

You wrote your "journal the next morning after it took place ;" but the above was written at least twelve hours previous !

On the above, Mr. Howard remarks : " Here is what stands in the blank leaf of J. Wood's Testament—written by Mr. Taylor's own hand. First, I offered that if Mr. Taylor would take the affirmative of the salvation of all men, I would take, Secondly, the affirmative—that a part of mankind would be eternally lost. He then reversed it as you see first. I then took the pencil to put it as I agreed, and began to write ; but he took the pencil again, and wrote as you see the second question stated ; altering my words a little ; but placing my proposition first again ; knowing that as we had but one evening he would have nothing to do but to find fault without undertaking to prove his own proposition. I then told him that if he would reverse the order, and place the proposition as I agreed, I would meet him. This he would not do ; but withdrew from the meeting. As to backing out, it is a crime of which I never yet was guilty ; and the public may judge from Mr. Taylor's refusal to meet me in any of those places named by the editor, who it was that has backed out !"

So much for that. Your story of Mr. H's endeavouring to get the question, so that he would have "one speech more" than yourself, you must be aware, that in no way, "fix it as you please," can that be made even *probable*.

As to your "better method" of discussing the question, than a public oral exchange of sentiments, I am not satisfied. If disputants would keep close to the question, it would be preferable ; but generally there is too great a field occupied in written discussions. The expence of a faithful reporter would not be great, and the satisfaction and benefit of having the whole laid before the reader at one time is certainly superior to weekly or monthly parcels.

But notwithstanding this, if you persist in your refusal to meet Mr. Howard in a public oral discussion, if you can be patient until the press of matter at present on hand for the Christian is disposed of, you shall have a candid hearing in our publication, on the conditions specified in your letter. Although the Christian is too small for such a discussion, yet we oppose no system which we are not willing to lay before our readers in the precise language and style of its devotees. Our publication, however, as its name imports, is designed to act in the community the part of a *living christian*—to present the gospel fairly and fully before all, and to act consistently with its high and holy calling !

After this long introduction, permit me now to test the truth of your sentiments. It will be necessary first, however, to make a few general remarks on the system. Then we shall see whether your witnesses testify in favor of the endless happiness of all men or not.

No system so completely sets at defiance all the principles and rules of interpretation as Universalism. What I mean by rules of interpretation, is, that common sense which every man should call into exercise when he examines any production. In so doing, he asks, who is the writer ? to whom is he writing ? what were their characters ? what are they now ? On what subject was he writing ? what was the grand