

And so Mr. Campbell construes the Commission to authorise him to convert wicked, prayerless men, and make them scriptural disciples of Christ, as the encroaching heret and unfeeling children and servants of Satan?

The hearing of the discussion of the Commission upon one of the issues between us is very evident and the settlement of the above questions is conclusive of that issue. You affirm that there was not a Baptist in the first four centuries. If I satisfactorily sustain the affirmative of the last proposition, then will I conclusively have proved that all the Apostles and the severity, and all those disciplined to Christ during his ministry, and, also, all those baptized and baptized during the ministry of the Apostles, were, in one great disgruntled principle, Baptists, and conclusively, that there could not have been one Pedobaptist, much less a Presbyter, in the first four centuries.

That the active participle always, when connected with the imperative mood, expresses the manner in which the thing commanded is to be performed," and Mr. Campbell affirms: "to furnish the soldiers, arming them, and converting the nations, baptizing them, are exactly the same forms of speech."—Christian Baptist, page 630.

And so Mr. Campbell construes the Commission to authorise him to convert wicked, prayerless men, and make them scriptural disciples of Christ, as the encroaching heret and unfeeling children and servants of Satan?

The hearing of the discussion of the Commission upon one of the issues between us is very evident and the settlement of the above questions is conclusive of that issue. You affirm that there was not a Baptist in the first four centuries. If I satisfactorily sustain the affirmative of the last proposition, then will I conclusively have proved that all the Apostles and the severity, and all those disciplined to Christ during his ministry, and, also, all those baptized and baptized during the ministry of the Apostles, were, in one great disgruntled principle, Baptists, and conclusively, that there could not have been one Pedobaptist, much less a Presbyter, in the first four centuries.

That the active participle always, when connected with the imperative mood, expresses the manner in which the thing commanded is to be performed," and Mr. Campbell affirms: "to furnish the soldiers, arming them, and converting the nations, baptizing them, are exactly the same forms of speech."—Christian Baptist, page 630.

And so Mr. Campbell construes the Commission to authorise him to convert wicked, prayerless men, and make them scriptural disciples of Christ, as the encroaching heret and unfeeling children and servants of Satan?

The hearing of the discussion of the Commission upon one of the issues between us is very evident and the settlement of the above questions is conclusive of that issue. You affirm that there was not a Baptist in the first four centuries. If I satisfactorily sustain the affirmative of the last proposition, then will I conclusively have proved that all the Apostles and the severity, and all those disciplined to Christ during his ministry, and, also, all those baptized and baptized during the ministry of the Apostles, were, in one great disgruntled principle, Baptists, and conclusively, that there could not have been one Pedobaptist, much less a Presbyter, in the first four centuries.

That the active participle always, when connected with the imperative mood, expresses the manner in which the thing commanded is to be performed," and Mr. Campbell affirms: "to furnish the soldiers, arming them, and converting the nations, baptizing them, are exactly the same forms of speech."—Christian Baptist, page 630.

And so Mr. Campbell construes the Commission to authorise him to convert wicked, prayerless men, and make them scriptural disciples of Christ, as the encroaching heret and unfeeling children and servants of Satan?

The hearing of the discussion of the Commission upon one of the issues between us is very evident and the settlement of the above questions is conclusive of that issue. You affirm that there was not a Baptist in the first four centuries. If I satisfactorily sustain the affirmative of the last proposition, then will I conclusively have proved that all the Apostles and the severity, and all those disciplined to Christ during his ministry, and, also, all those baptized and baptized during the ministry of the Apostles, were, in one great disgruntled principle, Baptists, and conclusively, that there could not have been one Pedobaptist, much less a Presbyter, in the first four centuries.

That the active participle always, when connected with the imperative mood, expresses the manner in which the thing commanded is to be performed," and Mr. Campbell affirms: "to furnish the soldiers, arming them, and converting the nations, baptizing them, are exactly the same forms of speech."—Christian Baptist, page 630.

And so Mr. Campbell construes the Commission to authorise him to convert wicked, prayerless men, and make them scriptural disciples of Christ, as the encroaching heret and unfeeling children and servants of Satan?

The hearing of the discussion of the Commission upon one of the issues between us is very evident and the settlement of the above questions is conclusive of that issue. You affirm that there was not a Baptist in the first four centuries. If I satisfactorily sustain the affirmative of the last proposition, then will I conclusively have proved that all the Apostles and the severity, and all those disciplined to Christ during his ministry, and, also, all those baptized and baptized during the ministry of the Apostles, were, in one great disgruntled principle, Baptists, and conclusively, that there could not have been one Pedobaptist, much less a Presbyter, in the first four centuries.

<p

THE BAPTIST.

NASHVILLE, SEPTEMBER 26, 1857.

KEEP BEFORE THE PEOPLE.

THE BAPTIST'S BOSTONIAN.

TO ANTI-COMMUNION.
Your article, which we clipped from the Louisiana Baptist, thus closes us a spirited reply to the editor of the Texas Advocate:

In conclusion, we beg to say, that if in the dying hour, memory cannot summon from the recollections of the past, any greater "sting" than the most determined hostility, against every form of tyranny, Episcopacy no less than civil, over the mind of man—if our opposition to a system of ecclesiastical government, which the courts of our country have decided that the lay members have no part or connection with—never had—the traveling preachers comprising the embodiment of its power, ecclesiastical and temporal!—is the exercise of which they represent themselves, and have almost entirely neglected. There are many Baptists scattered over the country, and several rural churches which have been organized: but those organized previous to the difficulties last year, were almost broken up during the war. There are four Baptist churches already organized in this (Leavenworth) county. One at Leavenworth, and one at Weston city, and two in the country. There are other places in this county where Baptist churches might be organized. I have been riding and preaching at my own charges; this I can do long enough, my funds will soon be gone. I will you would use influence to induce the Southern Board, at Marion, Ala., to appoint a missionary for Kansas. This would set all the rest in motion, as the Southern Board has no money to spare.

Average attendance, omitting fractions—2 officers; 6 male teachers; 18 male scholars; 6 female teachers; 12 female scholars; total 140.

Mr. Howell is the Chair. This report embraces five weeks:

2d Sabbath—2 officers; 6 male teachers; 18 male scholars; 6 female teachers; 12 female scholars; total 147.

3d Sabbath—2 officers; 6 male teachers;

18 male scholars; 6 female teachers; 12 female scholars; total 142.

4th Sabbath—2 officers; 6 male teachers;

18 male scholars; 6 female teachers; 12 female scholars; total 145.

5th Sabbath—2 officers; 6 male teachers;

18 male scholars; 6 female teachers; 12 female scholars; total 146.

6th Sabbath—2 officers; 6 male teachers;

18 male scholars; 6 female teachers; 12 female scholars; total 147.

7th Sabbath—2 officers; 6 male teachers;

18 male scholars; 6 female teachers; 12 female scholars; total 148.

8th Sabbath—2 officers; 6 male teachers;

18 male scholars; 6 female teachers; 12 female scholars; total 149.

9th Sabbath—2 officers; 6 male teachers;

18 male scholars; 6 female teachers; 12 female scholars; total 150.

10th Sabbath—2 officers; 6 male teachers;

18 male scholars; 6 female teachers; 12 female scholars; total 151.

11th Sabbath—2 officers; 6 male teachers;

18 male scholars; 6 female teachers; 12 female scholars; total 152.

12th Sabbath—2 officers; 6 male teachers;

18 male scholars; 6 female teachers; 12 female scholars; total 153.

13th Sabbath—2 officers; 6 male teachers;

18 male scholars; 6 female teachers; 12 female scholars; total 154.

14th Sabbath—2 officers; 6 male teachers;

18 male scholars; 6 female teachers; 12 female scholars; total 155.

15th Sabbath—2 officers; 6 male teachers;

18 male scholars; 6 female teachers; 12 female scholars; total 156.

16th Sabbath—2 officers; 6 male teachers;

18 male scholars; 6 female teachers; 12 female scholars; total 157.

17th Sabbath—2 officers; 6 male teachers;

18 male scholars; 6 female teachers; 12 female scholars; total 158.

18th Sabbath—2 officers; 6 male teachers;

18 male scholars; 6 female teachers; 12 female scholars; total 159.

19th Sabbath—2 officers; 6 male teachers;

18 male scholars; 6 female teachers; 12 female scholars; total 160.

20th Sabbath—2 officers; 6 male teachers;

18 male scholars; 6 female teachers; 12 female scholars; total 161.

21st Sabbath—2 officers; 6 male teachers;

18 male scholars; 6 female teachers; 12 female scholars; total 162.

22nd Sabbath—2 officers; 6 male teachers;

18 male scholars; 6 female teachers; 12 female scholars; total 163.

23rd Sabbath—2 officers; 6 male teachers;

18 male scholars; 6 female teachers; 12 female scholars; total 164.

24th Sabbath—2 officers; 6 male teachers;

18 male scholars; 6 female teachers; 12 female scholars; total 165.

</div

(Continued from page 1)
are the fruits of "almost three score years of labor. I am sorry that he should have labored so long to no little purpose; but this consideration shall not deter me from pointing out the faults of his work; the older his mistakes are, the greater is the obligation, under which I lay him and the public, by correcting them.

Before proceeding to the examination of the Latin text, permit me to answer some of your interrogatories.

Speaking of Dr. McClaime's translation, you say, "Up to 1810, though his history had been hidden the public, and in the hands of scholars for several years, no other inaccurate & untrustworthy was offering to our correction which the translator acknowledged himself to have made, had been discovered by himself, or pointed out to him by others—not even by the learned and living Mosheim himself?" For the first edition of McClaime's History was published in 1764, about half a century before the death of Mosheim, and did the worthy Recruit of St. Philip's ever hear of Mosheim's complained of the gross perversion of the history exemplified in the above article? You will recognize the italics and punctuation in your own work.

Answer.—Whatever degree of interest the publication of Dr. McClaime's translation may have excited when it first appeared, much of it must have abated before I was old enough to give the subject any attention. But I am free to admit that up to that period, no complaints probably had been made, as none seem to have reached the ear of the translator. This, however, does not prove that there existed no ground for complaint; for, however skilled scholars may be in translating Latin, few would choose to read a church history written in that language, in preference to an English translation; never still, would think of comparing a translation with the original for the purpose of detecting errors. Nor was there any other translation into English with which to compare it.

You cannot prove that Dr. Mosheim ever saw Dr. McClaime's translation. It is my opinion that if he had seen it, he would not have failed to point out its faults. I am quite sure that he never saw it, and shall continue to do so until you prove that he has seen it.

You continue: "Did he ever hear it complained of until quite recently?"

Answer.—Copies of the original of Mosheim are very numerous in this country, and as only one translation was in use, until Dr. Murdoch's was published. It is not likely that many complaints were made against it over discovered until by the lynx eyes of Was party?"

Answer.—You might propound the same interrogatory in like terms, in reference to any argument of error. It would not help my cause to ask if "omnis teadearum heresi" was ever known to mean "are held by means of darkness" until that meaning was discovered by the lynx eyes of party."

Accordingly, I shall not attempt to prejudice your translation, by assuming that it is attributable to any such influence. I prefer to prove, as I shall do in this communication, that it is impossible for the Latin words to have the meaning which you have given to them.

Again you ask: "We ask Mr. Johnson, can he find that the Latin passage was ever differently rendered by any scholar before Mr. Murdoch's slight variation?"

Answer.—I have never seen but three translations of the passage, by persons claiming to be scholars, except those of Dr. McClaime and Murdoch. One of these is by Mr. Fuller, one by Mr. Ormond, and the third is by yourself. Mr. Fuller has charged but one word of Dr. McClaime's translation. He has made no comparative degree of "remoteness," and thus contrived to give the "most depth of antiquity" to the sect, which McClaime placed in the "remote depth of antiquity." (Italics mine.) Orchard's translation (I believe you edit his work in this country) is very free. "The true origin of the Baptist denomination, [may be] who espoused the Mennonite views, and who espoused the signs of Anabaptists by administering anew the rite of baptism to those who came over to their community, is hid in the remote depths of antiquity."

Whether or not these gentlemen introduced their variations to express dissatisfaction with the translation of McClaime, I shall not undertake to say. If it was Mr. Orchard's intention to quote McClaime's translation, then he has professed by the example of the translator, and taken very much such "liberties" with him, as he declares himself to have taken with the historian. But if he had ever seen the original of Mosheim, and undertaken to make a translation of his own, it would exhibit even a wider departure from the sense of the author than that of Dr. McClaime to speak of the "Baptist denomination;" where as he speaks of a "sect" which was known by the name of "Anabaptists," and which received the "apostolization" of "Mennonites" from Menno. Mr. Orchard's translation will leave no impression on the minds of his readers, that Dr. Mosheim knew this "sect" under the name of "Baptists," and that he regarded them being called "Anabaptists" as a "strange." For there is no authority in the text.

Again, he makes too hasty to teach that they "espoused the Mennonite views," while Dr. Mosheim distinctly says that Menno journed them; all of which I shall show, together with the circumstances under which the name was made. The Latin words "a secunda et non auctoritate secundum felicitatem sunt huius etiam pars, Menno etiam appellatur," he has left without any reference to England. Why he did not see fit to translate this part of the Latin text, he does not inform us; perhaps it was his ambition to balance the account with the historian, by omitting as much as Dr. McClaime has added. Verily, these impressions are followed up, Dr. Mosheim's history will prove to be a sort of polyglot, in which men may be made to stand as best suited to their own peculiar historical wants.

Again, you ask: "Has he [Mr. Johnson] any knowledge of any man, or Doctor, before himself, who presumed to make so serious a charge against these worthy men?" What for information?

Answer.—Undoubtedly I have. The very men whose names would have prompted them to maintain the credit of Dr. McClaime's translation, have endorsed the most serious charges against it. At the end of an edition of McClaime's "Ante-Nicene Fathers" the Quakers is published, and again they stand again that they seem

to have regarded as misrepresentations of the author. "On the 23rd page of the IV. vol. of the edition published in New York, in 1824, the same ' vindication' appears. It was sent to the publisher with the following note for publication. 'The following vindication was published at the end of Mosheim's Ecclesiastical History, printed in Philadelphia in 1800. It is but just to remark, that so far regards the religious society called Quakers, the translation of A. McClaime is very faulty; the translator has interwoven his own sentiments in such a manner with those of the original author, both in the notes and in the text, that it is impossible for a mere English reader to distinguish them; and in divers instances he has entirely contradicted him. This will be evident to all, if a literal translation of Meekin shall ever be published.'

Signed,
JONATHAN EVANS.
SAMUEL P. GARRISON.

To this, the editor of the edition of 1824, adds the following note:

"The editor of the present edition, since the above note was sent for publication, has obtained a literal and accurate translation, from a Latin (4) copy in the library at Cambridge. And by comparing it with A. McClaime's translation, I find that W. M. has taken an unauthorized freedom with his author; and, in many instances, has been very profuse and inaccurate."

"To a candid reader it would evidently appear, that W. M. has interwoven his own sentiments with unusual acumen."

On the 23rd page of the iv. volume of the edition of 1824, a letter is published addressed to Samuel Estridge, Jr. dated New Bedford, 12th month 9, 1811, accompanying, "A refutation of A. McClaime's ecclesiastical history of the Quakers, and asking for its publication in an edition of that work which was then republishing." At the bottom of the page is the following note:

"The following corrections of the MISREPRESENTATION, principally of the translator of Mosheim were written by gentlemen who had (all of them) seen the preceding vindication of the Quakers, which was printed in Philadelphia. This will account for the repetition of some things, which in a few instances appear."

The following corrections of the MISREPRESENTATION, principally of the translator of Mosheim were written by gentlemen who had (all of them) seen the preceding vindication of the Quakers, which was printed in Philadelphia. This will account for the repetition of some things, which in a few instances appear."

I trust that you are now satisfied that I am not the first person who has presumed to question the correctness of Dr. McClaime's translation.

You continue: "Did he ever hear it complained of until quite recently?"

Answer.—Copies of the original of Mosheim are very numerous in this country, and as only one translation was in use, until Dr. Murdoch's was published. It is not likely that many complaints were made against it over discovered until by the lynx eyes of Was party?"

Answer.—You might propound the same interrogatory in like terms, in reference to any argument of error. It would not help my cause to ask if "omnis teadearum heresi" was ever known to mean "are held by means of darkness" until that meaning was discovered by the lynx eyes of party."

Accordingly, I shall not attempt to prejudice your translation, by assuming that it is attributable to any such influence. I prefer to prove, as I shall do in this communication, that it is impossible for the Latin words to have the meaning which you have given to them.

Again you ask: "We ask Mr. Johnson, can he find that the Latin passage was ever differently rendered by any scholar before Mr. Murdoch's slight variation?"

Answer.—I have never seen but three translations of the passage, by persons claiming to be scholars, except those of Dr. McClaime and Murdoch. One of these is by Mr. Fuller, one by Mr. Ormond, and the third is by yourself. Mr. Fuller has charged but one word of Dr. McClaime's translation. He has made no comparative degree of "remoteness," and thus contrived to give the "most depth of antiquity" to the sect, which McClaime placed in the "remote depth of antiquity." (Italics mine.) Orchard's translation (I believe you edit his work in this country) is very free. "The true origin of the Baptist denomination, [may be] who espoused the Mennonite views, and who espoused the signs of Anabaptists by administering anew the rite of baptism to those who came over to their community, is hid in the remote depths of antiquity."

He says: "I was chosen pastor of a large and flourishing church, and declined, because of the origin in which the origin of the Mennonites was received; but he has rendered tolerably well by the English words, 'of consequence extremely difficult to be ascertained.' But he has volunteered an explanation of this difficulty, by introducing a sentence, for which there is not a word in the Latin text, nor warrant in the context. If he intended it to be in the remote depths of antiquity" as a translation of "omnis teadearum heresi" then where are the Latin words whose meaning is in dispute, "omnis teadearum heresi," he has rendered tolerably well by the English words, "of consequence extremely difficult to be ascertained?"

He says that it did not require a long experience to convince him that he had made a mistake in joining the Baptists. In May, 1851, he joined the Baptists; in September 1855, he was excluded, and in August, 1855, was irregularly restored. He was a Baptist when excluded. In writing to the church on the day of his exclusion, he says: "I believe the doctrine of the Missionary Baptist church, and admire its usage." In August, 1855, he wants to be restored, and got a letter so that he can join the Baptists of Louisiana, and if I am not mistaken, he tried to join the Baptists in Louisiana in 1856. Did he not, brother Lee? So we conclude that he did not learn his "mistake," until he found there was no chance for him to live with the Baptists. He says: "I was chosen pastor of a large and flourishing church, and declined, because of the origin in which the origin of the Mennonites was received; but he has rendered tolerably well by the English words, 'of consequence extremely difficult to be ascertained.' But he has volunteered an explanation of this difficulty, by introducing a sentence, for which there is not a word in the Latin text, nor warrant in the context. If he intended it to be in the remote depths of antiquity" as a translation of "omnis teadearum heresi" then where are the Latin words whose meaning is in dispute, "omnis teadearum heresi," he has rendered tolerably well by the English words, "of consequence extremely difficult to be ascertained?"

He says that it did not require a long experience to convince him that he had made a mistake in joining the Baptists. In May, 1851, he joined the Baptists; in September 1855, he was excluded, and in August, 1855, was irregularly restored. He was a Baptist when excluded.

In writing to the church on the day of his exclusion, he says: "I believe the doctrine of the Missionary Baptist church, and admire its usage." In August, 1855, he wants to be restored, and got a letter so that he can join the Baptists of Louisiana, and if I am not mistaken, he tried to join the Baptists in Louisiana in 1856. Did he not, brother Lee? So we conclude that he did not learn his "mistake," until he found there was no chance for him to live with the Baptists. He says: "I was chosen pastor of a large and flourishing church, and declined, because of the origin in which the origin of the Mennonites was received; but he has rendered tolerably well by the English words, "of consequence extremely difficult to be ascertained." But he has volunteered an explanation of this difficulty, by introducing a sentence, for which there is not a word in the Latin text, nor warrant in the context. If he intended it to be in the remote depths of antiquity" as a translation of "omnis teadearum heresi" then where are the Latin words whose meaning is in dispute, "omnis teadearum heresi," he has rendered tolerably well by the English words, "of consequence extremely difficult to be ascertained?"

He says that it did not require a long experience to convince him that he had made a mistake in joining the Baptists. In May, 1851, he joined the Baptists; in September 1855, he was excluded, and in August, 1855, was irregularly restored. He was a Baptist when excluded.

In writing to the church on the day of his exclusion, he says: "I believe the doctrine of the Missionary Baptist church, and admire its usage." In August, 1855, he wants to be restored, and got a letter so that he can join the Baptists of Louisiana, and if I am not mistaken, he tried to join the Baptists in Louisiana in 1856. Did he not, brother Lee? So we conclude that he did not learn his "mistake," until he found there was no chance for him to live with the Baptists. He says: "I was chosen pastor of a large and flourishing church, and declined, because of the origin in which the origin of the Mennonites was received; but he has rendered tolerably well by the English words, "of consequence extremely difficult to be ascertained." But he has volunteered an explanation of this difficulty, by introducing a sentence, for which there is not a word in the Latin text, nor warrant in the context. If he intended it to be in the remote depths of antiquity" as a translation of "omnis teadearum heresi" then where are the Latin words whose meaning is in dispute, "omnis teadearum heresi," he has rendered tolerably well by the English words, "of consequence extremely difficult to be ascertained?"

He says that it did not require a long experience to convince him that he had made a mistake in joining the Baptists. In May, 1851, he joined the Baptists; in September 1855, he was excluded, and in August, 1855, was irregularly restored. He was a Baptist when excluded.

In writing to the church on the day of his exclusion, he says: "I believe the doctrine of the Missionary Baptist church, and admire its usage." In August, 1855, he wants to be restored, and got a letter so that he can join the Baptists of Louisiana, and if I am not mistaken, he tried to join the Baptists in Louisiana in 1856. Did he not, brother Lee? So we conclude that he did not learn his "mistake," until he found there was no chance for him to live with the Baptists. He says: "I was chosen pastor of a large and flourishing church, and declined, because of the origin in which the origin of the Mennonites was received; but he has rendered tolerably well by the English words, "of consequence extremely difficult to be ascertained." But he has volunteered an explanation of this difficulty, by introducing a sentence, for which there is not a word in the Latin text, nor warrant in the context. If he intended it to be in the remote depths of antiquity" as a translation of "omnis teadearum heresi" then where are the Latin words whose meaning is in dispute, "omnis teadearum heresi," he has rendered tolerably well by the English words, "of consequence extremely difficult to be ascertained?"

He says that it did not require a long experience to convince him that he had made a mistake in joining the Baptists. In May, 1851, he joined the Baptists; in September 1855, he was excluded, and in August, 1855, was irregularly restored. He was a Baptist when excluded.

In writing to the church on the day of his exclusion, he says: "I believe the doctrine of the Missionary Baptist church, and admire its usage." In August, 1855, he wants to be restored, and got a letter so that he can join the Baptists of Louisiana, and if I am not mistaken, he tried to join the Baptists in Louisiana in 1856. Did he not, brother Lee? So we conclude that he did not learn his "mistake," until he found there was no chance for him to live with the Baptists. He says: "I was chosen pastor of a large and flourishing church, and declined, because of the origin in which the origin of the Mennonites was received; but he has rendered tolerably well by the English words, "of consequence extremely difficult to be ascertained." But he has volunteered an explanation of this difficulty, by introducing a sentence, for which there is not a word in the Latin text, nor warrant in the context. If he intended it to be in the remote depths of antiquity" as a translation of "omnis teadearum heresi" then where are the Latin words whose meaning is in dispute, "omnis teadearum heresi," he has rendered tolerably well by the English words, "of consequence extremely difficult to be ascertained?"

He says that it did not require a long experience to convince him that he had made a mistake in joining the Baptists. In May, 1851, he joined the Baptists; in September 1855, he was excluded, and in August, 1855, was irregularly restored. He was a Baptist when excluded.

In writing to the church on the day of his exclusion, he says: "I believe the doctrine of the Missionary Baptist church, and admire its usage." In August, 1855, he wants to be restored, and got a letter so that he can join the Baptists of Louisiana, and if I am not mistaken, he tried to join the Baptists in Louisiana in 1856. Did he not, brother Lee? So we conclude that he did not learn his "mistake," until he found there was no chance for him to live with the Baptists. He says: "I was chosen pastor of a large and flourishing church, and declined, because of the origin in which the origin of the Mennonites was received; but he has rendered tolerably well by the English words, "of consequence extremely difficult to be ascertained." But he has volunteered an explanation of this difficulty, by introducing a sentence, for which there is not a word in the Latin text, nor warrant in the context. If he intended it to be in the remote depths of antiquity" as a translation of "omnis teadearum heresi" then where are the Latin words whose meaning is in dispute, "omnis teadearum heresi," he has rendered tolerably well by the English words, "of consequence extremely difficult to be ascertained?"

He says that it did not require a long experience to convince him that he had made a mistake in joining the Baptists. In May, 1851, he joined the Baptists; in September 1855, he was excluded, and in August, 1855, was irregularly restored. He was a Baptist when excluded.

In writing to the church on the day of his exclusion, he says: "I believe the doctrine of the Missionary Baptist church, and admire its usage." In August, 1855, he wants to be restored, and got a letter so that he can join the Baptists of Louisiana, and if I am not mistaken, he tried to join the Baptists in Louisiana in 1856. Did he not, brother Lee? So we conclude that he did not learn his "mistake," until he found there was no chance for him to live with the Baptists. He says: "I was chosen pastor of a large and flourishing church, and declined, because of the origin in which the origin of the Mennonites was received; but he has rendered tolerably well by the English words, "of consequence extremely difficult to be ascertained." But he has volunteered an explanation of this difficulty, by introducing a sentence, for which there is not a word in the Latin text, nor warrant in the context. If he intended it to be in the remote depths of antiquity" as a translation of "omnis teadearum heresi" then where are the Latin words whose meaning is in dispute, "omnis teadearum heresi," he has rendered tolerably well by the English words, "of consequence extremely difficult to be ascertained?"

He says that it did not require a long experience to convince him that he had made a mistake in joining the Baptists. In May, 1851, he joined the Baptists; in September 1855, he was excluded, and in August, 1855, was irregularly restored. He was a Baptist when excluded.

In writing to the church on the day of his exclusion, he says: "I believe the doctrine of the Missionary Baptist church, and admire its usage." In August, 1855, he wants to be restored, and got a letter so that he can join the Baptists of Louisiana, and if I am not mistaken, he tried to join the Baptists in Louisiana in 1856. Did he not, brother Lee? So we conclude that he did not learn his "mistake," until he found there was no chance for him to live with the Baptists. He says: "I was chosen pastor of a large and flourishing church, and declined, because of the origin in which the origin of the Mennonites was received; but he has rendered tolerably well by the English words, "of consequence extremely difficult to be ascertained." But he has volunteered an explanation of this difficulty, by introducing a sentence, for which there is not a word in the Latin text, nor warrant in the context. If he intended it to be in the remote depths of antiquity" as a translation of "omnis teadearum heresi" then where are the Latin words whose meaning is in dispute, "omnis teadearum heresi," he has rendered tolerably well by the English words, "of consequence extremely difficult to be ascertained?"

He says that it did not require a long experience to convince him that he had made a mistake in joining the Baptists. In May, 1851, he joined the Baptists; in September 1855, he was excluded, and in August, 1855, was irregularly restored. He was a Baptist when excluded.

In writing to the church on the day of his exclusion, he says: "I believe the doctrine of the Missionary Baptist church, and admire its usage." In August, 1855, he wants to be restored, and got a letter so that he can join the Baptists of Louisiana, and if I am not mistaken, he tried to join the Baptists in Louisiana in 1856. Did he not, brother Lee? So we conclude that he did not learn his "mistake," until he found there was no chance for him to live with the Baptists. He says: "I was chosen pastor of a large and flourishing church, and declined, because of the origin in which the origin of the Mennonites was received; but he has rendered tolerably well by the English words, "of consequence extremely difficult to be ascertained." But he has volunteered an explanation of this difficulty, by introducing a sentence, for which there is not a word in the Latin text, nor warrant in the context. If he intended it to be in the remote depths of antiquity" as a translation of "omnis teadearum heresi" then where are the Latin words whose meaning is in dispute, "omnis teadearum heresi," he has rendered tolerably well by the English words, "of consequence extremely difficult to be ascertained?"

He says that it did not require a long experience to convince him that he had made a mistake in joining the Baptists. In May, 1851, he joined the Baptists; in September 1855, he was excluded, and in August, 1855, was irregularly restored. He was a Baptist when excluded.

In writing to the church on the day of his exclusion, he says: "I believe the doctrine of the Missionary Baptist church, and admire its usage." In August, 1855, he wants to be restored, and got a letter so that he can join the Baptists of Louisiana, and if I am not mistaken, he tried to join the Baptists in Louisiana in 1856. Did he not, brother Lee? So we conclude that he did not learn his "mistake," until he found there was no chance for him to live with the Baptists. He says: "I was chosen pastor of a large and flourishing church, and