To the Editor of Haszard's Gazette.

Sir;

Having disposed of the argument from the Abrahamic covenant, and shewn that there is nothing in it, to warrant the expectation of the restoration of the Jews; their original connexion with, and typical relation to, the land of Canaan being dissolved, when the Jews themselves ceased to be types of the spiritual seed of Abraham, I now proceed to the argument from prophecy. It may be, that, though the land of Canaan relatively to other countries, and the Jews to other people, can never possess peculiar sacredness of character, (the hour having long since come, when neither in Jerusalem, nor in any other place in the land, are men to worship the Father, that is to say, exclusively, or preeminently, and when anywhere may He be worshipped in spirit and in truth,) it is determined in the counsels of God that the Jews shall reoccupy their ancient territory. If so, the Divine purpose, may be expected to be disclosed in prophecy.

In the view of many, it is acknowledged, that the restoration, is in the clearest manner predicted. Thus speaks "Inquirer," and the argument he makes use of, is very generally employed. "*Let any individual free from prejudice, review the history of the Hebrew people; consider their deliverance from Egyptian bondage, on the very day the 430 years were accomplished: their entrance into Canaan on the expiration of their 40 years wandering. Their captivity in Babylon, and their return thence, after the predicted 70 years, &c. These things have been literally accomplished, and the same God has declared He "will gather Israel as a shepherd does his sheep."* "That he will set his hand the *second time* to recover the remnant of his people &c., Isaiah XI, 11, 12." *As the threatenings have been literally accomplished, where is the authority that the promises are not literal also?*"

So says 'Inquirer,' and others before him. The argument we allow, is plausible, and may impose upon superficial thinkers. But to shew, that the principle of interpretation, laid down by him, is not founded in truth, I would refer to the prophecies, concerning the Saviour. All that he did, and said, and suffered on earth was predicted with great minuteness, and the predictions have been fulfilled to the very letter; and it might have been supposed, with as much reason antecedently to the event, as in regard to the restoration of the Jews, that the predictions relating to His exaltation and kingdom, would be accomplished to the very letter also. What reason, it might have been asked, is there, why we should adopt a different principle of interpretation, in explaining the prophecies, referring to his exaltation, from what we do, in expounding those relating to his humiliation? It is plain, however, they have not been *literally* accomplished. He did not literally bruise the head of the serpent. He did not literally go down to the enemies country, and tread his foes in his anger, and trample them in his fury. He did not come up thence, travelling in the greatness of his strength, with dyed garments. He did not literally go up with a shout, nor lead captivity captive, followed by a retinue of 20 thousand literal chariots, nor sit upon the literal throne of his father David or at the literal right hand of God, &c. Admitting then, that the prophecies relating to the dispersion of the Jews, have been literally fulfilled, it by no means follows, that those predicting their restoration, or *apparently so*, must also be accomplished to the letter.

The reverse, indeed, may rather be expected. The coming of the Messiah, and the introduction of the kingom of heaven, under him, so deeply affected all existing relations, and elevated the divine administration, so far above its former level, that another rule and measure, than what was observed before the advent, might be expected to hold, for what was to come after. Prophecies which have received their fulfilment, under the past dispensation, cannot be taken as a guide, although couched in the same phraseology, in our interpretation of such, as fall to be accomplished during the present. Who does not know, that, while both old and new Testament worshippers, are alike declared to have had the gospel preached to them: to be eaters at an altar; to offer sacrifices incense and a pure offering; to have their persons purified by the blood of sprinkling and their bodies washed with pure water; the ideas conveyed by such expressions, are very different under the different dispensation. If the ideas, which such expressions conveyed, under the former economy, have been modified, elevated and enlarged, by the introduction of the kingdom of heaven, may it not be reasonably supposed, that the same cause, must have similarly affected, the utterances of prophecy, remaining yet to be accomplished?

It is the characteristic of prophecy, morever, to take its form and shape, from the occasion and circumstances that gave rise to it. Predictions of new Testament ideas, were cast in the mould of old Testament relations. To interpret them literally will convey a false impression. The real substance of the prophecy, can only be obtained by looking through the form; in which for the time, it happened to be embodied, or the mould in which it happened to be cast. The first promise of deliverance, received its form, from the manner of temptation and fall. As far as I know no one ever expected, that, what to be done, was the bruising of the head of the outward serpent. But what was true of the first promise is true of by far the greater part of the delineations given, of prospective blessedness and glory, when the scene is laid, at least, in a state of things essentially different from the present. It was under the form and aspect of circumstances *present*, to the ancient Jews, that the *future* was pictured to their mind. It was thus only, that *they* could form a conception, at all approximating to the reality. But it would be very absurd, to expect the prophecy to be fulfilled, according to the letter, of the form or shape in which it was given. Thus to a downcast and mourning people, it was predicted, that the Messiah would come to give them beauty for ashes, the oil of joy for mourning, the garment of praise for the spirit of heaviness. Was it to be supposed, that the Messiah would go about with vessels of oil and change of raiment? For the same reason we read of there being many mansions, in the house of our heavenly Father, whither, the redeemed are to go: of remembrance books, to be opened on the day of judgment: of a tree of life, in the midst of the paradise above; of crowns of purest gold, &c. The unseen future, is clothed in the hue and aspect, of what is known and familiar, that the idea may assume in the mind, a more vivid and substantial existence. It is for this purpose, that prophecy throws its delineations of coming good or evil, so much into the form of existing relations and current or past transactions, which were all so ordered and arranged by God, as fitly to represent and image forth, the things, that were to be hereafter; hence the glowing character of these delineations, which, but for such reference, to the present and the past, must have been comparatively cold and lifeless.

With these remarks, we proceed to examine the references, given by my learned opponents, as decisive of their view of the question. And, the first, I select is that, on which "Inquirer" seems the most, to depend. It is to be found, in Isaiah, XI, 11, 12. He sees no reason, why those verses should not be understood *literally*, like the predictions relating to the captivity. And, it will be observed, that he has marked with special emphasis, the words, "*the second time*," apparently, for this reason, that the reader may be convinced that the accomplishment of the prophecy cannot be referred to the restoration in the days of Ezra or Nehemiah. Now, I affirm, that, if the "unprejudiced reader" will look through the whole passage of which the verses form a part, he will be satisfied, that "Inquirer,' is entirely mistaken in his view; the providence of God, the great interpreter of prophecy, having rendered a literal fulfilment, an absolute impossibility. The passage affords the clearest and most incontrovertible evidence, that it is to be interpreted on the principle I have laid down. Why are these countries only mentioned? These are not the countries in which the Jews are alone or principally to be found. Are they to return, in the first instance, to Egypt as Hosea also affirms, if he is to be understood literally, VIII, 13. Are they to enter the land of Canaan after retracing the steps of their forefathers, spoiling the people, as they had done the ancient Egyptians, and witnessing the like stupendous miracles? Is the whole ancient East again to appear? Are the Philistines, the Edomites, Moabites, &c., to be also restored to their own land, and to stand in their ancient relations, to the restored Jews? Must we deny all history, and prostrate our reason to believe all this. It would be as possible for the Philistines, &c. to re-appear, as it would be, for the Saxons, Danes, Normans, Celts and Romans, to emerge from their common descendants the English. No man, contends for the restoration of the Edomites, but in this passage, there is as much consolation for him as for the Jew, so far as is implied, in restoration to his own land. Admit the *one* to be predicted, and the *other* must be received. The distinct and separate existence of the Edomite and the Philistines &c., again, is however, physically impossible, and by consequence their restoration. These people therefore must be *typical*. But if they are, if the countries *from which* the monarchies *in spite of which*, the restoration is to be affected, must be understood *typically*, are we not bound, in consistency, to regard as *typical*, the *people* who are to be restored, the *country*, to which they are to be restored, and the *restoration* itself. If *one* be typical *all* must be. How incongruous were it to mix up in one prediction, a typical foe and a literal Israel, a typical Egypt and a literal Judah. The subject of the restoration and deliverance, it is obvious, is not the natural Jew at all, but the *believer* of whom he was the type, and the restoration or deliverance is, not to be literally such as in former times was experienced by the natural Israel; but one from sin and death of which the former was typical. The restoration is the same as that predicted in the 68th Psalm, 18 v., and Luke 1, 74.

It has ever been, we may observe, the general character of God's communications to his Church, that they stand associated, with manifold circumstances, of place and time, and when prospective, they necessarily bear on them, the type of past and present realities. For all former good to the Church and evil to the adversaries of God, is a pledge of similar good or evil hereafter, in like circumstances to arise. Hence the great mass of God's promises to the Church, take the form of a recovery, a restoration or restitution; the state of things before the fall being made the type of one class; the signal deliverance from Egypt first, and afterwards from Babylon, the type of another; the rest, fulness of enjoyment and manifold goodness, enjoyed in the time of David and Solomon, of a third, &c. All these promises, therefore, being drawn out in the form and pattern of former things are to be accepted as conveying "*image of the things*" not as holding out to our expectation, the recurrence of those events which, were merely the shadow of the good things to come.

This must be taken as a specimen of the manner in which the other reference might be handled. I proceed to select one, and the one apparently the most pointed and decisive made by another opponent. In justice to me, and morality his real name should be published. Why should he represent me as opposed to God, or to the Bible, because I don't read the *word* as he does, which is precisely as a child looks on the works of God, and is led to believe the stars to be twinkling diamonds? Why should he make use of God's name in the way he does? It will not do to say, he quoted the simple and pure words of the Bible, he did so *with a sense attached to them they will not bear*. In the same way he might assert that all the evil that exists, is the creation of God, and quote his own authority for it.

The reference I mean to examine, will be found in Ezekiel, XXXVII, 20, 28. Let the reader turn to it and he will find three things predicted. 1st, a kingdom, composed of the 12 restored tribes, united under one sceptre, pure and holy. 2d. A King not liable to death. 3d. A temple, which is not to be destroyed. Now, then, to begin with the last; the temple cannot be a material structure, but must be that of which the new Testament speaks which is composed of living stones, built on Christ, the foundation stone, who also, is the chief corner stone. It is by their connection with Christ that they become living stones, a living temple the residence of the Deity, and fitted to promote his glory. This temple alone, is imperishable. Built and constituted as it is, it will survive the wreck of matter and the crush of worlds. Besides, the new Testament expressly discountenances the idea, that the temple of Jerusalem, will be rebuilt, and the worship formerly maintained revived. 2d. A King, David by name. Is this David the identical son of Jessie? no, it is Christ, the antitypical David. But Christ is now reigning. 1800 years have passed away, since he was raised to the throne of his father David. Let all the house of Israel, know assuredly, said Peter, that God hath made that same Jesus, both Lord and Christ. Him hath God exalted with his right hand, to be a Prince and a Saviour. Therefore, 3dly. The kingdom over which he is reigning, must have been established, and existing, during all this time, while the tribes of the natural Israel have been lost, or dispersed. It must also be of a character with its king, antitypical and spiritual, and consists, with the definition, which he has given of the nature of his kingdom—not if this world. Need I say it is composed of believers—the 12 tribes of the spiritual Israel, once lost, now gathered from all lands, by his word and spirit These are firmly united under David the King. Never can be heard in this kingdom the cry of schism and revolt "*what portion have we in David.*" One principle of affection binds all the subjects to Him and to each other. His doctrines only will they believe. His rule only will they obey.

Of the several references made to the new Testament, one only, has a semblance of bearing; on the question, Luke, XXI, 24. The words, however, simply declare, that as the kingdom was to be taken from the Jews, and an earthly centre was no longer needed, the providence of God would so order events that it should never rise from its depression during the whole continuance of this gospel age. Beyond this, it is silent and we must not insert words not to be found in it.

The argument from the expectations and desires of the Jews is most absurd. Has the Christ not come because they look for him as still to come.

A good deal more might be said but enough has been said to vindicate my sentiments.

Pastor.

(For Haszard's Gazette.)

Sir,—In the *Islander* of the 2d May, the editor remarks, "That he does not know how the contingent expences are laid out, but believes they are intended to pay, for those splendid dinner parties to Messrs Cooper, M'Intosh, and Laird, at Government House, &c. &c." may be understood by readers near Town, but others are not a little puzzled, to find out the meaning, and the following explanation is offered to them: At the close of the session, the chief officers of the House, envited the members to a parting cup; and on the governor's health being proposed, M'Intosh made inquiry, and ascertained that those present had been invited to the governor's parties; with the exception, of the three Members before named. And M'Intosh refused to drink to a Governor's health, who would make such invidious distinctions, which refusal was soon blown abroad, and made a part of the town talk.

Such trifles, though lighter than chaff, serves all the better to shew, how the winds blow. It shows in the first place; that Mr. Daly has undertaken to govern this Colony, to enable one class of persons to prey upon the other. To uphold conspirators in their usurpation of the public land; so that they may defraud the agricultural inhabitants of their property. And also to defraud the citizens of their common, that property which was set apart, by an order of the king in council, intended for the improvement and ornament of the city. And it shews that out of a representation of twenty-four Members, how very few there are, who *strenuously* oppose the nefarious measures. And I believe, that besides the party, Mr. Daly has pledged himself to serve; and the party who have pledged themselves to serve him; the rest are invited with the veiw to countenance and strengthen his party, and enable him to defraud the labouring class, in *disobedience of the law and the sovereign's instructions*. But when Mr. Daly found, he could gain no support to his measures by inviting those three Members, their dinners would have been a *total loss* to him; and he deserves credit at *least* for his economy, to *leave out of his list*, such men as he could not bend to serve his purpose.

It is seldom that men who aspire to be honored and respected, will do a public wrong without some strong inducement, and it has become a maxim in common parlance; that when men in Office, invested with power and authority, to do what is lawful and right; and yet do that which they know to be wrong, it must be from interested motives. Therefore it is said of such men, that they have been corrupted, and as murder has frequently been committed, for no other cause but to conceal other crimes, so one unlawful act, generally requires many more of the like nature to conceal and secure the first, and as this is peculiarly applicable to the state of this Colony, and on referring so often to these matters, it is necessary that I should show the *grounds* and the *authors* of the corruption in this Colony, in a connected form.

After repeated applications to the Home government by petition, between the years 1787 and 1802 for a settlement of the Land question, it was favourably entertained by the Colonial Minister, and an act passed in this Colony received the Royal assent about the year 1803, to revest the forfeited Lands in the crown, and on its arrival with the Royal Assent, that circumstance was whispered to a few. But while those measures were coming to maturity, the governor and others were possessing themselves of the Townships, of I believe, more than half the Island. And instead of revesting the forfeited Land in the crown, the Colonial Government recalled their whispers, turned traitors, concealed and denied that the Royal assent had been given to the act, usurped the Royal authority and vested the Lands in themslves for nominal or trifling sums. But for the government of a small Colony, to usurp the Royal authority, and deprive the labouring class of their rights, required the *consent* of some who had no township, and the *secrecy* of others who were privy to the design, and the *silence* of those who had a right to enquire into such matters. Consequently, an agreement to such conditions as would secure the traitors in their usurped possession of the Townships, could be obtianed only by making all the rest partners in crime. To understand such matters it must be borne in mind, that the receivers of stolen property, are equally guilty with the thief and the corrupter as guilty as the corrupted. Therefore the *consent*—the *secrecy*—and *silence*—was purchased with Charlottetown common: To do this, was more criminal than the former. The sovereign was belied—the Royal instructions subverted—and false grants executed in the Name of the king to a fraud, and that fraud to bribe traitors with the people's property and and the *value given to that property* by the people of Charlottotown, and those grants wherein the *king is made* the principal to defraud the people of Charlottetown, were given and accepted, upon conditions, and with a mutual understanding, that the parties were to assist each other, to hold possession of the public property.

This plot for villiany, has no parallel in history, and without doubt or exception, is a complete machine to perform the robbery; a slack cog or pin, would have deranged the whole machinery. The usurpers *here* who had been the leading men for the land settlement, sought no more for an escheat; but blindfolded the people in the Island, and misrepresented matters to the Colonial office, and the usurpers in England supported their measures; and nominated governors to deceive the Sovereign, and subvert the Law. The usurpers of the Townships could not have retained the land, without the countenance and support of the usurpers of the common. For if an independant governor had established a court of Escheats, they would have lost the common. Therefore they must be taken as a whole, to be all guilty or none guilty. And the present authorities by changing the name from *Tory* to *Liberal*, have not mended matters, but have added to the former iniquity. They have deceived the Queen and the people They deceive and heap dishonor on the Sovereign, when they say they have the *royal assent* to take the *public money* to *purchase forfeited* lands from *usurpers* and *imposters*; and they deceive and *rob* the people, when they compel them to refund the money which has been given for forfeited land, without investigating the titles. Any person of common sense may see, that with those and many other additions, the whole machinery of government, under the *name* of *liberal*, is of a more villianous and corrupt nature than it was before.

But to return to the example which they have followed, we find that for a period of 12 or 14 years, the Government and leading men persevered for an escheat of the forfeited lands, and when that was conceded, a party escheated the forfeited lands to themselves, and Charlottetown common which was not forfeited, was taken to bribe the rest, to prevent any escheat. And then every sound about an escheat, or a settlement for the people was hushed to silence. And the better to conceal such transactions from vulgar eyes, it was covered with religion which would have been deemed sacrilege to uncover, or pry under, and accordingly the chief traitor and instigator, the name of Edmund Fanning was to be looked up to as a saint, by those who received the benefits, and set up as an example of innocence on a tablet to grace the Episcopal church. Now if Mr. Daly succeed, in running this Colony in debt, 2 or £300,000, to complete the robbery which general Fanning began, he will be equally *deserving* of having his name set up as a saint, in a niche beside the generals, and then there will be a sight for the sincere christians to look upon, and think of, when he worships his creator, in the church of his fathers, to see the House of God turned into a den of theives.

N. B. It requires no act to establish a Court of Escheats, the Government can establish that court any day.

Wm. Cooper.

Sailor's Hope, 22d May, 1846.

Lord Brougham, who knows a little of every thing, and talks about it all the time, wrote the following epitaph on himself:

"Here, reader, turn your weeping eyes,
My fate a useful moral teaches:
The hole in which my body lies
Would not contain one half my speeches."