

One, that the lecturer was in full sympathy with his subject. The King Among Men was Abraham Lincoln. There can be no doubt that the Doctor stirred many a heart to the effort of a noble life such as Lincoln's. Although the lecture was somewhat long, yet we were sorry that some part of it was passed over. We could have listened much longer. The audience was large and attentively appreciative.

Our last two lectures have been delivered on the Hill in the New Academy Hall. The place is well suited for the purpose.

SUBSCRIBERS.—Our obligations to our publishers are due *and more than due*; we are actually deeply in debt. Cannot you, who have not paid, send us 50c. immediately? If all will forward their subscriptions, we shall be able to clear ourselves from debt. Surely the ATHENÆUM is worth 50c. if anything. All our exchanges, with only one or two exceptions, are \$1.00 or upwards.

Correspondence.

[We have no particular desire to make the ATHENÆUM a medium for controversy; yet as we published an article last issue, signed "PETER," to which one of our old friends seems to take exception, we feel compelled to insert an answer in this issue. Robert Hall once said that "the evils of controversy were all transitory, but its benefits were permanent and eternal."]

MESSRS EDITORS :

In writing a few lines for insertion in the columns of your neat little paper, I do not wish to be understood as one desiring to find fault, but as a sincere well-wisher towards yourselves and the institution which you represent. Any remarks, therefore, that I shall make, which might seem to indicate an inclination towards fault-finding, are made rather in order to bring about a proper understanding of the facts of the case in question—and that the truth be known must

certainly be a benefit to all. In your last issue I noticed a communication from a correspondent, signed Peter, under the caption of the new "Theological Department." I wish briefly to notice some of his arguments in order. In speaking of students looking with disfavor on the above named project, your correspondent goes on to remark, that among this class of persons there exists a "wide-spread misapprehension" as to the matter. Now I am inclined to give students credit for having a better knowledge of their wants than Peter would allow them. For example, a student comes to Wolfville, and first spends one or two years in the preparatory department, then enters College and spends four years more on the regular course. What now is the best course for him to pursue? is the natural and sensible question that he asks himself. Is it to remain still in the same place, surrounded by the same influence, and to a great extent, under the tutorship of the same man; or rather is it not preferable to have a change of associations and of teachers, and to seek some place where he may come into contact with the thought, as well as the men of the day outside of the institutions? The latter must, I think, be conceded as the more advisable course to follow. I fear that the time is far distant, when Wolfville will become such a literary background for an educational institution as Boston is for the one where most of our young men seek their theological training at present. But, moreover, Peter asserts (and like Peter of old, evidently without consideration) that our College and some others commenced small and grew up gradually, *ergo* all other institutions must do the same for all time to come. Wonderful logic, Peter! did you never hear of the fallacy of *non sequitur* when you were studying the syllogism? But to return. This I consider an important point, and one that we would do well to consider in its true light, and in view of all its attendant circumstances. If our College began low, common education in the provinces was proportionally low at the time, so that it met the requirements of the gener-