

Chaldeans, the sins of Judah and its king had stained to the fall. Zedekiah was then on the throne, wearing the crown of David. Ezekiel was commanded to say to him: "Thou profane and wicked prince of Israel, whose day is come, when iniquity shall have an end, thus saith the Lord, remove the diadem and take off the crown; this (Zedekiah) shall not be the same (Son of David mentioned in the covenant); exalt him that is low (aven Jesus) and abase him that is high." That is Zedekiah. But then what is to become of the kingdom of David? Hear the Lord: "I will overturn, overturn it; and it shall be no more until he shall come whose right it is, and I will give it to him." Ezekiel xli. 27.

This prediction was fulfilled literally. The king's eyes were put out, the temple was stripped of its furniture, the palaces were burned with fire, the capital was destroyed, and not a tribe remained in the land. After seventy years captivity there was a partial restoration under Ezra, Nehemiah and Zerubbabel. But from the time of the overthrow until the year 165 before Christ, the Jews in Palestine were not a kingdom, but a subject province of the Persian Monarchy, and afterwards of the Macedonian. About the year 165 before Christ, they became a kingdom again, but not of the house of David. The throne belonged to the Armoceans, who were of tribe of Levi. Their dynasty was superseded by the Roman senate, who set up the Idumean family of Herod. The Herods were finally deposed, and Judea was reduced to a Roman province, under a procurator; thus verifying the prophecy of the patriarch Jacob, that the sceptre should depart from Judah when Shiloh came. From the time of King Zedekiah to this hour there has been no kingdom of Israel in Palestine. The last remnant of the Hebrew commonwealth was broken up about forty years after the crucifixion of Christ; the temple was burned with fire, Jerusalem was captured by the Romans, and the miserable survivors were sold into slavery and scattered among the nations in blind unbelief.

But the student and believer of "the sure word of prophecy," rejoices in the sure and certain hope of the restoration of the throne of David and its glorious perpetuity through ages to come.

But the inquiry naturally arises, when will the throne of David be restored and occupied by the Lord Jesus Christ? The apostle James, who was the brother of our Lord, and, in the council of Jerusalem, "stood up and declared how God at the first had visited the Gentiles, to take out of them a people for his name." Then, quoting the words of the prophet, he says, "After this I will return and build again the tabernacle of David that is fallen down, and I will build again the ruins thereof and I will set it up; that the residue of men might seek after the Lord, and all the Gentiles upon whom my name is called, saith the Lord." (Acts xv. 14-17.)

When the work of "taking out from the Gentiles a people for his name" is all finished, the Lord will return. But for what purpose does he return? The answer of the prophet is, "I will return and build again the tabernacle, or throne of David, that is fallen down, and I will build again the ruins thereof and I will set it up."

The ulterior object of this restoration is that the residue of men, the remnant of Israel, the house of Jacob, "may seek after the Lord, and all the Gentiles of that age, upon whom my name is called, saith the Lord." The apostle speaks of another class as being taken out of the Gentiles of this age, and says they are "a people for his name." And who are they? They are those who are "to sit with Christ on his throne;" elsewhere they are called saints and heirs of the kingdom, "heirs of God and joint heirs with Jesus Christ." They are those of whom Paul speaks, when he says, "Know ye not that the saints shall judge the world? know ye not that we shall judge angels?" They are those of whom John and Peter speak, when they say, "Those who suffer with Christ shall reign with him in glory." They are the heirs, the possessors, the rulers of the kingdom of Christ

and differ essentially from the subjects of the kingdom, the governed class.

Such a kingdom, so vast, so exalted, so spiritual, so infinitely transcending all earthly empires, will require a multitude of administrators, such as no man can number, and of such a character as no earthly kingdom can produce. They must be some of God by celestial birth, raised from the dead and clothed with immortality. They are the called, the elect of God, but they are called by the gospel on the principle of faith, and chosen in Christ by the operation of the Holy Spirit.

The gospel of this glorious kingdom has been preached for centuries, in order that heirs, kings, princes, rulers, of all ranks and degrees may be furnished in that day, when Jesus shall sit on the throne of his glory in the regeneration. (Matt. xix. 28. The time for collecting the divine ecclesia is almost finished. The teachings of prophecy and the signs of the times indicate this. Those who survive the terrible desolations and fiery judgments of the last days of this dispensation, may become the subjects of the Messianic kingdom, in its New Jerusalem state of perfection and splendor, and may live in the hope of immortality in the ages to come, but as the inheritors of the honor and glory of Christ's throne, they can have neither part nor lot.

It is only with the utmost brevity that I can mention—

II THE ESSENTIAL CONDITION OF THIS EXALTATION. "To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me on my throne."

Everything depends upon overcoming evil. "To him that overcometh will I give to eat of the tree of life." "He that overcometh shall not be hurt of the second death." "To him that overcometh will I give power over the nations." "He that overcometh shall be clothed with white raiment." "He that overcometh shall inherit all things." The victory of Christ is made the measure of our victory. "Even as I overcame and am set down with my Father on his throne." Referring to his own conquest, he says: "I have overcome the world," including all the powers of evil, all forms of satanic temptation; all source of suffering. He was plunged into the lowest depths of human sorrow, pain and agony, and yet came up unharmed. He came up from Borrah with garments dipped in blood, the victor of all the grandest battle ever fought between good and evil, right and wrong. He led us, as a captive. A similar victory over the world, the flesh and the devil, is demanded of those who would share Christ's throne. The apostle Paul says, believers are "joint heirs with Christ, if so be we suffer with him, that we may be glorified together." To Timothy he says, "If we suffer we shall also reign with him." To the ambitious disciples who desired to sit one on his right hand and the other on his left, Jesus said, "Ye know not what ye ask; Can ye drink of the cup that I drink of, and be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with? They say unto him, we are able. And he saith unto them, ye shall drink indeed of my cup and be baptized with my baptism." Suffering with Christ in the life and death struggle between light and darkness, sin and holiness, is made the condition of sharing his throne in the world to come. This being so, what shall become of the Christians of this age. How many suppose you, of this church, of this community, how many of this State, or this continent, are willing to suffer for Christ, resisting temptation even unto blood? If this is the condition of reigning with Christ, how many will fall and be forever excluded from his throne! Thrones and crowns belong to victors over "principalities and powers, the rulers of the darkness of this world, and spiritual wickedness in high places." Those immortal heroes led on by the King of kings and Lord of lords, will carry forward the great purposes of God in ages to come "until all things shall be subdued to him, and the Son himself shall become subject to the Father, that God may be all in all."

In conclusion, this subject of Christ's throne is in perfect agreement with other teachings of the Scriptures relating to the destiny of the earth

and its glorified occupants. This earth was created for the eternal home of man. He received the charter of sovereignty and dominion. All was perfect and good. But when man fell, creation fell with him. He lost all. His life, his dominion, his abode. The very ground was cursed and became his grave. "Creation was subjected to vanity and it groans and travails in pain until now." (Rom. viii. 22.) But God's unspeakable love was manifested in the redemption of man, and not man only, but his abode also. "Creation itself shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God." "We look for a new heaven and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness."

The curse shall be removed and the lost dominion regained. This completed redemption our Lord styles "The Regeneration," in which "the Son of man shall sit on the throne of his glory, having for his associates his faithful followers." "The earth is the Lord's," it belongs to him by covenant. He redeemed it from the hand of the enemy. He breathed its air, was baptized in its waters, controlled its storms, healed its diseases, broke the bars of its graves, sealed it with his blood, stamped it with his cross, selected from it his glorious Bride, builds on it his throne, and converts it into a heavenly home. "The meek shall inherit the earth." "Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost; as it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be, world without end." Amen.

Discussion on Universalism.

The Scriptures teach the dual purity and happiness of all mankind. MR. BURRUS Assrs. DR. GRAVES Deates.

LETTER VIII.

Reply to J. C. Burrus' Last Letter.

DEAR SIR:—Your last letter in this discussion is before me. It is but a fourth rehearsal and reassertion of what I have as many times exploded. This last effort to support your theory against the Word of God and the arguments I have weighed against it, is proof of the utter exhaustion of your resources and your signal failure.

1. I have examined the publication you have put forth as "the discussion between us, Dr. J. R. Graves and J. C. Burrus," and found that Mr. Fowler has but mildly stated the facts, which you have the audacity to deny, after designedly suppressing the most important part of my replies, and when your dishonesty is brought to light, you openly deny it, and assert that your pamphlet "contains all that was written on that subject and is complete in itself."

Now what will the reader think of your veracity and honesty when I tell him that you have left out, save a few unimportant lines, all my first reply to your first letter, amounting to two hundred and sixty-five lines in my paper, the whole strength of my argument, containing four syllogisms and a demonstrative argument! Of my third letter you have omitted a whole column, amounting to ninety-nine lines of my wide measure,—the strongest parts of the whole letter? From your publisher I learned that you never printed these omitted parts in your paper, since he avers he set up all the letters that were printed in the papers sent him! What other omissions and additions you have made in your pamphlet, I have not had the time to detect, and would never have known these, had it not been for Bro. Fowler's kindness, or some one else. I denounce this as infamously dishonest treatment, and your publication as spurious and false. Was it not to prevent the full and fair publication of the discussion by me that infamously you to pre-occupy the minds of all Universalists with this partial and garbled production?

As I have stated, this, your last, is but a reassertion of arguments and constructions of Scriptures that I have repeatedly exploded, but would I allow them to pass unnoticed in this last form you would claim that I deemed them unanswerable, and therefore I must devote a few columns to their exposure.

1. That I did not say to my readers concerning

your wish for the letters on the second question to be extended to eight. What harm in either of us desiring eight instead of six?

2. After giving three false quotations to prove the salvation of the Sodomites, who perished with their cities, you now correct and give a different passage which does you no good, for what though God will repeople the plains of Sodom in coming generations, how does that act save the souls of those filthy sinners whom he destroyed from the face of the earth two thousand and seven hundred years ago? The passage does not intimate that God will raise and save them. Jerusalem and Palestine will be re-peopled, but not with the wretches who rejected and crucified Christ.

It is false that you have convicted me of forgery, and you know it. See my reply to this.

3. You have signally failed to show that God punishes to correct, or that his punishments ever corrected and reformed the sinner. Your passage is against you, for it does not say that those were reformed by it, but intimates that they were not! Did God's punishment of the Antideluvians, of the Canaanites, of the inhabitants of Sodom and Gomorrah, of the Jews at the destruction and sack of Jerusalem, reform and save them? Was it intended to reform them? Max Muller's theory about the Sanscrit root of the Latin noun poena, determines nothing. Penal suffering, in no law, human or divine, is inflicted for the reformation of the criminal. See my last letter.

4. My crime in quoting Hedge and Dewey among Restorationists is precisely what yours is in calling your paper "Universalist Herald," when it is not an advocate of what was known as Universalism, but Restorationism, and call yourself a Universalist, when you are not. Will you deny that Hedge and Dewey were once Restorationists or Universalists? And will you deny that Channing is classed with Universalists, or that there was once such a paper published as the Monthly Religious Magazine, that advocated universal salvation. If not classification has misled me.

How well it becomes you who have garbled my letters as you have done, and palmed them off upon your readers as "complete" to charge it belivous guilt to me to have classified Hedge and Dewey among Restorationists, because they had advanced a step beyond you.

5. I again assert that I have never referred to Hades as the place of endless punishment, but as an intermediate state, in which the righteous are happy and the wicked unhappy, but that the moral character is forever fixed.

6. I charged you in "Bible Language," and still charge you with holding and teaching that those condemned to the "lake of fire and brimstone," whatever that might be, were by those penal fires brought to repentance.

7. I have demonstrated that *Ktisis* in Rom. viii. 21, means the self-same creation, earth, that was cursed for man's sin, and thus made subject to vanity, corruption and decay, is the creation that the apostle declares is to be redeemed from that curse and restored to its pristine beauty and heavenliness. I have forever taken this passage from Restorationists. A man in Christ is a new creation, but not "the *Ktisis*," the earth creation. It is false that I have admitted that a Christian ever lost or ever will lose grace of salvation. I asked you the question about Heb. vi. 6, for you to fall into the very horrid pit your system prepares for you—an open and direct denial of the plain teachings of the apostles.

8. You say Peter fell away, referring to the very words of the apostle, (Heb. vi. 6), and of course meaning that he fell away in the very sense Paul used the expression, and you say to the Holy Ghost that Peter was renewed again to repentance, while the Holy Ghost who indited this verse, positively says that it is impossible to renew such an one to repentance. You no more hesitate to putting a lie into the lip of the Holy Ghost than you do into mine, or to one yourself, as when you declared you had published my letters entire in your spurious pamphlet.

Peter never fell away in the sense Paul used the phrase, Heb. vi. 6, or the Holy Ghost did actually contradict himself. Peter was overcome for a moment with sudden fear, but his faith in Christ remained, for Christ prayed for him that his faith should not fail.

9. God's government over all his created intelligences is a moral government, and the aim of that government is to use all moral influences to induce men and angels to do right, and to punish all who will do wrong. God never determined to save men or angels who persist in rebellion or to exert his physical power to prevent them from sinning for he could not do it by the exercise of mere power.

10. Your logic again. I have shown that from the first to your last letter you have not constructed one logical syllogism. You have not presumed to question my assertion. I have repeatedly charged you with being utterly ignorant of the first principles of logic, or knowing logic you have *deliberately* constructed these fallacies to deceive your ignorant and credulous readers. If you had the sensibilities of a scholar or an honest teacher of God's Word, would you have not let such a charge pass unnoticed? Would you not have attempted a defence of your syllogisms? But you have not in a single instance! It is evident you have selected these syllogisms from the writings of others, and you are the ignorant dupe of your own false teachers.

Here you launch out eight somethings which you call syllogisms to prove the final salvation of all men, as well as the devil and his angels, but not one of them is a logical syllogism, and consequently no argument, and you know it if you know anything about logic. I will briefly notice each.—

In your first the verb "will" and the noun "will" have two senses and you have them in one, and therefore you have virtually four propositions in this syllogism, and no middle term distributed, and consequently it is no syllogism, which can have but three.

The reader unfamiliar with logic will understand the difference between a *pleasurable will*—desire—and a *determined purpose*. God as much wills and more that all men should be saved in this life as in the next, but his desire or will does not accomplish it. Christ willed in this sense the salvation of Jerusalem, and he wept because it would not be saved. To escape this he will remember that you denied Christ divine, or God—thus confessed yourself an infidel. God does work all things after the counsel of his determinate will, and that will is to save all those who accept his Son, and he will miserably destroy all who die rejecting him.

In your second you incorporate the same fallacy, using the verb "purposes" and the noun "purpose" as synonyms meaning the same thing—which they do not, and you have virtually four instead of three propositions, and of course, no syllogism. But your passage is against your theory. The apostle (Eph. i. 9-10), tells us when God purposes to save all who are saved and gather together in one all things in Christ, etc., viz.: "In the dispensation of the fulness of times."

This dispensation of the fulness of times was prior and not subsequent to the judgment, i. e., during the first probation. But you admit that all men are not saved in the gospel dispensation and therefore your argument is null and against you. God has made known that it is as much his purpose to punish his enemies with everlasting destruction from his presence as it is to reward his children in Christ with everlasting happiness in his presence.

In your third the "pleasure" is an ambiguous term.

Here is its counterpart:—"Light is contrary to darkness. Feathers are light. Therefore feathers are contrary to darkness."

If you were not already past feeling, if the opinion of scholars and logicians could shame you, you could not for shame look them in the face.

Then the first proposition as stated by you is

not true. It is not the pleasure of God to save any except those who trust in the atonement of his Son for their salvation. It pleases God to save those who believe, 1 Cor. i. 21, and Christ is the special or personal Savior of only those who believe. 1 Tim. iv. 10. Neither is your fourth a syllogism or the semblance of one. There is an illicit process, nothing more,—scholars will understand me. It is not true that all men were given to Christ to be saved, but given into his hands, to rule, to reward his friends and to destroy his enemies. Turn and read the second Psalm. "I will give the heathen for thine inheritance and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession. And thou shalt rule with a rod of iron; thou shalt dash them to pieces as a potter's vessel. Kiss the son lest he be angry and ye perish from the way, when his anger is kindled but a little. Blessed are all are they who put their trust in him." And this implies that all do not and are not all blessed. This answers for the second or third time your argument from 1 Cor. xv. 18, i. e., the universal subjugation to Christ. Your fifth syllogism, "Some he places upon the throne and others under his feet."

The fallacy of your fifth argument (?) all can see. If justice requires the destruction of all wrong, and God cannot be just without destroying all wrong out of his government, how could he be just and permit it for 6000 years? No more will it require it in the future than in the past and now, it is not true that justice requires the destruction, but it is fearfully true that it requires the punishment of all wrong.

Your fifth has not even the form of a syllogism. Three independent propositions prove nothing! God is unchangeable. He has ever hated sin and those who love it—his enemies—and he ever will and must hate them while he is holy and just, and sinners must always hate God while they are unholy.

Your seventh is no syllogism, nor even a respectable fallacy. God is indeed *not* to his friends, but a consuming fire to his enemies. God will work no wrong to his creatures, but he would work wrong to himself and to his moral government, and to all the righteous on earth, and in heaven if he did not vindicate his character as a just God, and punish the willful transgressors of his laws, for he would both encourage sin, and render insecure the law-abiding. And what shall I say to your eighth and last? The school-boys in logic will laugh at it, while perhaps, your dupes will gulp it down for reason! This we cannot help, for it is written, "God shall send them strong delusion that they may believe a lie, that they all may be deceived, etc., who believe not the truth, but have pleasure in unrighteousness." Let me change the tense and the sensible will see the fallacy.

"God has been able to overcome all evil. He has for 6000 years desired to overcome. Therefore he has overcome all evil." There has been none. Try another. Christ was able to overcome the hatred of the inhabitants of Jerusalem. He desired to overcome it. But did he overcome it? By no moral influence was he able to do it. He could use no other, and therefore, he could not overcome their hatred and induce them to love him and be saved by him. What did God say of Israel of old whom he called his vineyard? Isa. v. 7. "What could have been done more to my vineyard than I have not done in it? Wherefore when I looked for it to bring forth grapes, brought it not forth wild grapes?" And he determined to destroy it from the face of the earth. This answers for the third time, all your arguments drawn from God's attributes of almighty power, love, justice, mercy, etc. That man convicts himself of theological idlony who asserts that all sinners will be saved because God is almighty and all merciful, or all just, while it would be in violation of justice and the annihilation of man's accountability to save him dynamically, the exercise of God's almighty power, it would not be an act of mercy any more than of justice to the sinner.

You say all things are made for God, and quote a part of Prov. xvi. 14, why not the rest—"And the wicked for the day of evil?" You make no

more of garbling the word of God, than you do my Letters. You quote Heb. viii. 11, to prove the salvation of all sinners, when you should know that it was spoken of the remnant of the Jews converted in God and residing in Palestine after the coming of Christ, and before the final judgment. You refer again to Rom. v. 19, and the reader will find an answer to your arguments and an application of the passage in the seventeenth. You wreat Matt. xxvi. 29, to make Christ contradict himself, when he said it were better for Judas had he never been born. You affirm that Judas partook of the Supper, that Christ said to him as well as the other apostles that he should drink of the fruit of the vine new with them in the kingdom of his Father. But Judas never partook of the Lord's Supper. John says (xiii. ch.) that while they were eating the Passover supper Jesus designated Judas as his betrayer by giving him the sop after dipping it in the gravy of bitter herbs, and so soon as he did this commanded him to leave, and he did go out immediately, but not until they had finished the Paschal supper (the Passover). After it was eaten, Christ went forth to the garden and then Judas met him with his armed force. You cannot save Judas by such a perversion of Scriptures. It is to-day, it will be at any point in eternity true of him that it were good for him had he never been born. Judas is lost, and your cause is lost.

I called upon you to show a way out of hell not hales but the Gehenna of fire, the place into which wicked men and the Devil and his angels will be cast after the final judgment, and you refer me to the mental distress of David which he compared to that of the lowest hell and to Jonah's despair in the belly of the great fish, which he compared to "the belly of hell," and to Rev. xii. 13, "And death and hell—Aodes—delivered up the dead that were in them," and here you stop when had you quoted a little farther your readers would have seen that you were deceiving them,—"And death and hell—Aodes—were cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death." That is, all those whose bodies were under the power of death, and whose spirits were with Divine Aodes, after the first resurrection—were raised, judged, and committed to the lake of fire and under the power of the second death. This is their final and fixed state, and you cannot show where any one of these ever escaped or that an offer of mercy was, or ever will be, made to such, and this settles the question forever against you.

A Summary of my Arguments on the First Question.

In discussing the first question I showed—

1. That where there are moral beings there must be government or anarchy.
 2. Where there is government there must be laws.
 3. Where there are laws there must be adequate penalties.
 4. That the province of moral law is two-fold: 1, To protect the well-being of the law-abiding, 2, To restrain by its terrors from its violation.
 5. That the protective and restraining power of law are in exact ratio to the penalty and the certainty and promptness of the infliction.
 6. That the penalty in all beneficent governments is in proportion to the estimated value designed to be protected, and its merciful quality is in exact ratio to its benign influence to restrain those who would, from the violation of law and the commission of sin.
 7. I showed that the infinite love, mercy and beneficence of God, were manifested in the infinite penalties he has attached to his laws, thus making them as protective and as restraining as laws for moral beings can be possibly made by an all-wise God, and since the values designed to be protected by God's laws are infinite, for these reasons, if for no other, the laws that protected them should be made correspondingly protective, which can only be so by infinite penalties.
- I showed that to condone the violation of God's laws without preserving their protective and restraining influences, would be an act of the gravest injustice to both God and man, since it would rob God of his character as a just and beneficent

Ruler by making him encourage sin by not adequately punishing it, and to be regardless of the well-being of his own creatures.

I showed that the violation of infinite guilt deserved infinite punishment, and therefore in a perfect government we must expect to find infinite penalties—endless punishments threatened to all transgressors of the law. Were it not so the government would be radically defective and imperfect.

From the very nature of moral law we see that its operations lie outside the province of mercy, and that it would be destructive of all law, and the aim and purpose of all government, for God's love or Almighty power to disregard the claims of justice in order to condone guilt, and therefore it is impossible for God to extend mercy in any case, or the least iota to abate the stern demands of law, unless all the ends for which government was originated could be fully met and the infinite demands of justice satisfied, which could only be done by a Divine Being voluntarily and vicariously taking the sinner's place and satisfying all the demands of the law in his stead—the law-maker suffering the full penalty of his own laws that his mercy might in strict justice be offered to the law-breaker, and it is evident that the gracious provisions of this relief cannot be thrust upon, but only extended to, those who voluntarily apply for it.

Now, this is the only condition of things that could exist in a perfect moral government; there must be penalties threatened and inflicted in all respects adequate to the demerit of the guilt of the transgressor. We see that punishment is right in the very nature of God's character and moral government, and not merely because it is enacted. It was right before it was enacted and enacted because it was right. Eternal retribution would and must follow the transgression of infinite law, if the fact was not revealed to us in the Scriptures. But when we opened the Divine Statute Book I showed the violation of God's law is everywhere denounced as a sin involving infinite guilt, and a Holy and Just God cannot be just unless he punishes it as it deserves in the offender or his substitute. I showed that throughout the Divine Law Book that every term and symbol in human language was exhausted to convey to the human mind an idea of the terrible nature of the future punishment that awaits the transgressors of God's laws.

I showed that the duration of this punishment was described by the very terms that applied, 1, To the existence of God, 2, To convey to us the idea of eternity, 3, The continued existence of angels and men, 4, To teach the duration of the holiness and happiness of the righteous, 5, The abiding wrath of God upon the Devil and his angels.

I offered the following presumptive arguments which you did not notice, in support of the endless punishment of all who die in sin.

PRESUMPTIVE ARGUMENT.

- I. We are in reason bound to believe that all the vital and important doctrines of Christianity were understood and taught by the apostolic Fathers who lived in or near the days of the apostles themselves, and received their views and doctrine either from the apostles, or from those who conversed with the apostles. A doctrine therefore totally unknown and believed by no one for hundreds of years after Christ cannot be true. Now, modern Universalism was unknown to the apostolic Fathers. They all held and taught without a discordant voice, what they had received from the apostles; viz., that the righteous would be rewarded with endless happiness, and the finally impenitent with endless punishment.
- II. We are in reason bound to believe that the apostolic Fathers, most of whom were learned Greeks, understood their own language, which was the language of the New Testament was written in, far better than the man who originated Universalism a little over fifty years ago, who knew nothing of the Greek.
- III. We are in reason bound to believe that the Christian church of the first and purest ages—the saints, to whom was delivered "the faith,"

i. e., all the doctrines—must have known and held all the essential and important doctrines of Christianity. But it is a fact the whole church immediately after the apostles, and to this day without a dissenting voice, held and taught the eternal happiness of the righteous, and the eternal punishment of those who die in sin. It is therefore to be presumed that a doctrine wholly unknown to the Christian church for eighteen centuries, and never believed to be taught by the word of God by any Greek Father or person regarded orthodox, must be false and a heresy, and no part of that "faith once delivered to the saints."

Added to these this crowning argument: That all infidels, sceptics, and opposers of the Bible from the days of Julian until to-day, have urged it as an objection to Christ and Christianity that our Scriptures do teach the endless punishment of a class of God's creatures. They have, one and all, so understood the language of the Scriptures. I add this other fact, that all orthodox Christians and writers from the days of Julian until now, have frankly admitted the fact that they taught and have not attempted to escape the odium of the charge by denying it.

I say not one of these weighty arguments have you ever noticed, but to show your classical erudition you take me to task for using "Belides" when you say a novice should know the daughters of Danans were known in classic lore as "Danalides," (see Letter) and thus you discover your own ignorance. "These fifty daughters were the grand-daughters of Belus, after whom they were called Belides."—Prof. White, Mythology, page 104.

The order of my argument in support of the teachings of the Bible can be seen from this summary.

Summary of my Arguments in Reply on the Second Question.

It should be distinctly understood by our readers that you hold and teach that all men who die in their sins, will at the last judgment receive the condemnation of a holy God and be consigned to everlasting punishment "in the lake of fire and brimstone, which is the second death." You concede that millions have died in their sins, and are yearly dying in sin, and that these will be at the last judgment cast into "the lake of fire." Thus far we perfectly agree. But the point of our disagreement is this. You hold and teach that probation will be continued, and at some point in the roll of eternal ages, after "suffering the vengeance of eternal fire" the heart of the lost sinner will be melted into submission and love, his will gently subdued to the will of Christ, when he will be taken out of "everlasting burnings," bright and pure, into the full bliss of heaven, and impurity and suffering will ultimately nowhere exist in the universe of God. Your theory, as well as all your arguments drawn from God's almighty power, etc., as all can see, necessitates the conversion and salvation of "the Devil and his angels," through the agency of penal sufferings only, since Christ's atonement does not include these.

All your arguments and all the Scriptures you have adduced to prove the ultimate purity and happiness of all God's creatures fall to the ground, unless "the Devil and his angels" are also converted and saved by penal fires and suffering.

The method you have pursued to make a show of sustaining your theory has been in the highest degree reprehensible and will secure the condemnation of all scholars even of your own school. While they are quite agreed that Restorationism is not revealed in the Bible, and one prominent writer gives the reason, because it would be abused and defeat the end of probation.

The editor of the Monthly Religious Magazine, while cherishing the idea of universal restorationism as one of the hopes of humanity, frankly declares that it is an unrevealed doctrine, because it would be abused, and even if announced to sinners in the world of woe it would defeat the end of a second probation, as it would the first!

"Even if there be such a consummation away in the depths of eternity, how clear it must be that it could not be made the subject of divine revelation to a fallen and sinful race. If it be a

truth, it is the very one which the worst men would abuse and profane."

"Suppose the consummation away in the eternal depths were depicted to a man burning in his lusts, and he were told, 'See, you are to have the happiness of angels.' How would the combat with evil be given over in the supposed assurance that the result was established as God's decree! In the very nature of things, therefore, the final salvation of all men can never become a fixed doctrine of the church."—July, 1861.

F. Starr Kins.—"I freely say I do not find the doctrine of ultimate salvation of all souls clearly stated in any text, in any discourse that has been reported from the lips of Christ. There is no argument for the final triumph of goodness recorded in the four gospels, nor any dogmatic textual assertion of the doctrine."

One of the editors of the monthly Religious Magazine of July 1861, wrote:—

"It will hardly be asserted by competent scholars that the doctrine of universal salvation" (meaning universal restorationism) "is fairly made out as the teaching of sacred Scripture. Much of the Universalist exegesis must be, and is abandoned as fantastic and absurd. The scholar must argue the doctrine, if at all, from the attributes of God, not from any word which he has spoken. This is conceded now by the most intelligent believers in Universalism. They argue it, not from textual, but from general and philosophical grounds."

The same editor, nine years later, said: "Unitarians do not believe it (Universal Restoration) as a doctrine of Revelation fairly yielded by the interpretation of the Scriptures. This we mean is the average opinion. They do not think the Bible gives any verdict as to the final salvation of all mankind. It reveals clearly the issues of this life in the life proximate beyond the grave; but what lies beyond that, in the abode of eternity, touching the incorrigibly wicked, they do not think has been a matter of disclosure in any written revelation."

But he says that Unitarians nevertheless hold the hypothesis of universal restoration, not as a dogma or revelation, but as "a deduction of the private reason," &c.

And yet you have brought forward texts by the scores in both Testaments and dogmatically affirmed that each one adduced, unquestionably taught the salvation of all God's creatures! How will your arrogant assertions and silly pettifoggery appear in the eyes of your own scholars and all men of sense?

Thus I have disproved your assertions and exposed your multiplied misconstruction of God's word, so that you close your last letter without a retaliatory argument or passage of Scripture left you that offers a shadow of support to your theory. If it be true that all men and Satan himself after uncounted ages of suffering will be saved, it is an unrevealed doctrine, and that it would be dangerous to reveal it, those who cherish the hope frankly admit! The idea will not even cheer the damned during the long ages they experience the penalty of their transgressions. The only semblance of ground for the idea is, that penal sufferings will ultimately produce repentance and love to Christ or God in the hearts of the most incorrigible—even in Satan himself—and therefore the hypothesis that punishment in God's government is corrective and reformatory.

I have fully met this forlorn hope of the Restorationists by stern facts.

1. That no human government inflicts penalty for the purpose of reforming the guilty.
2. That it is a fact established by the experience of all nations that punishment is not reformatory. Sir Edmund Burke said: "The infliction of penalty has no tendency to reform the guilty."
- Dr. Channing (Universalist) said: "Crime thrives under severe penalties; thrives on the blood of offenders."
3. That in this life God has never inflicted punishment for the reformation of the guilty. In my last I showed that he visited his punishments upon the antediluvians, the people of Sodom and Gomorrah, the Canaanites, upon Moab and Edom, upon Assyria and Babylon, not for their reformation, but for their utter destruction, as an example to others. God visited his punitive justice upon the angels that sinned, and that its infliction was neither calculated nor designed to reform we have ample evidence, since the Devil and his angels, instead of being increased in their enmity, malignity and rebellion, any suffering

for more than six thousand years. And we learn that those upon whom the fifth angel poured out his vial of God's wrath, (Rev. 16.), though they gnawed their tongues for pain, "they blasphemed the God of heaven because of their pains and their sores, and repented not of their deeds;" and this was the result of the pouring out of the fourth vial: "And men were scorched with great heat, and blasphemed the name of God which hath power over these plagues and repented not to give glory to him." We see that it is not in the nature of punishment, however severe, to bring men to repentance, to regenerate their natures, to produce love to God in their hearts or to reform their lives, and it is preposterous to base the hope of the future purification and happiness of the ungodly upon the corrective effects of penal suffering.

I also showed that if future punishment is calculated and will work the salvation of all the wicked, it is a blessing and not a curse, and a greater blessing than the atonement of Christ, which is incapable of doing it. A medicine, however distasteful, that cures the most dangerous complaint is certainly a blessing and not a curse. This reduces the whole theory of Restorationism to the basest absurdity.

FACTS TOUCHING A SECOND PROBATION.

I charged upon your theory of a second probation, the following manifest and monstrous absurdities:

1. That the confinement of all obstinate sinners in the "lake of fire," and inflicting upon them the punitive wrath of God without mixture of mercy, will produce in them regeneration of the heart, repentance toward God and saving faith in Christ, and inculcate the principles of moral purity and virtue—gracious effects that the Spirit, and grace of God and love of Christ were not able to do in this world! Therefore,—
 2. That the sacrifice of Christ is of itself insufficient to make a complete atonement for human transgression, so—
 3. That human suffering, in its disembodied state, is essential to supplement the atoning blood of Christ and the influences of the Holy Spirit.
 4. That it is freely admitted by Universalists themselves, that it is not in the nature or design of penal sufferings to regenerate and reform the guilty, and therefore the theory is absurd.
 5. That justification is the result of works—i. e., the sufferings endured by disembodied spirits—rather than of faith, which is contrary to God's Word.
 6. I showed that it is a fact that your own writers are forced to admit, and no thoughtful man will deny that a second probation would nullify the influence of the first, and therefore encourage the sinner in transgression by offering him an additional chance to escape the penalty. Therefore, I charge—
 7. That your system encourages the sinner to persist in sin, while the Scriptures forbid him to commit it, and—
 8. That the words of the Lord addressed to sinners in his day, that unless they repented they should die in their sins, and where he was they should not come, are deprived of their weight and solemn significance.
 9. And if it is necessary to save some that the influence of penal sufferings must be added to the moral influences of the gospel, then in all such cases the salvation by Christ is not complete.
 - I also urged—
 10. That your theory of probation in eternity is in harmony with the pernicious doctrine of the Romish church—that purgatorial fires are corrective and purifying in their nature, and—
 11. That prayer offered for sinners in hell would be as effectual as those offered for men in this present probation.
- I think while it has not devolved upon me to prove a negative that I have done so beyond all dispute, and proved that there can be, and there is no second probation in eternity, and that those who die in their sins must perish, and that without remedy.
- In reply to your repeated challenges to prove by positive and explicit Scriptures that any one of Adam's race will ever be hopelessly lost, I have

submitted the following instances—his swift have failed to set aside, and witnesses against you:—

1. Those who con-Christ's and the apostles' There were thant it, and multitudes commit day who B? There is never forgiveness for them it in, nor the world to come.
 2. All those who crucify to themselves the son of God afresh and put him to an open Hebr. vi. 4-7. If Restorationists believe that a human being ever committed this sin, then they must believe that there is no forgiveness for such here or hereafter.
 3. All those who have or may die in their sins. This has been true of all the millions of unbelieving Jews since the day it was spoken, and it must be equally true of the millions of Gentiles, since in this respect there is no difference.
 4. All those whose names will not be found written in the Lamb's book of life at the final judgment. And it is evident that the millions of impenitent sinners who will appear there are not registered in the Book of Life. No further probation and no subsequent judgment awaits such; their sats is fixed.
 5. All those classes of men remaining "filthy" and "unholy" subsequently to the day of judgment, mentioned in Rev. xiii. 15. That such classes will exist subsequent to the day of judgment is evident from this and other passages, and all such will remain unholy and sinners forever, and the agony of conscious guilt will be theirs forever.
 6. The woe Christ pronounced upon Judas consigned him to endless unhappiness. There never will be a period in eternity when the words of Christ will not be as true as when he uttered them. "God were it for that man had he never been born." If there should be a period in eternity when Judas will be pure and holy, he would be infinitely happy, and it would be good for him that he had been born. Just as sure as the words of Christ are true, Judas is hopelessly lost. And finally, to close these testimonies, and as a complete refutation of all your reasonings from your false postulates—viz.:—
 - "That gospel invitations are continuous."
 - "That God is not weary in well-doing."
 - "That love ever seeks to bless," and
 - "That there are seasons of grace after death."
- I urge the one explicit passage:—
- "Because I have sinned, and ye refused; I have stretched out my hand, and no man regarded; but ye have set at naught all my counsels, and would none of my reproof; I also will laugh at your calamity; I will mock when your fear cometh; when your fear cometh as desolation, and your destruction cometh as a whirlwind; when distress and anguish cometh upon you, then shall they call upon me, but I will not answer; they shall seek me early, but they will not find me; for that they hated knowledge, and did not choose the fear of the Lord: they would none of my counsel; they despised all my reproof. Therefore shall they eat of the fruit of their own way, and be filled with their own devices."—Prov. i. 24-31.
- The great day of God Almighty, when he shall judge the wicked in his wrath, will be the day of their calamity; and when their fear will come as a desolation, and their destruction will come upon them. Now Restorationists charge God here with uttering what he knows to be a falsehood—viz.: That, after this, all those who rejected God's gracious call to repentance in this life may still be heard, and that God will not laugh at their calamity, but will commiserate and relieve it. Thus have I shown that those who believe in a second probation and the ultimate purity and happiness of all God's creatures, reject the clearest statements of God's Word, and the sole and all-sufficiency of the atonement of Christ.
- Touching the publication of these Letters entire, I will make you this proposition: If you will destroy the spurious pamphlet you have put forth I will join you in the publication, furnishing one-half the means and receiving half the copies published. The garbled work you have put out to be recalled and supplied with a genuine copy by you. This is a fair proposition. I will apprise my readers if you accept it. My half of the means is now ready. Truly,

J. B. GRAVER

The Baptist.

THIS BAPTIST GIVES A BAPTIST... THAT IT KATE DISPLAYED... THAT FEAR THEM...

J. R. GRAVES, Editor and Proprietor... J. E. HAINY, Arkansas Editor, Annover, Dorey, Proprietor...

TERMS: \$2.50 per annum in advance... Single Copies: 10 Cents.

Distinguishing Principles of Baptists.

- 1. As Baptists, we are to stand for the supreme authority of the word of God... 2. As Baptists, we are to stand for the ordinance of Christ...

Church Fidelity.

- 1. Baptists believe that a Christian church is a local congregation... 2. That, under Christ, each church is absolutely sovereign and independent...

Distinguishing Policy of Historical Baptists.

The non-recognition of human societies as Scriptural churches by affiliation, ministerial or ecclesiastical, or any alliance or cooperation that is susceptible of being apparently or legally construed as an endorsement or support of the same.

Allegiance to the most efficient Accomplisher of Error.

THE CANTERBURY VERSION.

INQUIRIES are multiplying as to this version, now being made under the influence of the Archbishop of Canterbury, England.

We have watched with interest its progress from the day of the inauguration of the movement until now and weighed well all we could learn concerning it, and we regret to say that we have little of good to hope from it so far as getting a pure version of God's word is concerned.

The churches of Christ can faithfully translate Christ's word to the least "jut and tittle" and her own "faith and practice" will be clarified and strengthened thereby.

From this it is evident to every thoughtful mind that the Scriptures cannot be faithfully translated by a committee composed of scholars of ten or a dozen different creeds without destroying those of them whose faith and practice are not sustained by the word of God.

no longer be added to the church in order to secure their salvation as Pedobaptists now teach, but use practice would be explicitly condemned by the word of God.

We said to Breth. Armitage, Judd, Wycoff and McClay, you cannot organize a union of all denominations that will faithfully translate the New Testament, or even the third chapter of Matthew.

Let the American Bible Union reorganize: under the name of The Baptist Bible Translation Society, and one million of the two million of the Baptists of America, and a half million more of English Baptists will rally at once to their support.

The Baptists must give the world the Bible faithfully translated into all tongues, or it will never get the Bible.

Our only objection to the great John's Street Society is that it has for years been sailing and is sailing under false colors. It is making the impression that its work is done by a union of all denominations, or other denominations than Baptists, which is not and never has been the fact.

We say to our "Bible Union" brethren in New York, close out the affairs of the defunct Bible Union, by organizing a new Society bearing the name of the Baptist Bible Translation Society.

THE CHURCH CONTROVERSY.

THIS controversy carried forward by Dr. Graves, our editor-in-chief, Bro. Gambrell, of the Record, and others—has taken such a wide range that it is quite difficult to tell what the real question at issue is.

divine model and is independent of all others, that to each local church is committed severally the law of Christ, which provides for the preaching of the gospel, the administration of the ordinances and for the discipline of the membership.

Let the subject be discussed in a kind, Christian spirit. If we do not mistake the signs of the times, the church question is destined to undergo a thorough re-discussion from Alpha to Omega. It would take more space than we desire to devote to this article to state our views on this subject and the reasons therefor.

Dr. Harvey says, on page 24 of his book, THE CHURCH: baptism is the initial, public act of submission to him, the sacramentum, or oath of fealty to his kingdom, and hence, this ordinance, which is commonly initiatory to the church, was administered to a believer even where there was no local church as the symbol of submission to the heavenly King.

There are instances where church organization is impracticable, but where individuals might profess their fealty to Christ the great King in the act of baptism. Such were true of many Christian soldiers during the late war, who answered to a good conscience in the act of baptism, and went on their way rejoicing till the missiles of death cut them down and they never enjoyed church membership.

Convince us that it was not and we would be ready to reject it. But is it true of Philip that he was directed by the Spirit whom to baptize and whom not? If so, how do we account for the fact that he baptized Simon Magus, who was in the gall of bitterness and the bonds of iniquity?

one. The denomination throughout the State should feel a deep interest in the cause at Little Rock. We learn that Rev. J. W. Lipsev, of Mississippi, will probably locate in Arkansas.

SUMMARY.

A good meeting has been in progress at Enon church, near this place for several days. Yesterday Rev. N. C. Denson, pastor, baptized two cheerful candidates in the Saline river one of whom was our daughter, Theodora.

The following good news from our esteemed young Bro. Wharton we highly appreciate; as we feel that we could not improve the form by re-writing, We publish the card just as he sent it. This is a self-made boy:

DEAR BRO. SEARCY:—I write to let you know how I am getting along in my field of labor. I have held protracted meetings with two of my churches. At new Hope, in Union county, we had a good meeting. The church which had long been in a distracted condition was greatly revived.

Three Weeks, Ark., Aug. 22, 1880.

Our highly esteemed friend, Rev. W. A. Forbes, has left Little Rock and gone to Arkadelphia, to take charge of the Baptist High School there. We wish Brother Forbes and the school over which he is to preside abundant success.

We learn that the Banner, formerly published at Judsonia, has turned over its subscription list to the Central Baptist, of St. Louis. This was, perhaps, wise on the part of the proprietor of the Banner, as the Baptists in the State would not unite upon it and give it support.

Yet, while my character, however bad, it cannot hinder me, nor prevent my being received by God. What is good in me (if such there be) does not make me better than a sinner; and what is bad does not make me worse.

THE BIBLE VS. DANCING.

REV. DR. PATTON, in an able article in an exchange on the subject of dancing, thus sums up his conclusions: Having carefully examined every text in the

Old and New Testaments in which the word occurs, we are led to the following conclusions: 1. That dancing was a religious act among idolaters as well as worshippers of the true God.

DEATH.

On the 21st of August, little Maima Davis, infant daughter of our esteemed friend, Dr. S. Davis, of Hermitage, Ark., died of spasms. This was his last child of seven. In a little more than one year he has buried five sweet little children, three in one week.

APPOINTMENTS.

Central Association, which meets at Pleasant Plains, two miles east of Carroll Station, on the first Sunday in this month. We will be at Carroll Station on Friday evening (D. V.).

Western District Association meets with the New Hope church on Friday before the first Sabbath in October, eight miles north of Dresden. Bro. Am. Cox may expect us this year, if God wills. Shall we get off at Dresden?

The Southwestern Association meets at Wildersville, fifteen miles from Huntingdon, on Saturday before the second Sabbath in October.

We have accepted the invitation of Bro. S. G. Jenkins' churches, to be present at a mass meeting and deliver the Lectures on the Church and its Ordinances, on Friday before the 24 Sabbath in October, and closing on Monday at eleven o'clock. The place will be twelve miles from Taladega.

CONFIDENCE TOWARD GOD.

IT is not because of character that I, a sinner, can find favor in the eyes of God. Such is my character, even at its best, that I can find on it no plea of acceptance. I may labor hard to men and meliorate it; yet, after all, I find myself a sinner still; and, being so, my character cannot justify me, nor can it in the very least contribute aught toward my justification.

I do not expect anything from God on account of what I am, or feel, or do. Granting that my character is a good one, still it is not so good as that God can show me favor on account of it. I must, therefore, set it aside. I cannot act upon it, or ask God to act upon it.

Yet, while my character, however bad, it cannot hinder me, nor prevent my being received by God. What is good in me (if such there be) does not make me better than a sinner; and what is bad does not make me worse. So that, whatever I be, I must still meet God just as a sinner. And as such he is willing to meet me; as such he is willing to receive and bless me. The only condition he makes is that I shall come to him as I am, making no secret of my sins, nor pretending to be—what I am not, and never can be—less than a sinner.—H. Bower, D. D.

CORRECTION.

Through accident, the following paragraph was omitted in Mr. Barrum's eighth letter, published last week:—I CONVICTED YOU OF FORGERY.—Our readers know I did, and you, sir, know it—you added to the word of God, in order to help out your cruel, barbarous creed—the most scoundrel that can be conceived of. Your quibbles and cavils on the subject, are of no avail—the cases are too plain.

BREVITIES.

We again urge the brethren who expect to attend the State Convention to read the card of Pastor Strickland, and comply with his request.

We shall publish Dr. J. M. Pendleton's review of "Old Landmarkism—What Is It?" that recently appeared in the Religious Herald, in our issue of next week. It will be followed the week after by the reply of our editor-in-chief, Dr. Graves that appeared in the same paper. Both articles will repay a careful perusal.

We are in receipt of a circular letter from Rev. J. M. Waters, of Nashville, chairman of the Ministerial Relief Board of the State Convention, which we shall publish in our next issue. The subject of ministerial relief is one of vital interest, and we are pleased to note that Bro. Waters has given it serious thought, and proposes a definite plan of action.

How many of the churches will defray the expenses of their pastors to the State Convention? We should be glad to know that every church had resolved to do this very thing. The interests of the State Convention are of the highest importance, and in no better way could the churches put themselves in closer sympathy with its work, than by sending up their pastors to the next meeting, and along with them a handsome contribution to its treasury.

Rev. M. C. Harris, of Gurretttsburg, Ky., dropped in to see us last Monday. He was on his way to Benton, Ark., where he goes to hold a series of meetings. He expects to spend the fall and winter in that State as an evangelist, and will be glad to serve churches in that capacity. Bro. Harris ranks second to none of the able young ministers sent out by Kentucky, and we bespeak for him a cordial welcome from the Arkansas brethren. He will represent THE BAPTIST and the Baptist Book House.

The editor in chief has been absent the past week, attending the Judson Association, and will attend to several matters, the Record not excepted, in our next issue. The reply of the senior to Mr. Burruss is lengthy, but will repay several perusals. The Book House is issuing the closing letters on each side in tract form, for general circulation, at 10 cents per copy; \$1.00 per dozen, by mail, postpaid. Send for a dozen copies to circulate. They contain the summary of the arguments, pro and con.

THE DISCUSSION.

THIS has continued for a long time, from various and unavoidable causes. Instead of twenty-four, the letters have reached thirty-two, and then two suspensions on account of yellow fever and our absence in California have intervened. But those interested have had time to thoroughly examine the arguments and expositions of Scripture that have been submitted, and it has been an advantage rather than loss. We can say that this discussion has been of great advantage to us in several respects. All the Scriptures and very many more than Restorationists rely on to support their theory Mr. Burruss has brought forward, and we know them. All the arguments and ingenious fallacies which they use have been presented, and we know them, if we have not fully exploded them. The discussion has compelled us to examine to the bottom all the grounds this new delusion rests upon, and we are ready to meet any Restorationist, at any time, with absolute confidence of success with God's Word.

Our young and middle-aged members will have this new and dangerous error to meet, whether they will or not, for it is springing up like thistles everywhere, and it certainly becomes to make themselves familiar with its arguments and sophistries, and not be taken unawares. So should every intelligent Baptist who would be a witness for the truth, and who would not be overrun by a Universalist, make himself familiar with the arguments to refute them. We trust the discussion has not been in vain, and that great good will come of it. "Will you publish it?" That depends on Mr. Burruss. If he will destroy his garbled publication, which he has put forth and

is selling for the discussion, and unite with us in a publication of the whole discussion, without change, then we shall be pleased to publish; but but if he serves this as he did the last, we shall be compelled, in self-defense, to publish. We shall wait to hear from him, or to see what he will do.

NEWS FROM THE STATES.

Georgia.—The Louisville News and Farmer of the 25th ult., says: "On last Sabbath evening, there was an immense baptism at a canal in the community of Mr. J. N. Beahm, Thom. Hardeeman place. The number of one hundred and six were led into the water, one at a time, and immersed. Great preparation was made for it, and about sixty hands worked a day or two, preparing the baptismal pool."

Bro. J. H. Weaver writes from Burnsville, August 20th: "During our recent series of meetings here, four were added to the church by baptism, and several by letter. Since Mar lat, we have received fifteen by letter and five by baptism, twenty is all."—The Harmony Grove congregation of the First Mission says: "In addition to the regular services at the Baptist church last Sabbath, there were three young men and one young lady baptized in the pond near the church."—"We have received," says the LaGrange Reporter, "news of a great meeting at the Baptist church at Harrisville, in which twenty-three joined, seventeen of them by profession of faith and baptism. The meeting lasted eight or nine days and ended Sunday night. It was conducted by Rev. Mr. Kelly, the pastor, who had no assistance except what the private members gave him. This was considerable, as the members were greatly revived, and as a general thing, did all in their power."

Kentucky.—The Seminary has opened well, and the students are greatly pleased with their new quarters.—Recorder.—We have just closed a most precious meeting of two weeks, [at Eminence.] Bro. A. F. Baker assisted our pastor, D. N. Porter and L. H. Sells. Bro. Baker endeared himself to our people by his earnest, honest, unflinching manner of presenting the truth. Many pronounce it the best meeting Old Fox Run has ever held. Results, eleven additions to the church, seven by letter and four by baptism. J. T. Wilson, in Recorder.—Alexandria church, Campbell county, is without a pastor.

North Carolina.—Dr. Tomalide was expected to begin a meeting with the church in Charlotte to-day (8th). The pastor of the church says: "I earnestly request the prayers of our brethren for its success in reviving and upbuilding the kingdom of Christ in Charlotte."—Baptist Recorder.—One hundred and one students were present at the opening of the present session of Wake Forest College. It is confidently believed the number will reach two hundred.—Recorder.—Neither the number of the thirty new school houses are to be built in Wake county this year.—Recorder. That is a "forward movement" worthy of imitation, and means real progress.—Elder B. I. Devin, the pastor, closed an interesting meeting of thirteen days continuance at Mountain Creek, Granville county, on Thursday, August 23th. Results: Forty-nine professions, twenty baptisms, and a goodly number awaiting the ordinances.—Mid.—Dr. Whitfield has declined the call to Greensboro.—The Baptists of Dallas have a new house underway, to be completed by winter.

Dr. Eaton preached his fifty-fifth anniversary sermon on last Sunday. During the five years, the church has had 573 additions, 289 of them by baptism, which is more than an average of one baptism a week for the whole period. Not a month has passed without some one's receiving the hand of fellowship. During the five years, we have raised, for various purposes, \$22,007.75. This does not include the expense attending the meeting of the General Association. Our present number is 634.—Petersburg, in Religious Herald. During the pastorate of Dr. W. A. Montgomery at the First church, Lynchburg, containing four years and nine months, he baptized 211 persons into the fellowship of that church, an average of one person for each week. Don't you want some more Tennessee preachers to cross the line, Bro. Herald?—Timothy, writing to the Religious Herald of Richmond College, says it needs two things: "One of these is an ample endowment—\$300,000 of interest-bearing funds. Its other need is students: Two hundred young men in its class. I would compromise on that number. It does not now need additional buildings. Money spent in completing the design of the present buildings would be wasted. The College, indeed, ought to have beautiful buildings, but the erection of such buildings must be the work of another generation. Let this generation endow it, and give it students." The above will apply with equal force to possibly every Baptist college in the South.

Tennessee.—Carson College, at Mowry Creek, opened her session with one hundred students in attendance. Many more have matriculated since.—Let us see; twelve miles wide, by one hundred miles long is twelve hundred square miles. Is the Big Hatchie less than one hundred miles long? After all it may be true, that she has twelve hundred square miles of destination.—Baptist Register. But the people who live in this district, whatever the number of square miles may be, are not "wholly ignorant." Feeling so much interest in the matter, one would naturally infer you would be rejected to know the Association proposed to apply this destination, but that point seems to be studiously avoided.—The church at Sweetwater are pushing forward the work of building a parsonage. They need help, and contributions will be gratefully appreciated. Elder W. C. Grace, the pastor, will receive and acknowledge any amount forwarded.—There is still time for the churches to take up a handsome collection for the State Mission Board, before the State Convention meets. It would cheer the heart of our corresponding Secretary, Bro. J. D. Anderson, to have the delegates greet him with a contribution. All the destitution in the State, we fear, is not confined to Big Hatchie Association, and the State Board really need funds to send out missionaries into those destitute places.—A series of re-

vival meetings are now in progress at the First Baptist church, this city, [Knoxville,] with favorable prospects.—Baptist Beacon.—Bro. W. C. Grace, in speaking of the plan of Mission work adopted by the Sweetwater Association says: "It is in substance the plan of the Big Hatchie and Central Associations of West Tennessee, and also that of our State Convention."

South Carolina.—Rev. N. G. Cooner, of Batesburg, reports the following revival news to the Baptist Courier, and the course adopted might be profitably adopted by many churches: "I have just closed a meeting at Pine Pleasant—preaching by Rev. N. N. Burton. Received one for baptism, expelled three, preferred charges against four to be disposed of at our next church conference. For these I have labored and prayed for nearly two years."—The State Mission Board proposes to raise \$6000 by the meeting of the State Convention.—Dr. M. B. Wharton, who is canvassing the State for the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, secured \$1310 for the endowment from the church at Anderson.—Rev. T. W. Reed, pastor of Mountain Creek church, near Greenville, held a meeting recently, and baptized thirty-seven persons.

Mississippi.—Rev. A. E. Taylor, of Grenada has been assisting Pastor King, of Senatobia, in a meeting. Will not Bro. King favor us with the results?—Before his return home, Dr. W. A. Montgomery labored in a meeting at Winona. Four professed conversion. Could he have remained longer, doubtless larger results would have been witnessed, as every indication pointed to a good meeting. Pastor Corbett continued the meeting.—The Record says Big Hatchie contributed only \$250 to some missions last year. You may add, Bro. Reed, that the First church, Memphis, of which the editor and publisher of THE BAPTIST are members, contributed one-fifth of that amount.—Bro. J. D. Anderson, at Hyattsville, and in now at Oxford, where he goes to the State University. He proposes to take the care of two or three churches. Churches wishing a pastor will find him a most excellent preacher, as well as a lovely Christian gentleman.—We understand that Bro. J. W. Harris has consented to remain at Hyattsville, as pastor of the church, Bro. Anderson having resigned and moved to Oxford. He has served them as pastor before, and now, as then, the church will be enthusiastic in his support. Bro. Harris has done a great work in that section of country, and we doubt not still greater results will follow his labors in the future.

Texas.—We regret to learn that Dr. J. H. Strickling has tendered his resignation as pastor of the church at Tyler, to take effect the first of next January. Bro. Strickling is one of the best pastors and preachers in the State. We do not think that the church of Tyler will consent to give him up. Such a pastor as he, is hard to find these days.—Baptist Herald.—Bro. Penn's camp-meeting at Mt. Zitt, Bell county, two hundred and seventy-two professed a good hope in Christ.—Elder S. C. Mullins takes strong grounds against intercommunion among Baptist churches, in a recent issue of the Baptist Herald.

Alabama.—We do not believe that Bro. Montgomery's orthodoxy can be questioned.—Dr. Hendrix, in Alabama Baptist. No, nor need any one else. But would it not be an act of common fairness, not to say justice, to Dr. Montgomery to print his speech in your columns, so that your readers could see exactly what he did say? It is short, and will be read with interest.—Dr. Hendrix, of the Alabama Baptist, gives this account of a meeting held at the colored church in Talladega: "At the close of a three week's protracted meeting, the fifth Sabbath, Bro. Barton, the pastor, extended the hand of fellowship to seventy-four persons who had been baptized during the meetings. This church is a good church and they have an excellent pastor. He tells us that there was not a visionary or dreamy experience told during the meeting, and he has confidence in the professions made. We were with them at the closing service, and we do not remember ever being more impressed by church music. The songs were new to us, yet they were all in the book, and there must have been several hundred voices engaged in the singing. The choir led, but everybody seemed to understand the music well enough to follow. It was grand."

Arkansas.—Bro. Harmon came into our meeting at this place, and, as I had other engagements, Bro. Harmon closed the meeting last Saturday with good results. Seven were baptized, received twelve by letter. Bro. H. will likely become pastor at this place, he has a fine influence with this people. Bro. J. G. Doyle, of El-Passo, was engaged in a precious meeting with his church. I went to his assistance on Tuesday. The meeting continued nine days, closing last Sunday night. Nineteen were baptized Sabbath morning. Forty-two were added to the church during the meeting.—W. M. Lee, Conway.—Of the proposed union between the churches in Little Rock, Bro. T. P. Epy writes: "You will be rejoiced to learn that the work of consolidation here will be a success. The work will be finished next Wednesday night. The central was unanimous on it, and only three voted against it in the Night-street, where there was a full meeting. This is the biggest thing that ever occurred to Baptists in this place. Rejoice with us."

Louisiana.—Our meeting at Boggy Bayou, in Caddo parish, closed August 22, after eight days continuance. Sixteen were added to the church, all by baptism except three. The sum of \$5120 was collected, in cash and pledges for State missions. An old gentleman was baptized, who dates his conversion back to August 7, 1850. The congregation was large, and the interest increasing at the time we closed. Bro. C. W. Tomkins preaches for this church. Brethren Forston and Alfred helped in the meeting. I have just learned that Bro. M. O. Strickling baptized twenty six at Mount Olive, DeSoto parish, on the 5th. The Lord be praised.—G. W. Hartfield, in Messenger.—The Baptist protracted meeting closed Saturday night. Five accessions by baptism. The meeting was ably conducted by Elders J. P. Everett and C. B. Freeman, of Shiloh.—Tennessean National.

LOGICAL AXIOMS, AND THE RELIGIOUS HERALD.

WHAT is the province of Logic? The answer to this is the laws of thought as thought, that is, it considers thought to the exclusion of its object.

We can discriminate in consciousness in every act of thought three things: The mind which thinks; that about which it thinks; and the relation which exists between the subject and the object—a relation always manifested in some determinate mode. Of the first and second of these Logic takes no direct account, that is, of the real subject or of the real object of thought, but it is limited exclusively to the forms of thought, to the "mere process of thinking, irrespective of what we are thinking about."

Logic, then, as a special science of thought, is to be viewed as conversant exclusively about the form of thought. "This definition," says Bowen, "assumes that the process of thinking, like every other operation in nature, does not take place at random, but according to certain fixed laws or invariable modes of procedure. There could be no communication of thought from one mind to another, if the process of thinking in all minds were not subject to the same general rules."

It is manifest that he who thinks correctly thinks in consonance with those fixed laws or axioms; "No thought can pretend to validity and truth," which is not governed by them. "Man," says Sir Wm. Hamilton, "can recognize that axioms as real and assumed which the laws of his understanding sanction."

To misunderstand the province of this science is to obscure and disparage it, for when it is found to it cannot do what its unwise friends claim for it, the recoil will be natural. If it fails to accomplish everything promised it will be as unwisely and as lightly inferred that it can accomplish nothing. Unless we know the province of Logic, we shall expect from the study of this science what the science itself does not warrant. To suppose that Logic takes cognizance of the matter of thought—that about which we think is to incumber and obscure it.

To say, then, that this science must not be applied to any one subject is to misapprehend its nature and province. "Logic," says Dr. Thomson, "like philosophy, of which it is a part, arises from a reflection of the mind upon its own operations; it is not one who thinks, but one who can declare how he thinks."

We may apply it to our formal errors, but not to our material errors, for they lie beyond its reach. It being the science of the Formal Laws of thought, it can only propose to purge the understanding of those errors which lie in the confusion and perplexity of an inconsequent thinking.

We will now attempt to make manifest the truth of the foregoing statement:

We have said that Logic is exclusively conversant about thought considered as the operation of comparison or the faculty of relations. Thought in this sense, is the cognition of one mental object by another in which it is considered as included. In this view all that we think about is considered either as something containing, or as something contained, that is, every process of thought is only a cognition of the necessary relations of our general notions. It is for this reason we affirm that Logic within its proper sphere, is of undoubted certainty. Hamilton says, "In this respect Logic and Mathematics stand alone among the sciences, and their peculiar certainty flows from the same source. Both are conversant about certain a priori forms of intelligence; Mathematics about the necessary forms of imagination; Logic about the necessary forms of understanding."

Logic is then conversant about the relations of our conceptions of objects, as in or under each other; i. e., as in different relations, respectively containing and contained. In a proposition the subject is either contained under the predicate, or the predicate is contained in the subject. This will clearly appear from the fact that a judgment is not arbitrary or dependent upon the will, but af-

firms the union and separation of two terms, according as the relation of agreement or disagreement is seen to exist between them. The mere succession or coexistence of two conceptions in the mind, does not constitute a judgment. We may think of church and then of visibility, but no judgment takes place until we affirm in thought a perceived relation between them—until we think the church is visible. Now, this relation cannot be perceived between these two terms unless one is regarded as an attribute or determination of the other.

If both were determining then would be nothing determined, and both cannot be determined unless there is something determining them. There are three necessary parts to every judgment: First, the thing determined, which is called the subject; secondly, the determining or attributive notion, which is called the predicate; and thirdly, that which expresses the relation of determination between the subject and the predicate, which is called the copula. The church is visible. This judgment consists of two terms, yet it is a single act of the mind by which we perceive and affirm the relation of agreement between these two terms, and in this way they are united in one act of thought.

There are two classes of judgment—substantive and attributive.

In the former, the two terms are always convertible or equivalent, therefore the sign of equality may be used as the copula, and the predicate is contained in the subject. The terms of the predicate in this class of judgments are defining terms—that is, the predicate is the definition. In the latter the predicate merely expresses one attribute of the subject, and the relation is that of a whole to its parts, since only a portion of that which constitutes the subject is affirmed of it. When it is said, the church is visible we do not mean that visibility-church, but that visibility is one of the attributes of the church, or one of the marks by which the subject church is determined.

Now as the mind only thinks of an object by separating it from others, that is, by marking it out, or characterizing it, and as it does this, it incloses it in certain fixed limits—determine it. If this discriminating act be expressed in words, we predicate the marks, notes, characters or determinations of the thing. When we gather up these attributes, marks, etc., into one total thought they constitute its notion. These marks, limitations or determinations, which we predicate of a subject, distinguishes it from all other subjects.

We may now see that thought in all its gradations of conceptions, judgment and reasoning, is only realized by the attribution of certain qualities or marks to the object about which we think. This attribution must be regulated by laws, which to some extent renders this process absolutely necessary. The law of identity—a logical axiom, is the application of absolute equivalence of a whole, and all of its parts taken together, to the thinking of a thing by the attribution of constituent qualities or characters. I conceive the thing as a whole, the characters or marks are the parts of the whole. The thing is equal to itself. The whole is equal to the sum of its parts and—of course, the sum of the parts is equal to the whole. This law is the principle of all logical affirmation and definition.

But it must not be supposed that the law referred to here, is only another name for those causes which operate blindly and universally to certain inevitable results, but it is a law suited to a free intelligence—an ideal necessity given in the form of a precept which we are certainly able to violate, but which if we do not obey our whole process of thinking is absolutely null.

Now as the law of identity is the principle of affirmation and definition, so is the law of contradiction that of logical negation and distinction. These two laws, are, in fact, one and the same law, differing only by a position and negative expression. These together with that which enounces that condition of thought which compels us, of two repugnant notions, which cannot both co-exist, to think either the one or the other as

existing, are the primary conditions of the possibility of valid thought.

We cannot affirm or deny the relation of agreement or disagreement between two terms without submission to those axioms which underlie and govern every act and product of the human understanding. These laws always, to say the least, implicitly direct our thought.

They do not admit of proof, as their truth is pre-supposed in every act of reasoning. We have said above that these laws are one and the same, differing only by a positive and negative expression, hence, in the language of a learned author, "we need not be surprised to find that the then primary axiom of pure thought are perhaps reducible to this single principle; all thought must be consistent with itself."

Then according to this principle, a thought that directly or indirectly contradicts itself is null. I cannot therefore affirm of church, relieved of its ambiguity—that it is both visible and invisible—that it can be seen and not seen, in the same time and the same place, nor can I affirm of a man that he is now both old and young. Were I to do so my affirmation would not be consistent, but self-destructive.

(To be Continued.)

NOTE.—Please make the following correction in my article of last week: For "A-not A-O," put "A-not A-O, or A-A-O," and for "argument" put "agreement," in the third line from top of third column.

MARY SHARP COLLEGE—THIRTY-FIRST ANNUAL OPENING—THE GRAND-EST SINCE THE WAR.

OVER ONE HUNDRED STUDENTS MATRICULATED.

On Wednesday at 9 a. m., September 8th, the spacious college chapel was crowded with students and patrons and the most intelligent and influential citizens of Winchester.

PROGRAMME.

1. Bible Reading, Lecture and Prayer by the President, Z. C. Graves.
2. Slating by the Students and Faculty, led by Prof. Charles C. Gifford.
3. Appropriate Lectures on the strength and influence of higher education of women—by the Faculty in the following order: Fred. Z. C. Graves, Prof. G. W. Johnston, A. T. Bern, C. C. Gifford, E. M. Gardner, and an impulsive original poem by Mrs. A. C. Graves.
4. A telling speech on the part of the Board of Trustees, by the Hon. P. Turney, Judge of the Supreme Court.

REMARKS.

The speech of Judge Turney was able and encouraging, and thrilled his audience. The adversity and opposition through which Mary Sharp College has passed were but as the mists that gather around our mountains near by, which anon are scattered by the coming sun that floods their heights.

"Food, impious man; thinkst thou you shalt, Halted by the breath of man can quench the orb of day? He but retains his golden food, To warm the nations with redoubled ray!"

Mary Sharp College for the first time since the war, is free from debt, and under the control of an efficient Board of Trustees, and an unusually able and experienced Faculty—even for Mary Sharp College—which never had an inefficient faculty. The college has now fully entered upon a new era of prosperity.

Let her friends, the time honored advocates of higher education for women, everywhere, throughout the States from whence have come more than five thousand students, rally around Mary Sharp College, which has done more for the women of the South, immeasurably, than any other college.

She will yet, abreast of the times, educate more than five thousand others in the higher and advanced learning of the day.

The numbers present at opening have generally been doubled during the collegiate year. Let every friend say a word for such a success, and let every student hasten to enter at once.

A. SPETTAGO.

STATE CONVENTION.

Delegates to the State Convention, to be held in Knoxville in October next, are requested to send in their names immediately, that the Committee may assign their homes, and then have time to notify each delegate by postal or the whereabouts of his home thus assigned. G. H. WELLS, LAY, Pastor First Baptist Church, Knoxville.

