

hundred names. Had all been waited upon, there is no doubt that a thousand would have been secured. Subsequent to this, a petition came here from Smith's Falls, another from Perth, another from Pakenham, and another from Sherbrooke—all of these were presented to the House of Assembly, and copies were sent to the Governor General, and to the Legislative Council. In the former branch of the Legislature, they were submitted to a Committee, consisting of the Hon. Mr. Badgley, Solicitors-General Drummond and Blake, and Messrs. Nelson, Holmes, Notman, and Richards. A Report was drawn up, recommending the views of the Petitioners; but the chairman (Mr. Holmes) was prevented from submitting it to the Committee, in consequence of the burning of the Parliament buildings. That it would have been adopted by them, may be asserted with confidence, as four are well known abolitionists, and the fifth (Mr. Blake) was then strongly inclined to support them. We deem it necessary to mention those facts, because they may be of some interest to the signers of the Petitions, and we also entertain a hope that they will induce them to renew these efforts immediately, as the period is rapidly approaching when the Legislature will be again called together.

In the present article, we do not propose to retrace the ground we passed over in a former one; but simply, in the first place, to advance a few facts which have subsequently come under notice, corroborative of the views we previously enunciated; and, secondly, to add one or two additional reasons for demanding the abolition of Capital Punishment.

The scriptural argument, as it is called, may be properly the first point for our consideration; and we have made an extract, from an able author which appeared upon it, in the *Nova Scotian*, which will well repay an attentive perusal:—

Our object being to advance truth and destroy error—to assist in abolishing a law which we believe has no foundation whatever in the Scriptures, but, on the contrary, is adverse to the entire spirit of Christianity, we shall continue the discussion of this question by answering the arguments of these several writers. "G. D." having entered most fully into the question, we will first turn to his letter. This writer adduces the old passage, upon which the opposition to abolition mainly depends, as found in Gen. ix. 5 and 6. "And surely your blood of your lives will I require: at the hand of every beast will I require it, and at the hand of man: at the hand of every man's brother will I require the life of man. Whoso sheddeth man's blood by man shall his blood be shed: for in the image of God made he man." The most general view taken of this passage is that it was merely predictive. A literal translation of the original Hebrew has been thus

given, "Shedding blood of man in man, his (or its) blood will be shed." Out of the thirty or forty versions of the Bible that have been published, the majority hold that the word "*man*" was an *interpolation*, and that the word "*shall*" should be read "*will*." Wickliffe, in his translation, left out the word "*man*,"—while the French, German, and Italian versions are said to have so interpreted it. Calvin and Pascal also interpreted the preposition "*by*" to mean "*in*," and the latter maintained that the passage took from *man* all power over his fellow-creatures. That we may have good authority for our assertion, however, we will copy the following passage from an eminent and learned living controversialist. Referring to the commonly received version, he says:

"Not only is it not necessary to adopt this translation '*by*' unequivocally involved in the original, but the weight of the authority is conclusive against it. That of the Septuagint would alone suffice, as it is not to be supposed that the seventy-two learned Jews of Alexandria, 287 years before Christ, would have misunderstood the Hebrew expression, and their rendering into Greek translated is, Whoso sheddeth a man's blood, for his blood (i. e. the blood of the slain,) will have his own shed. So also the Samaritan version, as rendered into Latin, has it, *pro homine sanguis ejus effundetur*, 'for the man his blood will be shed.'—While the Latin vulgate renders it simply: '*Quicumque effuderit humanum sanguinem fundetur sanguis illius*,'—'whoso sheddeth human blood, his blood will be shed'—omitting our '*by man*' altogether; as indeed is done by Calvin himself; both practically and theoretically; a good friend to the punishment of death, even for the crime of a difference of theological opinion, and certainly an authority second to none with our opponents in this controversy, who says that the particle rendered in *hominem* has the mere force of emphatic amplification, and that to render it '*by man*' is a forced construction. And Calvin expressly in his commentary on the whole passage interprets it in rather a denunciatory than in a merely legislative sense. The pious and erudite Le Clerc, than whom no higher authority can be elicited of either biblical criticism or Hebrew learning, translates it, not *by*, but *among*. '*Effundentis sanguinem humanum, inter nomines, sanguis effundetur*,'—'of the one shedding human blood, among men, the blood will be shed,' the expression among men evidently denoting, in human society, under the order of Providence in human affairs. In fact, in a note on the word, he says that while some translate it '*per hominem*,' i. e. *through or by man*, and that the preposition *betwixt* is constantly to be found in the sense of *per*, yet, 'in accordance with the most frequent use of the Hebrew language, it would have been said *BEAD ADAM, by the hand of man*. Yet it is always read *BEAD ADAM, or in man or among men*.' 'As in *man*,' continues Le Clerc, 'would scarcely make any sense, we are led to adopt the other signification, *among men*; whence arises a plain proposition which is the same as that of the words immediately preceding, but more clearly expressed. God has said that *he will require the life of the man slain from the slayer, among men or among beasts*; he here more fully sets forth the same truth when he says that the blood of the