

more freedom than the religion in which I had been educated would allow. Its rules were stringent and galling to my passions, and the thought of unbridled liberty was pleasing. I knew full well that Universalism could not be proved from the Bible; but I wished it true; all my animism coincided with it; I felt vexed that the Bible did not support it. The struggle was severe between my unrenowned heart and the Scripture truths which had been lodged in my understanding. I was rebellious against God for revealing what stood in the way of my embracing this easier system of belief. And yet no one knew my inward conflict. Openly I defended the evangelical faith; secretly I hated it, and wished it could be proved to be false.

At length I became more calmly reflective, and wholly by myself I wrought out a few conclusions:

1. The reasons why I wished Universalism to be true showed that, if believed, it would not make me a better man. More license to sin would injure rather than benefit me.

2. My believing it would not make it true. It must be true, if at all, independent of human belief. Though I might accept it, yet it might be false in the sight of God. I knew it was unscriptural.

3. Should it prove true, and the Bible false, then I should forever be safe.

4. Should it prove false, and the Bible true, then, as a Universalist, I should be an eternal loser.

By such reasonings I was held back from the peril to which I was exposed. Not long after this train of reflections, which had been my safeguard, issued in deeper inquiries in regard to my state and prospects, and I found more than an evangelical creed—a heart-faith that has never since been jostled by any assault of error. That mental process in early youth was unquestionably under the direction of the Holy Spirit. Everlasting thanks to God for parents who charged my young mind, not with interpretations, but with the very words of the Book of God.

—W. & R. PROVERBS 29: 27

For the Christian Messenger.

Native Preachers in Burmah.

The following note received by Rev. Dr. Tupper, Secretary of the Foreign Missionary Board, is forwarded to us for publication:

Dear Brother Tupper,
I am happy to have it in my power to respond to your request in the *Christian Messenger* of the 7th inst. You may calculate on receiving at least £4 Island currency from the small church here for the Burman Mission for the ensuing year, whether those brethren to whom you referred will be employed or not. The thought of doing a little for the mission was suggested by reading the communication to which you referred; and to make our late Thanksgiving Day a practical one, those of us who were then present subscribed that small sum, which is agreed to be paid next May, or sooner if necessary.

Yours with respect,
SAMUEL McLEOD.
Uigg, P. E. I., Dec. 16th, 1864.

Christian Messenger.

HALIFAX, JANUARY 4, 1865.

THE NEW YEAR

is surrounded with all that is buoyant and hopeful. The fact that another of Time's cycles has been completed, and a start been taken on a fresh period, is calculated to excite feelings of anticipation and enquiry. Whilst we take a review of events of past years, we more anxiously look forward for the developments which the present may make. A knowledge of history will help us to form opinions as to what those developments may possibly be. Beyond this all is unknown. This should be a source of thankfulness. Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof. Each of our readers will be speculating on what the days and months of this year may bear to them, of weal or woe, and will be planning to make the most of whatever opportunities may arise to their advantage.

We may safely predict that no previous year has been so important, to the several countries of this continent, as that of 1865. We are on the eve of great changes in our social relationships. It is vain for us to wish to avoid them, but it will be for us to use whatever of influence we have in endeavoring to make them changes for the better to all concerned.

The people of this province have a glorious inheritance, all the advantages of British freedom and connection are theirs without its burdens or religious restrictions. We may well offer thanks to Almighty

God, and seek to appreciate more fully, and guard more carefully, what our forefathers have had to purchase by fine, imprisonment and death. We have not to go into the wilderness to seek for freedom to worship God. With an open Bible and its attendant privileges we have no small amount of responsibility resting upon us. Let us arise to a full realization of our position.

The Christian Churches of this province, need fear no danger from enemies without; whatever of danger may exist it must come from within. Absence of love to God is perhaps the great source, but there are two or three subordinate sources from which evils commonly flow, 1. a deficiency of love and union in the church; 2. a want of zeal in carrying out enterprises of benevolence, for the good of men generally; and 3. neglect to sustain institutions established by the piety and self-denial of our predecessors with regard to the rising ministry. Either of these will produce weakness and ultimately effect decay and destruction. Men are dying; they pass away, but the institutions of the church are to survive them, and we should be concerned for the honor of Christ, and the welfare of this world after we are taken away from its active duties and joys.

The mission of Baptists is to contend for the spirituality of Christianity, by demanding personal experience of religion before membership,—that Christian churches shall be composed of christians. If, therefore, there be any lack of this element—spirituality—amongst them, their testimony for the truth is weakened, and they are shorn of their strength. On this point it becomes all Christian professors to make serious and faithful examination. With this done and diligent attention to our relative duties, we may be blessed with more of Divine favor than heretofore. We trust that such may be the general experience, and that thus this may become to all our readers, of every name, a Happy New Year.

CONFEDERATION MEETINGS.

The question of Confederation is now fairly afloat, and commanding an increased amount of attention every day. Finding it to be something more than a speculative theory our people have taken it up with the earnestness it demands. Meetings are being held in city and country for the purpose of obtaining information, discussing its merits, and developing the objections some parties entertain to the Scheme prepared by the Quebec Convention.

Public meetings were held on Friday and Saturday evenings in Temperance Hall, at which the friends and opponents of a Union of the Colonies entered into a full and free discussion of the subject.

On Friday it was agreed that each speaker should be limited to half-an-hour, and that the speakers *pro* and *con* should be allowed alternately to address the meeting. The following are the names of the gentlemen who spoke, and the order in which the addresses were delivered:

- | | |
|---------------------------|-----------------|
| For. | Against. |
| Hon. J. McCully, | E. M. McDonald, |
| Benj. Wier, | Alderman Tobin, |
| John Tobin, M. P. P., | E. M. McDonald, |
| A. G. Archibald, M. P. P. | |

There was not a very close adherence to the time named. The latter gentlemen continued to speak till near midnight when the meeting was adjourned to Saturday evening at 7 o'clock.

On Saturday, although the night was unfavorable and a very inconvenient one for many, the last evening of the year—yet the Hall was again crowded in every part. The speakers at this meeting were—

- | | |
|-------------|------------------|
| Against. | For. |
| W. Stairs, | Peter Lynch, |
| W. Annsand, | Hon. Dr. Tupper, |
| A. Jones, | |

The meeting was continued to about 11 o'clock.

The speakers opposed to the scheme did not all object to any Union with Canada. Some of them would prefer a union with the Lower Provinces at first, and at some future time, seek a combination with the greater country.

It would be absolutely impossible for us to give anything like a full summary of what was said. The principal objections offered were that the benefits which it is supposed would flow from Confederation, might be obtained by us without the expense of such a combination; and without giving up our present separate position and relation to the mother country; that but little reliance can be placed in the Canadian politicians, judging from past experience; that they wish for the Union to enable them to find an outlet to the Ocean on British territory; and that they

would build their portion of the Intercolonial Railway if Nova Scotia and New Brunswick would finish the distance between Truro and Moncton. The subject of the tariff and how a Union would affect the duties to be levied on imports, occupied a very considerable part of the speeches. Those opposed to a union contending that a much larger amount would be demanded for purposes of government, and that there would be a necessity for raising our tariff to rates far higher than they are at present to bring them up to those of Canada.

It was shown by the advocates of Federation, that the Tariff of Canada comprehended a smaller number of articles than either that of New Brunswick or Nova Scotia, and that while the ad valorem duties of the two latter provinces were below those of Canada, yet there were a larger number of articles admitted into Canada free of duty than into either of the lower provinces, and taking the whole of the imports into Canada, the amount of duties levied upon them was less than in either Nova Scotia or New Brunswick. Several articles were mentioned which pay duties here that go into Canada without any duties. It appears, too, that New Brunswick pays heavier duties on imports, as a whole, than either Nova Scotia or Canada.

The debt of Canada was also examined, and it was shown that the amount was smaller per head than in either of the provinces.

Respecting the Intercolonial Railroad, the lower provinces have already offered to pay at the rate of \$2.60 per head, whereas it is now offered with all the advantages of free trade, unrestricted intercourse, and full participation in the government of all British America for an expenditure of \$2.25 per head. By this great work being completed a large increase of population might be anticipated, and then Montreal and Ottawa would be as near to Halifax, in point of time or the expense of reaching them, as the extremities of this province are at present.

In reply to the objection raised by Mr. Power, that the commercial and other interests were not represented in the N. S. delegation, the Hon. Provincial Secretary stated that the invitation had been first given to the Hon. Mr. Howe, J. H. Anderson, M. L. C., and John Locke, M. P. P., who had each declined. He also announced that on the 9th of February the Legislature would be called together, and have this question submitted to them. He believed that they have the right to deal with it, and the idea throws out that it should be submitted to the polls was altogether an English and unnecessary. He quoted from public documents to show that a Union of the provinces had been contemplated ever since Lord Durham came out from England for the purpose of preparing a Constitution for the American Colonies.

The cost of military and naval defences was exhibited by the opponents of the Scheme, and the security of Nova Scotia especially of Halifax, in case of hostilities with neighbors, but it was also shown that there was no desire on the part of the British Nation to withdraw protection from British America. The probability was that there would be a greater readiness to afford naval and military defence to the Confederated Provinces than to them in their separate form.

The speeches of Mr. Archibald and the Hon. Provincial Secretary were perhaps the most masterly efforts that either of those gentlemen ever made, at least, out of parliament.

THE ENGLISH NEW TESTAMENT, AS REVISED BY THE FINAL COMMITTEE OF THE AMERICAN BIBLE UNION.

A vast amount of criticism has been expended by the opponents of Bible Revision on the operations of the Bible Union, many of them calling it a Baptist movement, &c., for the purpose of creating prejudice against it. Nothing could be more absurd—the very term *baptize* is ignored by the revisors.

At length the New Testament is published. The value of the labor expended upon it may be estimated variously by different persons who will now be able to examine this new edition of the Testament of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

A circular just issued by the Bible Union states that:

"This work has engaged the talents of many of the best biblical scholars in Europe and America. Many years have been consumed in its preparation. All the most ancient manuscripts have been consulted. A select library, containing many thousands of volumes, has been collected. The works of the best living biblical critics in the world have been secured and carefully examined, and no possible means have been neglected which might contribute to render this revision of the New Testament faithful to the original, and clear in its utterances to men.

The cost has been very great. It has all been cheerfully met by the free-will offerings of the friends of the Bible; and now, in their behalf, it is offered to the world at the mere cost of the paper, printing, and binding. It makes a beautiful duodecimo volume of 766 pages."

A note from the Rev. C. A. Buckbee, dated

New York, Dec. 2nd, informs us that "the demand for the Revised New Testament has kept one press, and part of the time, two presses, running for nearly five weeks, and still the advance orders are not filled. In two weeks the superior styles of bindings will be ready."

Amongst the objections urged against the Revised Text, perhaps none are so common as that against the use of the word "immerse," in some passages where the authorised version has "baptize," "wash," &c. This has aroused the hostility of many who appear afraid of the consequences of a revision of the Bible. A case of the latter occurs in Mark vii. 1, 5, which is made the occasion of remark in a New York pedobaptist paper. The writer of the article says, sneeringly:—"According to the New translation, the Jews immersed themselves every time they ate after coming home from the market." The passage reads as follows:

"And there came together to him the Pharisees and certain of the Scribes, who came from Jerusalem. And when they saw some of the disciples eating bread with defiled (that is, unwashed) hands, they found fault. For the Pharisees, and all the Jews, except they carefully wash their hands, do not eat, holding the tradition of the elders. And coming from the market, except they immerse themselves, they do not eat. And there are many other things which they have received to hold, immersions of cups and pots, and brazen vessels and couches." Mark 7: 1-5.

The above objection would mislead only the uninformed, as it is well known that the word rendered "wash" in the 4th verse in the common version, is a different word from that translated "wash" in the 3rd. Barnes in his Notes on the passage, recognizes this difference, and says, "Except they wash. In the original, 'Except they baptize.' In this place it does not mean to immerse the whole body, but the hands only." But in his Notes on the 3rd verse where it is translated "Except they wash their hands off." He says:—"Some have said that it ('off') means 'up to the wrist.'" "Others have said 'up to the elbow.'"

Ripley, however, in his Notes on the Gospels, makes it very plain and striking, as follows:—

"Except they wash. The original word, here rendered wash, is a different one from the word thus rendered in the preceding verse. It is the word which is usually rendered baptize, and which differs from the word used in the preceding verse, by distinctly conveying the notion of a copious use of water. The evangelist had a particular design in using here a word different from the one which he had employed in the preceding verse; because here he was stating a different case from the one there mentioned. The Jews were so scrupulous in regard to outward defilement, that, as Mark states they would not partake of food without first washing their hands, even if they had not been away from home nor among any but well-known friends, lest there might have come upon their hands, ignorantly to themselves, something that would make their food polluted; for their food was taken up in their fingers in order to be conveyed to the mouth. But if they had gone to the market-place, where they would be exposed to all sorts of men and of things, then, having returned home, they would not eat without a more thorough application of water, namely, either a bathing of their whole persons, or a dipping of their hands into water, so as to be sure that water had covered every part which had been exposed to any impurity. An attention to these different practices, and to the precise meaning of the different words used in the original, sheds light on this passage, and shows that what Mark has said in the fourth verse, is not a mere repetition of what he had said in the third verse. The different circumstances in which a person had been, a little while before taking food rendered it necessary, in order to satisfy his scruples of conscience, to use water in different ways; sometimes a partial use would suffice, but at other times a more serious and thorough use of the purifying element was demanded. Though it is not certain, that on returning from market, the Jews always bathed their whole person, yet learned authorities clearly show that there were among the Jews two methods of applying water for ceremonial purifying. These two methods may be expressed by calling the one a washing of the hands, by pouring water on the whole, and the other, an immersing, either of the whole person, or of the hands, in water.

In the light of these commentators the revisors do not appear to have done more than give us the sense of the original; and that is all that is wanted by honest men.

Many persons, even Baptists, take objection to a change of the word *baptize*, believing it to be, at the present day, as fully an English term as immerse. We shall not now go into that question. The passages as translated may be now read and compared with the authorized version, and we do not apprehend that any damage will arise to the cause of truth from this Revision, but, on the other hand, we believe that the rendering of the text will throw light on a great number of passages, to the common reader.

The copies we have seen are of the "Thirtieth thousand."