THE KING OF DELHI'S PRISON ISLAND.

The few remaining years, or rather months, of the King of Delhi's miserable existence are to be endured amid the savage population of a group of small islands in the Bay of Bengal. Since the year 1824, when the British expedition against Burmah assembled at Port Cornwallis, the Andamans have scarcely been heard of in this country, and even their position on the map is still comparatively unknown. The principal island is also the most northerly of the groupe, and extends 140 miles in length by twenty in breadth. The Little Andaman, on the other hand, is the most southerly, but does not exceed 28 miles in length by 17 in breadth. In the centre of the Great Andaman the land rises to the altitude of 2,400 feet, forming a well-known beacon to mariners—the Sadol Peak. A few small streams thence descended to the sea. Various kinds of timber suitable for ship building are found in abundance; but the only fruit worthy mention is the mangrove: the cocoa-nut which flourishes in the neighborhood of Nicobars, does not grow in these islands. Many varieties of fish are caught off the coast, and constitute the chief food of the barbarous inhabitants, who also indulge in lizards, snakes, guanas, and rats. On the skirts of the forest which occupies the interior of the principal islands are seen herds of a diminutive species of hog, supposed to be descended from a shipwrecked stock. With the skulls and bones of these animals the islanders adorn their huts, and were thence accused of cannibalism, from a belief that their favourite ornaments were the indigestible remains of human beings whom they had slain and devoured. They are, in truth, a cruel and savage race. All attempts to communicate with them have been repelled by darts and flights of arrows. They are described as resembling a degenerate tribe of negroes. They have woolly hair, thick lips, and a flat nose; their stature seldom exceeds five feet; their colour is a deep, unshaded black; and their costume that of primeval Adam before his fall. Their huts consist of four poles driven into the ground, and interwoven with boughs of trees. Their chief want is sufficiency of food, in search of which they are constantly prowling along the shores, or climbing steep rocks; their chief annoyance is from the countless insects that infest the islands, to guard against which they plaster themselves over with mud, and thus render their skin as impenetrable as the hide of the hippopotamus. Their woolly hair is painted with red ochre to an extent that would excite the envy of Gael. But, wild as is their aspect and fierce their disposition, they are nevertheless amenable to the laws of politeness and good breeding. That man is considered a boor and no gentleman who does not salute his neighbor in a becoming manner by lifting one leg and smiting the lower part of the thigh with the open hand. It is possible that these manners may not be altogether to the taste of the ex-King of Delhi, and that our "faithful allies" may even stigmatise the Andamans as a second St. Helena; but, at least, he will escape an ignominious death on the gallows, and will meet with comfortable quarters as are assigned to political offenders on the deadly shores of Cayenne.—*Allen's Indian Mail.*

BAIDUR SHORAPOOR.

The Rajah of Shorapoor evacuated his capital with all his Rohillas and Arabs on the night of the 8th of Feb., and has gone, they say, to Hyderabad. The Shorapoor story is as follows:—The Resident, having heard that the Rajah has been engaging mercenaries from the Nizam's country for hostile purposes against our government, sent Captain Campbell to call the Rajah to account. He arrived at Shorapoor in the beginning of January, and caused the Rajah to confess to his having engaged five jemaulers to collect three thousand men. On this, troops were ordered to close in on Shorapoor, from Lingsoogoor, Kulladghee, Bellary, and Belgaum, a good force of Europeans, horse, guns, &c.,—so that from the date of Capt. Campbell's arrival to investigate the enlisting of mercenaries up to the evacuation of the town, one month even has not passed. Quick work; and we are now snug in the hill chief's palace! Had he shown fight, and defended his fortress at all, he would have bothered us. On the evening of the 7th Feb., Capt. Wyndham's Lingsoogoor field force was attacked by 7000 Arabs, Rohillas, and others, and the enemy continued all night. Captain Wyndham, however, with his gallant little band of 400 men of the 4th Hyderabad Contingent, a few Russalah, and two guns, defied all the repeated attempts of the enemy to close on his column. Lieutenant Adey, 4th Hyderabad Contingent, managed the guns right well, and gave a good account of the enemy, and Capt. Campbell aided Captain Wyndham in handling his men and barricading the position of the detachment. Dr. Williamson was also present at his post, and gave every assistance. At one a.m., Captain Corsair arrived with cavalry and reinforced the detachment. On the morning of the 8th Major Hughes' moveable column advanced upon Deodroog; he attacked the enemy and drove them from some heights. Unfortunately, Capt. George Newbury, 8th Madras Cavalry, was shot dead when charging a body of Rohillas; and Lieutenant Stewart, 8th Cavalry, also was wounded in the head, but not dangerously, in the same spirited charge. Lieutenant-Colonel Malcolm and Lieutenant Kerr, Southern Maratta Horse, arrived on the evening of the 8th, and encamped before Shorapoor, and entering the town on the morning of the 9th, found it deserted, and it has been well looted. If the rajah had any valuables, he must have taken them with him, or they have been looted; where he is, no one seems to be certain of, but the report is that he has gone to the Nizam's country. If so, no doubt Salar Jung, who has already saved the Deccan, our best friend in this part of the world, will ferret him out; what the fate of Shorapoor is to be, remains yet to be seen. We have now in and about Shorapoor, Lieutenant-Colonel Malcolm's force, Major Hughes's ditto, with a large body of Mysore Horse, and Captain Wyndham's force.

THE INDIAN ARMY.

Nearly our whole Indian army is at present actually on field service. The Commander-in-Chief has nearly 20,000 immediately under him, with at least 15,000 more in his rear and flanks. The columns of Roberts, Rose and Whitlock, with their reserves, will muster 20,000 at least. Chamberlain must have 10,000 at his disposal—giving a grand total of 65,000, mostly Europeans, in almost constant conflict with the enemy; while there are probably half as many more in lesser detachments on active duty. 18,000 Europeans are mustering in the Punjaub, and we have probably 60,000 in all the native armies of Bombay and Madras included, stationary on garrison duty.—*Bombay Standard*, Feb. 24.

MONETARY AND COMMERCIAL REVIEW.

The effect produced upon the money market by the official announcement of the East India Loan has been favourable. In round numbers, the loan will absorb about one million per month, a sum which will certainly not distress the money market in its present state, especially considering the approaching payment of the dividends, and of two millions of Exchequer Bonds. The applications for money at the Bank are as scanty as ever, the rate of discount in the open market being still 2½ to 2¾ per cent. for first-class bills. The coin and bullion on Wednesday night, 24th, amounted to £18,753,815, being an increase of not less than £771,660. The increase in the past fortnight has been £1,020,573. The coin amounted on the 24th to £13,901,[illegible] reserve of notes and [illegible] £695,515. 790, being an increase of [illegible]

FRANCE.

On Wednesday night, for the first time since [illegible] the attempt of the 14th January, the Emperor and Empress visited the French opera in the Rue Lepelletier. The correspondent of the *Times* describes the precautions taken on the occasion. For about half an hour before his Majesty arrived, the streets were completely crowded; no group of persons were allowed to remain opposite the entrance. A chain of sentinels was stationed on both sides of the pathway and the middle of the street was patrolled now and then to keep it clear. The Emperor's carriage was preceded by five or six Lancers, with an escort of about twenty or thirty, not more than the ordinary number followed.

Official documents have been discovered, in which it appears that Yeh, during the short period of three months, put to death no less than the enormous number of 20,000 human beings. This is a fact beyond doubt, the documents taken showing the name of every man and woman, and for what they were executed.

Two priests, whose names are not given, have got into trouble for stealing the sepulchral ornaments which deck the tombs in the cemeteries of Pere la Chaise and Mont Parnasse.

An interesting and spirited controversy is going on in Piedmont as to the possibility of successfully achieving of the daring task of cutting a tunnel through the bowels of Mont Cenis. The contemplated tunnel will be eight miles long, and about a mile below the summit of the loftiest mountains in Europe.

The board of trade Returns for the month of February exhibit a steady contraction of the export trade.

Lady Inglis and 106 passengers, from India, arrived at Southampton in the Colombo.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editors of the Protector.

Gentlemen,—As there are a few more sects to dispose of, which "Lector" regards as right good Protestants, allow me to point out, for his information, that they came much nearer, both in doctrine and practice, the Roman Catholic than the Protestant church, if the opinions of Rome's accredited teachers and infallible guides are any authority.

The Monothelites, 625, maintained that there was *one will* and *one operation* in Christ; which doctrine was held in 634 by Honorius, Bishop of Rome, who was, notwithstanding his *infallibility*, condemned by succeeding Pontiffs, and deposed by the 6th General Council, held at Constantinople in 680.

The Paulicians, 650, interpreted the Scriptures in a forced and unnatural manner, regarded baptism as a mere allegorical ceremony, refused to celebrate the ordinance of the Lord's Supper, and rejected the books of the Old Testament; they also disbelieved in the *real* offering up of Christ on the cross, and refused to adore and worship the Virgin Mary,—which was, doubtless, the chief error in the eyes of those who persecuted them in the most unmerciful manner.

The Flagellantes, 1334, imagined that by voluntary mortification and penance they might appease the anger of God and obtain his mercy, and therefore lashed their naked bodies with the most astonishing severity. Numbers of those poor deluded creatures were burnt to death by orders of the Inquisition,—*i. e.*, by that very church which teaches that self-flagellation is a meritorious act and a means of attaining to superior sanctity,—so say Baronius, Cardinal Pullus, Gerson, the Roman Breviary, &c. Baronius calls flagellation "a laudable usage." Cardinal Pullus admits that though the satisfaction is rough, yet in proportion to its severity it is "the more acceptable to God." Gerson recommended the custom when under the control of a superior, and executed "without scandal and ostentation, and without blood." The Roman Breviary, published by the authority of Popes Pius, Clement and Urban, approves of the practice, and holds up to admiration the conduct of Xavier, Francisca, Teresia and many others, who subjected the flesh to the spirit by means of the whip. Xavier, the Indian apostle, we are informed, wielded against his own flesh "an iron whip which, at every blow, was followed with copious streams of blood." Francisca "took continual pains to reduce her body to submission by frequent self-flagellation." Teresia "often applied the bloody lash, rolled herself on thorns, and was thus accustomed to commune with God;" and her body, if we believe the testimony of of a book which is recommended to the perusal of the faithful by the highest and most infallible authorities of the Roman Catholic church, "remains circumfused in a fragrant fluid, till the present day, the undecayed object of worship." Is this Protestant teaching! Do Protestants lacerate their backs for the good of their souls? Do they torture their flesh, and submit to the most cruel inflictions, and draw blood from their mangled bodies, to merit heaven or to attain to superior sanctity? Does God, "who willeth not the death of a sinner, but rather that he should be converted and live," require such bodily chastisements to atone for sin? Does he who says "to obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams," regard the cruel torturings of his creatures as a thing acceptable in his sight? By no means. To whom, then, do the Flagellantes belong? Not to Protestants who make the law of God their guide, and not the commandments of men.

The Fratricelli, 1341, were Franciscan monks, who, clothed in rags, begged their bread from door to door and observed in the strictest manner that austere rule of poverty which St. Francis prescribed for his followers, and claimed as their patron Celestine V, Bishop of Rome. Are Protestants taught from the word of God to eat the bread of idleness,—to glory in their shame,—to bind themselves under austere rules of poverty,—and to cast themselves as burdens on society? Far otherwise. To whom then do swarms of lazy monks and friars belong? Not to the Protestant church,—which tells its members when in health and strength to "labor, working with their own hands the thing which is good, that they may have to give to him that needeth."

The remaining sects are not worthy of notice, as they are rejected by the Protestant community; but even if they were acknowledged, they would come far short of the absurdities (not to use stronger terms which might, in all truth, be applied) which were practised by individuals confessedly belonging to the Roman Catholic church, and acknowledged by its infallible head.

Hoping that these remarks may make "Lector" more wary as to what sects he would class among Protestants,

I am, &c.,

D. FITZ GERALD.

No. 2.

ON THE CANON OF SCRIPTURE.

To the Editors of the Protector.

Gentlemen,—Having in my last letter given you six authorities in proof of my assertion that the *Apocrypha* was not regarded as of divine authority in the early ages of the church, and was never authoritatively placed on the sacred canon, even by the Church of Rome, till the year 1546, when the Council of Trent decreed that *traditions* were of *equal authority* with the *Word of God*; allow me, for the sake of truth, and the importance of the subject, to give you a few more, beginning with Scott, the learned commentator, who says, in his preface to his "Commentary on the Holy Bible," "Considered as *human writings*, the apocryphal books have their use; but if *custom* sanction any of them being bound up in the same volume with the sacred oracles, *truth* requires that we explicitly declare that they are not THE WORD OF GOD. Should it be enquired, how we may distinguish between the genuine books of Scripture, and those which are apocryphal, we answer, that not only some, but all the books contained in our authorized version of the Scriptures, have many or all of those evidences of a divine original, which have been insisted on (*i. e.*, certain reasons, too numerous here to mention, which he gives in the former part of his preface, for believing that the Scriptures are the infallible word of God); but there is not one, of those called the *Apocrypha*, which may not be proved destitute of such evidence; and most of them contain internal proof that they are spurious."

8. Dr. Eadie, in his "Biblical Cyclopædia," says "The *Apocrypha*, which is sometimes bound up with the Bible, is a collection of books which were declared to be sanctioned by divine authority, at a Council held at Trent. The evidence by which their authority is supported is so different from that on which the received books rest, that they are generally rejected as spurious, whatever may be the intrinsic value of their contents. They were written after the canon was closed,—are not composed in Hebrew,—are never quoted in the New Testament,—have not been received by the Jews,—and contain absurdities and contradictions."

9. Calmet, in his "Dictionary of the Holy Bible," gives a *catalogue of the sacred writings, as received by the Jews, from Origen*, in the 3d century, in which he enumerates—1, Genesis; 2, Exodus; 3, Leviticus; 4, Numbers; 5, Deuteronomy; 6, Joshua; 7, Judges and Ruth; 8, The first and second Books of Samuel; 9, The first and second Books of Kings; 10, The first and second Books of Chronicles; 11, The first and second Books of Esdras, *i. e.* Ezra and Nehemiah; 12, The Psalms; 13, The Books of [illegible]rbs; 14, Ecclesiastes; 15, Solomon's Song; 16, Pro[illegible] 17, Jeremiah, with the Lamentations, and the Isaiah; [illegible]tives; 18, Ezekiel; 19, Daniel; 20, Job; Epistle to the [illegible] minor Prophets—*i. e.*, Hosea, Joel, 21, Esther; 22, The [illegible]h, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah, Malac[illegible] of Biblical Literature." 10. Dr. Kitto, in his "Cyclopædia [illegible] though incontestably spurious, are of considerable value from [illegible] antiquity, as throwing light upon the religious and theological opinions of the first centuries."

11. Nicholls, in his "Help to reading the Bible," says "The Apocrypha is no part of the canon of Scripture. The last Council of Trent presumed to call it so; but it was never considered as sacred by the Jews, was never alluded to by our Lord or his apostles, and is not in the Catalogue of Sacred Books given by the Fathers during the first four centuries. They were read in the church after the fourth century; but Jerome expressly informs us 'they were read for example of life and instruction of manners, but were not applied to establish any doctrine,' plainly implying they had no divine authority."

12. Bickersteth, in his "Scripture Help," says "The Canon of Scripture is that body of sacred books which God has given to serve for the divine rule of faith and practice. It is the complete catalogue of sacred writings. The *Apocrypha* is no part of it, nor has any divine authority. The books which compose it were never received as sacred amongst the Jews, to whom 'were committed the oracles of God;' and they are not thus quoted in the New Testament. They were not enumerated among the canonical books, nor quoted as such by any Jewish or Christian writer for many centuries after Christ. Josephus, in the first century, *gives a list of the sacred books, and omits them.* Melito, in the second century, does the same. Origen, in the third, does the same; as do Athanasius, Cyril, Epiphanius, Jerome and Rufinus, in the fourth century. Rufinus and Jerome mention some of the Apocryphal books as *not canonical*. The Council of Trent admitted the greater part of the Apocrypha into the Sacred Canon; and this is the only authority on which it has been received as equal to the sacred writings. It is evident, therefore, that it has not that just claim to divine authority which the Old and New Testaments have."

13. Hartwell Horne, in his "Introduction to the critical study of the Holy Scriptures," says: "Besides the Scriptures of the Old Testament, which are universally acknowledged to be genuine and inspired writings, both by the Jewish and Christian churches, there are several other writings,—partly historical, partly ethical, and partly poetical,—which are called the "Apocrypha," *i. e.* books which are not admitted into the sacred canon, because they are either spurious or, at least, not acknowledged to be divine.

1. The advocates of the church of Rome, indeed, affirm that even these are divinely inspired; but it is easy to account for this assertion: these apocryphal writings serve to countenance some of the corrupt practices of that church.

The Protestant churches not only account those books to be apocryphal, and merely human compositions, which are esteemed such by the church of Rome, as the prayer of Manasseh, the third and fourth books of Esdras, the addition at the end of Job, and the hundred and fifty-first Psalm: but also the books of Tobit, Judith, the additions of the book of Esther, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Baruch the prophet, with the epistle of Jeremiah, the Song of the Three Children, the story of Susannah, the Story of Bel and the Dragon, and the first and second books of Maccabees. The books here enumerated are unanimously rejected by Protestants for the following reasons:—

1. They possess no authority whatever, either external or internal, to procure their admission into the sacred canon.

1. *Not one of them is extant in Hebrew.*

With the exception of the fourth book of Esdras, which is only extant in Latin, they are all written in the Greek language, and for the most part by Alexandrian Jews.

2. *They were written subsequently to the cessation of the prophetic spirit, though before the promulgation of the Gospel.*

In the prophecy of Malachi (iv. 4—6) it is intimated that after him no prophet should arise, until John the Baptist, the harbinger of the Messiah, should appear in the spirit and power of Elijah; and the Jews unanimously agree that the prophetic spirit ceased with Malachi. The author of the book of Wisdom *pretends* that it was written by Solomon—a pretension not only manifestly false, but which also proves that book not to have been inspired. For, in the first place, the author, whoever he was, cites many passages from Isaiah and Jeremiah, who did not prophecy till many ages *after* the time of Solomon, and consequently the book could not have been written by him; and, secondly, it represents the Israelites (Wisd. ix. 7, 8; xv. 14.) as being in subjection to their enemies: whereas we know from the sacred writings, that they enjoyed great peace and prosperity during the reign of Solomon.

3. *Not one of the writers, in direct terms, advances any claims to inspiration.*

On the contrary, so far are the authors of the apocryphal books from asserting their own inspiration, that some of them say what amounts to *an acknowledgment that they were not inspired.* Thus, in the prologue to the book of Ecclesiasticus, the son of Sirach intreats the reader to pardon any errors he may have committed in translating the works of his grandfather Jesus into Greek. In 1 Macc. iv. 46. and ix. 27. it is confessed that there was at that time no prophet in Israel; the second book of Maccabees (ii. 23.) is an avowed abridgment of five books originally written by Jason of Cyrene; and the author concludes with the following words, which are utterly unworthy of a person writing by inspiration.—*If I have done well, and as it is fitting the story, it is that which I desired; but, if slenderly and meanly, it is that which I could attain unto.* (2 Macc. xv. 38.)

4. *The apocryphal books were never received into the sacred canon by the Jewish church, and therefore they were not sanctioned by our Saviour.*

No part of the apocrypha is quoted, or even alluded to by him or by any of his apostles; and both Philo and Josephus who flourished in the first century of the Christian æra, are totally silent concerning them.

II. The apocryphal books were not admitted into the canon of Scripture during the first four centuries of the Christian Church.

They are not mentioned in the catalogue of inspired writings made by Melito, bishop of Sardis, who flourished in the second century, nor in those of Origen, in the third century, of Athanasius, Hilary, Cyril of Jerusalem, Epiphanius, Gregory Nazianzen, Amphilochius, Jerome, Rufinus, and others of the fourth century; nor in the catalogue of canonical books recognised by the council of Laodicea, held in the same century, whose canons were received by the Catholic church: so that, as Bishop Barnet well observes, "we have the concurring sense of the whole church of God in this matter." To this decisive evidence against the canonical authority of the apocryphal books, we may add that they were never read in the Christian church until the fourth century; when, as Jerome informs us, they were read "for example of life, and instruction of manners, but were not applied to establish any doctrine;" and contemporary writers state, that although they were not approved as canonical or inspired writings, yet some of them, particularly Judith, Wisdom, and Ecclesiasticus, were allowed to be perused by catechumens. As a proof that they were not regarded as canonical in the fifth century, Augustine relates, that when the book of Wisdom was publicly read in the church it was given to the readers of inferior ecclesiastical officers, who read it in a lower place than those books which were universally acknowledged to be canonical, which were read by the bishops and presbyters in a more eminent and conspicuous manner. To conclude:—Notwithstanding the veneration in which those books were held by the Western Church, it is evident that the same authority was never ascribed to them as to the Old and New Testament; until the last council of Trent, at its fourth session, presumed to place them all (excepting the prayer of Manasseh and the third and fourth books of Esdras in the same rank with the inspired writings of Moses and the prophets.

III. The apocryphal books contain many things which are fabulous and contradictory to the canonical Scriptures both in facts, doctrines, and moral practice.

A few instances, out of many that might be adduced, wil suffice to prove this assertion.

Fabulous Statements.

(1.) Rest of chapters of Esther, x. 6 *A little fountain became a river, and there was light, and the sun, and much waters. This river is Esther, whom the king married and made queen.* xiv. 2.

(2.) The story of Bell and the Dragon is, confessedly, a mere fiction, which contradicts the account of Daniel's being cast into the lion's den.

(3.) The stories of *water* being converted into *fire*, and *vice versa* (2 Macc. i. 19—22), and of the Tabernacle and Ark walking after Jeremiah at the prophet's command. (2 Macc. ii. 4.)

Contradictory Statements.

(1.) The author of the book of the Wisdom of Solomon alludes to the people of Israel as being in subjection to their enemies, which was not the case during Solomon's reign. We read, indeed, that he had enemies in the person of Hadad, Rezon and Jeroboam (1 Kings xi. 14. 25. 26), who vexed him: but we nowhere find that they subdued his people; and the schism of the ten tribes did not take place until after the death of Solomon.

(2.) Baruch is said (i. 2.) to have been carried into *Babylon*, at the very time when Jeremiah tells us xliii. 6 7.) that he was carried into the land of *Egypt*.

(3.) The story in 1 Esdras iii. iv., besides wanting every mark of the majesty and sanctity of the Sacred Writings, contradicts Ezra's account of the return of the Jews from Babylon under Cyrus.

(4.) The first and second books of Maccabees contradict each other; for in the former (1 Macc. vi. 4—16.) Antiochus Epiphanes is said to have died in Babylon; and in the latter he is represented, *first*, as having been slain by the priests at Nanea, in Persia (2 Macc. i. 13—16.), and *afterwards* (ix. 28.), as dying a miserable death in *a strange country among the mountains.*

(5.) In the book of Tobit, the angel that is introduced (v. 7,18.) as representing himself as being a kinsman of Tobit, in xii. 15. contradicts himself, by affirming that he is Raphael, one of the holy angels. The author of this book has also added to the views of God and of his Providence, delineated in Old Testament tenets of Assyrian or Babylonian origin.

the [illegible] Contradictory Doctrines.

[illegible] —2 Macc. xii. 43, 44. *And when he had made a gathering throughout the com[illegible], to the sum of 2000 drachms of silver, he sent it to Jerusalem to offer a sin-offering, doing therein very well and honestly; for, if he had not hoped that they that were slain should have risen again, it had been superfluous and vain to pray for the dead.* This statement contradicts the whole tenor of the Sacred Writings, which nowhere enjoin or allow of prayers for the dead.

(2.) *The heathen notion of the Transmigration of Souls*, which is equally contradictory to the Bible, is asserted in Wisd. viii. 19, 20. *For I was a witty child, and had a good spirit; yea, rather being good, I came into a body undefiled.*

(3.) *Justification by the Works of the Law* (in opposition to the Scriptures, which teach that we are justified or accounted righteous only by faith) is taught in various parts of the apocryphal books:—2 Esdras viii. 33 *The just which have many good works laid up with thee, shall out of their own deeds receive reward.* Tobit xii. 8, 9. *Prayer is good with fasting, and alms, and righteousness. . . . . Alms doth deliver from death, and shall purge away all sins. Those that exercise alms and righteousness shall be filled with life.* Ecclus. iii. 3. *Whoso honoureth the father maketh atonement for his sins.* 30. *Alms maketh an atonement for sins!* xxxv. 3. *To forsake righteousness is a propitiation.*

(4.) *Sinless perfection.* Ecclus. xiii. 24. *Riches are good unto him that hath no sin.* But what say the scriptures? Eccles. vii. 20. *There is* NOT *a just man upon earth, that doth good, and sinneth not.* Rom. ii. 23. All *have sinned and come short of the glory of God.* 1 John i. 8. *If we say we have no sin we deceive ourselves, and the truth is* NOT *in us.*

IV Immoral Practices.

Commended in the apocryhal books, which practices are prohibited in the Scriptures.

(1.) *Lying.*—The instances cited No. (5.) may also be adduced here.

(2.) A desperate act of *Suicide* (which is expressly forbidden in Exod. xx. 13. (*Thou shalt* NOT *kill*) is related in 2 Macc. xiv. 41—46. as a *manful act*, and in terms of great commendation.

(3.) *Assassination*, which is equally prohibited, is commended in the book of Judith (ix. 2—9.) in the case of the Schechemites, whose base murder is justly condemned in Gen. xlix. 7.

(4.) *Magical Incantations*, which are forbidden in Lev. xix. 26. and Deut. xviii. 10, 11, 14, are introduced in Tobit vi. 16, 17, as given by the advice of an angel of God.

IV. Lastly, There are passages in the apocryphal books, which are so inconsistent with the relations of all other profane historians, that they cannot be admitted without much greater evidence than belongs to these books.

Thus in 1 Macc. viii. 16. it is said that the Romans "committed their government to *one man every year*, who ruled over all that country, and that all were obedient to that one, and that there was neither envy nor emulation amongst them."

Now this assertion is contradicted by *every* Roman historian without exception. The imperial government was not established until more than a century *after* the time when that book was written. In like manner, the account (in 1 Macc. i. 6, 7.) of the death of Alexander, misnamed the Great, is not supported by the historians who have recorded his last hours.

14. Dupin, a Roman Catholic historian, in his "History of the Canon of Scripture," says "The first and most ancient catalogue of the canonical books that we have, drawn up by a Christian author, is that of Melito, Bishop of Sardis. This catalogue is mentioned by Eusebius, in the 26th chapter of the 4th book of his history. In it he reckons only 22 books of the Old Testament. Origen, in a passage extracted from his commentary on the 1st Psalm, reckons also 22. The Council of Laodicea, which is the first synod wherein the number of the canonical books was determined, assigns only 22 books of the Old Testament, including the book of Esther, and joining Baruch, the Lamentations and the Letters with the prophecy of Jeremiah. This catalogue is followed by St. Cyril of Jerusalem in his fourth catechetical lecture, and by St. Athanasius in his Festival epistle." The same historian gives us the testimony of Jerome, and mentions also the condition on which the 3d Council of Carthage, in Africa, admitted the apocrypha into the canon. Jerome says "all the books of the Old Testament among the Jews are 22, of which five belong to Moses, eight to the prophets, and nine to the other holy penmen;—and we are to take notice, that whatever is not contained in the number of those books which we have translated from the Hebrew, is apocryphal. From hence, it follows that the Book of Wisdom—commonly ascribed to Solomon, Ecclesiasticus—said to be composed by Jesus the son of Sirach, Judith, Tobit and Pastor, do not belong to the canon, no more than the two books of the Maccabees." And with respect to the Council of Carthage, Dupin says, "The first catalogue wherein the books of the Apocrypha were admitted as canonical and as having the same authority as the Bible, is that of the 3d Council of Carthage, held in the year 397, and received on condition that the church beyond the sea should be consulted for its confirmation;" and at a *second* Council of Carthage, in 418, the Apocrypha was taken into the canonical catalogue on the same condition as that stated at the former Council.

It is worth while remembering that, even admitting this statement to be correct, it is but the decision of one church, and not of the church at large; and that the decree which this council passed never received, till the Council of Trent met in 1545, the confirmation which it required,—and then only from the Roman Catholic church. One should also remember that, admitting the apocryphal books as *canonical*, and regarding them as of *divine* authority, are two very different things. On this point we have the testimony of Bishop Burnet, as gathered from the early Fathers. "At first," he says, "many writings were read in the churches, that were in high reputation, both for the sake of the authors and of the contents of them, though they were never looked on as a part of the canon,—such were Clemens's Epistle, the books of Hermas, the acts of the Martyrs, besides several other things which were read in particular churches. And among these, the apocryphal books came also to be read, as containing some valuable books of instruction, besides several fragments of the Jewish history, which were perhaps too easily believed to be true. These therefore being usually read, they came to be reckoned among canonical scriptures: for *this is the reason assigned in the 3d Council of Carthage for calling them canonical, because they had received them from the Fathers as books that were to be read in churches;* and the word *canonical* was by some in those ages used in a large sense, in opposition to spurious;—so that it signified no more than that they were genuine.

On the strength of these authorities,—and many more, which might be multiplied to an unnecessary extent,—I hold the first assertion made by "Common Sense" to be not founded on fact or on the testimony of history, viz.. "That the Apocrypha has always been considered as of divine authority by the ancient councils of the church, and that the Protestant version which rejects it does not contain the whole canon of Scripture."

I am, &c.,

A Student of Church History.

"I know enough of Popery to dread its artifices."

—*Capt. Vicars.*

To the Editors of the Protector.

Gentlemen,—It seems that Mr. Lochhead and I, by supporting, at our recent Protestant Meeting, the resolution which asked for an improvement in the present state of the Academy, have brought out upon us the displeasure of Mr. Kenny. This,—though I did not think so then,—might be expected. The spirit of that gentleman's letters gives unmistakeable evidence that improved education "is pressed" upon Catholics, and is not "indigenous" to Popery; and, I think, ere this correspondence is terminated, some of the defects of the Academy, and something of the character of Romanism, will have more clearly appeared than they did at that meeting.

I renew my protestation, that I had no wish to do any thing,—nor do I believe that there was the slightest desire on the part of any person who spoke that evening, to say any thing,—prejudicial to Mr. Kenny's interests as a Teacher in the Academy; and, let it be distinctly understood, that Mr. K. has not contradicted one statement which I made, relative to the state of our principal institution of learning. By a reference, it is true, to "white chokers," "maternal vanity," and "broad looming hats," he tries to explain all away,—with what success, I leave, meantime, a reflecting public to decide, while I go on to consider some of his statements.

He objects to the tribunal before which the Academy was tried, and refers to Maynooth as proof of the validity of his objection. In this reference, he blunders. The examination into the state of that hot-bed of disloyalty by a committee, was the *result of public meetings*, just like the one we had. *It is time enough* to appoint a committee and complain to the trustees of the Academy,—were this our intention, or *should it be found necessary to do so.* Mr. K. has been worrying himself in the vain effort to cross a bridge ere he has reached it, and most unreasonably blames his fellow travellers because they are not in a similar predicament! Besides, the deficiencies of the Academy are *patent* to all: formerly, it had *three* teachers; now it has but *two*,—and it is no secret that it rejects the Word of God, as unfit to stand in its approved list of books. What rendered the course adopted in reference to Maynooth necessary, was the *duplicity* of the professors, who falsified in order to protect themselves against the just punishment due the crime of rebellion. They taught what they denied they did.—I hope we are not come to this state in our Academy; and were it even so, there is time enough for a committee.

In regard to other points, Mr. Kenny argues on false assumptions also. If his "strictures" have any force, this is due to the incorrect supposition that the Academy of to-day is as well supplied with teachers as it was some time ago. But what of the mathematical character of this postulate, when every body knows that now we have but Messrs. McKenzie and Kenny; formerly, Messrs. Le Page, Kenny and Cundall held professorial chairs. Before we can allow his argument to be of any value, he must prove, at least, that two are equal to three. Granted, that Mr. McKenzie can supply the place of Mr. Le Page; there yet remains a cypher in lieu of Mr. Cundall. Such is the state of the Academy, and is of itself sufficient to give rise to the discussion at the aforesaid meeting. He writes as if the Academy has been for some considerable time in its present condition, and points to professional men in the island who have been trained there, as evidence of its ability. Yet, in all times past he occupied but a subordinate position to one, and was associated with two others. What the present staff of teachers can do must be uncertain,—and the past can be no guarantee for the future. He, moreover, commits a grave offence when, for the purpose of feeding his vanity and blinding the public, Mr. K. carefully excludes Messrs. Humphreys and Cundall from any lot or part in the honors gained by the Academy. Having plucked every laurel from his colleagues and superiors, ignored them, treated them as useless and expensive appendages of the Academy, in utter obliviousness, too, of his "*exact* sciences," he attaches all to his own person,—and struts forth in a most magnificent air, to proclaim to all men his herculean strength, and to teach us that it is perfectly absurd to talk of improving that institution which is blessed with his direction. Very modest, Mr. Kenny—very.

Having treated others unfairly, I am no wise surprised to find him guilty of a similar misdemeanor as regards myself. By placing in immediate contrast what I did say,—but what referred to different subjects,—he calls in question my veracity in statement and honesty of sentiment *as regards himself*. My answer is a very simple one. I make a distinction between John Kenny, Esq., Head Teacher of the Academy, and John Kenny, Catholic, subject of the Pope—whose headship he holds, both in church and *state, to be universal*. This principle, so plain, it was supposed Mr. K. would admit. It seems, however, that he so identifies himself with popery — time and again proven to be Anti-Christ—that we cannot speak even of its darkest type (though we expressly guarded against such a contingency) without sorely offending him in his *status* as head teacher of this Island! This is a discovery, and one worth making,—but is wholly irreconcilable with his loud declarations of liberality, and freedom from narrow sectarianism; and must arrest the attention and excite the fears of Protestant parents, whose children are under his control. Mark it well; Mr. Kenny never forgets that he is a papist, and treats his severance as a teacher from his standing as a good son of mother church, an odious insult. Thus has he got himself into a pretty dilemma, and must either retract his charge upon me and abandon one of his chief pretexts for writing, or stand before the public a self-confessed and confirmed bigot, and as such, utterly disqualified to hold his present situation. Viewed from this stand point, we can very easily see why he raises such a cry against touching the Academy, and why he adopts the jugglery of his "co-religionists," practised in the Bible agitation, who, to turn public condemnatory sentiment from the *doer* of wrong, and fix it upon the *exposers* of wrong, clothe the latter in robes of persecution,—just so, Mr. K. construes the Protestant laudable effort to increase the efficiency of the Academy into a personal attack on him; that he may secure public sympathy on his side, and against us,—a circumstance which would enable him to advance, by popular credulity, popish interests, whilst he could repudiate party ends. He seems to know that persecution creates sympathy, and that oft people do not wait to ascertain who the *real* persecutor is. But I hope that there is good sense enough in our island to see the trick, and firmness and honesty enough to tell any man who, for whatever cause, does not wish to adjust himself to the spirit of the age, that he must be responsible for the effects of his own awkwardness; and that the Academy must be improved, *whether Mr. Kenny will or not.*

Giving, then, to the subject that length and breadth which are its due,—taking it out of the selfish grasp of a doubly interested individual, within the narrow limitations of which it was worse than folly to place it,—and treating it with the freedom of a public question (its real character, and one not hostile to Mr. K. himself), I would ask, was the Resolution put into our hands, and the strictures arising therefrom, out of place? The drift of all was to increase, not diminish the number of teachers, and otherwise improve the Academy. Now, the most hasty glance will convince one that the maintenance of this idea dovetails, in a thousand places, with what every where is transpiring around us. I might speak of social reforms,—of facilitated intercourse with neighbouring provinces,—of the more lively and improved state of things in Charlottetown itself; of the country also,—the mail visits the counties with increased speed and frequency,—farmers work more scientifically, and so do all craftsmen,—villages are springing up where formerly a solitary hamlet broke surrounding stillness; of the improvement in our schools and school-houses,—of our ministers, doctors, and lawyers,—who, at the bare idea of progress, are not cast into nervous fits! Rather, are they anxious that the coming generation shall be better than that which is passing away! But it will be enough to show the propriety of the Resolution, and confound our adversary, to apprize the reader of the fact that, even in Great Britain and America, there is a strong demand for educational reform, and improvement in the most renowned universities. Celebrated old Oxford, of grey antiquity, does not resist the demand to reform, indifferent to popular voice as she rests on her well earned reputation, much less scowls with froward countenance upon all who hint at progress. Sir William Hamilton, representing as well as guiding the school of common sense, directed not long before his death the powers of his gigantic mind to "education and university reform;" while Dr. Wayland, of extensive and well merited fame, writing on a similar subject, says, "it would seem that our whole system of instruction requires an *honest*, thorough and candid revision." And we know that Canada, New Brunswick, and Nova Scotia are alive to the importance of moving in the same direction;—nor is there a man in these provinces, placed at the head of any one of their best institutions, so *recreant to his trust or shamefully unpatriotic*, that would dare tell his country that it possesses all it needs in the question of education. But when we in P. E. Island speak of improving our poor Academy, we are immediately accused of the basest motives; in the heat of opposition made to this, even female modesty and domestic order are outraged; sons taught to despise their mothers; ribaldry itself employed,—and all this by the Head Teacher of that institution! This is truly deplorable, and calls for immediate and severe correction. Progress,—a desire to rise, and to ascend still higher, is the educational spirit in all enlightened countries, and is exemplified throughout British dominion, excepting in the Academy and Mr. Kenny's mind,—there every thing must remain in a dead standstill! He would have that seat of learning, as the popes rejoiced to have this lower world, a *fixture* in the wide field of space,—with sun, and stars, and planets in motion round it, to subserve and magnify its little greatness; and seems as ready to denounce any one who would interfere with his order of ideas, as were their "Eminences of the Holy Office" to curse Galileo for teaching that the earth *moves*, and than ours that there are greater orbs!—or, rather, like an animal disposed to cleave to "rocks" and tenacious in its grasp, his progress, "lobster like, backward goes." The very man, from his position, who should be foremost in this movement, to encourage and direct it, is acting as an educational obstructionist. I will give one reason, which will go far to account for this anomaly,—and I beg the attention of