

Sinner, those thorns as they pierce that holy brow, starting the purple drops of almost stiffened blood, were endured that a crown of glory might rest upon your ransomed head. What more could Jesus have done? The very extent of suffering had been endured, and "patiently for thee he carried out the appointed vow." Oh! can you withhold your love from him: whose whole life and death went, to show forth his love for us.

It is the severest trial of human patience to endure suffering wrongfully: yet from the Bethlehem manger to the yielding up of life on the cross, it was one continued story of Innocence suffering in the room of Guilt. Ah, wonderful, mysterious love of Christ! Is there ought on the wide earth to the human heart like that love? We may search in vain the chronicles of old, or the store houses of memory, there is nothing in all the catalogue of glorious deeds that men love to record, so great, so good, so sublimely grand as the life and death of the humble Nazarene.

And can we not bear the cross for him who so willingly laid down the crown for us? The question comes to us when our hearts have been warmed with a fire of heaven's own kindling, when our weary feet have been strengthened for the up-hill journey. Shall not the answer go back to heaven in the offering of daily life dedicated to Him?

H.

IRENE

Christian Messenger.

HALIFAX, JANUARY 19, 1859.

The Papacy: a Conspiracy against civil and religious Liberty. First Lecture, delivered before the Protestant Alliance of Nova Scotia, at Temperance Hall, Halifax, on Friday evening, Dec. 17th., 1858. By Rev. Andrew King, A. M., Free College, Halifax.

This is a great improvement on Mr. Ferrie's declamation. Professor King understands his subject, and treats it judiciously, though much more briefly than was compatible with complete discussion. There should have been two lectures; the first, on the opposition of the Papacy to civil, and the second on its opposition to religious, liberty. A third might be very profitably added; and we hope that some enlightened, liberal, and thorough-going Protestant will be selected to deliver it. The theme should be—"The unscriptural character and dangerous tendency of the union of Church and State." The history of Protestantism will furnish abundant materials.

Professor King's Lecture is divided into three parts. In the first, he notices "some of those peculiar principles of the Papal Church which go to establish and illustrate her character as a Conspiracy against civil and religious liberty." In the second, he shows that "the whole hierarchy, from the humblest priest upwards, are banded together, as sworn conspirators, in support of this system." In the third, he glances at the fruits, with particular reference to the records of persecution.

Under the first head the Creed of Pope Pius IV. is properly introduced. We notice an omission in the sixth article. The last clause reads thus:—"And that there is a conversion made of the whole substance of the bread into his body, which conversion the Catholic Church calls Transubstantiation." After the word "body" the following words should have been inserted—"and of the whole substance of the wine into his blood."

We suggest the following, as an improved rendering of the closing paragraph:—"This true Catholic faith, out of which none can be saved, which I now freely profess and truly hold, I. N., promise, vow, and swear, most constantly to retain and confess, whole and inviolate, by God's assistance, to my last breath; and to procure, as far as lies in my power, that the same shall be held, taught, and preached, by those who are under me, or are entrusted to my care, by virtue of my office. So help me God, and these holy gospels of God."

It has been stoutly denied that the Protestant Alliance is political. But there can be no doubt on that subject, now. Whoever reads Professor King's Address in Chalmers' Church, and the last paragraph of this Lecture, will be convinced that the object of the Alliance is to place "the administration of our public affairs" in other hands, and to deprive all Roman Catholics of office. The latter policy is not the policy of the mother country. There, all offices, that of Lord Chancellor only excepted, are thrown open to qualified men, of every religious persuasion. But the men of the Alliance have decided otherwise for Nova Scotia. Whether their

theory will be reduced to practice, is another question.

In the treatment of religious sects by government, two evils, are to be avoided—favouritism, and proscription. Favouritism is the encouragement or support of one sect, most commonly at the expense of the rest. It has had its day. Even statesmen begin to see it; Sir James Graham was waited on a little while ago by a deputation from the Church of Scotland, who were anxious to secure his support of a bill about to be introduced into Parliament for the purpose of preventing another schism in the church. He told the deputation that "public opinion had passed into a new phase, and, whereas various modes had been adopted to bolster up the national Church, he was fully persuaded that the days of Church establishments were numbered, and henceforth men would not be satisfied unless religion were left to the voluntary support of Christians. For his part, he would have no hand in buttressing any State Church."

As for proscription, we will only say, that it is cowardly and unjust in itself; that it is impracticable, in this nineteenth century; and that if it were practicable, it would be in the highest degree impolitic, and fraught with peril.

Ecclesiastical Titles and Precedence.

We noticed briefly last week the reference made to this subject by two of our contemporaries, the *Morning Chronicle* and the *Evening Express*.

We do not deem it a matter of great practical moment, whether the dignitaries of the Roman Catholic or Episcopal Churches shall be taken into special favour by our Lieutenant Governor, or not, except that it might lead either of the bodies represented by them to assume a position in reference to other denominations, which the laws of the Province do not recognize.

The last vestige of National or Established Churchism, as far as legislation is concerned, was taken away when the late venerable Bishop Inglis was removed by the hand of the Great Leveller. His successor, the present Bishop, was allowed to fill his more appropriate sphere at the head of the body he represents, but happily has not been called to mingle in political strife, and to descend to a secular position, so far beneath a minister of the gospel, as that of being a member of the Legislative Council.

The despatch sent from Earl Grey to Sir John Harvey, to which we alluded in our last, and which was placed on the table of the Assembly by the Hon. Mr. Young, introduced quite a new order of things. It recognized the titles of the Roman Catholic Prelates, and gave them a position on public occasions next to that of Episcopalians of the same rank. We cannot find that any remonstrance was then made against this new element by any parties. Previously the Bishop of the Episcopal Church was entitled to the first distinction, but by that Despatch the Roman Catholic Archbishop is entitled to pre-eminence. A Vicar General in the Roman Catholic Church is, we understand, entitled to the same distinction as an Episcopal Archdeacon. This does not appear to have troubled our friend Levee Dr. H. made his appearance in the position where the said despatch placed him. He did not appear to dislike it formerly any more than he did the change made in the President of the Legislative Council, when the Hon. Mr. Robie, a sound Protestant, was succeeded by the Hon. Mr. Tobin, as sound Roman Catholic. We feel perfectly free to discuss this question of clerical precedence as it is a matter connected with what is called religion. Although an effort is made to give it a party aspect, yet we deny that it has really any connection with party politics, seeing that there are different denominations in both parties, and all profess themselves opposed to any semblance of State Churchism.

The appearance of Church dignitaries on state occasions is a shadow of Religion established by-law, and we therefore think it should be abolished, like its substance, wherever it exists; not only because that by it, as in the latter case, injustice is done to other religious bodies, but also because the Church, so taken into the embrace of the State, suffers degradation; and the State itself also bars away its independence, for the support it may chance to secure from the adherents of the dominant body. It also affords an opportunity for partisans to take advantage of the favouritism, and stir up feelings of jealousy among those who would otherwise live in peace and harmony. We have the same antipathy for such church establishments, whether designated Episcopal or Puritan, as we have when called Roman Catholic. If privileges are accorded to one religious body by a Legislature or Government, we think they should also belong to all others.

If the Editor of the *Chronicle* will introduce a Memorial to Her Majesty, complaining of the Church Dignitaries of two denominations being elevated above the belong to other churches, and praying for an abolition of these distinctions, his reasons may be sincere in his present course, but he attacks only one branch of the subject, instead of trying to remove the root of the evil, his writing will have little weight with sensible reflecting men.

His mark that a contest with the Episcopal Bishop is pastime in which the *Messenger* Editors did just now join most heartily "we at once and most emphatically deny. When he says our "desire is not to keep the Papist out, but to pull the English Bishop down he knows well that he is indulging a propensity for prevarication which we are sorry see he does not strive to resist. While we differ from the head of the Episcopal Church in Nova Scotia in many respects, and do not offer him the hollow homage which the *Chronicle* and *Presbyterian Witness* pretend, we honour him for the labour voluntarily bestowed on some of the Christian and benevolent efforts of the Church in Halifax, and have before now called attention to them in our pages.

Bible Revisions.

The history of the Translation and Revision is a subject of great interest and importance. Not only the progress of religion but also of civil liberty has for many centuries been closely connected with it. Anything which affects the Word of Life being given to the nations worthy of most serious consideration. We therefore quite agree with the Rev. Mr. Rand the closing sentence of his communication another column that "a Bible cause needs the aid of misrepresentation." The question however which Mr. Rand raises, it will be readily seen, is one that is both impossible and unnecessary to be answered. King James gave by Royal command the rules which the revisors were to observe in preparing the Authorized version. "One of which (the 3rd) was that the old ecclesiastical words were to be retained," among which, of course, were *church baptize, &c., &c.* The fit of these from *eclesia* which in the earlier translations had been correctly rendered "congregation," but that word had been found inconvenient to the established Church, which, though having renounced some of the Popish errors, still retained the idea that uniformity should be secured, in the hope that this might be effected, it was ordered by Archbishop Parker in the Bishop's Bible, translated in the days of Elizabeth that the word "church" should be uniformly substituted for "congregation."

Mr. Rand asks whether the rules were not drawn up by some of the revisors of the Authorized Version and not by the King himself, and wants proof that they did not all agree to those rules. He seems to think that if they did, there was no compulsion in the King's command to retain the words above alluded to, instead of translating them. Mr. R. might as well doubt whether Her Majesty wrote the proclamation made in India. He knows that all that Royal mandates of the same as if spoken or written by his own hand or by his advisors. It matters not whether they agreed with said rules or not—those who acted under them were bound by them. As, however, he asks for facts we will give one or two which bear on the point.

"A disagreement having arisen among the Cambridge translators in regard to the application of the third and fourth rules, his Majesty, being informed of the same through the Bishop of London, added a feature to the arrangements, viz: a special Board, consisting of three or four of the most ancient and grave divines, to be assigned by the Vice-Chancellor, upon conference with the rest of the heads, to be Overseers of the Translation, as well Hebrew as Greek, for the better observation of the rules appointed by his Majesty, and especially concerning the third and fourth rules."—*Conant's English Bible, page 5.*

Mr. R.'s doubts about all agreeing, will perhaps be satisfied by the following:

"In these rules and regulations, we find a sufficient explanation of the exclusion of Hugh Broughton from the list of translators. He would never have been rejected his scholarship to such restraints, or added to the arbitrary decisions of men so decidedly far inferior to him in learning."—*Id.*

The last step taken by James in producing this translation, was but little calculated to inspire confidence, when his own character for intrigue and hypocrisy are taken into consideration. After the revision had been corrupted it finally passed into the hands of Bancroft, afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury—a man without scholarship, without scruples, and with power above him but the King, whose object in this undertaking pre-

cisely coincided with his own. But though he gave account to no man of his proceedings in this matter, yet the whole body of the translators stood before the public as endorsers of all he might please to do; and the Puritans were made to bear involuntary witness to the divine institution of the State church, no less than the most zealous of her sons. Bancroft was publicly charged with having altered the version in fourteen places."

The praise which has been bestowed upon James for this work accomplished in his reign, seems to have been rather the flattery of court favourites than the honest accord of true merit. The great design in making an authorized version appears to have been to produce uniformity among Protestants and to put down all other revisions, some of which were in some respects better than James's.

"Dr. Gell, who stood in an intimate relation to one of the translators, Dr. Abbott, (afterwards so disliked by James as the mild and liberal Archbishop of Canterbury,) has said of its defects: 'Yet is not all the blame to be laid upon the translators; but a part of it is to be shared with them also who set them at work, who by reasons of state limited them (as some of them have much complained) lest they might be thought not to set forth a new translation but rather a new Bible.' And he further asserts, that 'many mistranslated words and phrases by plurality of voices were carried into the context, and the better translation was cast into the margin.'

"The work was not received by the generation for whom it was prepared, with that unanimity for which James had hoped. The bait of Puritan scholarship did not sufficiently conceal the real intent and purposes of its royal and prelatical projectors, to ensnare the body of non-conformists. They had already enjoyed too intimate an acquaintance with the Church to be taken at her first east, and still clung to their beloved 'version of Geneva' which they felt sure was exactly right.

To these popular objections were added those of scholars like Dr. Gell, who conceived that the translation had been biased by sectarian influences. Critics of a far higher class, like the learned Selden, while warmly approving it as a decided advance on previous popular versions, objected both to its style, as rather "a translation into English words than English phrase," and to the too frequent inaccuracy of its renderings. Whitelocke says of him, when sitting with the Westminster Assembly of Divines: "Sometimes when they had cited a text of Scripture to prove their assertions, Selden would tell them, 'perhaps in your little pocket Bibles with gilt leaves, (which they would often pull out and read,) the translation may be thus; but the Greek and Hebrew signify thus and thus; and so would totally silence them.'"

Our readers will perceive that the friends of a revision of the Authorized Version are not without reasons for wishing a new version of the sacred volume. Although we should be sorry to weaken an enlightened confidence in our Common English Bible, yet we should be unwilling to encourage a superstitious dependence on any translation as being equal to the Divine original.

If any of our readers desire to pursue the subject they may find great help in doing so by consulting "the History of English Bible Translation, by H. C. Conant," in which is also given a list of other works on the subject.

Prohibition.

Mr. C. Robson, in a letter to the *Abolitionist* of the 16th inst., deprecates the decision of the Grand Division of the Sons of Temperance to ask the Legislature to submit the Prohibitory Liquor Law to the people at the next General Election.

He says:—

"If the voters at our Elections belonged exclusively to the intelligent and reflecting part of our population we might refer the question to them without any anxiety. But the elective franchise has been given to another and possibly as large a class, who are quite incapable either of understanding or of appreciating a great moral principle such as that involved in Prohibition. On the passions and prejudices of this class Rumsellers well know how to operate, and to a man they will be brought to the hustings against us. Everything seems to indicate, also, that the next General Election will occasion intense excitement, and that party feeling will rise to a higher pitch than it has ever yet attained. Experience has taught us the melancholy fact that in a multitude of instances the Temperance principle is too feeble to resist the swelling tide of political animosity and party strife; and we have reason to fear that now, as formerly, many of our friends will be regardless of their duty as friends of Total Abstinence."

Mr. R. mentions several counties and thinks all, even Colchester, will fail to affirm such a law.

We think there is great probability of such result being experienced if the vote is taken at the same time as that for the election of Representatives for the Legislature. A Temperance man would be unable to stand against the combined influence of Rum and his political opponent, if both unite against him, and Temperance men divide their votes between the two parties, as they commonly do. If, however, the Ballot, or open vote, as the