

ing. Theories, which in 1611 would have subjected their authors to the imputation and restraint of madmen, are now fully substantiated and accepted. Philosophy, "falsely so called," attempts to use to the disadvantage of divine truth the disparities that are brought to light between this increased knowledge of the nineteenth century and the statements of the translation made in the early part of the seventeenth century. The lately developed doctrines are run in a new mould of thought and technicality, and upon the antiquated phraseology of the Bible a charge is brought of antagonism to established facts. Here is a snare for the unlearned and the unwary. One well acquainted with the original, and fully posted in genuine scientific discoveries, can answer these infidelic flings; but the common man with his Common Version is at their mercy.

But the word of the Lord endureth forever; and He who has always cared for his word has provided for the elucidation of dark points, the removal of difficulties, and the triumph of the light of revelation over every foe. Glance at some of the aids already furnished. The channels opened by commerce, erudition, and statesmanship have been used to gather contributions for developing and illustrating the true meaning of the Book of books. The sources, structure, and power of language have been revealed; the land of the Hebrew people has been thoroughly explored, and has furnished information through its customs and monuments which materially helps to clear away the mystery which formerly enveloped it; manuscripts, covered with the dust of centuries, have been exhumed, and subjected to the severest tests of competent criticism (furnishing data for the solution of passages before in doubt, and the correction of positive errors).

In a word, profound investigations, conducted by the best minds in Christendom, have established facts and principles never thought of by those who worked under the rule of Hampton Court Conference.

Can these accumulations of the past two centuries and the accessions of the present be made available? Certainly. Will it be done by a general waiting for a universal movement of Christendom in that direction? No. That is not in accordance with the previous history of truth's triumphs.—The individual truth-lover must use his own influence, and combine it with the few or many who think with him, and by spreading the sentiment and helping the work truth conquers.

Is there any activity in this direction?—Yes. While the scholars and divines of Continental Europe have discussed the subject in its relations to the languages spoken by them, men of distinction in England, both in Church and State have recognized the need of thorough revision. The same subject has been talked of on this side of the Atlantic, in the United States and British Provinces; and the talk has produced results. For eighteen years a body of men have been working, "through evil and good report," on the New Testament. That Testament has been forsoveral years before the public, and has had an immense circulation, which continues. These same men (connected with the American Bible Union) are vigorously pushing forward the Old Testament. Their peculiar facilities are remarkable. With a valuable library, the accumulations of many years, containing treasures of the centuries which could not be replaced, if destroyed; and having secured the services of some of the best qualified men in the world, they deserve the sympathy and co-operation of all who wish to see the Bible shining in a purity and power that will dissipate the mists of error. Why should not the English reader enjoy these advantages, which now belong to scholars? How unfair that the common Christian should be compelled to listen to the Rabshakehs who proclaim in the language of the people, their fallacies and insinuations, designed to overturn the divine record; while, for his defense, he is obliged to fall back upon the defective rendering of the forty-seven men, who themselves never heard of some of the most effective weapons now used by the friends of revelation.

HENRICUS.

Christian Messenger.

HALIFAX, JANUARY 20, 1869.

SPIRITUAL BAPTISM.

Clear and definite views of Divine truth should be sought by every Christian. In-difference to what the Scriptures teach re-

specting our relations to the Divine Being is indicative of error existing in the mind, of the heart being in an unrenewed state, and is often a precursor of further departure from the truth. The article on our first page, on the Holy Spirit, we doubt not will awaken thought in the minds of many of our readers. The subject is somewhat difficult, and one on which we believe many persons have no very distinct views. This has arisen perhaps, in some measure, from imperfect translation. The suggestion of the writer concerning the proper rendering of the preposition *en* is doubtless valuable, and will assist many to understand the passage more correctly.

The same word in the original, in the sixth verse of Matthew 3rd, and the other passages quoted, is rendered "in," and, we believe there is no good reason why it should be otherwise in the eleventh verse. Yet even taking the passages referred to as they stand in our Common Version of the New Testament, and the preposition as it is there translated "with," the idea is always one of great abundance of the Spirit; just as in water-baptism, the Scriptures always convey the idea of there being "much water." Being baptized with the Holy Spirit could be understood then only as an overwhelming, like as by a cloud, and therefore being baptized with the Spirit would be understood as our being surrounded by, and filled with, spiritual and holy influence.

Persons sometimes use the language of the passages spoken of in prayer; not always it would appear with a very clear apprehension what an answer to such prayer would involve. How thankful should we be that the Spirit helpeth our infirmities, and although "we know not what we should pray for as we ought" yet that "the Spirit itself maketh intercession for us." To take any other than this enlarged view of the outpouring of the Spirit would be so limiting the petitions of such prayer that it would be repugnant to every christian heart, and dishonoring the Spirit.

It is probable that some persons use the expression "baptize with the Holy Spirit and with fire" as seeking for a higher degree of sanctification and purification. Fire is sometimes used as a figure representing a mode of purification. This, according to the article we are noticing, would not, however, be the correct meaning of the figure, as here employed.

It is exceedingly important that we, who are living under the dispensation of the Spirit, should have a clear apprehension of the Spirit's teaching, on a subject that is so much connected with our happiness, and our usefulness in the church and the world.

THE SEPARATE SCHOOLS QUESTION.

An article on this subject in the *Evening Express* of Friday last commences as follows:

"The most important question that can engage public attention is the proper education of the young. It would seem as if this Province were threatened with a fierce agitation on this subject, in which passion and prejudice are much more likely to be the principal weapons of warfare than reason and sober argument. A circular, signed by a number of the clergymen of this city, against separate Schools in any form, has been published, and doubtless already scattered broadcast over the Province."

It is a matter of regret that a bill has been introduced into the Legislature that would produce such a sad state of things as that anticipated by our contemporary. The Hon. Mr. Flynn's bill was deferred last session, for the very purpose that the opinions of the people might be learned. Upon such an important question surely the people should speak out. Their doing so should not be designated passion and prejudice. The *Express* would hardly wish to suppress discussion on such a question. We think the clergymen whose names are attached to the Circular are as likely to be guided by "reason and sober argument" as the Rev. Dr. Cameron, the author of the obnoxious bill, or any of its friends. Let the bill be withdrawn and all apprehensions of "fierce agitation" will doubtless subside.

The *Express* says:

"We believe that education, which does not embrace religious instruction and training, is not only defective, but, viewed nationally and morally, eminently pernicious."

The present law requires that Teachers shall "inculcate by precept and example a respect for religion and the principles of Christian morality; justice, and a sacred regard to truth, love of country, loyalty, humanity, and universal benevolence, sobriety, industry, and frugality, chastity and temperance, and all other virtues which are the ornaments of human society."

Is that a godless system? Surely not.

But they must not teach "the peculiar views which characterize the different denominations of christians." Is that not fair? Why should denominationalism be taught at the public expense? But further, if anything in the religious exercises of the school are objectionable to the parents of any of the scholars and such objection is presented to the Trustees, an effectual remedy is provided. This, we think, ought to satisfy every one, whether Catholic in a district largely Protestant, or a Protestant, in a district principally composed of Roman Catholics.

It is idle to talk of the immorality in the United States as flowing from its system of education and that being a reason for adopting the Separate School system here. The Nova Scotia system is not the same as that prevailing in the United States. There are many countries where free Common Schools do not exist, in which far greater immorality prevails than in the United States. Do the enlightened Christians of the United States ever charge the immorality in that country on their Common Schools? We have yet to learn that they do.

The altered condition of the Continent of Europe, in respect to the temporal power of the Pope, is probably the reason why the order against Common Schools has gone out from Rome. A writer in a late Dublin paper on this subject, says:

"In Italy, the Government have taken the schools altogether out of the control of the priests, as they exercise a mischievous influence."

In Austria, the demand is made by the people that schools shall be taken entirely out of the hands of the priests, and 2,000 schoolmasters have met and preferred a petition that school-books shall be left to them, and that the priests shall have nothing to say to them; and the Emperor has received very coldly the appeal of the Bishops.

France is free. In Belgium (Ultramontane Belgium) education has been taken altogether out of the hands of the priests, "their management being hurtful to the moral and social well-being of the people;" and a penalty of £20 and three months' imprisonment is awarded to any priest (see *Independence Beige* of June) who shall find fault with the Government arrangement."

Whatever amount of truth is contained in the above, we do not believe that any wish exists here to prevent the Roman Catholic priests and people from having the same privileges, in regard to the Schools of the Province, as other ministers of religion and their adherents have. There is no reason why they should not cooperate with others in reference to educational affairs as well as those belonging to other denominations, but we protest against any church being allowed advantages in which others may not participate.

In countries or districts where the population is mixed, and where all the children have equal educational opportunities there is, we believe, far more of healthful progress than where all are of one denomination. Numerous examples will occur to every intelligent mind in proof of this assertion. Separate Schools would we believe create rivalries deleterious to children, to parents, and to teachers, whether they be Protestants or Catholics. Some of our Roman Catholic fellow-citizens do not hesitate to express their regret that the question was been raised here, and greatly deprecate the course that is being pursued by the advocates of Separate Schools. They wish their children to have equal privileges with others and not be separated from them. The *Express* says "the reason alleged" against Separate Schools "is that Protestants should not be called on to pay for the dissemination of what they believe to be religious error." This may have been alleged, but we should regard it as equally unjust to Catholics to compel them to pay for the inculcation of Protestant views; we therefore say Teachers should not teach "the peculiar views which characterize the different denominations of Christians."

The *Express* very ingeniously provides for the education of all those who are outside of the Roman Catholic Church; as follows:

"The only argument which has a shadow of reason in it is, that it may impair the unity of the system of education, and that if granted to Catholics, other denominations may make the same claim, whereby, schools may be multiplied, expense increased, and the teaching efficiency diminished. Let us look at this argument fairly for a few moments. It is true enough, that if every district where it has an existence, however feeble, the cause of education would suffer seriously. But in practice the difficulty is all but imaginary. The children of Presbyterians, Wesleyans, Baptists and Episcopalians, could receive religious instruction in the same school, because all use the same translation of the Bible, and the minor differences existing among them are not so great as to lead to any serious apprehension that faith or morals would be in danger, by the religious instruction they would receive at school."

How very kind of our contemporary to tie up in one bunch all the non-Roman Catho-

lic denominations, and oblige them to sink their peculiar views just because all use the same translation of the Bible. The religious views they each hold respectively are no less dear to them, we presume, than are those of our Roman Catholic fellow-citizens to them, and there is no reason why Presbyterians, Methodists, and Baptists should not have Separate Schools, as well as Roman Catholics or Episcopalians.

We heartily endorse the concluding paragraph of our contemporary's article. It hardly comports with the first part. We trust that the wish in the closing sentence may be realized:

"We trust much in the sense of fairness, and the good sense and mutual forbearance of all parties in this Province in approaching this important question. Let it be debated and decided on its merits alone, and while justice is done let sufficient guards and checks be introduced, so that the integrity of the present system may be preserved, its efficiency kept unimpaired, and all parties satisfied that equal justice has been meted out to each of them."

The *Church Chronicle* has been changed from a monthly pamphlet to a weekly, eight page newspaper, published at the office of Mr. T. Chamberlain of the *Provincial Wesleyan*. It does not appear with any episcopal imprimatur, but whilst it says "no Bishop or Synod is in the last degree responsible for what we publish," yet it is, doubtless, as in its previous form, under the sanction of the Bishop of Nova Scotia. The names of the editorial staff, or responsible party, does not appear. We hope the anticipations of the editor, when he says, "We expect no temporal gain, we are fully assured that we shall suffer considerable loss," will not be realized. It may be well to be prepared for the worst, but we shall hope for better things for our valiant contemporary.

An anonymous correspondent in the *Church Chronicle* is anxious to see "a union of the Wesleyans and the Church of England." He proposes in carrying out such a measure, "that the Wesleyans choose from amongst their ministers, six, eight or ten, as it may be, to be consecrated Bishops." The writer seems to imagine that the English Wesleyans are an Episcopal body, for he adds, "and that these Bishops ordain their own clergy, that the English Bishops be requested to consecrate the ministers elected, and if legal or other difficulties prevent this, let them be consecrated by American Bishops." This "lover of Union," not only provides for Bishops amongst the Wesleyans but actually supplies them with a new name. He says: "The name assumed might be the Episcopal Wesleyan Church in union with the Church of England." He would even allow, "That any such Bishops be eligible to the highest preferments in the Church of England, provided they then conform to all that is legally required in connection with such preferments."

Once get this adopted and the "Precedence" question we presume would have received its quietus in that quarter. We do not apprehend, however, that the Wesleyans in Nova Scotia are to be caught by such baits any more they were in England. We shall see.

EPISCOPAL PROGRESS IN HALIFAX.—In the discourse preached at St. Luke's on New Years Eve, the preacher said:—

"There are many 'ivory houses' built in Halifax, but the best we can offer to God is this poor building, for a Cathedral. It is a shame, which Bishop, clergy and people must feel, that while around us we see 'ivory houses' daily increasing, God's house is allowed to lie waste and unbuilt."

The editor remarks at the close of his report,

"The first tangible proof of the impression made upon the congregation was the offering of \$500 from one of its members, towards the erection of the new cathedral, and which has been immediately crowned by a munificent gift of \$4000 from the Bishop."

The revolution in Spain has been generally regarded as a movement in advance, of a remarkably peaceful character, that Spain had been sinking in the scale of civilization under its former rulers, but that the platform on which its late change of government had been made was bringing it up abreast of the times. We were a little surprised, therefore, to read in the *Morning Chronicle* on Friday last, an editorial deprecating the altered state of things in that country.—The editor expresses the opinion that "This boasted revolution has turned out anything but a blessing to the people most concerned. One tyrant has been driven from power and a hundred installed in her place." This argument is commonly used