

American Bible Union.

We have received from the Secretary of the Union a copy of an important letter from Dr. Hackett. As it would occupy too much of our space to give it in full, we have made a few extracts, which we doubt not will be read with interest. Dr. H. left Boston for Athens on the 11th Inst. He says:—

“Though I have other objects in view, connected with the work of translation, the main purpose of the journey, as has been so fully stated on another occasion, is to give some attention to the Greek language, as spoken by the Greeks of the present day. It is self-evident, that a knowledge of this language as thus spoken, however perfect it may be, and whether possessed by a native Greek or a foreigner, would not, of itself, qualify a person to translate the New Testament Greek; but that acquisition, added to a competent knowledge of the ancient Greek, and to a proper training in the work of interpretation, and in the auxiliary studies related thereto, can not fail to be eminently serviceable to the Biblical scholar. I have felt, therefore, that, having been for more than thirty years, more or less, conversant with the language in its ancient form, I might enter still more deeply into its spirit, and bring it nearer to me as a living power, if I could sojourn for a term in the country, where the external objects are still called by their ancient names, and where the words heard from the mouth of the people, especially in their application to ecclesiastical and religious subjects, retain still so much of their original meaning.

“I am thankful, therefore, for the opportunity to make this effort to increase my ability for the performance of the work undertaken, and hope that, with the Divine blessing on my labors, I may thus be more useful than I otherwise could be, in promoting a knowledge of God's word.

“The object, as I understand it, is not to supersede, but revise the current version of the English Scriptures. A new translation of the original text, and a revision of the translation of that text, are very different things; and yet, different as they are, are confounded by many persons, who would feel much less objection to the enterprise, if they would keep in mind the distinction between them. It is not proposed to discard the present version; to cast away its manifold advantages; to introduce rash and doubtful innovations; to substitute a cumbrous Latinized style for the simple, nervous, idiomatic English, which brings it home to the hearts of the people; but simply to attempt to do upon their work, what our translators did upon that of their predecessors.

“The received English version, it should be remembered, was not made directly from the Hebrew and Greek Scriptures, without any dependence on previous translations. It was not so much a new version, as a revised one; it was not the product of one age, but a growth which had been springing up through successive generations, and received its present form, merely as one of a series of attempts to render the original Scriptures into English for general use. And the belief now, that the limit has been reached; that our translation must remain at the point where it stood two hundred and fifty years ago; that it was crystallized then for all time, and is to continue, henceforth, unchanged and changeless, when all else is moving on, so full of life and progress, is not, to say the least, a reasonable expectation, and is, I am persuaded, at variance with the characteristics of the age, which will disappoint any such expectations. The people, at large, have a deep interest in this question. They have a right to a translation of the Scriptures which presents, not the general truth, merely, but the exact truth of every passage and word, as nearly as the most faithful study can discover it, or the vernacular tongue can express it. If the Common Version of the New Testament, for example, contains five hundred, or but two hundred instances, more or less of a positively erroneous, or only inadequate representation of the “word of the Spirit,” why should not the bulk of readers have the benefit of the corrections, as well as a favored few? Why should they be known to a part of the clergy only, or those who have access to learned commentaries?

“The cause is one that should enlist the warmest sympathy of the people; for it has respect, in a peculiar sense, to their rights, and would carry out to its legitimate results, the great principle which has given us the Bible in a language which all may read and understand. With Christian regard, truly yours, H. B. HACKETT.”

Correspondence.

For the Christian Messenger.

Ordination at Ohio, Yarmouth Co.

In accordance with a request from the Baptist Church at Ohio, Yarmouth Co., a Council, consisting of delegates from sister churches, assembled in the Baptist Chapel, Ohio, August 11th, at 10 o'clock, to consider the propriety of ordaining Brother Joseph H. Saunders to the pastorate over that Church.

The following delegates reported themselves, viz.:—1st Yarmouth Church: Rev. H. Angell, Deacon Ansel Robbins, Brethren J. Shaw, Wm. Churchill, and J. Brown; 2nd Church, Hebron: Rev. E. N. Harris, Deacons Wm. Crosby and J. Patton; 3rd Church, Deerfield: Rev. J. A. Stubbart, Deacons Charles Tedford and R. Simonds; Chebogue: Rev. J. V. Tabor, Deacons

Lemuel Churchill and N. Holmes; Chegogan: Deacons Z. Chipman and N. Corning; Lake George: Deacons Joseph Crosby and B. B. Moses; Beaver River: Rev. T. C. Delong, Deacons S. Crosby, J. Rose, Wm. S. Raymond, Brethren N. Power, W. H. Goudey, and Ira Raymond; Weymouth: Rev. Chas. Randall; Ohio: Deacons E. Crosby, James Shaw, P. Durkee, N. Crosby, and Brother Jesse Shaw. Other brethren were invited to a seat with the Council.

After a discourse by Bro. J. H. Saunders from John xvii. 15, the Rev. C. Randall was appointed Moderator, and Rev. H. Angell, Clerk.

The Candidate related his Christian experience, call to the Ministry, and views of divine truth.

The Council voted unanimously to proceed to Ordination, when the meeting was adjourned until half-past 2 o'clock.

Before the time for service, the house was densely crowded. The following was the order of service:—Singing; Reading Scriptures, by Rev. E. N. Harris; Prayer, Rev. J. A. Stubbart; Sermon, from 1 Tim. iv. 16, Rev. C. Randall; Questions, Rev. T. C. Delong; Ordaining Prayer, Rev. J. V. Tabor; Hand of Fellowship, Rev. J. A. Stubbart; Charge to the Candidate, Rev. H. Angell; Charge to the Church, Rev. E. N. Harris; Concluding Prayer, by the Candidate.

The services, though lengthy, were deeply interesting and solemn.

Our brother enters upon his labors with encouraging prospects.

On behalf of the Council, HENRY ANGELL, Clerk.

Yarmouth, August 12th, 1858.

Matthew 5th Chapter 16th verse.

To the Editor of the Christian Messenger.

Dear Sir,—I send to your care three pounds enclosed for the following objects:—

- Home Missionary Society, £1 0 0
 - (Paid Treasurer, J. Whitman, Esq.)
 - French Mission, 1 0 0
 - (W. Churchill, Esq., please debit us this sum.)
 - Native Missionaries under the direction of the Rev. Mr. Crawley, 1 0 0
 - (The Secretary, Rev. Dr. Tupper, will please charge this to us and transmit to Treasurer.)
- £3 0 0

Please acknowledge in Christian Messenger, and oblige

AN UNFAITHFUL STEWARD.

For the Christian Messenger.

“Don't Care.”

What multitudes, in all ages, have been irrecoverably ruined by the irrational, habitual employment of this common vulgar phrase, which, though it may be used occasionally with the utmost propriety, and freedom from guilt or blame, is nevertheless more frequently the remorseful ebullition of a conscience unable to offer a more satisfactory extenuation of the crimes with which it is burdened. The more closely this truth is investigated, the more fully it will be exemplified. Examine, for instance, the history of an abandoned criminal, as it follows him through all his multiform gradations of folly, cruelty, and dissipation, from the daring urchin, taking his first lessons in crime, by pilfering apples from a neighbor's orchard, robbing a poultry-yard, or gulping a tumbler of porter in a fashionable saloon, to the surly countenance, grey-headed, marble-hearted culprit, paying the penalty of a long catalogue of outrageous enormities in perpetual confinement in the Penitentiary, or swinging on the gallows, and it will afford a genuine exhibition of the legitimate results of a too common, reckless, “Don't care” policy.

How often, in his wayward career, was he overtaken by the voice of affectionate remonstrance, warning him of the dangers accumulating in his course, and urging him to reflection and amendment? How often was he encircled by the tender sympathies of weeping friends, and vigilant guardians whose arms were extended to rescue him from the current of vice? How frequently were the admonitory counsels of devoted Christians administered in all the zeal of pious affection to arrest him in his downward career? And how often did the voice of conscience assail him with thrilling reproofs, and charge him with the basest ingratitude, infatuation, and obstinacy? And were not all these admonitions, warnings, and entreaties, spurned or evaded by the course utterance of a cold, inhuman “don't care?” However fully he may have felt himself condemned, and whatever amount of unhappiness he may occasionally have experienced under the painful reflections thus forced upon him, he exhibits no symptoms of repentance of the past, or amendment for the future; nor does

he even attempt the slightest justification of the course he pursues. No arguments are in his mouth or weapons in hand with which to defend himself against the accusations of conscience within him, or the condemnations of society around him. His only defence against all these is the cold and unfeeling utterance, a reckless “don't care.”

Impervious to pious counsel, inured to every species of crime, regardless of all consequences, and entirely given over to the power of evil habit, he cares for nothing but that which will gratify his depraved inclinations. Talk to him of squandered time, abused privileges, wasted opportunities, buried talents, and sacrificed happiness; and his only reply is a heartless “don't care.” Remind him of a mother's tears, a father's warnings, a sister's love, and a brother's sympathy, and with equal firmness he repeats his “don't care.” Point him to his injured health, impaired intellect, ruined character, and approaching a shameful end, and again you are met with his usual reckless exclamation, “don't care!” And it is thus he perseveres in his career of folly, till, overwhelmed with apprehensions of sudden and awful retribution, his “don't cares” are exchanged for loud cries of unavailing penitence and eternal remorse!

Youthful reader, art thou overtaken by temptations in the pathway of life? And art thou conscious of occasional deviations from thine integrity? Heed, then, in time, the voice of warning; indulge not for a moment the desire of evil, nor cherish a spirit of indifference to the consequences thereof. Be firm in your resistance of the smallest temptation; guard vigilantly against all carelessness of expression, or looseness of habit, remembering the fearful results which have too often followed the repeated utterance of a thoughtless “don't care.”

J. C. HURD.

Chester, August, 1858.

For the Christian Messenger.

Female Education.

MR. EDITOR,

My remarks on the above subject in your paper of August 11th, have, I perceive, occasioned other communications on the same subject. I shall be glad if the grave-like repose of this important topic is broken.

It is a token of good when “a father” can express the yearning he feels for his daughters without the charge of fanaticism. It is a little amusing, however, to hear him talk about his daughters learning Hebrew, before the denomination have made any provision for teaching them even the English Alphabet. But a doting parent can well be excused in this extravagance, on seeing for the first time, the prospect of a way being opened; of accomplishing his darling wishes. I believe there are many such parents in this province who have a desire for all their children to be fitted for the most arduous duties of common life, but whose way has been, and still is hedged up. They see no alternative but to leave their loveliest offspring doomed to irretrievable ignorance, debarred as they are from an Institution which their own money and prayers have called into existence. This statement may be illustrated by the case of Brother Hazitt, the Principal of our Academy. That gentleman has, I believe, a large family of daughters, who, so far as the school taught by their father is concerned, might as well be in the heart of Africa. They cannot step over its threshold though within the distance of ten rods. He must send his six daughters or so to Mr. Chase's or somewhere else, at £25 a year or leave them ignorant. Can any man with small means accomplish this? Away with such an abominable state of things. Let the managers of our educational affairs remember that they are appointed to serve and not to oppress the people.

Your last issue contains also a communication from “Progress.” He charges me with leaving the noble effort of Rev. Mr. Chase “discourteously unnoticed.” The object of my letter was not to advertise private undertakings but to point out the public duty of Baptists. But since “Progress” has undertaken this, why has he left other private establishments “discourteously unnoticed?” Why did he pass over the equally noble effort of H. E. Fitch, Esq., of Clarence? And of the Misses Bishop of Greenwich? Also, of the noble efforts at Berwick and Liverpool which have been made and have failed, as all merely private enterprises of this kind must do, when the object is to educate the poor,—since, in order to prosper, they must be conducted on the principle of getting as much and giving as little as possible? Why, has “Progress” made the invidious distinction of mentioning one only, and not the whole? I leave him in his dilemma. He has

taken his horn. There let him hang. But if the suggestions of “A Father,” as to Mr. Chase, be adopted, even “Progress” might change his tune. What do all these private efforts indicate but a universally felt want among the people, which it would be well for the Education Society to consider and meet? Is it honorable for a strong body of people to sit lazily down and see a few individuals crushed beneath the burden of the public good, especially when it could relieve them without adding to its own burdens? Throw open the doors of the Academy to females, the pressing want is supplied, and noble-hearted individuals will not feel called upon to establish schools, at damagingly low charges, to educate their daughters. The rapid rise, and I might add the disastrous fall, of private institutions, is a loud call to the Baptist body to duty in this matter of female education.

I shall be pardoned for also alluding to the editorial on the same subject. The five enquiries there made, for nothing is stated, can be easily answered, for they stand on one basis. If women have more duties which pertain to the education of children than men, should they not be at least as well taught? This, I think, is plain. Then, should not equal facilities be afforded to them? yea, and even superior? A young man can engage in a thousand avocations to earn money and help himself from which a young lady is debarred. Because the sex is thus the weaker, are they to be trampled upon? Yes, say the past educational efforts of Nova Scotia Baptists. As to the remarks on the comparative value set on female education by Wesleyans and Catholics on the one hand, and Baptists on the other, facts speak louder than the Editor. They have provided for such education: we have not. They understand the power of mental training and refinement among the other sex: our public acts ignore it. By doing so, we have cut off our right arm. Again, because Presbyterians and Episcopalians “have no such public institutions” this is no reason why we should not have one. We ought to understand our own wants, without reference to other denominations. If, knowing our wants, we cannot supply them, it is time we reconsidered our position. If our principles, taking root in society, spring up into a upas tree, and kill every plant of benevolence, it is surely time for us to pause and reconstruct our religious faith. But I cannot believe that such is the case. When I can, I shall seek another religious platform, for the real gospel is the real principle of public benevolence. As a people, we have great social problems to work out, for the good of man. As a people, with regard to public benevolence, we are yet in our infancy. The glory of manhood is before us. Let us follow the light.

August 19, 1858.

REFORM.

For the Christian Messenger.

Granville Street Church. College Agency.

We have been requested to give insertion to the following communication, and resolutions passed at a Special Meeting of the Granville Street Church, held on Wednesday, July 7th, 1858.

Wolfville, June 29th, 1858.

TO THE BAPTIST CHURCH WORSHIPPING IN GRANVILLE STREET, HALIFAX.

Dear Brethren,—The committee appointed by the Board of Governors of Acadia College to engage a general agent in behalf of the College, have directed me to transmit to you the accompanying resolution:

“Resolved, That in view of the advancement of the interests of Acadia College, with which the welfare of our denomination is closely identified, the Church in Granville Street be requested to surrender their pastor for the service to which he has been invited by this committee.”

Yours respectfully,

JOHN CHASE, Sec. Com.

After which the following resolution was unanimously passed.

“Whereas, This Church having received a communication from the Governors of Acadia College, earnestly requesting them to relinquish the services of their Pastor, the Rev. David Freeman, to act as the permanent Agent of the College,

Resolved, That the Church fully recognize the importance of the successful operations of the College to the general interests of the Denomination. That they, however, feel no desire to make any change in their present arrangements, highly esteeming as they do, the character and services of their Pastor, but under the peculiar circumstances of the case, they feel that they must be wholly guided in the matter by the decision of Brother Freeman himself.”

The Pastor of the Church then intimated that, after prayerful consideration of the im-