

the subject of *offered grace*: for in verse the fourth, he expresses his thankfulness for *given grace*, in the following language: ‘*I thank my God always on your behalf, for the grace of God which is GIVEN to YOU by Christ Jesus.*’

The apostle conceived of grace as given *by* Christ, as well as given *in* Christ. Grace was not *offered* to us in Christ, neither is it offered to us *by* Christ. It is grace *unto* you, as a gift, not grace placed *before* you as an *offer*. View grace in any position, and it is grace that is *given*. It is grace given *in* Christ, *into* Christ, *by* Christ, *through* Christ, and *for* Christ’s sake. In grace we see *sovereignty* and *certainty*. Sovereignty in the *giver*, certainty in the *gift*: the latter is founded on the former, and must be as *certain* as it is *sovereign*. Sovereignty *without* certainty, is sovereignty *with* absurdity. If it is therefore *absolutely* sovereign, it is as *absolutely* certain; and this *absolutely* destroys the notion of general redemption, possible salvation, offered mercy, and the whole train of errors connected therewith.

Third, the *exhortation*. *We pray you, in Christ’s stead, be ye reconciled to God.*

It may be observed, that both the epistles abound with corrections, instructions, and exhortations; which seem to suggest—1. That the saints of God on earth, are in a state of comparative ignorance, and subject to errors. 2. That they therefore need exhortation. 3. That they are proper subjects for exhortation. 4. That they should cheerfully allow the word of exhortation to be spoken to them. But their being exhorted to an acquiescence in God’s laws, can shew no reason that ungodly men should be exhorted to a reconciliation with God, in respect to their eternal concerns.

The true and literal meaning of the passage, I take to be this. ‘We have preached among’ you, and others, the doctrine of reconciliation through the work and sufferings of Christ; and as you have received with great pleasure, the ministry of reconciliation, we, (*apostles*) entreat you to render a cheerful submission to his spiritual laws and government, that your candle-

stick may not be removed out of its place, nor the displeasure of God manifested in afflicting dispensations.

But as this sense is disputed by some, it is proper that we should consider every objection of any importance. To this end, I shall lay before the reader, the following extract from Abraham Booth's 'Glad Tidings to Perishing Sinners; or, the genuine Gospel a complete warrant for the ungodly to believe in Jesus.' Fifth edition, page 63, marginal note. "The following criticism," says Mr. B. "is, I think, worthy of notice; and is laid before the judicious reader for his determination. 'The pronoun *you*, is not in the greek. The apostle is not here urging the believing Corinthians to be reconciled to God, for he considered them as already reconciled; but he is setting before them the apostolic message to the world at large, as appears from the foregoing verse: and therefore the supplement ought to be *men*, or the *world*.'" Mr. Maclean's 'Christ's Commission to the Apostle,' page 85. It seems this tiresome and perplexing *you*, have puzzled and nettled more than one. Mr. Fuller, says "it is *unnecessarily introduced*." Very *unnecessarily*, doubtless, and very *unfortunately* too, for his system. Mr. Maclean thinks it ought to be supplied by the plural pronoun *men*, or the substantive, *alias*, *substantial* **WORLD**; the great collective idea, according to Locke, of all bodies whatever. And Mr. Booth thought such a large idea *worthy* of notice.

It shall be noticed, and it is thought a *short* notice will be sufficient to eject the *intruding men*, and turn out the whole collected *world* from their usurped possessions. "The apostle is not here urging the Corinthians to be reconciled to God; *for* he considered them as already reconciled." Now, in just glancing at this quotation, a person cannot fail to notice the unhappy manner in which the conjunctive *for* is introduced. Because they were reconciled to God, by his Son, could they not be exhorted to act consistent with themselves? and as they were not their own, but bought with a price, to glorify God with their bodies and their spirits, which

were his, by acknowledging his authority, and by bowing to his princely sceptre? Are God's children never rebellious after they are called by his grace? Do they always take up their cross and follow him? Are they never fretting at his providence, never murmuring at his dispensations? Painful experience affords a strong affirmative to these dishonouring and displeasing things. And may not the same word be used to denote different things? and sometimes in a sense, more restricted or more extended, as suited with the nature of the subject? I presume, no person acquainted with the scriptures, will answer these interrogations by a negative. But if these things are admitted, where are we to look *for* the force of Mr. Maclean's reasons? Does it not appear, that the rational particle *for*, is rather *irrationally* introduced? It certainly could not exist in the *original* thoughts of either Mr. M. or Mr. B.; *for*, the *men*, and the *world*, are all out of place.

*Quot.* " *But* he is setting before them the apostolic message to the world at large, as appears from the foregoing verse: and therefore, the supplement ought to be *men*, or the *world*." Doubtless, adverse *but*s must be very consoling to a person whose creed is in danger, and who can use them in an offensive manner, to act with destructive energy upon the strong holds of their opponents; something like the Roman battering rams, that were made to *but* in a very alarming manner against the walls of Troy, and the fortifications of Jerusalem. *But*, admitting that to be the case, though I think it might be fairly questioned, I cannot conceive how the conjunctive *but*, can support the illative particle *therefore*, in the last member of the argument. I have already shewn, that God's people may be consistently exhorted to a *practical* reconciliation, after they have enjoyed the blessings of a *doctrinal* one. And though the latter is much more comprehensive than the former, nay, though it may include the whole of the other, still the word may be used in either a more limited or extensive manner. The word *all*, for instance, is frequently used in this form. Thus, Rom. v. 18. 'Therefore, as by the offence of one, (or one

offence) judgment came upon *all* men to condemnation, even so by the righteousness of one (or one righteousness) the free gifts came upon *all* men unto justification of life.' Again, I Cor. xv. 22. 'For, as in Adam *all* die, even so in Christ shall *all* be made alive.' Take a specimen of the substantive *many*. Rom. v. 19. 'For as by one man's disobedience *many* were made sinners, so, by the obedience of one shall *many* be made righteous.' No person of sober judgment will aver, that these words are in their signification of *exact* latitude. Why then, may not the word *reconciliation*, be used in the preceding verse, to denote, that *reconciliation* which is effected by God, through Christ: and in the verse which we are noticing, be employed to point out that holy disposition of soul, which renders the dispensations of providence, the discipline and order of his house agreeable? In short, that it should not be used both in a doctrinal and practical sense in the two verses?

'But the pronoun *you*, is not in the Greek, and the supplement should be *men*, or the *world*.' *It is not in the original*. Allowing this to be true, but very little is gained; for it will not be denied but what the pronoun *ye*, is to be found in the Greek testament; and in this passage too. And that it is also found in most or all of the Greek manuscripts, is, I believe, generally acknowledged. Let us then, construe the passage in the same form that those gentlemen would wish to see it. It will stand thus:—'Now then, we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech *men* by us: we pray *men*, in Christ's stead, be *ye* reconciled to God.' Or thus, 'as though God did beseech *the world* by us: we pray *the world*, in Christ's stead, be *ye* reconciled to God.' It must appear, to any person of common perception, that there is something extremely awkward in the *sound* of the passage; nor is the *sense* very likely to charm the heart, or enrich the understanding. If the design of the apostle, was to tell the Corinthians, that the object of their commission was to persuade the world to be reconciled to God, he ought to have used the neutral demonstrative *it*, instead of the pronoun *ye*. A personal pronoun in the plural

number, can never answer to a noun of multitude, when the idea of *unity* is conveyed: and this would certainly be the case, was the *world* to be substituted for *you*.

But supposing that a plural pronoun could be made to agree with a noun of multitude, in the above sense; suppose that the general rules of language could establish such curious phraseology, it would still be found necessary to expunge the pronoun *ye*, seeing that is in the second person, and cannot be made to agree with a nominative in any other number or person. The apostle ought therefore to have said, we pray *them*, and not we pray *you*. To make the apostle write so grossly incorrect, is paying but a poor compliment to Gamaliel's student. If the pronoun *ye*, is allowed to retain its office, the other pronouns must be made to agree with it; and as that is a pronoun of the second person, it must refer to the Corinthians; and if the other pronouns must be made to agree with that, they too must be in the second person, and refer to the Corinthians likewise; and if so, the supplies are strictly correct, and the passage cannot admit of the proposed amendment. The motion must of necessity be negatived, because no alteration can be made; and therefore, we pray "men or the world" to be reconciled to the scriptures, seeing the scriptures cannot be reconciled to them.

I have another objection to the amendment, it is this: if we admit the alteration we destroy the reason assigned by the apostle in the following verse; *for*, he hath made him to be sin for *us*, who knew no sin, that *we* might be made the righteousness of God in him. *How*, the substitutionary sacrifice of Christ for his church, could form a reason for the apostle's praying and beseeching all men to be reconciled to God, I declare myself unable to comprehend, even in a small degree. But it will exhibit a plain and powerful reason to a good man why he should be reconciled to the dispensations of providence and the order of his house. The apostle reasons from the greater to the less; from the favour to the obligation; and the sense is, he has reconciled his church to himself by his Son, by imputing

their sins unto him, and have commanded us to publish the doctrine of reconciliation, and to entreat his people to be reconciled to his government, to his laws, and to his authority. The proposed amendment, could it be carried, would render the passage absurd in composition, emusculate in sense, and pure nonsense in its conclusion. I therefore, feel decidedly averse to the proposition, and feel myself justified in stating my unqualified disapprobation of any such measures. The sense which I have given is in perfect agreement with the scope of the epistles, might with propriety be urged upon the notice of the Corinthians, and stands adapted to the circumstances of many of God's people in the present day. Wherever there are fretful or disobedient christians, we as ambassadors for God, may the ministers of the gospel say, "do beseech you in Christ's stead; we pray you be ye reconciled to God." For, consider his great love in giving his only begotten Son to die for us, that we might be presented before his throne of glory faultless and with exceeding joy; take his yoke and learn of him, for he is meek and lowly; "for his yoke is easy, and his burden is light."

That the apostle could not mean the reconciliation of the world to God in verse 20th, is, I think, pretty evident. In further proof whereof, I submit the following thoughts:—

1. *The death of Christ is represented in a vicarious point of view.* This is copiously indicated by God's not imputing the trespasses of the *world*, (or believers) unto them; and also, by the explicit declaration of Christ's being made sin for *them*.

2. *This non-imputation of sin comprehended all that are included in the world.* This must be admitted when it is observed, that there are no qualifying hints in the context either directly or indirectly. I mention this because I know of no religious sect that will admit, and much more contend for general redemption upon a vicarious plan.

3. *If all the world of mankind was designed by the apostle, then they are all interested in a plenary satisfaction.* It is absurd to deny this conclusion, without

abandoning the premises, which, I think, are certainly untenable.

4. *If they are all interested in a substitutionary sacrifice, and that sacrifice is accepted as complete in itself, it will follow that the whole world of mankind must by just consequence be saved.* This point have been so ably defended and so successfully directed against the opponents of limited and efficacious redemption, that they have been obliged to retreat in no very grand order, and to direct their attacks in another form. Thus the Socinians and Arminians deny that Jesus Christ ever did make a *proper* satisfaction for any one; while the latter *allow*, that he gave a *valuable consideration* to justice for the sins of all mankind. Calvinists who unite with them in their mode of inviting, exhorting, &c. have devised a very ingenious plan; they allow that he died for his people as their surety, and made a proper satisfaction for them, but that he also died for the *rest*; not as their *substitute*, but to perform ‘a grand operation in the divine government, a satisfaction to law and justice *as such*, laying a foundation for the absolution of sinners upon repentance, and thus for an *unlimited probationary* system.’ Mr. J. H. Hinton’s *Theology*, page 150. I shall notice a few of those extraordinary positions which this gentleman has advanced, in some future page.

4. *It cannot be understood of the reconciliation of all mankind to God, because our Lord and Saviour never prays himself for some.* He declared with his own lips, that he prayed not for the *world*, but for those who were given him out of the world. See John xvii. 9. We cannot suppose, that Christ should commission his apostles to represent him to all mankind, and to assure them, by all the means of entreaty and persuasion, to be reconciled to God; that he was anxious and earnest for their salvation, and, that in fact he had sent them, in order to beg of them to be reconciled and saved; when he avows the galling sentiment, that he confines his intercessory influence to some of them *only*. Or, are we to understand the apostle as saying,

God the Father is anxious to have the whole human race reconciled unto him, but it cannot be accomplished without a mediator or intercessor; and, as my Son confines his petitions to his own inheritance, do you pray them, and for them, in Christ's stead, to be reconciled to God? Feeble expedients these, they will surely be compared to physicians of no value, and, considered as suitable accompaniments to the figment of general offers and invitations, on the ground of Christ's having *died for the goats, without being their substitute and Saviour!!!*

5. *God is said to have reconciled the church unto himself.* Now if *he* had done it, how could the apostles do it likewise? Were they commanded to effect by *supplication* what Christ had accomplished by *substitution*? One would be apt to conclude not: and yet we must be denied the conclusion, if the sense for which I plead is rejected.

6. If they were to pray and beseech all mankind to be reconciled to God, it must include *infidels* and *deists*, and that both living and dying *as such*; but how could they be entreated to a reconciliation with God, if they believed there was no such being? or, if they would admit the existence of a God, yet would not allow themselves to be in a state of rebellion against him? To entreat them to be reconciled to God, when they will not allow themselves to be in arms—to lay down their weapons and submit to mercy, when you cannot convince them that they are guilty of any aggression, seem to be a plan of procedure that shows but very illegible traces of sapiency, propriety, or adaptation. It might be safely assumed, that no person will ever be reconciled to God, until he is positively and painfully convinced of his condition, as a sinner and a traitor: and when that is the case, we are in no danger of being mistaken, when we assert, that he will want no persuading to be reconciled to God, but that his chief enquiry will be to know if God is reconciled to him. Perhaps the language of a penitent convict, is not much unlike the following:



O! could I feel that I am saved,  
 Through Him who bled and died;  
 That I am shelter'd by his cross,  
 That God is *pacified*.  
 This, this, would set my spirit free—  
 That God is reconcil'd to *me*.

Persons who are so extremely tenacious for offered grace, and universal invitations, ought not to conclude, that because there are certain passages of scripture which *sound* something like their own notes, they must have a *sense* that is in strict agreement with their own *gamut*. They will probably recall to mind their juvenile days, when they studied their lessons on the page of 'words nearly alike in *sound*, but different in spelling and *signification*.' Possibly such retrospection may neither remove their prejudices, nor better their views; but, perhaps their prudence and policy will understand the hint. It has been said, 'a word to the wise is sufficient.'

1 Tim. ii. 4. *Who will have all men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth.*

This scripture is thought to express, in very plain language, the universality of divine love and the gracious designs of the Most High. It is urged, that if he wills the salvation of all men, he must offer salvation to them all; and if so, ministers being God's messengers, they ought to offer salvation to *all*, without any distinction.

This argument, in its nature seem to resemble mercury; being as much adapted to destroy the system of the manufacturer, as it is that of his enemy; and in its present form, much more so. Instead of this scripture supporting the notion of offered mercy, possible safety, &c. I will show, that it directs its whole energy against it in the most unqualified manner. I reason upon the passage, in the following manner:

First. *By the will of God we must understand his absolute and eternal purpose.* This will clearly appear, if we properly regard the conjunctive *and*. With a state of salvation, God has united the circumstance of *knowledge*. It is certain, that salvation and information are

correlatives ; for it is written, all thy children shall be taught of me. If we distinguish the will of God, into that of precept and purpose, or purpose and precept, it may assist our minds on this subject. His will of *purpose* contemplates our state and privileges ; his will of *precept* regards our relation and conduct. This shows what *ought* to be done, that what *will* be done. This may be *disregarded*, that must be *fulfilled*. This may be broken, but that can receive no fracture. The one defines what man *ought* to be, the other depicts what he *is*. The one is *wholly* revealed, the other is but *partially* revealed. That part which is hid in secret, belongs to God ; while that part which is revealed, belongs to us and our children for ever. His will of *precept*, *commands* all things that *ought* to be done, while his will of purpose, *connects* all things that *will* be done. *That* commands a *regular* course of action, *this* connects all the *irregularities* of action. The one is comprehended in the other ; and God's will, is a circle within a circle, ' a wheel within a wheel.' Now, as it can no where be proved, that God's will of *precept* commands every individual to have a knowledge of the truth, it must design his *decretive* will. I do not see how this consequence, which proves the truth of the position, can be evaded, and if not, it must be conceded, which concession involves all that I have any desire to plead for.

Second. *The absolute will of God is nothing more or less than the STATE OF HIS MIND.* The fixed and settled state of his mind, determines the order, commencement, progress, and consummation of all things. All the endlessly diversified combination of existences within the illimitable domains of uncreated majesty, when they shall have accomplished their operations will exactly answer to the eternal state of his mind. The conclusion of all things, will complete the *archetype* of his mind—the *copy* of his will.

Third. *His will must therefore be IMMUTABLE.* It can be neither feeble, fickle, nor inefficient. It is *will* united with *omnipotence*, so that whatsoever his soul desireth, even that he doeth. Job xxiii. 13. And it is

with the most lofty tone of majesty and independence, that the incomprehensible Monarch of the skies proclaims the invariable and eternal state of his mind, saying, 'my counsels shall stand, and I will do all my pleasure.' Isaiah xli. 10.

Fourth. *If, therefore, he willed all mankind to come to the knowledge of the truth, all mankind must be brought to receive the truth in the love of it, that they may be saved.* There are no means of either resisting or escaping the force of this inference. It cannot be resisted without overthrowing the omnipotent counsels of God, nor escaped by idle distinctions; because we have defined the will of God to be the state of his mind; comprehending the existence, order, progress, and conclusion of all his creatures, in all their incomprehensible variety, diversified modes, and inconceivable combinations. The division of his will, therefore, into *antecedent* and *consequent*, will be of no avail in this case. The inference thus established, destroys the notion of offered and uncertain mercy, and likewise support the sentiment of saving, sovereign, and certain grace: sentiments which contain all my salvation, and all my desire.—In their defence, I am *pleading*, in the firm belief of them *living*, and in the full enjoyment of them hope to be found *dying* to be *crowned* and *honoured* world without end.

It cannot be said that Jehovah determined all mankind to come to a knowledge of the truth, because simple inspection proves the contrary. There are hundreds of millions of our fellow creatures without even the bible. The doctrine is therefore contradicted by *facts* as well as *reasoning*. Again, the state of his mind, or in other words, his will, is his foreview of things; but how he could foresee that, as existing, which will never come to pass, is among the difficulties of a system, with which I at present feel no desire to be identified.

Fifth. *As his will of purpose must remain eternally the same, we must, of necessity, qualify the terms of comprehension.* The words, *all men*, cannot be more comprehensive than his will; and as his will in this

place, cannot embrace the salvation of all mankind, it follows, that all mankind are not designed in the phrase *all men*. And as no more than the elect seem to be intended, we must understand the phrase *all men*, as including people of all ranks, nations, manners, kindred and tongues under heaven. And we most gladly believe, that God has a people to call out of every nation, and every place; and that with regard to nation, rank, or pedigree, God is no respecter of persons. No circumstances on earth, could lay a foundation for preference in the acts of distinguishing and abounding grace. No, he found the cause of preference within his own self, in his own sovereignty. Electing, redeeming, and regenerating grace, is alike effectual in all its applications. No matter where a vessel of mercy is born. An African or an Indian sun may have burnt upon him, or he may draw his breath amongst the firs of Lapland, or grasp the single thread of existence near the foot of an everlasting glazier, where the sun itself shines but in feeble rays. No matter in what language his feelings have been uttered, his God adored, and his Maker blasphemed. No matter by what breath his doom have been pronounced and his slavery sealed. Sovereign, certain, and efficacious grace, is every where alike effectual; and, whenever the great trumpet is blown, and the voice of the Son of God is heard, that very moment the man becomes quickened, his fetters are melted by the breath of Immanuel's lips, his mind dilates beyond the measure of its chains, and as a prisoner of hope, he passes from the castle of thralldom to the palace of liberty. No matter with what solemnity he may have been devoted on the altar of spiritual slavery and gross idolatry, that moment he arrives at a real knowledge of the truth, that very moment is his liberty proclaimed, and his freedom enjoyed. The altar and the God sink together in oblivion; his soul, conscious of her dignity, walks abroad in her own majesty; is charmed by the privileges of unqualified emancipation, and at the throne of grace, stands confessedly elected, redeemed and regenerated, by the irresistible genius of sovereign and immutable grace.

This interpretation is in strict accordance with the scope of the exhortation, which seem to be this, 'let your petitions extend beyond the people of your charge, for God has got some of his family in every part of the earth, who are under different forms of government, but who must have the gospel preached to them; let prayer therefore be made for their conversion, and for the outpouring of the Holy Spirit.' Rulers are to be prayed for, and we think it no inconsistency to pray for our peaceful sovereign and our rulers, that we may have the rights of nature preserved from molestation, and that we may lead a godly and peaceable life. And were our king or rulers besotted heathens or persecuting catholics, we should not only see the propriety of praying for them, but the *urgent necessity* likewise. When men of power are converted to christianity it must be truly agreeable to those that publish salvation, and that love the sound. Witness, for instance, the example of Constantine, or the more recent conversion of the king of the Sandwich Islands. Timothy, a young man, and a younger minister, might have taken up very crude ideas respecting the order and extent of Christ's kingdom; and as the apostle gives him many invaluable rules, respecting a distinct and organized church, so he suggested that the common kingdom of the Redeemer would be very extensive, numerous and diversified; being composed of some of all ranks, nations, and people upon the face of the earth.

In conclusion, I have only to mark the following things. If all mankind are comprehended in the passage, then

1. It must include the damned in hell, who are suffering the vengeance of eternal fire.
2. It would embrace departed spirits who are in heaven, for they will no more lose their identity than lost and ruined sinners.
3. It would involve those who commit the unpardonable sin against the Holy Ghost. "There is a sin unto death," says John, "I do not say that he shall pray for it." I John v. 16. I presume no persons will contend for these things in a serious manner.

From the whole it must be seen, that as God's will is immutable and omnipotent, it must secure the salvation of all those who are included in it; and then the offerers of grace are reduced to this perplexity, viz. that God offers salvation to people whom he never designed to save. From the words under notice, no idea of offered salvation is either expressly asserted or tacitly implied; but the sentiment of sovereign and everlasting salvation is most clearly exhibited. For we find his determination to save his people clearly stated, and likewise the means by which their spirituality is to be formed and promoted. The same will that devised their salvation found their ransom, and effects their information. They belong to Immanuel as his purchased inheritance, his royal priesthood, and his holy nation. His ransom is founded upon his right, and his reign rests upon his ransom. His right, his ransom, and his reign are of equal extent, and inseparably connected; they form the golden cordage which begirt the whole family of God, and binds them to the eternal throne. But these ideas seem to me so powerfully hostile to offered grace, that it is impossible to bring them in collision therewith, without destroying the sentiment altogether. In my view, the system which I am examining, cannot meet this little combination without receiving some structural mischief; nay, without being shattered to pieces, ground to powder, and scattered upon the waters of oblivion.

Rev. xxii. 17. *And the Spirit and the bride say, come; and let him that heareth say, come; and let him that is athirst come; and whosoever will, let him take the water of life freely.*

On these words I have only to remark, that they exhibit the riches of grace in all their splendour, but are in no wise favourable to general invitations and proffered friendship; in them we see *riches* of grace, but not *offers* of grace. The language describe two indeceivable features of godly character; a disposition of soul for spiritual mercies, and a spiritual freedom of will. Whenever the heart is spiritually disposed, and

the will is spiritually guided, we are sure the subject of them is a new creature; that old things are passed away, and that all things are become new. God has given him a new heart, and made him willing in the day of his power. It is grace, and grace *only*, that gives birth to spiritual exercises, like those depicted in the above passage of scripture. As soon could the sun shine without light, or move without motion—as soon could the infant breathe before it is born, weep in the womb, or will without desire—as soon could the body enjoy the felicities of paradise while slumbering in the ground, or rise from the tomb before the trumpet's call; as a mere natural man can thirst for the waters of life like the hart for the streams of the waterbrook. They must therefore, be spiritual characters who had an interest in redeeming grace, and whose names were written in heaven. I shall without further observation dismiss this passage, being satisfied that more remarks cannot be necessary.

On the subject of invitations, I have these general remarks to make. They may be thus distinguished, moral, national, spiritual.—*Moral*. This class of invitations relate to temporal favour on the ground of moral obedience.—*National*. These invitations are of the same genus, and relate to national prosperity on the ground of national propriety.—*Spiritual*. These respect spiritual mercies on the ground of predestinating mercy, redeeming merit, and regenerating might. They are made to none but spiritual characters, though diversifiedly described. We thus see what I have before observed, viz. that *relation* is the root of obligation and the ground of favour; and that it regulates all consistent addresses, commands, exhortations, and invitations. If this can be *proved* erroneous, I must then acknowledge the feebleness of my arguments, and confess myself mistaken in a very important point; though for the present I labour under no such apprehensions. I am not aware that there are any spiritual invitations made *to* the dead, blind, self-sufficient, and self-exalted. It is true, they are often made *by* such sort of characters, though I am pleased to say, not without *many* valuable exceptions. As far

as I have observed the nature and import of spiritual invitations and promises, they are made to hungry, thirsty, naked, trembling, helpless, indigent, self-condemned and self-despised individuals. Thus I think, and thus I assert; “and if it be not so now, who shall prove the contrary, and make my speech nothing worth?” Job xxiv. 25.