

him); so shall he sprinkle &c. But what correspondence or opposition can be conceived between astonishment and sprinkling? Manifestly none. Hence we naturally suspect some defect in the translation, and seek a more appropriate meaning. And we find on examination that another rendering may be adopted; and has actually been adopted by the most learned modern translators of Isaiah. *Gesenius*, with whom also *De Wette* coincides almost word for word, gives a German translation of the whole passage, which may be rendered thus:

Just as now many are shocked at him,
(so marred before men is his visage
and his form before the children of men,)
so shall many nations exult on his account,
before him kings shall shut their mouths;
for what was never told to them, shall they see,
and what they never heard, shall they perceive.

In this version the parallelism is plain and natural; for *exulting* stands opposed to *being shocked*. This improvement of the translation cannot fail to commend itself to an intelligent reader of Scripture, especially if he is aware that the term in the original warrants the change.

It is worthy of notice, that in the Septuagint, which the Eunuch was most probably reading, and from which the quotation in Acts is made, the clause is rendered: *so shall many nations wonder at him*.

FOR CANADA BAPTIST MAGAZINE.

RULES FOR CONTROVERSY.

It would seem vain to expect any speedy termination to those differences of opinion, which exist among Christians. We must, therefore, for the present be contented to bear with the numerous controversies to which they give rise. It is, however, highly desirable that such controversies should be so conducted, as to make it evident that the object we have in view is to elicit truth, not to gratify personal

feeling; and that we should give no occasion, by manifesting an unchristian spirit, to an enemy to smile, or to a friend to sigh. A few rules may not be without their use: if we ourselves should not be drawn into controversy, we may wish to form an opinion of the way in which others conduct it.

1. The point in dispute should never be lost sight of, but kept steadily in view. For example: if the point be, whether education be important for Ministers—we should not speak or write as if it were, whether any one can be a useful Minister except an educated man; or, whether we may educate men in order to *make* them Ministers. These are not, in the case supposed, the points in dispute.

2. We should not misrepresent the person from whom we may differ. We should not misrepresent his words, but quote them correctly, and with a regard to their connection. We should not misrepresent his sentiments, which is in some degree worse. For example, if I profess to believe that there are parts of the Bible which some degree of learning would assist a person to understand, I am not to be accused of maintaining generally, "That the Bible is so unintelligible that it requires profound learning to understand its contents." This is to misrepresent me.

3. To injure an opponent, except so far as he may sustain injury by our arguments, is universally condemned by honourable minds. If he be a public character, occupying a responsible station, we are especially bound to avoid offensive charges. We are not lightly to impute a wicked design. For example: if he says his design is to "promote the peace and usefulness of the community" to which he belongs, we are to give him credit for this, and not to charge him with seeking to deprive God of his glory, with impiety, and with "giving a mortal stab to divine