

honored procedure in the Church, their attention being directed toward it by the fact that certain ministers not of the Episcopal Church, and among them Dr. Vance Smith, a Unitarian, were admitted to the Communion in Westminster Abbey before the commencement of the revision of the New Testament. The Bishop of Rochester presented the memorial which set forth the convictions of the English Church Union on the subject to Convocation, and the Bishop of Winchester very sensibly lamented that people opposed to the teaching of the Church should have joined in the Communion, while other bishops, including Gloucester, Salisbury and Llandaff, defended the old state of things, and did not think that members of the Church had any right to enquire who their fellow-communicants were. The Bishop of Winchester's lament seems very proper and natural from a Presbyterian stand-point, or, in other words, from one of reverence and common sense; but coming from a dignitary of the Church of England, we fear it can be regarded as neither proper nor natural. For if the rule apply to those who are without the Church, it certainly must apply to all within; but of those within, not only communicants, but office-bearers dispensing the Sacrament, are, many of them, opposed to the teaching of the Church probably to as great an extent as Dr. Vance Smith and the most of his conferees.

Now, the revised translation of the Bible must be such an one as to satisfy the various phases of belief and unbelief indulged within the communion of this many-sided Church, and it is our impression that a Dr. Vance Smith more or less will not materially affect the result of the translators' labours. It is quite true that a Unitarian may be a profound critic, and may have a most complete and accurate knowledge of the languages in which the ancient Scriptures were written; but that a Unitarian can be helpful in promoting the knowledge of God's word is a contradiction in terms. He is like a man who should promise admission into a house, the door of which one key only can unlock, after having first thrown that key into the well. The Unitarian is one who invites the Church that is founded upon the Word to say of him—*Anathema*. But suppose that the Church, instead of saying *Anathema*, invites the Unitarian to a solemn ordinance which he despises, and which the Church knows from his profession that he must despise, and then asks his aid in making plain the Divine Word, whose divinity it knew that he did and would trample under foot, what shall we say of that Church? Simply this, that Dr. Vance Smith will not much affect the results of its committee's labors. We shall have as the result an open Communion Bible, that will permit those who receive it to claim kindred with every system of error and superstition, paving the way for a universal Church of which this vague and indefinite rendition of God's will may be the creed.

Where men differ in mere matters of detail the remedy is plain, for, the difference being known, all that exhibits it will be carefully examined. Some close communion Baptists withdraw themselves from their Protestant fellow-Christians by reading an exclusive version of the New Testament, that tells how John the Immerser came *immersing* in the Jordan. Truth is little injured by this most unnecessary alteration, since he who knows the peculiar views of the sectaries that adopt this version (which is not authorized by the Baptist Church in general, or we should have no Baptist but an Immerser denomination) can exercise his judgment upon the rendition of passages in which these are strongly set forth. The Methodists might without injury, save to themselves, prepare a version that should not contain