

The Danbury Reporter.

STOKES AND CAROLINA.

VOLUME XXXI.

DANBURY, N. C. THURSDAY, JANUARY 19, 1905.

NUMBER 42

Clerk's Annual Report.

(CONTINUED FROM LAST WEEK.)

Recd. Feb. 5, 02, in suit Harris vs. Bohannon, due Alex. S Woodson \$ 5 84

Recd. Feb. 5, 02, in suit Harris vs. Bohannon, due Mary T Martin 3 33

Recd. Feb. 5, 02, in suit Harris vs. Bohannon, due Jessie Mitchell 3 33

Recd. Feb. 5, 02, in suit Harris vs. Bohannon, due Bessie Meadows 3 33

Recd. Feb. 5, 02, in suit Harris vs. Bohannon, due Sallie O Durham 3 33

Recd. Feb. 5, 02, in suit Harris vs. Bohannon, due Gracie Durham 3 34

Recd. Feb. 5, 02, in suit Harris vs. Bohannon, due C B Durham 3 34

Recd. Feb. 5, 02, in suit Harris vs. Bohannon, due Emma Durham 3 34

Recd. June 14, 02, in suit Landreth vs. Morefield, due J Van Lewis 25

Recd. July 28, 02, in suit Simmons vs. Smith, due JA Adams 30

Recd. July 28, 02, in suit Simmons vs. Smith, due J L Tilley 30

Recd. F T 02, in suit Lewis vs. Overby, due W Y Gordon 1 20

Recd. F T 02, in suit Lewis vs. Overby, due James Overby 30

Recd. F T 02, in suit Lewis vs. Overby, due W M Gordon 30

Recd. F T 02, in suit Lewis vs. Overby, due J F Alred 30

Recd. F T 02, in suit Lewis vs. Overby, due T M Baker 140

Recd. Feb. 28, 99, in suit Wall, ex. vs. Wall, due J H Shamell 50

Recd. Dec. 18, 02, in suit Boyles vs. Boyles, due S P Jarrett 25

Recd. Dec. 20, 02, in suit Smith vs. Martin, due Charlie Martin 1 00

Recd. Dec. 29, 02, in suit Blackburn vs. Fair, due S C Hauser 85

Recd. Dec. 29, 02, in suit Blackburn vs. Fair, due W C Wilson 1 80

Recd. Dec. 29, 02, in suit Blackburn vs. Fair, due C R Reid 30

Recd. Dec. 29, 02, in suit Blackburn vs. Fair, due W H Hood 1 85

Recd. Dec. 29, 02, in suit Blackburn vs. Fair, due J M Smith, Jr. 30

Recd. Dec. 29, 02, in suit Blackburn vs. Fair, due J B Tillotson 90

Recd. Dec. 29, 02, in suit Blackburn vs. Fair, due D H Wall 2 58

Recd. Dec. 29, 02, in suit Blackburn vs. Fair, due J H Page 1 66

Recd. Dec. 29, 02, in suit Blackburn vs. Fair, due Thomas James 4 62

Recd. Dec. 29, 02, in suit Blackburn vs. Fair, due Robert Covington 1 46

Recd. Jan. 1, 03, in suit Tilley vs. Penn, due Ira E Jessup 25

Recd. March 9, 03, in suit Foreman & Bro. vs. Taylor, due H D Leake 90

Recd. March 9, 03, in suit Foreman & Bro. vs. Taylor, due J W Morris 50

Recd. March 12, 04, in suit Martin vs. Martin, due C C Flynt 1 20

Recd. April 29, 03, in suit Pearce vs. Lynch, due JE Dodson to R L Haymore 50

Recd. April 29, 03, in suit Pearce vs. Lynch, due J E Dodson 10

Recd. April 29, 03, in suit Pearce vs. Lynch, due Martha France 3 60

Recd. April 29, 03, in suit Pearce vs. Lynch, due John A Martin 50

Recd. May 21, 03, in suit Johnson vs. Slate, due W H Haymore 62

Recd. May 21, 03, in suit Slate vs. Thomas, due W P Ray in controversy 90

Recd. May 21, 03, in suit Slate vs. Thomas, due W R Carter in controversy 60

Recd. May 21, 03, in suit Slate vs. Thomas, due P W Robertson in controversy 1 20

Recd. May 21, 03, in suit Slate vs. Thomas, due J C Newsum in controversy 25

Recd. May 21, 03, in suit Slate vs. Thomas, due P H Mabe in controversy 75

Recd. May 21, 03, in suit Slate vs. Thomas, due John C Clark in controversy 25

Recd. May 21, 03, in suit Slate vs. Thomas, due James A Johnson in controversy 3 36

Recd. May 21, 03, in suit Slate vs. Thomas, due M A White to Joel Tilley in controversy 2 00

Recd. May 21, 03, in suit Slate vs. Thomas, due M A White in controversy 4 64

Recd. S T 03, in suit State vs. Martin, due J B Webster 60

Recd. S T 03, in suit State vs. Shelton, due J M Davis 30

Recd. S T 03, in suit State vs. Samuel, due J W Gibson 1 00

Recd. May 22, 03, in suit Campbell vs. Golding, due E H Rainey, (judgt). 14 74

Recd. June 18, 03, in suit Marshall Bros. vs. Southern R R Co., due S G Brown 1 20

Recd. June 18, 03, in suit Saml Hall exparte, due J A Forest 1 00

Recd. Jan. 4, 04, in suit Reynolds vs. Wall & Wall, admsrs., due W F Moir 1 20

Recd. Jan. 4, 04, in suit Saml Hall exparte, due R L Hall 60

Recd. Feb. 9, 04, in suit Presley Pearce et al exparte, for probate of deeds 1 25

Recd. Feb. 22, 04, in suit Southern vs. Southern, due J I Blackburn 1 00

Recd. Feb. 22, 04, in suit Southern vs. Southern, due Geo. Manuel 50

Recd. Feb. 22, 04, in suit Hill admr. vs. Hill et al. due D Poindexter 50

Recd. April 16, 04, in suit Hughes vs. Bryant,

due James Flippin

Recd S T 04, in suit State vs Webster, due Phil Carter

Recd S T 04, in suit State vs Webster, due Jas. Scales

Recd S T 04, in suit State vs Mabe, due Laurel Mabe

Recd S T 04, in suit State vs Jones, due J R Covington

Recd S T 04, in suit State vs Jones, due D F Tillotson

Recd S T 04, in suit State vs Frazier, due C S Cardwell

Recd S T 04, in suit State vs Linville, due Cephas Vaughn

Recd S T 04, in suit State vs Lankford, due D S R Martin

Recd S T 04, in suit State vs Harris, due L T Priddy

Recd S T 04, in suit State vs Martin, due J B Webster

Recd S T 04, in suit State vs Martin, due J E Shelton

Recd S T 04, in suit State vs Martin, due J A Amos

Recd S T 04, in suit State vs Martin, due J T Kallam

Recd S T 04, in suit State vs Voss, due J T Johnson

Recd S T 04, in suit State vs Scales, due R P McAnally

Recd S T 04, in suit State vs Heath, due J L Mitchell

Recd S T 04, in suit State vs Lewis, due J S D Pulliam

Recd S T 04, in suit State vs Moser, due W L Culler

Recd S T 04, in suit State vs Lewis, due Dr. J W Neal

Recd May 27, 04, in suit Hawkins vs Hawkins et al, due James M Fagg

Recd May 27, 04, in suit Hawkins vs Hawkins et al, due C H Sheppard

Recd May 27, 04, in suit Joyce vs Southern R R Co., due D Poindexter

Recd June 6, 04, in suit Morris vs Jones admr., due J E Crews

Recd June 7, 04, in suit Southern et al vs Hall et al, due S G Brown

Recd June 7, 04, in suit Southern et al vs Hall et al, due J H Covington

Recd June 13, 04, in suit Ellington admr. vs Ziglar et al, due R F Brown

Recd June 13, 04, in suit Ellington admr. vs Ziglar et al, due J W Hylton

Recd June 13, 04, in suit Ellington admr. vs Ziglar et al, due S A Thompson

Recd June 13, 04, in suit Ellington admr. vs Ziglar et al, due R J Woolwine

Recd June 13, 04, in suit Ellington admr. vs Ziglar et al, due C R Martin

Recd June 13, 04, in suit Ellington admr. vs Ziglar et al, due S H Dunkley

Recd June 13, 04, in suit Ellington admr. vs Ziglar et al, due W R Massey

Recd June 13, 04, in suit Ellington admr. vs Ziglar et al, due T D Howell

Recd June 13, 04, in suit Ellington admr. vs Ziglar et al, due S A Anderson

Recd July 4, 04, in suit Cromer vs Bitting, due Jasper A Slate

Recd July 4, 04, in suit Cromer vs Bitting, due J M Gibson

Recd July 4, 04, in suit Cromer vs Bitting, due J D Barr

Recd July 4, 04, in suit Cromer vs Bitting, due W A Petree

Recd July 9, 04, in suit State vs Clark, due J W Young

Recd July 9, 04, in suit State vs Clark, due Geo. Price

Recd July 9, 04, in suit State vs Clark, due Phil Carter

Recd July 9, 04, in suit State vs Clark, due James Scales

Recd July 9, 04, in suit State vs Clark, due Jno. Ziglar

Recd July 9, 04, in suit State vs Manuel, due R W Hill

Recd July 9, 04, in suit State vs Mabe, due Robert Lawson

Recd July 22, 04, in suit Mitchell et al vs Bennett et al, due J C Wall

Recd July 22, 04, in suit Mitchell et al vs Bennett et al, due J W Flinchum

Recd July 30, 04, in suit Martin vs Collins, due H D Shaffer

Recd July 30, 04, in suit Martin vs Collins, due J A Cardwell

Recd July 30, 04, in suit Martin vs Collins, due T J Gann

Recd Aug. 2, 04, in suit Hicks admr. vs Moody et al, due W A Young

Recd Aug. 23, 04, in suit Wall vs Jones admr., due W B Vaughn

Recd Aug. 25, 04, in suit Fair vs Jones admr., due J S Parish to A J Fair

Recd Aug. 25, 04, in suit Fair vs Jones admr., due J M Davis

Recd Aug. 25, 04, in suit Fair vs Jones admr., due J M Davis to Jones & Patterson

Recd Aug. 25, 04, in suit Fair vs Jones admr., due W T Southern

Recd Aug. 25, 04, in suit Fair vs Jones admr., due M F Pinnix

Recd Aug. 25, 04, in suit Fair vs Jones admr., due J I Blackburn

Recd Aug. 25, 04, in suit Fair vs Jones admr., due R E Clodfelter

Recd Aug. 25, 04, in suit Fair vs Jones admr., due A A Miller

(CONTINUED ON THIRD PAGE.)

"DOG-KILLER" HEARD FROM AGAIN.

Replies To Article of Mr. "J." Published Some Time Since.

Mr. Editor:

We will now take up the challenge in which Mr. J. offers to give us five dollars to prove that Jesus condemned the manufacture of whiskey. While we wish and expect to win his five dollars, not for ourself, however, but to bestow as a gift on some poor needy one (yet to be decided on) who has been made a subject of charity through the influence of strong drink; our main reason for taking up his challenge is for the sake of truth, and because so many seem to be easing their conscience over the manufacture and sale of whiskey, all because they think the word of God is silent on the matter. Indeed, it seems that many are real glad to believe that it is silent about it. But let us assure you, dear reader, that it is not silent on the subject. We intend to try the case by God's word; and we ask all the intelligent, thoughtful readers of the Reporter to do us the kindness to serve as jurors in the case, and follow us closely and patiently while we examine the evidence, and then pass in their verdict after they have heard all the testimony. And as it will take sometime to examine all the scriptural evidence bearing on the case, and we want the readers' verdict when we are through, we ask them to please preserve all our letters and read them connectedly when we shall have finished writing on the subject.

Now, while we admit that Jesus never mentioned the word "whiskey," we affirm that he condemned the thing we sometimes designate by that word. And now in the beginning of these letters we lay down the indisputable fact or proposition that we can talk about things in other than direct or specific terms. When I say that trees bear leaves, I state a fact which is common to all kinds of trees, though I do not specify any particular tree. If I say that causes produce results, I state a fact which is common to all causes. Then, if the Saviour teaches us that all causes are condemned, which produce sinful results, he teaches us a fact which is common to all such causes. That is to say, he teaches us a truth which must be interpreted of all causes which produce sinful results. Now, reader, with these thoughts fixed in your mind, we ask you to go with us to Matt 18:6. By the aid of the Saviour's teaching in this verse, we are enabled here in the beginning of this discussion, to deal a death blow to the idea that he was silent on the whiskey business. Here are his words:

"Whoso shall offend one of these little ones which believe in me it were better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck, and that he were drowned in the depth of the sea." Again, in order to emphasize this declaration and impress it more forcibly on the minds of men, it is stated again in Mark 9:42; and still again in Luke 17:2. We refer you to these passages in order to call your attention to the word "offend." We do not believe for one moment that that is the full meaning the Saviour wished to convey by the word. Indeed, we think that it is only a very light shade of his meaning. We do not understand that it is a sin to get angry for just cause, that is if we conduct

ourselves aright while under the passion. For we read of the anger and wrath of God. Again, we are told to "be angry and sin not." So then, when one offends us in the sense of making us angry, if we conduct ourselves aright while under the influence of the anger it is no sin to us. So we will have to look for a broader meaning of the word "offend" as used by our Lord in the above named passages, than just simply to provoke anger. So be patient, reader, we will get to the thoughts we wish to enforce further on.

It is sometimes the case that when words in our common English Bible fail to give us a clear understanding of the Spirit's meaning, it will help us to go back and find out the meaning of the corresponding Hebrew or Greek words they translate. This seems to be the case with the word under consideration; as it is variously rendered by different translators. In the "Emphatic Diaglott, Doctor Wilson readers it "Insnare," instead of "Offend."

Let it be remembered that the New Testament was first written in the Greek language. The Spirit selected certain words with which to convey its meaning to the children of men, and those words were written down, and they constitute what we call the "Greek New Testament." Since then this original work has been translated into many other languages; and we have the common English version, in which we find the word "offend," which is the word we now have under consideration. And now, before we hear Webster on the meaning of the word, we will go back and find out the meaning of its corresponding Greek word. The word "offend" in the passages referred to, is a translation of the Greek word "Skandalizo." And now, as "Liddell and Scott" are the standard authorities on the definition or meaning of Greek words, and as we have their Greek-English Lexicons before us, we will let them tell us what the word means. In their abridged lexicon they say that "Skandalizo" means, "to make to stumble, give offence or scandal to any one, throw difficulties in his way." In their unabridged work they give about the same meaning, but extend it somewhat by citing Matt. 5:29, as an instance in which the word is used.

We will now call in Doctor Robt. Young and let him tell us what the word means. In his English, Hebrew and Greek Concordance to the Bible, he says that "Skandalizo" means "to cause to stumble;" just what Liddell and Scott say about it.

Now, we will hear Webster on the meaning of the corresponding English word. In his unabridged work, he gives several shades of meaning to the word "offend." Here are some of them:—"To disturb, annoy, or cause to fall or stumble. To draw to evil, or hinder in obedience; to cause to sin or neglect duty."

Reader, we have now learned from these wise men that to offend one, is to disturb or annoy him, to draw him to evil, to hinder him in obedience; to cause him to sin or neglect duty. In short, to cause him to stumble and fall by throwing obstacles or difficulties in his way. And now with these thoughts fixed in your minds, I ask, what are you doing, you who are manufacturing and dispensing whiskey? And what have you done, you who voted in its existence and sale? Do you know how many of our fellow beings you have offended, or

"caused to stumble and fall" by your bringing about the existence of the deadly stuff and thus "throwing it as an obstacle or difficulty in their way? Do you know how many you have offended, or "drawn to evil" by it? Do you know how many you have offended by it by causing it to "hinder them in obedience" to the laws of God and man and of common decency? Do you know how many you have offended by it, by its "causing them to sin and neglect their duties" to their wives and children, and to God and themselves? Do you know how many of God's worshiping congregations or little ones you have offended, by its "disturbing" and breaking up their devotional exercises? No, you do not know how many you have offended in any of these senses. The number is so great, and you have been so thoughtless and unconcerned about it, that you cannot count them. But hear the Saviour's denunciation of the man who offends only one of his little ones. Here are his words:

"Whoso shall offend one of these little ones which believe in me, it were better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck, and that he were drowned in the depth of the sea."

Reader, please remember that I am not talking about the word "whiskey," but about the thing sometimes designated by that word; and that when I speak of it, its attributes—its characteristic influences as well as its substance are implied. That is to say, I speak of it not only as an article or substance, but as a cause, agent, agency, or instrumentality, as well. So then, to manufacture whiskey is to manufacture it both as an article or substance, and as a cause, agent or instrumentality. Then when I say that to manufacture it, is either to drink it or cause others to drink it, and that to drink it and cause others to drink it, is to cause all the evils which follow its use; I state facts which are verified by the experience and observation of all observing people, and prove beyond all doubt that the manufacture of whiskey is the great basis or underlying cause of all the evils which follow its use. And as long as truth is truth I shall find no ground to surrender my convictions in the matter.

We will now put our scriptural argument in the form of a syllogism.

PREMISES—Jesus condemns that which offends his little ones.

Whiskey offends some of his little ones, by "causing them to sin and neglect duty."

CONCLUSION—Therefore Jesus condemns whiskey.

Webster says that if the premises, or major and minor propositions of a syllogism are true, the conclusion must be true, and the argument amounts to demonstration. So then, reader, if the premises of the above syllogism are true, if it is true that Jesus condemns that which offends his little ones, and is true that whiskey offends some of them by "causing them to sin and neglect duty," then according to Webster we have proved our case, both logically and scripturally; and that, too, by the use of a single verse. But we are not done yet; for we intend to clinch the proof and seal it with other declarations of God's word. So we trust that you will bear with us till we get through.

Jurors dismissed till we meet in our next, at which time we will call in other witnesses.

DOG-KILLER.