

---

DR. LELAND AND A PURE VERSION.

---

This learned theologian, (a Presbyterian, we believe) writing to a friend, among other things, says—

Old as I am, I hope to live to see the day when such words and phrases as "*Go to now,*" "*in no wise,*" "*God forbid,*" "*I do you to wit,*" "*trow,*" and many similar, will not be found in good copies of the Holy Scriptures. I also wish I may see the time when false renderings, which now favor unsound doctrines, may be corrected. I allude to such phrases as these: *Then were all dead; If they shall fall away;* and the translation of the Greek word *kai* in several instances by *and* when the sense requires *even*.

---

---

"PERMANENT SCHISM."

---

We are old-fashioned enough to believe that where the entire Christian strength of the locality is barely adequate to the support of one worshipping assembly, any attempt to divide that strength, and to set up two little churches where there ought to be only one, and where that one might be strong, is an attempt to make a schism. If the attempt is successful—if two churches are established side by side—that is what we call "a permanent schism."

If, in a given locality, Christianity is organized in the form of a Baptist church, we hold that to divide the Christian strength of that place for the sake of setting up an Episcopalian or Presbyterian congregation there, would be a schism. Whose fault the schism would be in that case, is a point on which opinions will differ; but the fact of the schism is patent. Even our Baptist brethren can understand this. We beg that we may be allowed to think and to say that a Baptist church and a Presbyterian church in a place where there ought to be only one church are a schism; and that if the duality is permanent, it is "a permanent schism."

---

The preceding is copied from the New York Independent. The writer appears to be a whole-souled man, and is doubtless elevated several degrees above the meagreness of usual "evangelic" liberty. We honestly wish that he would become 'old-fashioned enough' to go one step farther and maintain in terms not to be mistaken, that two religious bodies in *any* locality, whatever the strength, must be regarded as proof that "Christ" to them "is divided."

D. O.