

speakers, and I believe it has never been denied, that Drs. Carey, Marshman, Yates, &c. were men of eminent learning and undoubted piety; and that the translations made by them were in general good, and were extensively useful. Is it not, then, highly presumptuous for those who are comparatively babes in knowledge to charge such men with "tampering with the word of God;" and to attribute it, as one did, "rather to their wills than their consciences," that these eminent servants of Christ mildly, but firmly, adhered to their purpose to translate every word of the sacred Oracles plainly according to the best of their knowledge? To evince that they could not consistently have done otherwise, I ask, If a man were employed by Government to translate a royal Proclamation, would he adventure to conceal, by non-translation, the meaning of a word enjoining on all loyal subjects an act expressive of allegiance to their Sovereign? If not, how could they have ventured to conceal, by non-translation, the meaning of that word which enjoins on all believers the first act expressive of their allegiance to the King of kings? The truth of the matter is, it is not for "tampering with the word of God," but for refusing to *tamper* with it, that both they and those who support their translations are blamed.

9. We were charged with inconsistency in retaining, using, and circulating the authorized English Translation, while we have the word *baptizo* translated, and not transferred, in versions for the heathen." When a similar objection was proposed to me by a friend, I remarked to him, in reply, "You have here a commodious and excellent house; and if you should even think that some part of it might have been constructed better, yet, as it is on the whole very good, and an alteration would be