

denomination or sentiments, except as expressed in the pamphlet under consideration. We can, therefore, have no prejudice for or against him, growing out of any thing else either in his faith or practice.

In reference to the pamphlet, however, we would say : we have carefully and repeatedly read and examined it ; its sentiments, although not new, are placed before the reader in a plain, forcible manner—some of his views being better and more ingeniously sustained than I have seen them by any other. His style as a writer is strong, nervous, and perspicuous. But on two points we are compelled to record our dissent : this however is but in part ; perhaps were we to gain a more intimate acquaintance with each other's views, or were we surrounded by circumstances similar to those that environ him, and retard what he believes to be the truth, we might consider the extreme into which he has seemed to run, called for. Our remarks, therefore, refer to the principles in the abstract. That under no circumstances a classical education is necessary in order, properly and scripturally, to fill the pastoral office, we deem, to say the least, an ultra view. Suppose that all the pastors of the Christian Church now living—or even those of a province or district—wholly unacquainted with the ancient Greek language, and a question arises in reference to the meaning of an original word, say *baptizo* for example—do the pastors of these congregations possess the qualification required by the Apostle, if they are unable to go to the fountain head of knowledge on this subject ? Can it be said they are “*apt to teach*”—that they are *qualified* to teach, when they confess ignorance on this or any other important doctrine or precept ? After all that has been written on the subject of baptism and kindred subjects, it is true a plain English reader may satisfy himself so as to feel the same degree of certainty that he would were he acquainted with classic Greek ; but who knows that other questions of great moment may not be called up, on which learned disputants on both sides have not yet written ! Suppose—what is not improbable—that Mr. M'C. is a pastor of a Christian congregation, and is not a classical scholar : he is visited by a number of his Bible-reading, God-fearing, zealous cooperants and admirers, with the question, “Do the words ‘*washing of regeneration*’ in Titus iii. 5, express the mind of the Spirit ? Dr. Macknight renders it the ‘*bath*,’ and Mr. Wesley the ‘*laver of regeneration*.’ Who is right ?” How will he answer them ? Will he refer them to other doctors and teachers ? Suppose they say to him, “You have taught us that these men are hirelings—men who labor for the fleece, and not for the flock : they have studied the classics to prepare them to make merchandize of souls ; they are covetous men, blinded by the God of this world, and how can we repose implicitly upon their testimony !” What reply will he make ! Will his admirers give us an answer for him ? Although we are far from advocating the absolute necessity of even an acquaintance with the original of the New Testament, to qualify the man of God to fill the place of an overseer of the Lord's house scripturally and efficiently ; yet that many of them in every large district should possess all the literary qualifications of the most erudite citizens of the kingdom of Satan, or of the clergy, is to me too plain to be covered by any sophistry, and too obvious to admit of denial.