

Correspondence.

For the Christian Messenger.

Ordination at Chegoggin, Yarmouth.

Pursuant to a call from the Chegoggin Baptist Church, an Ecclesiastical Council met at their house of worship, Dec. 10th, to consider the propriety of ordaining Bro. O. E. Cox, A. B., to the work of the ministry. Rev. Aaron Cogswell was chosen Moderator, and Bro. Trask, Clerk. After listening to the candidate's Christian Experience, call to the Ministry and views of Christian doctrine, the Council voted unanimously to proceed to ordination.

Reading Scriptures, by Dr. Day, of St. John. Prayer and Sermon, by Rev. G. D. Cox, of Clementsport.

Examination of Candidate, by Rev. Aaron Cogswell, of Beaver River.

Ordaining Prayer, by Rev. Mr. Normandy, of Tusket.

Hand of Fellowship and Charge to Candidate, by Rev. R. R. Philp, of Hebron.

Charge to the Church, by Rev. W. L. Parker, of Argyle.

Prayer and Benediction by the Candidate. Bro. Cox has secured the strong attachment of the people where he is settled, and we hope his labours will be crowned with great success.—Communicated by G. E. D.

(Christian Visitor, please copy.)

For the Christian Messenger.

"Blessed" and "Happy."

Dear Brother,—

The paper inserted in yours of the 4th inst., evidently from the pen of Dr. Wyckoff, may be supplemented by a few additional remarks.

The distinction drawn by Dr. W. is undoubtedly correct. *Makarios* refers to the character and state of the individual, in himself considered; *eulogeo*, in its various forms, to that character and state as under the influence of divine favour; the former describes the man as happy, the latter, as blessed by God.

As a general rule, the words of the original should always be expressed by the same words in the translation. Diversity leads to confusion, and misleads the mere English reader. I say "always," because, if any exceptions be allowed, for the sake of avoiding tautology, they are so few that the argument is not affected by them.

*Makar*, the primary form of *makarios*, is constantly used by Homer in connection with the state of the heathen divinities, who are called "the blissful gods," on account of their being free from all the disturbing influences which cause sorrow on earth. It is also applied to the virtuous dead, who are cut of the reach of those influences, and are everlastingly happy.

The word *makarios* is found in the Septuagint forty times, and is uniformly the translation of the Hebrew word *ashray*, a plural noun, which may be properly translated, "Oh the blessedness!" Thus, Psalm, l. 1, ("Blessed is the man," &c.), on which Dr. Alexander remarks, "The description opens with a kind of admiring exclamation—Oh the blessedness of the man!" The plural form may denote fullness and variety of happiness, as it he had said, "How completely happy is the man." The vulgar Latin always translates this word by "*beatus*," which signifies "happy," "*prosperus*," "*fortunate*."

The verb *eulogeo* occurs in the Septuagint about two hundred and fifty times. It is the translation of the Hebrew word *barak*, and is rendered in the vulgar by *benedico*, to "bless."

The adjective *eulogetos* appears in the Septuagint thirty seven times. It represents the Hebrew participle *barook*. In the Vulgate, it is *benedictus*, "blessed."

It will be seen, therefore, that the distinction advocated in Dr. Wyckoff's paper is observed in the Septuagint and Vulgate. The words in question are never used interchangeably.

In Dr. Campbell's excellent translation of the Gospels (published in 1788) we find, in Matthew v. 3-11, "Happy are the poor in spirit," &c. The Doctor says, "I agree with those translators who choose generally to render *makarios*, 'happy,' *eulogetos* and *eulogemenos*, 'blessed.' The common version rarely makes a distinction."

Dr. Doddridge had translated in the same manner nearly fifty years before. His "Family Expositor" was published in 1739. In his note on Mat. v. 3, he observes—"I have used the word *happy* rather than *blessed*, as more exactly answering to *makarios*, as the other does to

*eulogemenos*; and I rather choose to render it thus because our Lord seems to intimate by it, not only that the dispositions here recommended would be the way to future blessedness, but that they would immediately be attended by the truest happiness and the most noble pleasures."

Mr. Wesley was of the same opinion, for he also uses the word *happy* in his translation (published in 1754), and speaks of "that happy religion which our Lord describes in the eight beatitudes" (Journal, vol. iii, p. 326.)

Calvin, in 1855, pursued the same course, both in his translation and in the exposition which follows, showing that our Lord "spoke to his disciples about true happiness."

The cause, is God's blessing; the effect, happiness. When God blesses a man he bestows favour on him, in the enjoyment of which he is holy and happy. When man blesses God, he praises and adores him, acknowledging him as the sole source of his bliss. God says, "I will bless thee, and make thy name great," &c. Man says, "I will bless the Lord at all times, his praise shall continually be in my mouth."

Yours truly,

J. M. CRAMP.

Acadia College, Dec. 20th, 1867.

For the Christian Messenger.

Terminal Examination of Horton Collegiate Academy.

The Examination of Horton Academy was held on Thursday and Friday the 19th and 20th inst.

The New School Act has secured already for Nova Scotia a degree of efficiency in the Common Schools which was never enjoyed in the past. This together with the free school in the village of Wolfville, had the effect of reducing the number in attendance at Horton Academy. But while it has decreased the numbers it has added to the efficiency. Hitherto the schools throughout the country have been so deficient in the scholarship of the teachers and in the standard of instruction, that it became necessary for parents to send their sons away from home at a very early age for tuition in the commonest branches of education, but now the necessity exists only for the highest branches. Those who attend Horton Academy in the future will be nearer a level in their attainments, thereby making it a High School or Academy in the truest sense of the term.—While we cannot fail to see progress in the common school department, we also see the beginning of a corresponding elevation in Horton Academy. Hitherto the teachers have been obliged to give so much of their time to the instruction of classes in the elementary branches, that they were not able to do full justice to the students engaged in the more advanced studies. From this obstruction the School Act has relieved them none too soon; and now Mr. Higgins and his coadjutors will be able to satisfy themselves, and do better justice to their students.

The necessity for such an Academy still exists, just as much as there has been in the past the necessity for such an Institution as Horton Academy has been. For many years to come no county will be able to afford a High School around which there will gather so much to stimulate and aid in the study of the higher branches as is already found in connexion with Horton Academy. Parents may be deceived in taking for granted that their sons will do as well at the Common Schools because the teachers may be men of scholarship. If their learning is all that is desirable they have not the time to give instruction in the higher branches. The literary surroundings of the Common Schools are very defective, and the classes will be necessarily small and inefficient. If there are lads throughout the country who have become familiar with the ordinary and staple studies of the Common School, to whom their parents can extend further advantages, let them not inflict the injustice upon their sons of keeping them revolving in the circle of the county school studies, having but little encouragement or advantage to make that progress which will fit them for future usefulness.

The classes in Horton Academy were examined in the usual studies of such an institution, and manifested an interest in their work which is essential to rapid and high attainment.

Messrs Higgins and Hill have evidently been working hard during the past term, and the result of their labors appeared in the Examination. The Academy still has a great mission to fulfil.

ONE OF THE EXAMINERS.

For the Christian Messenger.

"Chronicler's" defence, in reply to Rev. Charles Duff.

DEAR BROTHER,—

It is not flattering to discover that a writer in the *Presbyterian Witness* of Nov. 23d, has found it necessary to occupy two columns in "correcting some of the misstatements" of a single paragraph respecting religious affairs in Margaree, C. B., in a late communication of mine, in your paper, even though he "would charitably hope that our Brother made none of his misstatements intentionally." Such an exercise of Christian charity is doubtless proper, and I think not misplaced, and, unless I am mistaken, had he employed his powers in the same charitable spirit in endeavouring to understand my statements and reconcile them with facts, he, at least, might have materially economized the valuable space of your contemporary.

Permit me to endeavour to make this manifest, and to say that were I not to reply, I might well be accused of the cowardice of which it is already intimated I am chargeable.

(1.) His first criticism then is entirely gratuitous. It cannot be made to appear that "what is recorded in the extract" quoted, I represented as "the reflex influence" of the settlement and success of the Pastor of the Margaree Baptist Church. My statement was simply that this "reflex influence is manifest in the rallying of surrounding denominations." What is said in addition, was a record of facts, which he does not attempt to disprove or deny. And when he admits that "it is not impossible for one denomination to provoke another to love and good works," and, that the "interesting work which has been going on among the Congregationalists, no doubt, has been helped forward in some degree perhaps, by the direct and reflex influence of the neighboring Baptist Pastor," he acknowledges, though with reluctance, all I asserted. And in so saying, I intended not the slightest reflection, much less to charge with "crime." Nor did I represent the visits of Congregational ministers "as the straining of every nerve to reclaim ground well nigh lost, but simply as an instance and illustration of the effort used. And when I am asked whether the Baptists or Methodists "had gained the ground," I reply, are they the only antagonists of Congregationalism in Margaree? Or is it in no danger of or impervious to the attacks of Satan, sin and the world? Perhaps our brother will inform us on these points when he describes "the attempts that have been made to gain this ground." And when he complains that I have not recognized "the work of God" among them, he will please remember that I was writing to Baptists of Baptist progress, and as I do not expect him to do my work, so he is hardly justified in requiring, especially so imperfect a "Chronicler," to do his. In order, then, to make "misstatements" appear in this "extract," my "critic" has found it necessary to put a strained and false interpretation upon it, and even then to admit, confirm, and repeat its real statements.

(2.) I said that "no pains are spared to send among them the best men that can be obtained." My objector replies that "the men had been sent as they were available," which is scarcely a contradiction, and will not go far toward establishing the charge of "misstatements." But he also objects to the remark that they employ all possible means to propagate their peculiar views, urging, that in order to this, they must use "dishonorable, immoral, and unchristian means," as well as those which are laudable; and add, "we do not say that it is impossible" to point out one improper means." This admission, I confess, surprises me. I had formed a sufficiently high opinion of these men, to believe that for them to deliberately use such means even in promoting error, was simply impossible. If, however, he persists in maintaining that this is not the case, I am only compelled, though reluctantly, to retract clause "(2)," and humbly apologize for its statements.

(3.) He next takes exception to the expression "infant church membership," but immediately says, "we will allow our brother to have his own chosen designation of infant baptism," "we accept our friend's term," and asks "why not?" This is all very well, and when he intimates that church members and infants are not similarly blessed by our Lord, he admits even more than I asserted. But, not content with this, he gratuitously introduces a supposed Baptist religion, and then concludes, "we leave him to the consolation and glory of his own objection." To say the least, this seems a little disingenuous, and betrays a serious deficiency of material. Our brother voluntarily imposes upon himself the rigors of Egyptian servitude,

"there shall no straw be given you yet shall ye deliver the tale of bricks."

I observe that he does not venture to repeat his "arguments for the unscriptural subjects drawn from household baptisms" and, "else were your children unclean, but now are they holy." In lieu of these, he hints that in the fact that "Jesus received infants and blessed them," he finds a warrant for their baptism. But let me assure him, that to make this apparent, it must be established that he also baptized them.

The additional "misstatement" of this "extract" is the remark respecting their "substitution of sprinkling or pouring, for Bible baptism." Of course our friend argues that his mode is the Scriptural one, although he does not venture to the length of some of his Pseudo-Baptist brethren, and pronounce ours unscriptural. His position is exceedingly charitable and liberal. "It," he says, "after conscientious examination, a person or people believe that Christ teaches sprinkling, pouring upon, or plunging under, as baptism, let them act accordingly." From this position we cannot do otherwise than entirely dissent. Nowhere in the Scripture, are we taught that conscientiously believing a thing to be right, renders it so. Once admit this principle, and instead of being guided by the plain and infallible teaching of God's word, we are left with no higher standard of duty, than a thing as variable as the human face, and as much the creature of circumstances, and compelled to excuse and justify every form of error.

We do take the ground that "there can be but one Scriptural mode," and that our opponent's argument for pouring as that mode, is untenable. Allow me to give it in his own words, "Jesus, in baptizing, poured the Holy Ghost upon those whom he baptized," "by pouring water upon candidates in baptism, there is an agreement between the blood, the Spirit, and the water, (1 John v. 8.) as they are all, in that case, poured out, or shed forth." And, to my intimation "that the use of the word baptize, (Matt. iii. 11), as applied to the outpouring of the Spirit, is figurative," he cites me to the Universalist and Unitarian mode of interpretation, and bids me "take heed." In reply, I beg leave to ask my friend a question or two. Is not the language that John used in addressing the Pharisees and Sadducees, in Matt. iii, highly figurative? Or does he mean to say that they were literally "vipers," that literally the ax was laid unto the root of the tree, and that Jesus had a fan with which to purge his floor, and separate chaff from wheat literally, &c.? If he admits that these expressions are figurative, will he please turn to the passage and answer why the term "baptize with the Holy Ghost" alone should be interpreted literally, except for the purpose of establishing a dogma? If, however, he persists in so interpreting it, and can conceive of a literal baptism of the Spirit, then I demand of him to show me a literal baptism of fire performed by Jesus, for John declares in the same connection, "He shall baptize you with fire." And further, can my friend perceive the slightest resemblance, except in name, between the act of Jesus in pouring His Spirit upon His disciples in such measure that "it filled all the house," and they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and that of the Rev. Mr. Duff, in pouring a handful of water on the head of an unconscious or reluctant babe, following the action with, I suppose, "an holy kiss?" Then as respects the argument based upon the agreement between the three witnesses, (1 John v.) which has at least the merit of novelty—I should think originally.—I would like to inquire, does he really believe that the inspired writer, in that passage, intended to show the similarity of their application, or rather, the agreement of their testimony respecting Jesus? I read, "And there are three that bear witness in earth, the spirit, and the water, and the blood, and these three agree in one. (testimony undoubtedly). If we receive the witness of men (see John viii. 17. 2 Cor. xiii. 1. Heb. vi. 16), the witness of God is greater, for this is the witness of God which He has testified of His Son." And further, before he can use this as a proof-text, he must show that the "water" spoken of, is undoubtedly that of baptism. (See John's Gospel, xix. 34, 35.) As to Universalists and Unitarians, I have only to say that it is somewhat doubtful whether they would accept our friend as their exponent, and whether they would or not, their position has nothing to do with the case in hand. Much more might be said, but having gone over a large ground he has yet traversed, we will ask a question or two more, and await further developments. But one word is used in the original to describe the act of baptism, and that must be translated. Would our brother consent to have his favourite word "pour" used as that translation? If so, we would read, "I have a