

his own words, as in those which I attributed to him. The inconsistency in the statement which I attributed to him was this, admitting that more could be said against prizes than in their favor, yet wishing them to be continued. The inconsistency in his own statement respecting what he said is much greater, preferring to see prizes continued, yet for the purposes of argument would rather go against them.

What are some of the many legitimate inferences that may be drawn from such a statement?

First, that more *can* be said against prizes than in their favor, since F. H. L. would rather argue against than for them; or secondly, if greater arguments can be advanced in favor of prizes than against them, then F. H. L. would prefer to argue on the *weaker* and *losing* side, since he would rather argue against than for them—but he wishes to do himself justice; and thirdly, in any case, F. H. L. is willing to argue directly against his honest convictions, since preferring to have them continued he would rather argue against them.

Now, from the little inconsistency I attributed to him in my first letter by way of a joke, I drew the inference that were F. H. L. drowning it would be pretty difficult to know whether he would go up or down stream; but from the much greater and more numerous inconsistencies which he attributes to himself, all my doubts have been removed, as any person who would rather argue on a losing side, yet wish to do himself justice, or who would argue directly contrary to his convictions, etc., would surely go *up* stream if drowning. But no one will accept such an explanation from F. H. L. as to why he would choose to argue against prizes, yet prefer to see them continued. The truth, I believe, is that he has nothing except a few of the old exploded arguments, such as helping needy students, being incentives to diligence, etc., to advance in their favor, and, therefore, wishing to do himself justice, to appear as a great controversialist crushing an opponent, he would rather argue on the negative side where there are numerous indisputable arguments against prizes.

F. H. L. then criticizes some of the arguments which I advanced against prizes. He begins by taking two of these, the first and the last; and by snatching parts of each away from the context tries to make them contradict each other. Such treatment of arguments is unfair, and is a direct violation of one of the chief canons of interpretation. Every statement must be taken as modified by the context. Treat the Bible in the same manner in which he treated my arguments and it is an easy matter to make it prove almost anything, and to make one text contradict another. One passage says, "*Work out your own salvation, etc.*;" another says, "*Stand still, and see the salvation of God.*" Again, one passage says we are justified by *faith*, another by *blood*, and still another by *works*.