

well expatiate on colour to a blind man. And the explanation you give, is as often misunderstood ; inasmuch as repentance in the Scriptures is expressive of a change of mind, and believing is giving credit to a testimony. The believer who, in simple and Godly sincerity, consults his or her Bible, will not only "*catch the idea*," but behold with joyful humility the import of the truth declared in John, third chapter, by comparing it with 2 Cor. v. 17, and 1 Peter i. 23 ; and the instance you bring from 1 John i. 7 is even more childish. What babe in Christ would be at a loss to understand that "the blood of Jesus Christ his [i. e. God's] Son, cleanseth us from all sin," implying the sins of our ignorance and unbelief, and our daily transgressions, encouraging the believer to come daily, as well as boldly, (with freedom) to the throne of grace, to "find mercy." This truth is obvious to every believer, whether Jew or Gentile.

Your Circular (while it inculcates the necessity of a learned distinctive class in the Church of Christ, and giving money for that purpose) is calculated to dishearten believers from studying and searching the Scriptures. The manner and connexion in which you bring in 2 Peter iii. 16, leads me naturally to conclude, that you understand by the "*unlearned*," the illiterate, which is not the truth taught here. Those that wrested the words of the beloved Paul wrested also the "other Scriptures to their own destruction." "It is written in the Prophets, They shall be all taught of God : every man, therefore, that hath heard and *learned* of the Father, cometh unto me."—John vi. 45. It was their not hearing or learning of the Father, and not their want of grammar and logic, that made and makes men "wrest the Scriptures." Your own statements, "difficult book," "high antiquity," "abstruse," "obscure," "seemingly unintelligible," when applied to the revelation of the mind and will of God to mankind, is only an echo of the papal councils ; in carrying out which they are more consistent when they withhold the Bible altogether from the laity. To you, it may be said with truth, what was said to Peter on another occasion, "Thou savourest the things that be of men."

Again, your second argument is, "*Ministers need Education, because it will enable them more effectually to explain the Scriptures to others.*" The learned have been engaged in translating, collating, and commenting on the Scriptures for fifteen hundred years ;—friends and foes to divine truth have ransacked every page, line, and syllable of the Bible. One religious learned man exercised his time and talents to *explain* its sacred contents ; but he was fallible, and had his prejudices. Another enters the field, and claims equal erudition ; he controverts and opposes. The consequence is wofully manifest, that disunion and distraction ensued. The Corinthian error reigns triumphant : "I am of Paul, I of Apollos, and I of Cephas," "each claiming truth, and truth disclaiming both."

The various translations which have been made of the English language have been criticised, and undergone severe scrutiny, particularly the translation we now peruse. And what important error has been detected ? Very few, if any. Then, if we have divine revelation in a generally correct form, in our mother tongue, it must follow, according to your theory, that God did not see fit to communicate his mind to us in a manner that we could comprehend, but in a way that required learned men to explain. You say, "The education, then, for which we plead will teach him (the minister) how to express in an intelligible, if not in an attractive form, HIS OWN DISCOVERIES." What has he to discover, if he offers any thing for the information