

any dissenting sects, who were the agents therein. And this will be still more apparent, if you remember the *great number of pious clergymen who appeared about the same time*, and with many of whom the Wesleys themselves were more or less in habits of intercourse, but who never joined in their eccentric movements. Indeed, I think that a better acquaintance with the history of our Reformed Church will convince you that one of the most striking marks of its truth and vitality is, that it does appear to have within itself the seeds of its own spiritual regeneration; and this, I think, is to be attributed, not only to its holding the pure spiritual truth of the Gospel, but also to its possessing that discipline which it received from Christ and His Apostles, whereby the unity of its body and the orders of its ministers have been preserved. From what cause, save the conservative effect of our scriptural discipline, and the blessing of God having rested upon His Church on account of its being retained therein, can have arisen that great difference which at present exists between the Church and a large portion of Dissenters? while, both in England and America, a large—it is to be feared a *very large*—proportion of the Presbyterian, Congregational, Baptist, and Quaker communities have left the faith of Christ, and become Socinian; there is not, I may venture to assert, a single instance of any congregation connected with the Church of England, in any part of the world, having become thus fearfully apostate; but I believe I may go much further, and say, that such an awful event is unknown in the history of any portion of the Church placed under the care of an Apostolic Episcopacy: perhaps you may think that I ought to except the Arian Controversy of the Third Century; that, however, was far short of modern Socinianism, and the Church was then in circumstances too peculiar for us to be compared with it. Now, my dear Sir, does not this difference between the orthodoxy of the Church and the Dissenters speak volumes?

Mr. Brown.—Again, as an honest man, I am compelled to say, that I do not see how I can meet your statements: I cannot help seeing that it was not Methodists, but Clergymen, who were the agents in the great revival of spiritual religion; and, also, I must confess that I have often been struck with the fact, that while Dissenters have fallen into all kinds of heresies, it is impossible to deny that the Church, though she may for a season have become lukewarm and worldly, has yet continually arisen from the dust, and sought to do her first works. But yet, you must remember that the Methodists have ever retained their purity of faith and doctrine, although they are separated from the Church.

Mr. Secker.—Yes, and herein is a great corroboration of what I have been saying, respecting the holy conservative influence of the Church; for, as the British Methodists are the only body

of Dissenters who have clung to the Church, so they are the most remarkable for their doctrinal purity and their connectional success: is it, therefore; too much to say that these are greatly owing to the influence Methodism has received from the Church, and to the blessing of God, which has, in some degree, been with them, for having in some measure remained friendly to His ancient Church. But I see that you are waiting tea, so I will postpone till afterwards some comparisons which I was about to institute between Mr. Wesley and Mr. Simeon, and also my further remarks upon Methodist success.

The Proposed New Version of the Bible.

At the Anniversary Meeting of the British and Foreign Bible Society, the Earl of Shaftesbury said:—"I know not whether any of you have directed your attention to sundry efforts that have been made here and there, and that now appear to be embodied in a Parliamentary motion before the House of Commons, the object of which is, to obtain what is called a new and improved translation of the English Bible. Now, before you accede to such a proposition, or before you pass it aside as a thing of no moment, take into consideration two or three points, and let your minds dwell upon them with attention. Supposing it possible for this new translation to be effected—I say nothing of the difficulties in the way of effecting it—the delays, the differences of opinion, the controversies, the various obstacles and impediments that will arise—but, supposing that this new version were given to the world, would it be possible that thenceforward we could have for this country, for our colonies, and for the States of North America that speak our own language, an authorized version—one that would be received by common consent, by every human being speaking the Anglo-Saxon language? Destroy that common consent to receive an authorized version; and my belief is that you have inflicted a deadly wound upon the cause of the propagation of the truth among all the nations who speak our language. Look, too, at the effect upon your own operations. Think of the millions upon millions of the Sacred Scriptures that you have diffused in all parts of the British Empire and the United States, and remember that, if this scheme is carried out, all those copies will become at once discredited, and of no value. You must, in consequence, have a fresh issue—you must begin your work over again. Meanwhile, you must also suspend your operations till you know whether a new version will or will not be imposed upon this country. I might go on stating a variety of dangers. Let me ask you to consider the source from which these propositions arise. If you look at the samples that they have given of what they call a new translation—if you consider the anxiety that