

CORRESPONDENCE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE COLONIAL HERALD.

"Amicus Plato, amicus Socrates, sed magis amica Veritas."

SIR:—I feel that an apology is due both to you and your readers for the further liberty I am about to take, in again introducing to your notice a subject which I acknowledge I approach with extreme reluctance and diffidence—conscious as I am that the discussion of such topics in the public Newspapers is not approved of by many intelligent individuals, as not being calculated to lead to any beneficial or practical results. I have, then, briefly to state, that my previous letter to you, Sir, was called forth by the appearance in the Royal Gazette of the 9th ult. of a somewhat lengthy article, taken from the British North American Wesleyan Methodist Magazine for May, 1842, and which, I cannot help observing, en passant, appears to me peculiarly deficient in that spirit of meekness and charity which one would naturally expect, coming as it does from such a pure and unsullied source! This article, I have been given to understand, was intended, in the first instance, for the especial benefit of a Rev. Gentleman in the neighbouring Colony of New Brunswick, who has most unwisely—as some suppose—embraced the heretical doctrines of the Millenarians! This gentleman, I am also informed, on a recent occasion went so far as to preach a sermon embodying his views on these subjects in so tangible a shape that they could not possibly be mistaken. It appears, however, that his sentiments were so highly appreciated by his auditory, that they very generally, if not unanimously, requested him to publish the sermon in question. With this request the Rev. Gentleman signified his willingness to comply, and the necessary preparatory steps were actually taken by him to give it effect. In the meantime, his Rev. Brethren, taking the alarm, peremptorily ordered him, on pain of suspension, &c. to desist from the undertaking, and altogether to abandon the preaching of those doctrines. Whether the individual adverted to will comply with this injunction, or not, remains to be seen.

But, to come more immediately to the point in hand, and to be as explicit as possible, I have to state, that a volume of Lectures on the Restoration of the Jews, prepared by twelve eminent CLERGYMEN OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND, and delivered by them during the solemn season of Lent, 1841, in the Episcopal Chapel, West Street, London, and dedicated, "by His Lordship's kind permission," to the Bishop of Ripon, having fallen into the hands of some individuals in this town, they conceived the idea of reading them, one by one, on a certain evening in each week, until the whole should be disposed of, to as many of their friends as might think proper to come and hear them; and a public notice to this effect was accordingly published in the Colonial Herald of the 6th ult. No sooner, however, was this intention made known, than the article above alluded to made its appearance in the columns of the Royal Gazette, as before stated. The evident intention of this document is too obvious to be mistaken. Such expressions as these—"popular delusions"—"folly"—"monstrous catalogue of heresies"—"fanatics"—"monomaniacs, absorbed with one idea, and lost to all idea of comprehending a second"—will be found pretty plentifully mixed up with other epithets, equally sublime, in the exordium as well as in other parts of this laboured production. Even "the Church of God," it is said, "has not been wanting in her efforts to impose upon weak and unstudious minds!" And "the final apostasy—the battle of Armageddon—the return of the Jews to Palestine—the personal reign of Christ for a thousand years on this earth," it is added, "are no more the Gospel of Christ, than the worshipping of the Atonic calf, the destruction of the Canaanitish nations, and the imperial reign of Solomon, were the Law of Moses!" and, consequently, according to this conclusive mode of reasoning, "that minister who, in urging such subjects, spends the sacred hours which should be employed in the worship of Almighty God, does, to use the kindest expression, sadly abuse his trust!"

I shall not trouble you or your readers with any further extracts from this literary titbit; neither shall I attempt to exhibit the fallacy—not to say, the anti-scriptural nature—of at least some of the arguments contained therein—these having been repeatedly exposed by far abler pens than mine, and believing, as I do, in the well-known maxim, that— "A man convinced against his will, Is of the same opinion still."

It was with the object of showing, that—whatever might be the views of our modern divines on this subject—we have, at least, the voice of antiquity in our favor, and that Millenarian doctrines were very generally, if not universally, held in the first and purest ages of the Christian Church, that I sent you some extracts from a lecture delivered by the Rev. W. DALTON, whose character as a Christian and a scholar is too firmly established and too generally appreciated to need any encomium of mine, and which you were kind enough to insert in your paper of the 27th ult. This, however, has called forth a writer in last Tuesday's Gazette, who styles himself A LOVER OF THE TRUTH; and giving him all credit for veracity and sincerity, I must say, I think his researches have signally failed to elicit anything like a satisfactory refutation of the position assumed by Millenarians, viz: that these doctrines were held "by all Christians that were exactly orthodox" at the period adverted to; and I am further of opinion, that it would not be so very difficult a matter as A LOVER OF THE TRUTH appears to suppose, to establish this point to the entire satisfaction of every candid and unprejudiced mind. That "these doctrines were regarded as heresies by the Fathers of the three first centuries," I positively deny, and this denial I am prepared to establish by irrefragable evidence, taken from their writings; and such an assertion, in my humble opinion, could only have been made by a person possessed of but a very shallow acquaintance indeed with the subject on which he treats.

As Papias, Bishop of Hierapolis, and Nepos, a Bishop of Egypt, are both handled in a very summary manner by A LOVER OF THE TRUTH, and as the latter appears disposed to place implicit reliance on the testimony of Eusebius, with reference to the orthodoxy of those eminent Fathers, and sagely supposes that what Eusebius says in this respect "will not be denied," I must crave your further indulgence, while I here introduce an extract or two from a very talented work that has lately come into my possession, and which, by the way, I cannot resist the opportunity thus afforded me of warmly recommending to A LOVER OF THE TRUTH, and all others who take an interest in this subject:—

Among those who in the reign of Constantine may be justly suspected of time-serving, was Eusebius the historian, bishop of Pamphylia, who boasts of his conversation with that monarch; and as from him appears to have originally sprung the obloquy which was cast upon the Chiliasm (as they were now called), it is necessary to bring him first in order under notice. He does not directly attack the doctrine itself; but raises questions on the canonical authority of the Apocalypse, and on the supposed author of the millenarian doctrine. His statements, however, on this head, are contradictory and absurd; for in one place he seems to attribute the invention of it to the heretic Cerinthus, and to insinuate that the early upholders of the doctrine were Ebionites; but in another place he distinctly says that Papias was its author, and that by the generality (pleistois) of ecclesiastics following, it was afterwards received, owing to the antiquity of the man. (Lib. iii. sect. 39.) Now, Papias was no ancient in his own generation; and though Irenaeus, in the age immediately following, speaks of him as having declared certain things on this subject which he heard from the apostle John, yet he by no means intimates that he adopted the doctrine from him; nor could Irenaeus indeed be moved by the antiquity of a man who flourished only about fifty years before him. Neither is there a shadow of evidence that any orthodox ecclesiastics in the first two centuries did otherwise than hold it. Moreover, when Eusebius is speaking of the Millenarian doctrine of Papias, he calls him a man of very weak intellect, and supposes therefore that he must have misconceived the doctrine; but when he refers to him in another part of his works, for other objects, he can admit him to have "enjoyed

great fame and celebrity," and to have been "a man most eloquent in all things, and skillful in the Scriptures." (Hist. of Euseb. iii. 32.)

Further, it is not a little matter that Eusebius, besides having disparaged the authority of the Apocalypse, and insinuated that it was perhaps the work of Cerinthus the Ebionite, was decidedly tainted with the Arian Heresy, which renders his views liable to suspicion on this point in more respects than the one named. The Magdeburgian centuriators thus treat of him: "Being now about to say some few things concerning the doctrine of Eusebius, we first give this admonition, that Jerome everywhere holds him forth suspected of the error of Arianism. For in his apology against Rufinus, he says of Eusebius, 'that he was indeed a most learned man, but not a Catholic; [i. e. according to the usages of the word in those times, not orthodox;] and throughout six of his books did continually declare that Origen was of the same faith with him—i. e. of the Arian falsehood.' (Hist. Eccles. cap. x. sect. 3.) Bishop Jeremy Taylor, in his 'Liberty of Prophecy,' not only says of him, that he entertained Arian sentiments, but that he is not clear of a suspicion of having endeavoured to corrupt and falsify the Nicene Creed, (fol. ed. p. 954,) which will account for what Scultetus says of him, that though immediately after the Council of Nice he seemed to have returned to his right mind, he never did cordially believe the co-equality of Christ with the Father. Now, a man who can be disingenuous enough to insinuate that Origen was of the same faith with him; who can go about to falsify a document of such importance as the Nicene Creed; and who can apparently veer round in his opinions on an important doctrine, and yet in heart remain of the same opinion still; may justly be suspected of having been influenced in his change of sentiments by the opinion of the Emperor, who, in the Council of Nice, took decidedly against Arianism, and yet it is on the credit and judgment of such a man, that the whole weight of an objection, insignificant in itself, is placed.—Brook's Elements of Prophetic Interpretation, pp. 60—62.

The above extracts are rather more lengthy than I could have wished, but they are so much to the point, that I could not possibly curtail them, without materially lessening their force. Dionysius, Bishop of Alexandria, is then brought forward by A LOVER OF THE TRUTH, as the accuser of Nepos. Here I shall, with your permission, insert two or three further extracts from the work above quoted, with the view of showing how far importance is to be attached to the opinion of Dionysius, on this subject; and which, I trust, will also clearly exhibit who those "other authorities" are, who, according to our correspondent, have borne equally successful testimony to the heretical nature of "these doctrines":—

With Origen a new era commenced in the history of prophetic interpretation; and Jerome and Augustine were almost the last of the fathers of any eminence who preceded the authoritative establishment of the papacy. Origen flourished about the middle of the third century: Jerome died about A. D. 420; and the papacy was (as many suppose,) firmly established by Justinian in 533: and in the century that intervened between Jerome and this period, there arose no one on the side of genuine Christianity who may not be considered a feeble follower of that father.

As the system of interpretation which now commenced with Origen greatly affected the sense of holy writ, and became so popular in the end as insensibly to carry away with it the majority of Christians, it must of course be viewed as having greatly affected the voice of the Church, and it consequently becomes an important question, how far the system of Origen was compatible with the mind of the Spirit, as exhibited in the holy Scriptures. It is likewise important to observe, that up to the time of Origen, and also in his time, the system of exposition which characterized the two first centuries was still prevalent. Owing, however, to the great influence of the learning and talents of Origen, his allegorizing system soon began to obtain; and the papacy was prompted to write a book, entitled 'The Reprehensions of Allegorizers,' which was specially directed against those who now began to explain the Millennium figuratively. After the death of Nepos, Dionysius, a zealous disciple of Origen, became Bishop of Alexandria; and perceiving that the views of Nepos outraged the principle of his master's system, he laboured to refute them; and of his success in drawing over one Coracion, who preserved the account. (Lib. vii. c. 22—24.) But he relates also, that Dionysius, in the pursuit of his object, was led to question the canonical authority of the Apocalypse; from which a fair inference may be drawn, that he found himself hard pressed by passages in that book. Mosheim, in his Ecclesiastical History, observes, "that long before this controversy, an opinion had prevailed, that Christ was to come and reign a thousand years among men, before the entire and final dissolution of this world;"—"that this opinion had hitherto met with no opposition;"—"and that now its credit began to decline principally through the influence and authority of Origen, who opposed it with the greatest warmth, because it was incompatible with some of his favourite sentiments." (Vol. i. p. 284.)

In regard to the system of interpretation struck out by Origen, and which was adopted with modifications and varieties by so many others, the best way of briefly conveying an idea of its general character, and of showing, that the opinion here expressed of it is not that of an individual writer, will be to bring forward two or three instances, displaying the manner in which it has been reprobated by eminent expositors in subsequent times. Jerome, who had himself, though unconsciously, in a measure, imbibed the leaven of it, does nevertheless condemn it; but his opinion may be shewn by a reference to Luther's, who says, in his Annotations on Deuteronomy, "That which I have so often insisted on elsewhere, I here once more repeat; viz: that the Christian should direct his first efforts toward understanding the literal sense (as it is called) of scripture, which alone is the substance of faith and of Christian theology;—which alone will sustain him in the hour of trouble and temptation;—and which will triumph over sin, death, and the gates of hell, to the praise and glory of God. The allegorical sense is commonly uncertain, and by no means safe to build our faith upon; for it usually depends on human opinion and conjecture only, on which, if a man leans, he will find it no better than the Egyptian reed. Therefore, Origen, Jerome, and similar of the fathers, are to be avoided, with the whole of that Alexandrian School, which, according to Eusebius and Jerome, formerly abounded in this species of interpretation. For later writers, unhappily following their too much praised and prevailing example, it has come to pass, that men make just what they please of the Scriptures, until some accommodate the word of God to the most extravagant absurdities; and, as Jerome complains of his own times, they extract a sense from Scripture repugnant to its meaning: of which offence, however, Jerome himself was also guilty." (Ann. on Deut. cnp. i. fol. 55.) Dr. Mosheim observes: "After the encomiums we have given to Origen, &c. it is not without deep concern we are obliged to add, that he also, by an unhappy method, opened a secure retreat for all sorts of errors, which a wild and irregular imagination could bring forth." And after noticing that he abandoned the literal sense, and divided the hidden sense into moral and mystical, or spiritual, he adds: "A prodigious number of interpreters, both in this and the succeeding ages, followed the method of Origen, though with some variations; nor could the few, who explained the sacred writings with judgment and a true spirit of criticism, oppose with any success the torrent of allegory that was overflowing the Church." (Ch. Hist. cent. iii. part 2. sect. 5, 6.) Milner, in his Church History, says somewhat similar:—"No man, not altogether unsound and hypocritical, ever injured the Church of Christ more than Origen did. From the fanciful mode of allegory, introduced by him, and uncontrolled by scriptural rule and order, there arose a vitiated method of commenting on the sacred pages; which has been succeeded by the contrary extreme, viz: a contempt of types and figures altogether. And in a similar way his fanciful ideas of letter and spirit tended to remove from men's minds all just conceptions of genuine spirituality. A thick mist for ages pervaded the Christian world, supported and strengthened by his allegorical manner of interpretation. The learned alone were considered as guides implicitly to be followed; and the vulgar, when the literal sense was hissed off the stage, had nothing to do but to follow their authority, wherever it might lead them." (Vol. i. page 469.)

Jerome was a vehement adversary of the Millenarian doctrine; but whatever his own prejudices may have been, he nevertheless lets fall a very important admission, as to the number of divines who continued to hold it, in his days. In his commentary on Jeremiah xix. 10, he says; "that he durst not condemn the doctrine, because many ecclesiastical persons and martyrs affirmed the same."—Brook's Elements of Prophetic Interpretation, pp. 49—58.

Extracts to the same import as the foregoing might be multiplied ad infinitum; but I am of opinion that quite sufficient "food for thought" will be found by A LOVER OF THE TRUTH, in those given above, for at least one week to come. I should like, however, as it is possible this may be the last time I may trouble you on this subject, and as our friend of the Gazette "has neither time nor inclination to pursue this

subject through the mazes of folly with which it stands connected," to close my remarks with the following extracts from a work recently published by a pious and learned Minister of the Established Church:—

Those who look upon Millennial views, affirmatory of the restoration of the Jews, and the previous resurrection of the saints, as dangerous innovations, and opening the way to other errors, would do well to listen to the following testimony of the late Bishop Van-Mildert, who, by the extent of his learning, and the general sobriety of his judgment, is at the farthest remove from all suspicions of wildness and extravagance:—

"Nothing is more certain than that the scriptures clearly foretel the conversion and restoration of the Jews, and that a most satisfactory pledge of the fulfilment of the predictions is already given by what has actually been brought to pass in their dispersion and preservation. Respecting the Millennium, which shall have its saints on earth for 1000 years after the events;—When place, there is room for a great variety of conjecture. Whether, with the earlier fathers of the Christian church, and some recent expositors of modern times, we are to expect, that a resurrection and triumph of the saints shall precede that it is and final resurrection; or whether we hold with others that it is not to be a reign of persons raised from the dead, but a renovated state of the church, flourishing gloriously for 1000 years, after the conversion of the Jews, and the flowing in of all the nations to the Christian faith; it is not necessary to determine. The former interpretation seems to offer the least violence to the language of scripture, and is supported by great authority. But our trust in the promises of God depends, not on the determination of this question; since, whichever interpretation we adopt, the splendid predictions of the inspired writers, both in the Old and New Testament, will doubtless be verified, either in a literal or a figurative acceptance, to their fullest extent. In the mean time, the condition of the church, antecedently to that its triumphant state, may reasonably be expected to exhibit a diversified scene of trial and victory, of peril and deliverance, of depression and recovery, similar to what it has hitherto undergone."

The sentiments also of the learned, humble and pious Mede may well weigh with those who really know his writings. He remarks, "I incline, on the whole, to the opinion founded on the sentence of St. Paul, 1 Thess. iv. that all the righteous will rise again during the course of the millennial kingdom: but in a certain order, according to that of the apostle, (1 Cor. xv. 23,) first, in the very commencement of the Millennium, the Martyrs, then the rest, according to the decree of God the Arbitrator, and that this is called the first resurrection, or the resurrection of the Just. Luke xiv. 14. Afterwards, the Millennium being completed, the wicked will rise; and the last and universal judgment be completed; these to be thrust down to the fire, and the saints to be carried up to the heavenly mansions, where they will live for ever with Christ. I do not indeed think we are to expect two advents of Christ; but one, namely, that in which he will judge the quick and the dead at his appearing; but that both his advent and his judgment will be protracted through the period of a thousand years."

The whole statement of the apostle, 1 Thess. iv. 14—18, clearly respects the resurrection of the righteous, at the coming of the Lord, and their being brought with him; and when this is connected with the statements in the second epistle (ch. i. 7—9, ii. 1—8,) respecting (as the author is persuaded) the same coming, and the destruction of the Man of Sin at that coming, it is conclusive, in his view, that the saints rise before the Millennium,—it being generally agreed, (at least by those who hold a future Millennium,) that the Man of Sin will be destroyed before that blessed era. According with this, is the statement in the 15th Corinthian, and in particular, the expressions, Christ the first fruits; afterwards they that are Christ's at his coming; and then cometh the end, verse 23, 24. The Author cannot see why there should not be a lengthened interval between each of these three events; as there have manifestly been above 1200 years between Christ's resurrection and his second coming. The statement in the 52d verse, which, as the expressions, and the connection, equally manifest, relates to the resurrection of the righteous; the strength of the apostle's desire to attain this resurrection, Phil. iii. 11; and the emphatic distinctions of a special resurrection promised to the righteous, Luke xiv. 14; xx. 35, 36. Heb. xi. 35. John vi. 39, 40, 44, 54,) add further weight and strength to these observations. Nor is there anything inconsistent with them in the expressions, John v. 28, the hour is coming, in which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice and come forth; they that have done evil unto the resurrection of life, and they that have done evil to the resurrection of damnation: when the term hour is translated time, Romans xiii. 11, season, 2 Cor. vii. 8, and in such a passage as 1 John ii. 18, as well as in the one preceding the text quoted (John v. 25), manifestly applied to the whole period of the Christian Dispensation. It appears to the author that the 20th of Revelation is, like all the rest of the book, symbolic, with literal explanations. We find literal explanations running through the book. See chap. i. 20; xvii. 15; xix. 8; and so we find in the 20th chapter, the literal explanation, which is the Devil; and this is the first resurrection, a similar literal explanation. The difficulties that have been made on the subject are resolvable into our ignorance. How little is it possible for us to know of the heavenly Jerusalem in which the saints dwell, or of the nature and glories of their risen bodies, or of their being equal to the angels, (Luke xx. 36,) and how material must be the distinction between them, and men living in the flesh. We may soon get into the atmosphere of Socinianism, and reject every doctrine of the Bible, if mysteries and difficulties be a stumbling-block to our faith, instead of producing their right effect, a believing and patient waiting for the manifestation of God's will.

The doctrine of a near personal advent of Christ may be traced throughout all ages. The idea of a spiritual millennium, which has not yet begun, before our Lord's return, is sometimes called the old way, the old paths, but it is not an entire novelty of modern times? I believe an uncommenced spiritual advent to be the real novelty. Has it any plea of general antiquity whatever to urge in its behalf? I believe not. Bishop Hall, in his list of varied opinions on this subject, gives no intimation of it. I have not been able to trace it higher than Dr. Whitty, who speaks of it as a "new hypothesis," at the beginning of the eighteenth century. "Viting writing soon after Whitty, though in a far superior spirit, and tremblingly sensitive of the danger of putting off the hope of our Lord's coming, adopted his sentiments of the spiritual millennium. He ably maintained the truth, that the millennium was yet to come, giving the names of F. Lambertus, C. Gallus, A. Conrad Mantuanus, C. Pannonius, J. Brocardus, A. Leonius, Laune, Mede, and Cotter, as supporting it. One very material objection to the mere modern theory of a spiritual millennium, yet to take place before our Lord's coming, is, that this view, more than any other that the church has ever held, tends to bring all Christians to that awful and most dangerous state of mind to the evil servant, My Lord delayeth his coming.—Bickersteth's Practical Guide to the Prophecies, pp. 274—288.

I am, &c., A CONSTANT READER. Charlottetown, Sept. 9, 1842.

\* It was, in some respects, a clearing away of error, to acknowledge that a Millennium was yet to come; but in other respects it was a more serious injury, when men were led to view the whole as a mere spiritual lengthened period. Thus a barrier of 1000 years was raised before the real coming of our Lord. It became impossible for men to be waiting for his coming, and so they were thrown off farther than ever from the blessed hope of our Lord's speedy return, which has been in a great measure consistent with all previous views.

I have not yet discovered the idea of a spiritual Millennium uncommenced before Dr. Whitty's "new hypothesis." There have been from age to age those who have held the personal coming of Christ before the Millennium, and in most ages there have been carnal views of a mere earthly Millennium; but where is the voice of the church, as to a spiritual Millennium uncommenced, and to last 1000 years, before his real coming? The views of the Reformers, who speak plainly of the near approach of Christ's personal coming and kingdom, though they thought that millenarianism was a heresy, were less prejudicial in one respect to the truth, than the modern views, as they brought Christians to the right posture of mind, waiting for the coming of Christ. But it is manifest that the present generally received modern view is far from being the old way.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE COLONIAL HERALD.

SIR:—In your papers of the 23d and 30th ultimo, two articles have appeared, both bearing the signature of A LICENSED TEACHER, although purporting to be the production of two different geniuses. From the extraordinary topics, however, which are introduced into both, the peculiar manner of discussion, and the extravagant and disgusting view of conceit which runs through each, there appears to me very strong presumptive evidence that both have emanated from the same brain; and that the more especially, as your correspondent, in the paper of the 23d, threatened a continuance of his subject, unless undertaken by some "more competent" agitator. Although many of your readers may regard the authorship of these famous productions as a matter of small importance, I have a reason for wishing to trace them to their true origin, which is, that I altogether doubt whether there is more than one individual in the profession of teachers in this Island so seriously demoralized as delibe-

rately to entertain the opinions and sentiments contained in these letters.

Just look, Mr. Editor, and people of Prince Edward Island, at the character and position which this Solon claims for himself and his brethren of the birchen rod. He delineates to us that they are the depositaries of all the "intelligence of the country," and that they deserve to be ranked with the most respectable classes of the community, for morality, learning, and good breeding. Far be it from me, Mr. Editor, to assail the characters of this class of my countrymen, or to undervalue their utility; but how contemptible and arrogant are such claims as these! Even if his comparisons were just, and his conclusions true, how poorly does it become a member of that body to assume the right of summoning, severally, the clergyman, the judge, the legislator and the lawyer, to the tribunal of his opinion, and deliberately pronounce them only equal, if not inferior, in moral and social standing, to his own fraternity; and in point of literary attainments, entirely dependent on them; and, consequently, in this respect, at best, only their equals, as the stream cannot rise above its source. Such unparalleled arrogance calls for the severest rebuke. Surely, Mr. Editor, this writer must be altogether ignorant of what constitutes a man of intelligence, or else of the attainments of a large number of his brethren in this Island, or he would never dare, in an enlightened community like this, to make the unwarrantable comparisons he has made between the erudite and deeply read Ministers of the Gospel, Commissioners, and private gentlemen in this Island, and the uneducated, dull and uncultivated beings, who, in many instances, are filling the places and enjoying the emoluments of teachers of youth. If, Mr. Editor, the articles to which I am replying are a fair specimen of the productions of the "intelligence of the country," and if the genius which produced such rhetoric as they contain be the highest standard of intelligence in the Island, then, alas! alas! for its intellectual condition, and the prospects of its rising generation.

But, Mr. Editor, let us take one thorough look at this new invention in politics which A LICENSED TEACHER has brought to light—a representation in the Legislature for pedagogues. Novel idea! in what prolific brain must that have hatched? Art thou the offspring of the unassisted propulsive powers of a licensed teacher?—or wert thou begotten by the combined energies of our author, and some other luminary in that bright constellation—"the intelligence of the country?" Happy the individuals that gave thee existence! Illustrious even in that illustrious fraternity—the Schoolmasters of P. E. Island!

But, seriously, what are the grounds upon which the right of the teachers of this Island to a Representative in the Legislature claims to be sustained? Hear A LICENSED TEACHER. Because 70 electors at Malpeque return two members. Well, because one abuse is tolerated, another must be introduced! Ay, Mr. Teacher, is this your method of demonstration? We must have something more convincing than this. What then are the grounds of your claim? The LICENSED TEACHER has not stated any; and I am not capable of imagining any which are sufficient to warrant such a step. Even admitting that the teachers have not each and all as much salary as they might wish, and that the schoolrooms in many places are scarcely sufficient, large and convenient, and the books not of the best quality, I am at a loss to see how electing a member to the House of Assembly could remedy these evils. The public purse, even if the Legislature were willing to appropriate its contents in that way, is much too light to afford a remedy to all these evils. But were it tenfold heavier, it would, I conceive, be very unsound policy to employ the Revenue to do what should be particularly the concern of parents of children to do. If the teachers have insufficient salaries, or unsuitable schoolrooms and books, let them exert themselves to procure better. Surely so "talented and influential a body" cannot need the assistance of the Legislature to make their bargains or conduct their concerns.

A LICENSED TEACHER speaks of that body being "despised," as though that constituted a reason why they should have a Representative in the Legislature. If they are despised, I presume there is some cause for it; and I would like to be informed how granting them a Representative can either cure or prevent this. Surely he cannot mean that the want of such a privilege is the cause of their being despised. If so, I have some cold comfort for him. I fear they will continue to be despised. But he rather uses this as a proof of their being despised, than as the cause. The cause exists somewhere else, and the better way of preventing it is, by removing the cause, which, I presume, can be discovered without spectacles. Let me assure the LICENSED TEACHER, that in an enlightened community, neither that class of society, nor any other, must expect honours apart from integrity and honorable dealings; and that his assertion, that the teachers are despised, goes far to invalidate his testimony in favour of that superior excellence and eminence of character which he attributes to them.

The writer of these articles seems entirely to forget, in maintaining the right of the teachers to a Representative, that there are other large bodies in the country unrepresented, who have an equal claim with them; and in setting up his own individual claims, forgetful of those of others equally strong, his conduct seems to savour more of selfishness than of conceit, than of fair and candid investigation. Have not clergymen, lawyers, physicians, mechanics, and, in short, every distinct class of society, as good a right to separate representation as licensed teachers? Why not, then, take up the subject on the broad principle, and show that our system of representation is essentially deficient, and propose a general remedy, not a partial one? Is our author afraid that others will get justice as well as himself? But how absurd to complain of a want of Legislators, where there is one to every 2000 inhabitants. Do not the present members of Assembly represent all the various interests of the country, and of all classes? Do they not especially represent the Schools? No subject has been so much legislated upon for the last ten years. Almost every Session something has been done to improve the School Laws. If the system is still imperfect, let its faults be shown, and the Assembly petitioned to mend them.

But there have been licensed teachers in the House of Assembly in this Island—two at a time—and what have they done? What improvements have they introduced into the system of managing Schools? There is even now a licensed teacher in the House. What peculiarities has he, during four years, introduced into the School Acts? If licensed teachers have interests to represent, why not instruct him of them, and delegate him to see them attended to? A brother will not surely neglect to enforce, with all the fervour of his powerful eloquence, the claims of his despised and neglected fraternity. If they neglect to employ him, I, for one, shall consider all this fuss about a Representative as mere finesse—only a showing off.

The LICENSED TEACHER has made a great ado about malice, ignorance, prejudice, calumnies, contumely, &c., which that class are called to endure for the rest of society. He is not content with claiming for them the highest seat in the synagogue—he must next make them appear as martyrs for the cause of Education. After obliging them on our notice as the most learned, intelligent and virtuous class of society, he must make them out the most suffering and ill treated. Each of them has the wisdom, the virtue, and the disinterestedness of Socrates, and each, like him, dies by the hands of those he is benefiting. This is no exaggeration. Read the articles, and see in variety of expression what I have embodied in few words. But if all perfectly false. The teachers in this Island are despised, ridiculed or frowned on, it is every way probable that they deserve it.

Mr. Editor, with an apology for the length of these remarks, I subscribe myself, Yours respectfully, Prince County, Sept. 4th, 1842.

CHARLOTTETOWN: Printed and published by COOPER & BENNETT at their Office, East corner of Pownall and Water Streets—TEMPLE 15s. per annum, payable half yearly in advance.