

water-brooks, so panteth my soul after thee, O God," it is impossible not to be affected by the combination of chaste elegance of expression with vehement ardour of feeling. Yet in our temperate clime, where water is scarcely ever known to fail, where the sun scarcely ever pours his sickening ray upon our heads, we are not prepared to enter into all the beauty of the figure, as an inhabitant of Judea would have done. Again, the hart is not with us a wild animal, subject to the various privations which it was compelled to endure in regions where the sun had burned up its food, and dried the streams at which it was accustomed to slake its thirst. It would be no unusual thing; however, for an Israelite to see this inoffensive animal exhausted and fatigued, and panting for a drop of water; and, consequently, the application of the figure to the Psalmist's desire after God would convey an impression far more forcible than can be produced by it on our minds.

In the forty-ninth chapter of Jeremiah, we have another figure still more peculiar to the land of Judea.—He shall come up like a lion from the swiftings of Jordan against the habitation of the strong. In this passage too, there is obvious beauty and even sublimity of description; but it is considerably more obscure to us than the former. It would, however, be perfectly familiar and intelligible to those for whom it was first written. What we here know of a lion is chiefly by description, and by the exhibition of a few of these monarchs of the four-footed race engaged in caravans. These are comparatively small and feeble, and at the same time so tame through confinement and the discipline of the keepers, that they shew us nothing of the true character of that unrivalled animal, who walks in conscious superiority through the forest, or bounds with resistless speed and violence across the plain, and fills, by his tremendous roaring, a whole neighbourhood with terror. The river Jordan, too, is so dissimilar to our rivers, as to increase the obscurity of the passage to those who are not acquainted with the peculiarities of its course. When the snows of Lebanon and of the neighbouring mountains began to melt, and when the rainy season commenced, the mountain torrents rushed into the vale below, and regularly caused Jordan to overflow all its banks, and thus inundated all the adjoining lowlands. The lion had his abode among the lofty reeds which grew on the bank of this river; and when the descending waters caused Jordan to swell so as to invade his resting-place, he was driven to madness by the intrusion of an enemy whom he could not resist, and flew to revenge himself against the inhabitants of the adjoining cities. How striking a picture of the rage and violence of an invading army!

In the second verse of the fourteenth chapter of Hosea, the prayer of repenting Israel is, "Take away all iniquity, and receive us graciously, so will we render the calves of our lips." To an English ear there is something grating in the expression "the calves of our lips,"—and without a knowledge of Jewish peculiarities, we shall not understand it. But when we remember that calves were among the best of the sacrifices which were offered up to God, we gain at once a key to the explanation, and a view of the beauty of the figure. The passage in our language, means simply this; "So will we render the best sacrifice of praise from our lips."

Thirdly. The dress and manners of the ancients were exceedingly different from ours. Their loose and flowing raiment formed a perfect contrast to the tight elegant garb of our own time and country. A knowledge of this is necessary to explain many passages of Scripture. The girding-up of the loins is frequently mentioned in places which allude either to diligence in labour, or to swiftness in running the appointed course. Now it is obvious, that a long, loose robe, would be very inconvenient to servants who required to have their hands much at liberty, and to be able to stoop with ease in the performance of their work; and also to those who had to move quickly, and required that their step should not be impeded, nor their feet entangled by the length of their garments. To remedy this, they always had a girdle, by means of which, when they had gathered up the skirts of their garments, they fastened it round their loins. To one who knew that he could neither work nor run without having recourse to this measure, how forcible would be such passages as these—*Let your loins be girded, and your lights burning, and ye yourselves like unto men who wait for their Lord. Gird up the loins of your mind, be sober, and hope unto the end, &c.*

It were easy to extend observations of this kind, and to produce other causes of obscurity in the various figures which are employed in the page of inspiration. The truth is, that similar difficulties present themselves in all the classical productions of antiquity; and it would have been a strong argument against the genuineness of the scriptures, had they been wanting in that style of speaking and thinking which was peculiar to the times in which they were written.

There is only one more remark on this subject to which the attention of the reader is particularly requested; and that is, the difficulty of conveying the true import of a figure in a translation. Let the reader take a French book, and regardless of the idiom of the two languages, and of the different class of figures employed by them, let him translate literally, and how much will he lose of the beauty and, in many cases, of the sense of the original!

Now in the translation of the Bible there is less liberty allowed to the imagination, and even judgment of the translator, than in any other book. His business is not to embellish, and not even to give his own explanations of passages, but to put his reader in possession of the plain word of God. He must not sacrifice correctness to beauty; he must not aim at what he thinks the spirit of the passage, while he neglects the letter; because, in so doing, he may have missed its true meaning; he may have mistaken the nature of the allusion, and then he entails his own mistake upon posterity. But if he translates accurately, though the passage may be obscure to himself and to his readers, yet perhaps the information brought home by some traveller who has observed the customs of eastern nations, or the discovery of some book of antiquity, may throw light upon it, and enable us to perceive beauties which were before concealed, and which would have remained in darkness had the translator taken the liberty which translators of other books are permitted to take with impunity.

Making then due allowance for these several circumstances, which hinder us from perceiving many of the excellencies of Scripture, are we not still constrained to acknowledge that there is no book that can stand a comparison with the Bible—none, which labours under such great disadvantages to the development of its peculiar beauties of composition, and which yet rises far above them all, exhibiting those specimens in every style of writing and of thinking, which are above all imitation and all praise. J. K.

To the Editor of the Church.

STREETSVILLE, February 8th, 1838.

STR.—It is now ten days since I received the copies of your paper, which contain the letters of Dr. Strachan to the Hon. William Morris: but I have been prevented until now by other duties from offering you a few remarks on the censures and accusations which the Hon. and Ven. the Archdeacon has brought against myself. I perceive, indeed, from a Toronto newspaper that you had refused admission into your columns to the reply of Mr. Morris to Dr. Strachan; but I am unwilling to think that you will refuse insertion to these lines, as all the vindication of my character which I am concerned to make, rests in a few brief explanations which I desire to submit to the readers of Dr. Strachan's Letters. You aim, as I learn from the editorial article in one of your papers, to make the Church "speak exclusively of the things pertaining to the Kingdom of God"—an object in which I heartily bid you God speed: and nothing but the consideration that I have been maligned in your columns would induce me to trouble you with a single sentence on the subject to which this letter refers.

The censures and reproaches which Dr. Strachan has dealt out against me, are founded on two separate communications of mine to Mr. Morris; the one of which is simply referred to in his printed correspondence; the other forms a part of that correspondence. The former is a letter which I wrote to him accompanying an abstract of certain returns from a considerable number of our congregations in this Province; the latter is the abstract itself, with certain appended remarks. Now, of the former I have to say, that it was not intended by me for publication; as, indeed, it was not fit for meeting the public eye. It was written in haste, and no copy of it was made; and I can account for its having been passed to Lord Glenelg, only from the circumstance of its having been written on the same sheet with the abstract and appendix, and not marked private. After this statement, it is not perhaps very important for me to notice the expressions on which Dr. Strachan animadvert. The words "arrogant claims of the Episcopalians" were I presume found in the letter; and the Attorney General and some other members of the Council of King's College spoken of as "the most intolerant grade;" and, though I might say, that I do not deem these epithets slanderous, when applied to those who would claim a seventh of this ample territory for the ministers of the Church of England, as though they were the only Protestant Clergy in it, or who would speak in the reproachful way of Ministers of the Church of Scotland, that the Attorney General is represented as having done in the House of Assembly,—I will rather say, that I should not be called on to defend them, as they were not written under the slightest sense of my accountableness to the public for them.

For a remark in the same letter, respecting the location of Reserve Lots by individuals to be eventually surrendered to congregations of the Church of England, I am accused by Dr. Strachan of fastening "a charge of deliberate fraud on the local Government." Now, it appears that I have been misinformed in regard to the particular instance, Whitechurch, which I had mentioned—though I gave it only as matter of hearsay. But, the amount of the charge was, that of partiality to the Church of England, a disposition, which, whether evinced by the Local Government or by the Lessees of Reserve Lots, is not, I am sure, a crime in the eyes of Dr. Strachan. I believe it will not be the violation of a secret when I say, that those who were desirous of securing Reserve Lots for congregations of the Church of Scotland were counselled from a somewhat influential quarter to adopt the very expedient which we understood was practised for congregations of the Church of England; though I am not aware that the advice was followed in a single instance.

So much for Dr. Strachan's remarks on the communication which should have been private. As to the reproaches which he has cast on the Statistical Table with which I furnished Mr. Morris I may say, that I am not very careful to reply to them. Mr. McGill of Niagara has vindicated the portion of the appendix which he supplied. The direct accusation against myself is weighty enough;—it is that of *having attempted a gross deception on the Colonial Secretary* in the drawing up of that table: and, if this were indeed true, honest men might not only be amazed, as Dr. Strachan says, but also be grieved. But let the readers of the Church judge between us.

I was called on, as Moderator of the Synod of the Presbyterian Church of Canada, to abridge certain returns from our congregations, and send the substance of them to Mr. Morris when he was in London; now this I did with some pains, though one or two errors are found in the table which I drew out. Let it be observed, that I gave to Mr. Morris all the information contained in all the returns which had reached me at the time I wrote to him. These returns, in point of fact, were only twenty in number; many of the congregations not having sent returns at all; and a few, not until after my communication to Mr. Morris was despatched. The table was thus necessarily partial; and the letter accompanying it which, contrary to my intention, Lord Glenelg and Dr. Strachan have seen, and which, the latter at least has connoed with care, stated—if I can at all trust my memory—my regret at having received so few returns. And yet, I am charged with attempting "a gross deception" on Lord Glenelg, as though I had possessed returns from all our congregations, and had selected only those cases which might go to shew the unkindness of the Colonial Government to our congregations.

Dr. Strachan has constructed a table from the records of the Executive Council, shewing the result of all applications for land from congregations in connexion with the Church of Scotland until September 1837; but, he knew I was not quoting from

those records. His experience in making ecclesiastical tables might have taught him, that accuracy in such matters is a somewhat difficult virtue. And Mr. Morris, in his reply, has given pretty strong reasons for doubting the accuracy of the present Table of the Archdeacon. I by no means claim the merit of perfect accuracy to the Table which I drew up. A mistake in regard to the title and endowments of the Episcopal Church at Brockville was promptly acknowledged by me, in the newspapers in which the mistake was first pointed out to me. Another mistake in the Table, as it appears in the printed correspondence, may shew, that the errors have not been all in the way of exaggerating the liberality of the Colonial Government to Episcopal Churches, as the united congregations connected with the Church of Scotland in Peterborough and Cavan are represented as aided by Government in the building of Churches to the amount of £135 17s 10d while the true reading is "Peterborough £20 0s 0d Cavan £65 0s 0d."

Dr. Strachan has noted that my Table, as it appears in the printed correspondence, is not quite the same with that which had been sent to Mr. Morris. The truth is that it is enlarged in the printed correspondence with the substance of the few returns which reached me after I had sent off my communication to Mr. Morris—so little thought had I of keeping back any information in regard to our Churches, whether it made for, or against the liberality of the Colonial Government to them. The copy of the Table and the appendix were furnished to the publisher of the printed correspondence, on his own request, by myself, and not by Mr. Morris, and the additions to it, which I have just mentioned, were noticed in a letter to him from me, intended for publication, though, he appears to have thought the circumstance too trivial for public notice.

I trust, Mr. Editor, that, in seeking the insertion of this letter in your Journal, I shall be regarded by you, as only shewing a due respect to the good opinion of that branch of the Christian family, before whom, through your Journal, I have been evil spoken of, and, as I think, without cause.

I remain,

Yours &c.

WM. RINTOUL.

THE CHURCH.

COBBOURG, SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 24, 1838.

We observe from remarks in a few of the newspapers of the day, as well as from certain private intimations, that an erroneous and unfair construction has been put upon our denial to the Hon. W. Morris of the opportunity of replying through our columns to the Letters lately addressed to him by the Venerable the Archdeacon of York. We should have thought that a reference to our Prospectus,—a reference which, in the case of any such misconception of our conduct, it would be but natural to make,—would at once have satisfied any individual disposed to join in that complaint, that not only were we consistent to our avowed principles in declining compliance with the request of Mr. Morris, but that, in acting otherwise, we should have been departing from the plan and intention so specifically announced at the outset of our editorial labours.

It was distinctly stated that the object of establishing this paper was, on the one hand, to disseminate amongst our fellow churchmen that information regarding our venerated communion which might serve to "put them in remembrance" of its claims to their unwavering support and love; and, on the other hand, to defend the interests of the Church, whether temporal or spiritual, whensoever and by whomsoever assailed. With this candid declaration of our objects, it could not, in the mind either of friend or foe, be matter for a moment's doubt that this journal was to be *exclusively* the advocate of the Church of England; nor could it have been anticipated, that if to the doctrines or to the secular claims of our Church objections should be advanced, the pages of this journal were to be open to the expression of such objections. Were such a species of concession ever meditated, we should have to permit the publication—side by side with their defence—of invectives against Episcopacy, of railery at our Liturgy, and of attacks at last upon the vital doctrines of our common Christianity! That "THE CHURCH" was to evince so pernicious an inconsistency in its management, its friends at least would have been astonished and grieved to discover.

But why the same sound rule of action is to be departed from, when the outward defences of the Church are assailed, we can, we confess, see no sufficient reason. The exercise of a native willingness to oblige, or a condescension to the "liberal" spirit so much eulogized by the careless ones of the day, might have prompted a departure from the natural and proper rule by which we felt it necessary to be guided; but principle is not to be sacrificed to good nature, and the elements of truth are not to be abandoned because such concession may win the plaudits of the Dissenter, or gain perchance the fellowship of the Infidel.

After a long and stormy agitation of the question of the Reserves and Rectories, during which the members of the Church of England sat in meek and uncomplaining silence, a pamphlet is produced detailing the operations in London of the Hon. W. Morris, as agent for the Scottish Presbyterian body, and explaining to the world the progress he had made towards overturning what we believe to be the rightful claims of our own communion. To this pamphlet, after it had been widely circulated and copied into several newspapers, we believe, in both Provinces, an answer is returned by the Archdeacon of York through the legitimate channel of such defence, "THE CHURCH;" but if it be expected that a rejoinder to that reply is to have a place in our columns also, we should like to be made acquainted with any argument which would not render necessary a similar concession, under similar circumstances, to the opponents of our ritual and ministry, and even to the advocates of false religion.

We certainly feel much pain in being compelled to deny any request of so respectable an individual as the Hon. W. Morris; and the more so, as his reply evinces so careful an exclusion of that asperity of feeling and coarseness of language which has characterized so many other productions on his side of the