

it would not help the matter; for much as we admire and value the Septuagint, yet it is only a translation, and no one supposes the translators of that version were any more inspired than were our English translators.

It is admitted that the Seventy translate the passage, "So shall many nations admire him," or "admire at him." Yet it is doubted by many learned men, whether the word *yazzech* was in the copy from which they made their translation, or whether it was another word.

Parkhurst, under the word *nazzech*, says, "After all, may we not reasonably suspect that the Seventy had in their Hebrew copy a different reading? And it seems not improbable that the Hebrew word they intended to translate was, *yehezzezu*, from the root *hezzezu*, which signifies, to see, to behold."

Whether the Seventy had the word *yazzech*, or not in the text from which they made their version, no one will doubt that sprinkle is the proper meaning of that word: and if the word *admire* were used instead of sprinkle, it would make many texts of the Old Testament speak the most consummate nonsense.

Lev. xiv. 7, "And he shall, *We-hizzah*, sprinkle upon him that is to be cleansed seven times." If you read "admire," what sense can be made of the text?

Verse 16: "And the Priest shall dip his right finger in the oil that is in his left hand, and shall, *We-hizzah*, sprinkle of the oil with his finger seven times before the Lord." Verse 27: "And the Priest shall, *We-hizzah*, sprinkle with his right finger some of the oil that is in his left hand seven times before the Lord." Numbers viii. 7: "And thou shalt thou do unto them to cleanse them: *hazzah*, sprinkle water of purifying upon them." Num. xix. 18: "And a clean person shall take hyssop, and dip it in the water, *We-hizzah*, and sprinkle it upon the tent." Lev. xvi. 14: "And he shall take of the blood of the bullock, and shall sprinkle, *We-hizzah*, it with his finger upon the mercy-seat eastward. 2nd Kings, ix. 33: "And some of her blood was sprinkled on the wall, and on the horses."

These various forms of the word *Nazzech*, will, I think, determine its meaning to be "sprinkle," and although the Rev. Mr. Martell may find another word in another language, to mean something else; yet it is absolutely impossible for him or any one else to translate the Hebrew sentence *Chen yazzech Gaim Ravbin*, in any other way, or at least in any better and more correct way, than our venerable translators have done,—"So shall he sprinkle many nations."

But the Rev. Gentleman seems determined to "blow up pedo-baptism;" he therefore proceeds, as he thinks, to show the incoherence of the English text. He says, "In the preceding verse the prophet says, 'As many were astonished at him,' &c.; 'So, or in like manner, he shall sprinkle many nations.'" Here the "comparison don't bear inspection."

Don't it, Rev. Sir? The writer may be "pedantic," "flippant," or "illiterate;" nevertheless, he will venture to show that the comparison is very striking.

But first our critic's paraphrase:

"But if we read thus, 'As many were astonished at him because of his deep humility and poverty: So, or in like manner, will he cause many nations to rejoice in himself, this makes good sense of the subject. For as many wondered at his humiliation, so many shall admire his exaltation and glory. Hence the prophet proceeds, 'Kings shall shut their mouths at him,' that is, in viewing his glory and honour they shall be struck with amazement, and be silent in reference to their own dignity. Thus 'So shall he cause many nations to rejoice in himself,' is both a scientific, evangelical, and reasonable rendering."

At the risk of being driven into one corner of the Rev. critic's triangle, I must say that the above rendering appears to me to have little to do with science, it is less "evangelical;" and, least of all has it to do with accuracy.

On its science I shall say nothing, and its inaccuracy I have already shown; but a word on its want of an evangelical character.

In the above paraphrase there does not appear to be any reference to the atonement. "How are many nations to rejoice in himself," or be made happy? Not solely by his humility and poverty. Has his sprinkling blood nothing to do with it? And why was his human nature thus exalted? The answer is given in the 12th verse of the 53rd chapter: "Therefore will I divide him a portion with the great, and he shall divide the spoil with the strong; because he poured out his soul unto death, and he was numbered with the transgressors, and he bare the sin of many, and made intercession for the transgressors."

Your readers need not be told that the blood of Christ is called the "blood of sprinkling;" and this being borne in mind the evangelical sense and accuracy of the passage throughout will be apparent. "As many were astonished at his humiliation and death,"—"So shall he sprinkle many nations," namely, by his blood.

Here the word *many* is put in opposition. "Many were astonished," "Many shall be sprinkled." And when many nations shall be sprinkled with his blood; "the kings shall shut their mouths at him, for that which had not been told them shall they see; and that which they had not heard shall they consider."

Sprinkling with the atoning blood of the great Redeemer is certainly the primary meaning of the text, and as the sacrament of baptism was instituted as an outward and visible sign of that "sprinkling blood," and as there should always be a similarity between the sign and the thing signified, it surely cannot be wrong to sprinkle in baptism, or a misapplication of the above text when applied, in a secondary sense, to those who are baptized in the "name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."

Should the Rev. Mr. Martell condescend to notice these remarks, I would respectfully request him not to introduce any other word, but to show that either "yazzech" is not the word in the original, or that "sprinkle" is not a correct translation of that word. With "sprinkle," we have nothing to do, as it is not in the text of Isaiah lii. 15: "So shall he sprinkle many nations." Yarmouth, May 10, 1852. PHILELOGOS.

Correspondence.

For the Wesleyan.

Horton and Cornwallis Circuit.

MR. EDITOR,—In my last communication I remarked, that we were holding a series of Meetings for the Revival of Religion at Lower Horton, and that from the first we had encouraging tokens of success; and that we were hoping that the Lord would abundantly pour out his Spirit on this part of his heritage, and render our services a great blessing to many precious souls. I can now say, that his Spirit has been poured out, the members of the Church here have been greatly quickened and blest in their christian course, backsliders recovered to the favour of God, a number of persons seriously impressed with the importance of experimental religion, and twenty-four souls have professed converting grace. Our services were continued four weeks, part of the time twice a day, and then in the evenings. Brothers Tuttle, Rounsefell, and Isaac Armstrong, rendered valuable assistance in preaching, and exhortation, and prayer; and other praying members manifested much fervency of spirit in their addresses to the throne of the heavenly grace. Our services were highly prized by the pious, and not lightly esteemed by those who make no profession of experimental godliness. A solemn influence pervaded the meetings. The lover of Zion could often feel in them, surely the presence of God is so manifested here that all must acknowledge his claims, and desire at least to partake of "the joys of his salvation." A spirit of christian love and harmony has been more largely diffused amongst us; a greater zeal for God's glory, and a more fervent desire for the salvation of mankind are more fully evinced. Our regular means of grace are now rendered more precious, by increased heavenly influence; a new vigour has been infused into our religious services, since we have realized God's condescension and mercy in answering the prayers of his people for the conversion of souls. Four of my own family though young in years have been blest with that religion that makes them happy in the Saviour's love. May they be faithful to this early call into the Lord's vineyard, and so continue to make progress in the way to heaven, that their path may be like that of the just shining brighter and brighter unto the perfect day.

Our new Mission House is nearly completed. It is a substantial, excellent building; and I have no doubt will be a very comfortable habitation for the preachers who may be stationed hereafter on this circuit. It stands in a delightful situation, amid one of the loveliest landscapes that can be found in our province; its commanding site giving an extensive compass of beautiful scenery for the eye to delight in. The friends have been liberal in their subscriptions to its erection, and must be pleased to see so good a result of their liberality. May the good Lord abundantly reward them for their labour of love, Amen. I remain Your's truly,

THOMAS H. DAVIES.

Lower Horton, 11th May, 1852.

For the Wesleyan.

The Old Controversy Revived.

In the *Christian Visitor* of April 16th, we have the following announcements:—"A well grounded hope cannot exist, except it be built upon the doctrines of grace."

"The doctrines of election, effectual calling, and the perseverance of the saints,"—or "their being kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation, are necessary to the existence of such a hope."

"The doctrines of grace all correspond to each other, and if one is rejected you may as well reject them all, for they must all stand or fall together, and assurance or even hope that is well founded cannot exist, but on the foundation of the doctrines of grace."

"Take away these doctrines of grace, and the anchor of hope is gone." "Though you may think to sustain it, yet there is nothing left that is sure and steadfast."

So say the Calvinistic editors of the *Visitor* and *Boston Recorder*. Let us hear what St. Paul says—"Other foundation can no man lay

than is laid, which is Jesus Christ."—1st Cor. iii. 11. "If any man defile the temple of God, him will God destroy."—Same chap., verses 16 & 17.

"Let us therefore fear, lest a promise being left us of entering into his rest any of you should seem to come short of it." "Let us labour therefore to enter into that rest, lest any man fall after the same example of unbelief." "Looking diligently lest any man fall of (fall from) the grace of God."—See Hebrew iv., 1 and 11; xii and 15; also chapters vi and x.

"Toward them which fell severely, but towards thee goodness if thou continue in his goodness, otherwise thou also shall be cut off." "In due season we shall reap, if we faint not."—Rom. xii. 2; Gal. vi. 9.

"Am I not an Apostle?—But I keep under my body and bring it into subjection, lest that by any means, after having preached to others, I myself should become a castaway."—1st Cor. ix. 1 and 27.

Hear St. Peter: "If ye do these things ye shall never fall."—2nd Peter, 1. 10. Lastly, hear the Lord of life and glory: "If a man abide not in me, &c.," John xv. 6. "If any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the Holy City, and the things which are written in this book."—Rev. xx. 19.

XX.

THE WESLEYAN.

Halifax, Saturday Morning, May 22, 1852.

THE PRESBYTERIAN WITNESS.

An article in the last *Presbyterian Witness* written in his characteristic style, and which should have been headed—"Attack on the Wesleyan," instead of "Attack of the Wesleyan," deserves a passing notice. Aware that the generality of his readers have little or no opportunity of seeing our paper, the writer of that article indulges in a strain of vituperative remark, which they will be ready to suppose has been justly called for by an unprovoked attack on our part. The allegation against us of "unwarranted interference with the pages of the *Witness*"—of "dictatorial suggestions"—of feeling "no little uneasiness"—of manifesting "a fiery indignation"—of venting "our wrath" upon our mild and unoffending contemporary,—are all pure flourish, introduced *ad captandem*: the best apology, for the free use of which, we can make for our friend, is, he had nothing better to give. One thing he has made undeniably manifest—he can abuse, if he cannot argue.

With all the care used to conceal the real position of the case, the truth jakes out occasionally, as he declares that we have not "in the slightest manner, endeavoured any formal discussion of the real merits of the subject which we have undertaken to defend from the charge of Popery"; that is, if his language have any consistent meaning, he originated the charge of Popery against Arminianism—he attacked our distinctive system which we have undertaken to defend. We advise him to alter the heading of his late article and make it consistent with truth.

He remembers, and he has reason to remember our former well-merited castigation for preferring a "similar charge"—a charge which he has since had neither the manliness nor honour to retract or prove; but with peculiar fatuity and inconsistency he alleges that our previous defence of Arminianism against his gratuitous attack was made "in order to provoke him into an angry controversy for the mere gratification of manifesting to the world" (the elect world?) "what a very Christian-minded and charitably disposed man the Editor of the Wesleyan is." Plain people know there could have been no defence had there been no attack. Our object, therefore, in defending, could not have been to "provoke him into an angry controversy" for the gratification aforesaid, but to show the world (Arminian reproaches,) the correct knowledge, enlarged charity and sincere friendship of the *Presbyterian Witness*,—to prove to them how much better he understood their doctrines than they themselves, to convince them of their fatal mistake in having supposed themselves to be genuine staunch Protestants, when he was prepared to demonstrate contrary to their strongest convictions that they were really Papists in disguise, and consequently their "whole system" most dangerous to the interests of true piety! We fear, however, the Wesleyans, as Arminians, failed at the time to realize the great obligations, under which, this real friend had placed them to himself personally, for his disinterestedness and christian charity. He has lately renewed his

acts of kindness, and intends to repeat them until he compel them to admit their error, and to see that truth lies within the limits of genuine Calvinism! We suppose we shall have to lend him a helping hand somewhat after the fashion previously adopted. 'T would be a great pity that so much laudable effort, so much true friendship, should result in nothing!

It is only right for us to apprise our readers, that our neighbour does not regard our labour of love with a very friendly eye. He evidently thinks we are opposed to his favourite scheme, and are the abettors of Arminianism, which he says is only Popery revived in a new form. We know our position. We have a notion after all, that evangelical Arminianism, is a reality—the very truth of the Bible. Although he has acquitted us of "endeavouring any formal discussion of the real merits of the subject," yet he says, were it not for certain considerations he would not now even allude to our "very profound and elaborate arguments." We forgive the sneer, as we do not profess to be so profound as to be abused, nor so elaborate as to evolve a tissue of mere absurdity and inconsistency. We leave such profundity and elaborateness to one who can see in *fundism* a system accordant with the "findings of true philosophy."

He finds it necessary to inform his readers that "in discussing the subject of Calvinism," he "never once named Wesleyans or Evangelical Arminians," though he is careful not to say he did not intend to refer to them in his "profound and elaborate" disquisitions, or except them from the charge of Popery,—but only "argued the broad question of Calvinism vs. Arminianism"—we shall be happy to learn from himself, that this "broad question" was so narrow as not to include Wesleyans or evangelical Arminians within its circumference—a statement to this effect would narrow the question down to a very small compass. Yet, he reminds "the more intelligent adherent of Wesleyan Methodism" of the "undefined and indefinite thing called 'Evangelical Arminianism'!" Here are *profundity and elaborateness* with a witness! A deep, and yet a lower deep! The "more intelligent adherent of Wesleyan Methodism" will know the precise value of this apparent compliment to his superior understanding. As disclosing, however, a deep still more profound in the abyss of absurdity, in which the elaborate witness is floundering, whilst stigmatizing Evangelical Arminianism as a thing "undefined and indefinite," he, with a gravity peculiarly his own, and which prevents him from rising to the surface of consistent truth, favours us with a quotation from the *North British Review*, containing "the testimony," as he says, "of the leading professedly-religious periodical of the day," in which the Reviewer admits the existence of "Evangelical Arminians," and so definitely understands their doctrines as to avow his belief that "Evangelical Arminians ought in consistency to be Calvinists."

To us it has occasioned no surprise, that the *Witness*, in his profound and elaborate researches, has discovered "one very significant feature in the articles of the *Wesleyan*," which he says, "he cannot allow to pass unnoticed," and that is, "the entire absence of any proof from the Bible in support of his peculiar views." The significance of that feature is easily accounted for—the Editor of the *Wesleyan* did not intend, in the articles in question, to cite such proof. Proofs from the Bible will be given in due time,—in greater abundance, perhaps, than our friend will like to see, and so conclusive, we believe, that he will find it impossible to dispose of them, if viewed in the "light of revelation" and determined in accordance with the "conclusive findings of true philosophy."

Our neighbour appears to be in great distress, because, as he affirms, we did not bring forward a "single quotation from any theological controversialist," but only "brought forward merely incidental allusions, in a letter, it may be, to some of the tenets held by John Wesley." "His profound discovery is worthy of a note of admiration! We admire his penetration—his candour—his controversial fairness! He knew our design—but he must produce an impression.—His (un-)common sense must have led him to see, that, as he had with culpable temerity published to the whole world (of the elect) that the views of Arminianism on the doctrines of Original Sin, Salvation by Grace, and Justification by Faith, are identical with those of Popery, our