

us come to? Would you simply pull down and not build up? Have you nothing definite to offer?" My object in writing this is rather to provoke discussion than to dogmatize—to traverse the whole field and give as complete a survey as possible of the present state of the controversy—to urge that these, to me, overwhelming objections to the popular doctrine should be thoroughly met, or candidly admitted. But not to evade the question, I will frankly express that I accept the views (which are by no means of a mere negative or destructive type) propounded by And. Jukes in his work "The second Death and the Restitution of All Things," a book which I should urge all my brethren to read as the work of a scholar of no mean order, and a divine of the Anglican Church, and a good Churchman too.* It is the only treatise I have seen, which fairly attempts to *reconcile* ALL the texts—including such as, on the one hand, "many called, few chosen" (all which modern upholders of the popular view seem to drop into oblivion) and, on the other hand, all those passages, and they are many, which taken in their obvious signification tend to establish the "Restitution of all Things," which texts also the orthodox, in this discussion, very conveniently ignore. I shall not spoil Jukes' beautiful train of thought by attempting to epitomize it; but, by way of leading up to it, I shall thus give my own "confession of faith."

1. I believe that Christ came "to destroy the works of

* Saml. Cox's *Salvator Mundi* is also a valuable and powerful contribution to this side of the question.