

Perhaps none of the readers of the *Eastern Chronicle* doubt to whom the article from which we have quoted, or another upon the same subject, Sept. 27, 1853, is to be ascribed; but as the writer has chosen to occupy a position secluded from public view, and to reduce his name to a cypher, it would be indelicate to draw him forth from his retirement, and expose the blushes of diffidence to the rude gaze of unfeeling onlookers. There is cause to blush. To whatever respect the individual, who has adopted the signature "T," may be entitled in *propria persona*, "T" is entitled to no more respect than the article so subscribed. It is scarcely worth while to criticise very exactly an article written for a local newspaper, yet there is something rather calculated to excite surprise, in finding the man, who "could pick out a list of unaccountable mistakes, with very little trouble, from every one of new and improved translations of ten or a dozen books of the Old Testament, by Hebrew scholars of the highest standing," writing the condemnation of Rouse's doggerel, (Sept. 23, 1853) in a communication, in the first three paragraphs of which, *there is not one correct English sentence.*

That the only use of language is to communicate thought or feeling, is a mere truism, in its application to a revelation from God, as liberally as in the matter of the interchange of ideas between man and man. But there is no stereotyped combination of sounds necessary to express a particular idea, or train of ideas. To impart the same state of mind, different persons are found using forms of speech as numerous as are the individuals giving utterance to the thought. To use the language of the *Christian Observer*, upon a kindred subject, as quoted by Dr. Carson: "Take a familiar example; a parent says separately to four children, 'Call your brother Richard.' One simply repeats the message as the words of his parent, 'Richard, my father desires me to call you.' A second makes the message his own, 'Richard, my father wants you.' A third repeats it as an injunction, 'Richard, you must go to my father.' The fourth, 'Brother Richard, pray run directly to our dear father, for he wants to speak to you.'" Are not all these exactly the father's message? and is it to contravene this proposition to say, that each was delivered in a manner characteristic of the respective speakers?"

The same individual does not always express the same thought by the same combination of words, or even by the same words. For the sake of greater elegance, perspicuity, effect, or simply variety, different forms of speech are used by a speaker, or writer, when he has not the least design of adding to what he has said, or of introducing a modification of the idea to be expressed. And if in the same language, the same communication is made by different speakers, or the same speaker, in different words, why should a difficulty be raised, as if the infor-