

to the glad tidings. We are gratified to learn that the Academy has been engaged, at an expense of \$150 a night, until June next. It is a noble building and can be put to no more noble use. We hope measures will also be taken to continue the services in Chatham street. If the mountain will not come to Mahomet let Mahomet go to the mountain, and if, through pride or prejudice or ignorance, men will not attend church, take the services of the church and the influence of the church, where it can scarcely fail to reach them.

The theatre in Chatham street was well filled last Sabbath evening by a much more orderly audience than the one which greeted Dr. Hiscox, on the first night of his appearance. His sermon was from the text, "Thanks be to God for His unspeakable gift." The boxes contained a well dressed and respectable company of ladies and gentlemen. The second and third tiers were occupied by young men who paid strict attention to the discourse, and the pit was crowded with dirty boys, from six to twelve years ago, who required the aid of policemen with rattans to keep them in order, though there was a marked improvement in their behaviour. A daily paper says:

"The meeting was, on the whole, very correct, excepting the pit, where the constant effort to preserve order, and the occasional taking of a boy by the ear, did not promote devotional feelings, at least among the youthful portion of the congregation. The concluding hymn was well sung, most of the audience joining. When the benediction had been pronounced the boys rushed for the door, as they had been accustomed to do when the curtain falls on the last act."

For the Christian Messenger.

**Bible Translation by the British and Foreign Bible Society.**

DEAR BROTHER,

I beg permission to point out what appears to me to be a slight inaccuracy in your remarks upon the "Report of the Micmac Mission" in your last number. It has reference to the principle of Translation adopted by the British and Foreign Bible Society. You say: "After all the scrupulous adherence of the British and Foreign Bible Society to the English Version, as their standard, they shew by their adopting this translation, that although the bodies they represent, object to a revision for the English reader, yet they, nevertheless, by sanctioning this version of the Psalms for the Indians, renounce that principle, or at least make an exception to it in this instance."

What do you mean by "the bodies they represent"? The B. and F. B. S. is, I always supposed, one body, but composed of individuals belonging to a number of "bodies," one of which is the "Baptist body." There are plenty of Baptists in England and these Provinces who patronize it.

But let that pass. Your remarks are calculated to make the impression that the "English version" is adopted by that Society as the standard of all their translations into Foreign Tongues, to such an extent that the new versions must in all things conform to it. This is certainly a mistake. I have not the documents at hand, but they can easily be obtained. The "principle" was from the first,—that is, from the time the Society withdrew its aid from the Baptist versions, modified by a qualifying clause, to this effect,—"at least so far as that all the different denominations united in this Society can make use of them." The Greek word *Baptizo* covered, I apprehend, about all the ground. At all events, I have always taken this view of the case. I have been engaged for the last seven years in preparing translations for the B. and F. B. S., and I never heard of any such sweeping principle as that which you appear to me to lay down for them. In preparing my translations I have used a great many different versions, in several languages, the most of which were published by the B. and F. B. S., and not one of them conforms in all things to the English version. I cannot perceive how the "principle" of objecting to a Revision of the English Scriptures "is either renounced" or an "exception" made to it, by publishing the very best versions they can obtain in other languages. Pray what relation is there between the two ideas? The money paid into the Funds of the B. and F. B. S., is paid, not for the purpose of revising the English Scriptures, nor for revising any Scriptures, nor for making translations at all. Their "Principle" is, to publish, not to prepare. Not one penny from them could we obtain towards preparing our manuscripts. That, they told us, is "Missionary" work. When the manuscript is all ready for the press, and passed over to them, they examine it. If they approve of the work, they publish it. Of course there was no means of examining the Micmac translation except that of cross-examining the translator. The question, "does it agree with the English Authorized Version?" was not put. But I having stated that it varied from the English Version in some instances, they then said, "Tell us where and why?" The manuscript when put into their hands, is theirs, and published on their own responsibility. Hence the call for care and caution.

I beg to state in this connexion that no restraint has ever been laid upon me as a translator, either by the B. and F. B. S. or by the Committee of the Micmac Mission. I could never submit to be trammelled in a matter of so much importance and responsibility. From the commencement I

protested against any interference of that kind. I would neither allow Baptists nor Pedobaptists, nor any one else, to stand over me with a club, and say, "You shall translate thus or so, whether you deem it correct or not." I always said, "I will do my best, but I must do it according to my own judgment, not yours." But to others would pertain the work of publishing. I always agreed to work for the M. Mission in translating, with the understanding that if they chose to alter my work in any respect, they were welcome to do it, provided always that they did so upon their own responsibility. The translators employed by the Bible Union enter into just such an agreement. The work as it comes from the Translators' hands, is to be "altered and amended" by his employers, and published under their supervision, and upon their responsibility, not upon his. The translator is, of course, at liberty to translate the word *baptizo*, by "immersion or dip," if he deems this correct. The "Committee of Final Revision" may, if they think proper, put in the good old word "baptize." I, for one, hope they will. That, however, is their business, not mine. I believe that to be the best word in English, and *baptisa-vaahdega*—corresponding to it, to be the best word in Micmac. Providentially, I am not the Pope of Rome, otherwise I would be bound to be infallibly right, and not mistake myself, and to make every body else so. As the case is, I am at liberty to be mistaken, and to confess that I may be; and can allow others to be in error, without molestation. Happy is the man that condemneth not himself in the thing which he alloweth.

Yours truly,  
S. T. RAND.

Halifax, Jan. 8, 1859.

**Christian Messenger.**

HALIFAX, JANUARY 12, 1859.

Amid the vast and complicated relations that exist among the great families of civilized man, although peace to a great extent prevails in almost every part of the earth, yet it is seldom that many months transpire without the prevalence of threatening rumours of wars and commotions. So it is at the present conjuncture in Continental Europe. France, Austria, and Sardinia are apparently in pursuit of individual interests which cannot be obtained without serious collisions, in which all Europe would probably be involved.

The small French army quartered in Rome, is becoming a source of serious trouble, not only to the Papal Government, with whom they are on the worst of terms, but to the French Emperor himself, on account of the concessions and sacrifices he is compelled to make to the Ultramontane party of the Romish Priesthood. There can be no doubt that the withdrawal of the French troops from Rome, unless immediately replaced by an equal Austrian force, would be the signal for a revolt against the Papal authority.

Throughout Italy it is evident that the most intense discontent reigns as regards the present state of things. This we believe to be true both as to religious and political matters. Indeed it is confidently asserted that a large and increasing party among the lower classes of the population throughout Italy, are forming small religious societies, in which the Scriptures are freely read and commented on, and the legitimate consequences are beginning, it is said, to be developed in the conversion of many to a sound Scriptural faith.

An extensive movement in the right direction in the Established Church in England, is beginning to take place, in the efforts to bring the Gospel home to the working classes, as well as to the poorer and more destitute orders of society. The Bishop of London has placed himself at the head of this movement, and his example is being followed by many of the most pious and gifted of the Episcopal ministry.

It is gratifying to find that vigorous efforts are being made by almost every evangelical body in England, to attempt a supply, as far possible, of the vast field now opened in India, China, and Japan to the preaching of the Gospel. The demand for such labour is far beyond what any one can hope speedily to supply. It is, however, a sign of the times which calls for devout gratitude to God, and will doubtless call forth a large measure of the zeal of his people to meet the emergency.

**The Rev. Mr. Rand's Letter.**

We are not disposed to enter fully into the question which the letter from Rev. Mr. Rand, in another column, opens up. Our own time and space, and our readers' patience alike forbid more than a glance at the difficulties which have been experienced in the matter of obtaining pure translations of the Word of God.

The painful position in which the Baptist denomination in England were placed in their connection with the British and Foreign Bible Society, from 1833 to 1840, because they maintained the principle of the translator's independence, is too well remembered

by those conversant with that controversy to desire a repetition. The injury, we consider, the cause of pure translations then received from those who had till then been its friends, we are not desirous of again reviving. A full review would, however, fully substantiate all that we have said on the subject.

Mr. Rand endeavours to give the B. and F. B. Society a character to which, we believe, they have never laid claim—"publishing the very best versions they can obtain in other languages." He is quite aware, we suppose, that if they have not used the very words he quotes from our editorial of last week in their Constitution, the very first article of that Constitution states that—"the only copies (of the Scriptures) in the languages of the United Kingdom to be circulated by the Society, shall be the Authorized Version." This, of course, does not, in so many words, commit the Society to that version as a standard for other translations, but as no other is recognized, and as a resolution, adopted by the Committee on July 1, 1833, requires translators to render certain Greek terms, "either according to the principle adopted by the translators of the Authorized Version by a word derived from the original, or by such terms as may be considered unobjectionable by other denominations," we think it is fair to conclude that that is held generally by them as the rule by which to judge other translations. Mr. R. probably knows that translations which they had previously pronounced "the very best versions they could obtain," the Committee have refused to continue publishing, because the translators would not alter certain terms and substitute for them words having the ambiguity of a foreign tongue, and by that means make them conform, in that respect, to the Authorized Version—a version of which the Committee themselves said, in their Annual Report for 1839, page 121,—"Errors are to be found in it which the humblest scholar could not only point out, but correct. Errors, too, there are, which obscure the sense in some important instances." The terms to which allusion is here made, the translators or revisors of the Authorized Version had been compelled, by the Royal Mandate of a semi-popish Sovereign, to transfer from the Greek and not translate into English.

Mr. Rand has fallen into the mistake so common now-a-days of saying, "all the different denominations," whereas he should have said what the Committee themselves said, "the other denominations," (viz., besides Baptists.)

As regards the opinion Mr. R. expresses, that "the word *baptizo* covers about all the ground," we may reply that the smallest interference with a translator's independence is the same in principle as if he were bound in the most abject slavery—the ancient Christians might have saved themselves from martyrdom by casting a little salt upon the pagan altars. Many of the noble army of Christian martyrs in Roman Catholic fires might have saved their lives by merely kissing the crucifix. Would Mr. Rand like to hear it said of them that a little salt or kissing the crucifix "covered about all the ground?"

The versions mentioned by Mr. R., as in his possession, published by the B. and F. B. Society, and yet differing from the Authorized Version, were probably published before the obnoxious rule was laid down, and at a time when the translations by Baptist missionaries were received as readily as those by Pedobaptists; or if not, we do not conceive that that circumstance is any evidence against the English Version being a standard, just because they do not coincide with it in every particular.

We are glad to find that Mr. Rand has had so much freedom accorded to him in preparing the Word of Life for our aboriginal neighbours. If, however, the Society had returned the Mic-mac translation, and declined publishing it because he had refused to modify any of the "nearly a hundred passages," in which "his version varied" "from the Authorized English Version," notwithstanding they had previously accepted similar translations by him, they would then have treated him as they did the Baptists in India, and would have sought to interfere with his independence as effectually as they would have done by "standing over him with a club" and saying—"you shall translate thus or so, whether you deem it correct or not."

We agree with Mr. Rand that the word *baptizo* is perhaps the best word to use in the English Version for *baptizo*. It is now sufficiently Anglicised for that purpose, seeing that we have lexicons and means of learning the true meaning of that word, in addition to the opinions of learned Christian men in various different denominations, who all agree as to its true interpretation; without one of a contrary nature, by any scholar whose reputation entitles him to respect. But let Mr. Rand attempt to give the Mic-macs a pure Mic-mac version of the whole new Testament, or a translation in any other foreign language

without any Greek words transferred, and he would soon find it is not sufficiently near to the authorized English as a standard to be published by them.

We have no desire, however, to call up any other feelings towards the British and Foreign Bible Society, than those of active co-operation. We gladly act with that body in the matter of Home operations, in common with our brethren in Great Britain and other parts of the world, as we find that facilities are afforded by that society for extending the circulation of God's Word in the English language which cannot be obtained in connection with any other body, but in doing so we do not endorse their foreign policy, any more than we do the efforts they employed to keep up the monopoly in Bible Printing, against the successful labours of Dr. Campbell and others, to whom belong the credit of destroying it, and thereby greatly reducing the price of Bibles.

To the Editor of the Christian Messenger.

Mr. Editor.—The *Presbyterian Witness* is striving hard to make political capital out of the Protestant Alliance (so called.) If the Baptists and Roman Catholics should enter upon a controversy about baptism, and the Catholics should maintain that infants are fit and proper subjects for baptism and church membership; and sprinkling the only mode of baptism; Which side do you think the *Witness* would take? Just ask him. Baptists would like to know whose ally he and his party would be.

Yours truly,  
JONAS GRUFF.

In reference to the above we can only say, that we cannot imagine that there would be any difference of opinion between our amiable contemporary and Roman Catholics, except that the latter would at once own that no authority could be obtained for the practice of infant baptism from the Bible, but that they derived their authority wholly from the decrees of the church, whilst our neighbour, not quite prepared to admit, like his Roman Catholic Pedobaptist brethren, that baptism washes away the stains of sin, or that putting of salt in the mouth, or making the sign of the cross on the forehead, breast, &c., of the child, or touching the nostrils and ears with spittle, are necessary for its due performance, would, nevertheless, try in vain to make it appear that the unconscious one was by baptism put into some sort of connection with the church. What that connection is, however, has not yet been satisfactorily determined, there being on that subject so many different opinions.

In the case of the Jewish boy Mortara, who was taken from his parents recently by the Roman Catholic authorities, which circumstance has caused so much disturbance in Europe, we see the legitimate fruits of infant sprinkling and membership.

In one case the religious liberty of the child is interfered with by his being, often unwillingly, made a member of the church, and in the other by both parent and child being deprived of that liberty, notwithstanding that emperors and kings remonstrate against it. This we look upon as one of the bitter fruits of leaving the plain dictates of God's Word. All who sanction this in religious matters must not be surprised when they see such consequences follow from their own practices.

The bitterness of the Protestant Alliance and the wish openly professed by many of its members to deprive Catholics of civil rights, we look upon as simply the result of a spirit of partizanship and rivalry amongst different sects of Pedobaptists.

It is intimated by some of our contemporaries that an Alliance of Catholics is shortly to be formed, to oppose the operations of the Protestant Alliance, whether for a religious or political object we are not informed,—probably both, like its opponent. Strife will doubtless, be the result of such combinations. Our Protestantism we conceive worth but little, if it consists merely in uniting with certain turbulent spirits in a crusade against Romanists. If a war of extermination is initiated on one side, we must not be surprised if the challenge is taken up and pursued by the other.

Our Protestantism, we hope, has a higher object and a broader basis.

We desire the conversion, and not the destruction, of both Catholics and Protestants, and demand for them an open Bible, and an appeal to it for authority in Christian doctrines ordinances and practices. Anything short of this, by whatever name it is called, we think but a poor apology for Protestantism.

The Editor and Proprietor of the *St. John Religious Intelligencer*, in an article on the position of that paper, says:—

The history of the "Intelligencer" during the six years of its existence, if written out, would be an interesting record, and might be of use to persons hereafter engaging in similar enterprises. For ourselves we are conscious of making one serious mistake, and that was in transferring the proprietorship of this paper to