

Correspondence.

For the Christian Messenger.

ONTARIO CORRESPONDENCE.

EDUCATIONAL:—TORONTO UNIVERSITY AND UNIVERSITY COLLEGE; UPPER CANADA COLLEGE VS. THE GRAMMAR SCHOOLS.

The intimate connection existing between the educational institutions of a country and its material and moral state and progress, is now so generally understood that no apology can be needed for an attempt to describe briefly the present condition of public education in Ontario. And at the outset I may observe that the whole system of Grammar and Common schools appears to be just now in a state of transition, I had almost said of chaos. Indeed the sweeping and almost radical changes proposed in some departments would almost justify the use of the latter term.

To begin at the beginning, I must needs say a word in regard to the Toronto University, and its College, which are of course at the head of the Educational institutions of the Province. Of these not only the Torontonians but also the people of Ontario generally, are justly proud. The University itself, it must be borne in mind, is not a teaching, but only an examining body. These two functions have been separate and distinct since 1853. The latter are discharged by what is called University College, Toronto, which has a staff of 9 or 10 professors. The lectures are delivered in the University buildings, which are very fine, situated in a beautiful park and approached through a delightful avenue. The annual income of University College and the University combined, reached a few years ago nearly \$55,000, and is, I presume, still increasing with the increase in value of the unsold portion of the magnificent Endowment. This Endowment consisted originally of 250,000 acres of land, of which portions to the value of about a million and a half of dollars had been sold several years since. I have not at hand statistics of the present state of the fund. As might be expected not only are the buildings, the grounds and the external arrangements generally both excellent and attractive, but the internal furnishing and apparatus are costly and magnificent. The library of the University and College consisted at the date of my statistics of 15,000 volumes, and has no doubt been largely increased since that time. The museum is very extensive and valuable containing seven or eight years ago nearly one hundred specimens of mammalia, nearly one thousand species of birds, large numbers of reptiles, fishes, crustacea, insects, mollusks, zoophytes, &c., &c. It also contains a large number of botanical specimens, and well furnished Geological and Mineralogical departments. With regard to the respective courses of instruction in Arts, Law and Medicine, only a glance at the published curriculum is necessary, to show that they are extensive and thorough. Probably the regular and honour courses in Arts, combined, embrace a wider range than that of any other institution upon this continent. I need scarcely add that my remarks at the commencement with regard to proposed and probable changes do not apply to this university. It is a fixed fact. Its Endowment is sufficient pledge of this.

Passing by, for the present at least, the numerous denominational colleges, we take a few steps downward and reach Upper Canada Colleges. The "Upper Canada College" question, can scarcely be altogether unheard of, even in Nova Scotia. It gave occasion for the appointment of a Parliamentary committee, during the last session of the Ontario Legislature. That committee has not yet finished its labours. May I take it for granted that your readers would like to know something of the dispute?

In the first place let us try to get a correct conception of the character of the College. Upper Canada College was founded in 1829, by Sir John Colborne, then Governor of the Province, at York, (now Toronto.) It was intended to supersede the Royal Grammar School, which was its predecessor. Sir John managed to obtain for it a grant of 66,000 acres of land, this being a portion of a grant of 500,000 acres originally set apart for Educational purposes, of which one half constituted the Endowment of Toronto University and the other half was set apart for grammar school purposes. The 66,000 acres in question came out of the latter half. In addition to the annual income derived from this source the institution has been largely aided from other sources, especially by Government grants and by loans, not yet repaid, from the University. Its annual expenditure is at present between \$15,000 and \$20,000. The chief aim and special work of this institution are, to

thoroughly prepare students for Matriculation in University College. It is modelled to a considerable extent after the high schools of England, such as Harrow and Eton and Rugby. Its students are classified in six forms corresponding to the six years of its course. As might be expected they carry off the lion's share of the scholarships and prizes from the University. This, no doubt, is one main cause of the present vigorous attack upon it. Neither grammar schools nor sectarian colleges can ever hope to compete successfully with it in this respect. That attack is mainly carried on by the grammar school masters of the Province. A pamphlet, ably written, though somewhat too violent and personal, has recently been published under the auspices of the "Grammar School Masters Association" of Ontario. This pamphlet, which is entitled "The Upper Canada College Question," has been widely circulated and has led to the appointment of the Parliamentary Committee above mentioned. The counts in the indictment against the College are numerous, such as that it takes its origin in an illegal diversion of a large portion of the Grammar School fund; that it has been badly conducted from the first, that it does only grammar school work, though at a vast expense; that it is local in its character and work, that its system of scholarships is unjust, as it draws students from grammar schools, and after retaining them for a timesends them up to the University and gains thereby the credit justly due to the grammar schools, &c.

Of course the friends of the institution are no less warm in its defence, claiming that it is now economically conducted whatever may have been its past history; that it does a work for high and thorough Classical Education which grammar schools cannot possibly do, and that to destroy it would be to destroy the only institution in the Dominion which really approximates in character and operation to the high schools of England and the *gymnasias* of Germany.

The feud rages hotly. Its issue I do not profess to predict accurately. I have no expectation that the movement will be successful in its main purpose, viz. the destruction of the institution, though it may lead to serious changes in its management which no doubt calls for improvement and retrenchment.

Meanwhile the grammar schools themselves are in their turn threatened and much more seriously threatened, with destruction. The new creation which is expected to arise from their ashes, I will, with your permission, attempt to describe in my next.

J. E. W.

For the Christian Messenger.

BAPTISM AND PARDON.

The great mass of professing christians maintain that Baptism regenerates. Many teach that it introduces its subjects to the blessings of the Covenant. Others hold views which, though expressed in different terms, and with various modifications, are nevertheless essentially the same. It is a peculiarity of the Baptists that they attach no such importance to the ordinance. While contending for implicit obedience to the command of Christ, they do, as earnestly protest against ascribing any mystical efficacy to the sacred rite. In its place, they believe that Baptism is a precious blessing; out of it, that becomes a curse. God has ordained that an abuse of His gifts shall bring its penalty upon those who pervert them.

Have we, however, authority to say that one may be saved without baptism? The question is frequently put in this form by those who hold the ordinance to be a condition of pardon. It we reply in the affirmative, do we not show that we lightly esteem the command of Christ? We certainly have need to beware lest we err on this point. But on the other hand, if we answer *no*, do we not virtually declare that baptism is essential to salvation, and therefore to the attainment of that "holiness without which no man shall see the Lord?" There is but one way by which forgiveness of sins may be secured. God cannot change to suit individual preferences, or special cases. By whatever way He saves one, by that He saves all. If He imposes certain conditions under which He will bestow His grace, He will not save on any other terms. "He is in one mind and who can turn him." If baptism and the Lord's Supper are appointed as media by which divine grace is communicated, without these ordinances the soul must remain in sin and condemnation. Such a doctrine is however plainly opposed to the teachings of the Word; that represents Christ as the only "Way," and is moreover contrary to evidence as furnished in the history of the church. Thousands have been saved, and thousands more are on the way to glory, who never surrendered their bodies to the

yielding wave in the name of the sacred Trinity. By their faith in God men and women found their way to heaven through all the periods of the Old Testament history, as is shown by the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews. Christ himself taught this to be the grand requirement of the gospel, and emphatically confirmed his teachings, on this point, in his dying hour, when he gave the assurance of pardon and future blessedness to the penitent believing thief on the cross beside him.

We would not dare to assure any of salvation, who are living in *willful* disobedience of one of the divine commands; yet we are required to teach men that their own obedience, or merit can avail them nothing, when, as suppliants, they are seeking mercy. We are to teach them that righteousness is imputed to them, not when they do, but when they believe. "He that believeth on him (Jesus) is not condemned." "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life." "He that heareth my word and believeth on Him that sent me hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation, but is passed from death unto life." What can be more clear or conclusive than these words of the "Great Teacher" himself? One without faith is under condemnation; with faith, the very moment he possesses it—he "has everlasting life;" he "is passed," or as it is expressed in the original, "has passed from death into life." We need not refer to the numerous other passages in which the same great truth is inculcated, and which forbid us making obedience to a duty, or submission to an ordinance a condition of pardon. The two pillars by which Romanism is supported, are sacramental efficacy, and human merit. Let us beware lest we have "fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness."

True "faith," as James expresses it, "if it hath not works, is dead, being alone;" but it is saving faith of which the Apostle treats, a faith that produces good works. Any other he condemns as worthless, as no better than the love that speaks kindly to the suffering, but sends them away unfed, and unclothed. The true believer seeks to know the will of the Lord, and by divine assistance, to obey every revealed command. He may fail in many respects, he doubtless will; but his failure will not imperil his soul, for, trusting in Jesus, he has "the righteousness which is of God by faith."

We have been led to this train of thought, by the following sentence, in connection with other statements of a similar nature contained in the writings that have recently come under our notice. "If baptism jointly with faith and repentance is for the remission of sins, as we un-*waveringly* believe it is, then we still steadily affirm that no unbaptized person has in this life the assurance that his sins are remitted."

From the sentiment indicated above we wholly dissent. The confession of the writer as to his own belief may be correct enough; but the dogma, so boldly proclaimed, is as false as any thing can well be; it is as much opposed to the truth as darkness is to light. Our churches receive for baptism and fellowship only those who profess faith in Christ, and who can speak of the hope they have that their sins are pardoned. The degree of confidence may vary, some may come tremblingly, while others have the joyful assurance; but in every case there is a profession of trust in the blood of Christ. Are all these deceived? Did peace come to their minds too soon, or in other words, was the peace they enjoyed previous to their baptism a delusion? If it was, we can only say, then was the assurance after their baptism a delusion too.

Dr. Chalmers writes in his journal:—

"I never had a more close, edifying, and satisfying faith in Christ than I had this day. O God may I hold fast my confidence and the rejoicing of my hope firm unto the end."

Dr. Watts sings in joyful strains,

"O the sweet wonders of that cross,
When God, the Saviour, loved and died;
Her noblest life my spirit draws
From his dear wounds and bleeding side."

J. B. Taylor gives expression to the following words:—

"Such a season of sweet submission of my will to the will of God was given that I wept, and cried, glory, glory, glory. This was as spontaneous as my breath. I was brought to see my utter helplessness as never before, and to throw myself on God who graciously received me, and afforded the communications of His love."

John Newton thus declares his trust on his dying bed:—

"Hereafter I hope, when I shut my eyes on things of time, I shall open them in a better world. What a thing it is to live under the shadow of the wings of the Almighty?"

Were these, and thousands of others, all deceived in the matter of their assurance, because they misunderstood the teachings of Scripture with reference to baptism? The idea is pro-

posterous. Of those who are holy in this life, it shall be said hereafter, "Let them be holy still." If we cannot find true servants of God outside the Baptist pale, they can be found no where in this world. We thank God that, though there are multitudes who despise the ordinance of christian baptism, there are nevertheless so many sincere followers of Jesus, whose pathway shines with heaven's own light.

The fear is entertained by some that if we teach that men may be saved without baptism, they will neglect this duty, and seek to satisfy their conscience with a human invention. We reply: If one does only what will be for his salvation, and not from the love he bears to Jesus, it is clear he misunderstands the Gospel, and is therefore unfitted for the ordinances. The rule laid down by Paul, Rom. vi. 15—17, will apply in this case also. We are not, however, under the necessity of saying to the people that they may be saved without baptism. We have first to seek to bring the sinner to Jesus, and then to urge his command, and require him by obedience to prove the genuineness of the faith he professes. But more hereafter.

A. B. C.

For the Christian Messenger.

REVISION OF THE ENGLISH SCRIPTURES.

No. 6.

The most prolific source of trouble to the ordinary reader, in the Common English Version, is the change, either partial or entire, which has taken place in the meaning of particular words since the book was first published. To enumerate the cases known to scholars would occupy many pages. Examples, prominent and striking, and easily remembered, may be adduced to convey the general idea of the nature of these changes.

The word "LET" once meant to hinder. Now it has uniformly the meaning of permit. It is found in both significations in the English version.

"PREVENT" formerly meant to go before, to anticipate. Now it uniformly signifies to hinder.

The term THIEF was not formerly strictly distinguished from robber, as it now is.

To show the liability to error in the common mind when such words are used, we may cite the passage 2 Thess. iv. 15: "We which are alive and remain—shall not prevent them which are asleep." The term "PREVENT" is here generally supposed to mean hinder.

The word CONVERSATION furnishes a striking example of the errors resulting from the gradual but decided change of meaning. It formerly signified deportment. Now it means converse by speech. In the very numerous instances in which "prevent" and "conversation" are employed in the Common Version, they invariably communicate to the ordinary reader ideas which the Holy Spirit never dictated.

A most unfavorable feature of the version is, the material which it furnishes for scepticism and infidelity. No one will pretend that any such purpose was entertained by the translators; but the facts are incontestable. In consequence of erroneous translation, there are contradictions in the statement of events and in the record of facts; imputations upon the divine character and government; and false colorings of circumstances, bringing religion itself into disrepute. These are found especially in the Old Testament, and have been seized by the enemies of truth, and employed, with merciless malignity, to turn youth aside from the paths of wisdom, and force them to the conviction that Christianity is a delusion and the Bible a fable. Take, for an example, the order given by Jehovah to the children of Israel, when parting with the Egyptians. It stands thus in the Common Version:

Ex. xi. 2 and 3: "Speak now in the ears of the people, and let every man borrow of his neighbor, and every woman of her neighbor, jewels of silver and jewels of gold."

"And the Lord gave the people favor in the sight of the Egyptians."

Ex. xii. 35 and 36: "And the children of Israel did according to the word of Moses; and they borrowed of the Egyptians jewels of silver, and jewels of gold, and raiment."

"And the Lord gave the people favor in the sight of the Egyptians, so that they lent unto them such things as they required. And they spoiled the Egyptians."

There was no purpose to return these jewels, and they were afterward employed in the decorations of the tabernacle.

These circumstances, so recorded, have for more than two centuries been employed, both secretly and openly, to poison the minds of youth against the Bible and the God of the Bible. The dishonesty and duplicity, the covetousness and the greediness, which characterize many of the Jews of the present day, have often