

the sincerity of his heart, is, to himself, of the last importance ; for, "The Lord weigheth the spirits : " Prov. xvi. 2. Nothing among men, perhaps, is more detestable than hypocrisy ; and perhaps, nothing to God : Matt. xxiii. But it surely has occurred to Mr. C.'s mind, that a man may be quite sincere, and yet quite wrong. It is hoped he was sincere, and his mind fully convinced *before* it was, as he says, in a "*transition state*" on this subject, when he remarked, "*I am persuaded of the truth of what one said 'a real Christian is not the work of suasion, but of greatness.'*" And when he further remarked, "*With respect to general invitations, we may say that those who use them 'teach by persuading, and not persuade by teaching.'*" It is hoped also his mind was quite sincere *while* it was in a "*transition state*," however long it lasted, and whatever he might then think, feel, say, or do. And the sincerity of his mind is not called into question *now* ; now it has passed out of a "*transition state*," and he is wildly exulting in the liberty wherewith general invitations have made him free from the "*bonds of system*." (I had almost said the bounds of prudence and truth.) Now he virtually says God invites the blind to see, the deaf to hear, and the dead to live, act, eat, drink, &c. : I question not he is convinced, but I must be excused from receiving such incoherencies, so destitute of proof, probability, and propriety, as the "*sound speech*" of divine truth "*which cannot be condemned*." I may add, however, the sincerity of his present convictions, would have appeared to the world in a stronger light, had he published with them a *refutation* of his former arguments. When I make a recantation of principle, without publishing a refutation of the arguments whereby I supported it, let the world impute to me unhallowed motives.

After citing six portions of scripture, namely, Isa. lv. 6—8 ; Prov. i. 22—26 ; Matt. xxii. 2—4 ; Mark i. 14, 15 ; John vi. 27 ; and Acts iii. 19 ; direct notice of which I shall at present omit ; Mr. C. requires three things to be observed respecting each of those Scriptures. And,

First. "*That unconverted persons are addressed*." As this is of little weight, I shall only enter a demurrer on behalf of the first and last cited scriptures, holding the assertor to proof.

Second. "*That spiritual acts are called for. God commands sinners 'to seek,' 'to return,' to 'turn,' to 'receive the Spirit,' to 'labor,' to 'believe,' to 'be converted,'*" &c. What does Mr. C. mean by spiritual acts ? Does he intend intelligent, reasonable acts merely ? Or does he mean those acts which are only performable by spiritual people, by persons who are "born of the Spirit," "live in the Spirit," "walk in the Spirit," "are led by the Spirit," "have access by one Spirit to the Father," and whose bodies are the temples of the Holy Ghost ? The latter no doubt. If so, then God *sovereignly* commands that which is plainly impossible, which is against his reasonableness. By no means can

the gospel be made more effectually, a ministry of condemnation and death.

Let my reader distinctly remark, the question is not, *what* God *necessarily* requires of the fallen creature according to the law, as law, nor as it is a covenant of works; but what he *sovereignly* commands to the fallen creature under a new dispensation. The *necessary* commands of God, as Creator and Lawgiver, according to the law, and as it is a covenant of works, are, and must be what they were. No change in the creature, involving a loss of ability, can abrogate that law, or diminish its claims; nor can the creature's obligations be lessened. As a creature, though fallen, he is still subject to its demands; and as a sinner, he is exposed to its curse. But the reasonableness of all this, must be fetched from the perfect adequacy of the creature, in his original state, to render perfect obedience. Mr. Cox will not care, I imagine, to call those commands of which he speaks, in the manner in which he speaks of them, *necessary* commands. Then they are *arbitrary* commands. Commands which might, or might not be.

Every *arbitrary* command of God is necessarily reasonable; and every such command is possible, or it cannot be reasonable. This is a self-evident truth, and a first principle. By this, according to the Scriptures, I shall easily prove the falsity of Mr. C.'s assertions. No arbitrary command can be reasonable which is impossible. Every impossible command is foolish, or tyrannical, or both. No such command can be of God. To command, arbitrarily, an infant to act like a man, a man like an angel, or a natural man like a spiritual man, would be imperious madness. Every *arbitrary* command of God must be suited to the capacity of those commanded. His divine reasonableness forbids the contrary. If, therefore, I prove the impossibility of those commands of which Mr. C. speaks, I shall prove their unreasonableness; and if I prove their unreasonableness, I shall disprove our author's assertions.

1. We are told, "*Spiritual acts are called for. God commands sinners to seek.*" Properly, to seek, is to search, by the aid and use of light and sight. A blind man cannot seek, because he cannot see; but sinners, as such, are spiritually blind: Eph. iv. 18; Rom. xi. 7, 10; 1 John ii. 11; Matt. xv. 14; therefore a spiritually blind man cannot spiritually seek. This argument is incontestable. To command a spiritually blind man to seek spiritually, is against the reasonableness of God, foolish, and false. "The Lord openeth the eyes of the blind:" Psa. cxlvi. 8; but he never commands them to see. To command a blind man to seek, is an anomaly so gross, foolish, and cruel, as to be utterly insufferable, only where divine truth, wisdom, and mercy are professedly exhibited, as employed to guide the feet of sinners into the way of peace!

2. We are told, *God commands sinners to return and to turn.* By this I understand our author to mean, that sinners, as such, are com-

manded, spiritually to turn, or return to the Lord; or in the language of the New Testament, *to come to Christ*. There can be no doubt this is his meaning, and I shall reply to it in the express words of Christ, saying, "No man can come to me, except the Father which hath sent me draw him:" John vi. 44. The testimony of Christ is true, undoubtedly true; but the assertion of Mr. Cox virtually contradicts the testimony of Christ; therefore the assertion of Mr. Cox is false. If God has commanded it, it is possible; but Christ says it is impossible; therefore God has not commanded it. The wisdom and reasonableness of God, the testimony of Christ, or the assertion of Mr. Cox must fall.

3. We are told, *God commands sinners to receive the Spirit*. Mr. C. does not define what this is, nor how it is to be received. We are not informed whether it is a substance, a sensation, or a sentiment; nor whether it is to be received by the mouth or the mind. I suppose, however, the "Spirit of God" as the "Spirit of promise," the "Spirit of grace," the "Spirit of adoption," the "Spirit of life," the "Spirit of truth," &c., is intended. If this be the intended meaning, of which there can be no doubt, let my reader consult the testimony of John the Baptist, at John iii. 27; of Christ, at John xiv. 16, 17; and of Paul, at 1 Cor. ii. 12—14; and, though he may be incurably prejudiced, or incorrigibly perverse, he must deny one of three things, namely, God's reasonableness as a sovereign; the truth testified by John, Christ, and Paul; or Mr. Cox's assertion. But Mr. C. ought to have shown where in the Scriptures anything like a command is given to sinners to "*receive the Spirit*." I "*honestly*" deny it to be in the text he has quoted, and challenge him to find a single text in the whole Word of God, where any are commanded to receive the Spirit. It is a solemn thing to alter the Word of God! Cannot general invitations stand otherwise than by *false witness*?

4. We are told, *God commands sinners to labor*. Every body reprobates the conduct of Pharaoh and his task-masters with the Israelites, who has read of it, as cruel and tyrannical; and the conduct of God with sinners, as represented by Mr. Cox, is equally, if not more exceptionable. The cases are strikingly similar, only the latter is the worst. In that, men were required to make bricks without materials being provided for them, in this, they are commanded to do that for which they are totally incompetent. The natural man has no spiritual powers; therefore to command him to labor spiritually is cruel. No man without (*Choris*, separate from) Christ, can do anything spiritual: John xv. 5; but a sinner, as such, is without (*Choris*, separate from: Eph. ii. 12;) Christ; therefore a sinner, as such, cannot do anything spiritual. Can anything be more conclusive? Here again we are reduced to the former necessity. Either we must deny God his reasonableness, in commanding what is impossible, the testimony of Christ, and of Paul, or

the assertion of Mr. Cox. An idiot who has the least degree of reason, has a measure of competency to be the disciple of Newton. An infant has a measure of competency to emulate Hercules; but the natural man, as such, is totally incompetent to be a disciple of Christ, or to do any, the least spiritual work. When men talk folly on common subjects, they peril the credit of their understanding, and hazard their liberty; but on religion they are paid and pampered for it. But, to say God is unreasonable, is worse than folly!

5. Then we are told, *God commands sinners to believe*. That is, *spiritually*. That is, they are commanded to exercise a principle they have not;—a principle they can neither create, make, buy, work for, receive from the creature, nor any otherwise obtain or possess, than by the sovereignly bestowed favor of God: Eph. ii. 8; Phil. i. 29. A principle which is said to be by revelation from the Father: Matt. xvi. 17; according to the working of his mighty power: Eph. i. 19; and by gift: John vi. 64, 65. Now all this is plainly impossible, therefore plainly unreasonable, and therefore not of God. To tell men, God has arbitrarily commanded that which is absolutely impossible, is the easiest way to induce them to subscribe the fool's saying: Psa. xiv. i; to brand the Bible with infamy, and burn it to ashes! Ministers, consider the consequences of your assertions!

6. We are told, *God commands sinners to be converted*. It is usual, I think, with believers, to ascribe their conversion to the power and grace of God in regeneration; but as I have fully refuted this assertion in my second argument, I will not multiply words.

Third. The third position raised by our author, on the texts he has cited, is, "*That sinners are invited to participate in eternal blessings.*" Our author evidently means sinners, as such, generally. But as I have partly shown the falsity and folly of this, in some previous remarks, I shall add but little here. Let it therefore be further observed,

Every inviter is either sincere or deceitful. If the former, his invitation is worthy of regard; if the latter, his invitation is a delusion, a mockery, and a feint. Every sincere inviter has made a provision for his friends, and is desirous that his bounty should be tasted, his benevolence appreciated, and that his kind intentions should not be defeated. But God is certainly sincere in all his invitations, and has made a provision, equal to the necessities of his friends, and suited to their capacities; and he too is desirous that his kindness should be appreciated, and that his intentions should not be defeated. But if God invites *all*, generally, he invites more extensively than successfully; therefore his desire is plainly abortive, because his bounty is untasted, his good will unvalued, and his intention is defeated! What a pity it is, the benevolent intentions—the whole-hearted good will of Jehovah, should thus be thwarted! and, that the ever-blessed God should be destined—helplessly and

hopelessly destined, by the perversity of a perishing little creature against its own interest, to the gnawing chagrin of present contempt, and eternal disappointment! What a gratification it must be to the devil that he should succeed, by means of corrupting a petty earth-grub, to generate an undying worm at the heart of God's blessedness! Saints, if the invitations of God are abortive, so may his purpose be, and so his promise! For what then can *you* hope? Sinners if the invitations of God may be made void, so also may his threatenings! What then have *you* to fear? What have any to hope or fear, except from a blind fatality, or promiscuous fortuitousness! But the promise is, "Thy people shall be willing in the day of thy power:" Psa. cx. 3.

Mr. Cox next asks a string of questions relative to the above positions; to which I will now turn attention. And,—

1. He enquires, "*Can either of the above positions be honestly denied?*" I am surprised at this question, even to astonishment! What can it be—a defection of memory, or the artifice of simulation,—the dotage of imbecility, or the dissembling of hypocrisy? "Denied?" "Honestly denied?" Why, Mr. C. *knows* they can if he has not lost his memory. He *knows* they can be denied by arguments he *cannot refute*. He *knows* that Hussey, Skepp, Gill, Brine, Weyman, Stevens, Foreman, Palmer, Jones, and, indeed, JOHN COX himself, with a host besides, have *irrefutably denied* those positions again and again. "Honestly denied?" To what miserable shifts are the opposers of truth driven! Mr. C., instead of refuting the arguments of others, and himself, impugns the moral uprightness, learning, and labors of good men, by a pitiful, self-condemning question. Were not Hussey, Skepp, Gill, Brine, Weyman, and Stevens *honest* men? Did they not walk, speak, write, live, and die like honest men? Are not the rest of those living, who deny those positions, *honest*? In every case where necessity compels to the alternative of supposing or attributing knavery or folly, the latter is the more charitable, but Mr. C. has chosen the former. Whether John Cox *honestly denied* those positions none but the all-seeing Searcher of hearts can know so well as himself; but his question respecting the moral integrity of others, deserves a severer rebuke than saying, it is contemptible. Blush, blush, sir! or make it appear that universal invitations, connected with a limited provision, form the beautiful harmony of inspired truth; and that limited invitations, connected with a limited salvation, are only the *dishonest* discord of *designing* men. But with respect to your own publication, you were perchance not wholly unlike Darius, when he had signed the decree; what you had written, you had written; and, however desirous, yourself could not refute yourself. And, not willing to be silent, though you have most unjustifiably impugned the honesty of godly men, you have said, "Can either of the above three positions be *honestly denied?*" putting your

qualifying term in italics, to remind us, I suppose, *we ought to be honest.* But Mr. C. enquires,—

2. "*Are they not simple and obvious truths laying upon the surface of each text?*" No; neither upon the surface nor in the subsoil, as I will show presently. But our author's sight must have improved since he used to say, in denying, substantially, *the very things* he now affirms, "*In this doctrine fancy is mistaken for fact.*" Or perhaps he had not read those texts he now cites, when he said, "*I object to this doctrine, because the Scriptures nowhere affirm it.*" This was strong language, and I hope *honest.* But he said more, "*I object to this doctrine because it supersedes the necessity of the work of the Holy Ghost.*" And more, "*Be assured of this, in proportion as you exalt human ability, you lower the glory of divine influence; and if you by hideous hooting drive away the heavenly Dove, you will find to your cost what free-will can do.*" I could quote largely here from a pamphlet Mr. C. published since his release from the bonds of system, wherein he, undesignedly, makes it appear that he has realized the solemn verification of his own very solemn declaration! But I spare him. But the affirmations of our author are not the obvious truths of those texts. To command a sinner to believe, is, in effect, to command him to regenerate himself; and therefore I may say, as Mr. C. once said, "*I object to this doctrine because another of its tendencies is to set aside, or very much confuse the important doctrine of regeneration.*" Again, speaking on the same subject, he said, "*To whom is this change to be attributed? I shall answer in the words of Charnock, or rather in the words of God,—‘Take this new birth in all the denominations of it, it is altogether ascribed to God. As it is a call out of the world, God is the herald: 2 Tim. i. 9. As it is a creation, God is the Creator: Eph. ii. 10. As it is a resurrection, God is the quickener: Eph. ii. 5. As it is a new-birth, God is the begetter: 1 Pet. i. 3. As it is a new heart, God is the framer: Ezek. xxxvi. 26. As it is a law in the heart, God is the penman: Jer. xxxi. 33. As it is a translation out of Satan's kingdom, God is the translator: Col. i. 13. As it is a coming to Christ God is the drawer: John vi. 44. As it is a turning to God, God is the attractor:’*" Jer. xxxi. 18, 19. Our author's mind has passed through a "*transition state;*" but whether from darkness to light or contrariwise, I leave my reader to judge. He sent forth his pamphlet, entitled, "*An enquiry whether anything short of Almighty power can produce conversion to God,*" with this motto at the head of others,—"*God hath spoken once, twice have I heard this, that power belongeth unto God:*" Psa. lxii. 11. "*How is the most fine gold changed!*" But the question of obviousness comes but with an ill grace from a person who has said such contrary things; and our author ought to have spoken more modestly, seeing that he has said so many things against himself *without disproving one.* For the edification of my reader, I will transcribe a few more of his saying

in relation, substantially, to the subject in hand. "*But to proceed, I have a still greater charge to bring against this doctrine. The others were felony; this is treason.*" Strong language,—and if true, and Mr. C. has not disproved it, our author, by his own confession, is a felon and a traitor! "If thou, Lord, shouldest mark iniquities, O Lord, who shall stand? but there is forgiveness with thee, that thou mayest be feared." But again, "*I object, because it makes very light of that which the Bible makes a very weighty matter; viz., original sin, man's depravity, and Satanic influence.*" This objection was *honestly* raised, I hope, and until our author has disproved it, I shall hold it to be *true*, both as it respects himself, and all others who now speak with him, and shall consider him responsible for consequences. Again, "*I object to this doctrine because of its inconsistency.*" Does Mr. C. now receive it for its propriety? Again, "*It hinders the necessary distinction between the law and the gospel.*" Then Mr. C. now muddles, instead of rightly dividing the word of truth: (2 Tim. ii. 15.) Again, "*I object further,—I consider that preaching this doctrine is not dealing faithfully with sinners—it is calculated to make false professors, and to distress the child of God.*" If this objection be true, and who can disprove it? what a perilous condition, by his own confession, is our author in! (Matt. xviii. 6.) Paul was so fully aware of this, and so tenderly concerned to avoid it, that he would have made great sacrifices rather than *distress a child of God*: 1 Cor. viii. 12, 13. Again, "*It supersedes the necessity of prayer.*" Again, "*This doctrine robs God of his praise. Thus it is a thief; and it is also a maimer. It disfigures, more or less, every doctrine of the gospel.*" Justify then, sir, its character, or be considered, for ever, as the harbinger of a *thief*, and the abettor of a *maimer*! Again, "*It also aims to rob God of his power, by calling upon the creature to perform His work.*" Vindicate it then, sir, in common honesty, as you ought, from the charges you have preferred against it, or condemn and hang the traitorous knave, or be identified with it in all its malpractices for ever.

3. We are asked, "*Would any one, uninfluenced by system, form any other opinion?*" Why is system to be thus decried? Is the Bible so heterogeneous in its matter, so wretchedly confused in its form, so destitute of order, so contradictory in its doctrines, and so fanciful, or false, in its facts, that no set of ideas can be formed agreeably to self-evident truth, and relatively consistent? And is this the revelation of Wisdom's will to us, and our guide to God? Impossible! And why does Mr. C. speak of the *proportion of faith* if there is no proportion? There is something so inexpressibly beautiful in a well-arranged, symmetrical, and harmonious system, that one feels a difficulty in excusing the motives of a person who despises it. God's ways are altogether systematic and beautiful. Of this fact, all nature is a perpetual proclamation. Hence the Greeks called the world by a word signifying *order* and *beauty*; or a *beautiful whole*, or *system*.

What a beautiful series of dependencies, what a body of reciprocities, what nice analogies, and pleasing congruities, does the human body present! Indeed, it is a system of many systems, and Christ and his church are compared to it: Col. i. 18; Eph. iv. 15, 16. The providence of God, too, is a wheel in the middle of a wheel, while all the saving ways of God were formed in counsel, and all his works proceed according to a covenant, ordered in all things and sure. Why then should there not be system in divinity? And as to *forming any other opinion*, that man is truly pitiable who forms, and more so if he publishes, opinions which are radically inconsistent with truth, and relatively with each other, and is influenced, I think, by something worse than system.

4. We are asked, "*What does human reasoning avail in the face of such plain declarations?*" Human reason is a good gift from the Father of lights, to be used, and not despised,—human reasoning is the use of human reason. And although our author would represent it as a deceiving *will with a wisp*, we shall not hesitate to follow its directions in submission to the word of faith, nor be deterred from its use in meditating on the analogy of faith, and in "*comparing spiritual things with spiritual.*" We surely are not required in order to be "*simple*" believers to cashier common sense, and so become *silly* believers; nor to be simpletons, that we may worship God in simplicity. Must a man be ignorant to be devoted, and well-nigh an idiot to entertain respect for the doctrine of faith because of its incongruity? How is that subject shamed which requires such advocacy as the disavowal of *human reasoning*! But there are other plain declarations in the Word of God to which I beg to draw the reader's attention. See Isa. i. 15; Mic. iii. 4; Amos v. 22, 23; Jer. xi. 14; Ezek. viii. 18; Prov. i. 28. Let the above Scriptures be read and received in what Mr. C. would style their "*plain grammatical meaning*," without employing any "*human reasoning*" to explain them, and who then could pray to, or hope in God? But our author would say, *They mean*—Nay, sir! no *human reasoning*, we will have only the "*plain grammatical meaning.*" What next! That cause must be feeble or bad which requires the disavowal of human reasoning.

5. We are asked, "*What matters it if we cannot reconcile these Scriptures with God's sovereign purpose, and efficacious grace?*" Here we have a tacit admission of a sovereign purpose of God, and an efficacious grace employed by him for the salvation of sinners, but that there are some Scriptures irreconcilable thereto. Amiable infidelity will take this boon at your hands, sir, and thank you for this strength to her weak hands, and this confirmation to her feeble knees; while poor miserable Christianity must *wallow herself in ashes, and make a bitter lamentation*, that her professed friend should thus sap her foundations, pervert her directions, and bewilder her mind, by presenting to her irreconcilables for instructions, contradictions for directions, and



confusion for confidence ! "What matters it if *we* ?" &c. If *we* are concerned, if *we* are to be instructed, if *we* are to be reprov'd, if *we* are to be corrected, if *we* are thereby to be guided in our conclusions, if *we* are thereby to learn to fear the Lord, and if *we* are thereby to know the way of righteousness, it matters everything for the credit of the Scriptures with *us*, everything for *our* knowledge by them, everything for *our* confidence in them, and everything for our veneration of their divine Author. Can *we* be instructed by irreconcilable documents ? Can *we* deduce directions from contradictions ? Can *we* be edified on confusion ? Surely the great God did not inspire the Scriptures for his own amusement, but for the instruction of his people. What matters the Scriptures to us if we cannot be instructed by them ? And as all anomalies are perplexing, and no man can be instructed by writings he cannot reconcile, what matters the Scriptures to us if we cannot reconcile them ? If it be admitted that the Scriptures are irreconcilable, Christianity falls before infidelity like Dagon before the ark. Upon such an admission there was an unanswerable propriety in the following observation of perhaps the most popular and widely-read infidel of the nineteenth century, "*Why refer at all to a record that is made to say anything.*" If the Word of God be not to us yea, yea, Christianity has no solid foundation, no fixity, no tenable standing, no right of existence, and must give up the ghost ; while infidelity may reign rampant, and defy opposition and control. If the Word of God has no consistency it can have no authority.

6. Again it is asked, *Does he tell us anywhere to reconcile before we obey ?* What is not irreconciled requires no reconciling, and the Word of God is not "yea and nay : " 2 Cor. i. 18. Unsearchable mysteries it does contain, but not silly and abominable absurdities. Cannot universal invitations be established but on a tacit admission that the Word of God is yea and nay ? What ! is the declaration of God's will concerning us at variance with his will to us ? Does he give an authoritative mandate to us irreconcilable to his sovereign mercy in our salvation ? Impossible. Hear what heavenly Wisdom says in vindication of her own words, "All the words of my mouth are in righteousness ; there is nothing froward, (that is, nothing of sin *intwined*, no moral *tortuousness* or *turpitude*,) or perverse, (that is, *relative crookedness*) in them. They are all plain, (that is, *radically straight*, and *relatively consistent*,) to him that understandeth, (that is, to him that *distinguisheth*,) and right, (that is, *morally right*, or *upright*,) to them that find knowledge : " Prov. viii. 8, 9. The Septuagint excellently preserves the sense of this whole passage, and no part better than the first clause of ver. 9, excepting that there is substituted a plural participle for a singular. Literally, "*They are all in the face, or face to face to those who put together.*" Let, therefore, ministers no longer say, *What matters it if we cannot reconcile*, except they are prepared to forfeit the credit of their understanding,

or to impeach divine Wisdom. I put all such ministers by the above text to the alternative of denying the wisdom of God, or their own understanding; and choose which they may, they *must unfit themselves* for the teacher's chair.

7. We are asked, "*Ought it not to suffice that God has spoken, and spoken plainly?*" What God has spoken plainly in one place he has never falsified in another. Paul compared spiritual things with spiritual, for illustration, interpretation, and proof; and to show, as I suppose, the consistency of things; but we never hear him say, *What matters it if we cannot reconcile?*

8. We are asked, "*If such Scriptures may be explained away, and another sense beside their plain grammatical meaning put upon them, why may not other passages be treated in a similar manner?*" I may safely offer a premium of any amount, though I have nothing, for a greater piece of nonsense than this question presents. *The grammatical meaning!* If my reader will try the grammatical meaning upon either of the texts our author has cited, he will find the necessity of *some other* meaning to make out any suitable meaning to reflecting minds. Our author evidently has started without first principles.

9. It is observed, "*Less liberties taken with the sacred text enables the Socinian to get rid of the doctrine of Christ's divinity; and the Arminian to get rid of the doctrine of election. Indeed, no truth is safe if such a principle of interpretation is adopted.*" Indeed, if such confusion was adopted as to take *sound* for *sense*—for that is plainly what our author intends by the *grammatical meaning*—the Socinian, Arminian, and almost every other error might be easily established irrefutably. I appeal to the controversies for confirmation. And it is remarkable that our author uses some of the very same texts to introduce his own semi-Arminian jumble, as the Arminian himself. This looks a little like affinity.

10. It is observed, "*Those do not act wisely who substitute a comparatively MODERN method on the authority of Hussey, Gill, and Brine.*" I know not who our author alludes to as acting on human authority in divine things, and pity from my heart any who may be enthralled by such vassalage. If he does not explain, he must be considered as unfairly judging others by himself.

11. "*A method which I think no one can prove to be two hundred years old.*" I am ashamed to reply to this remark. What has the age of a doctrine to do with its truth? Mr. Cox could cite from Ignatius, when it suited his purpose, against the very error he now attempts to uphold,—and Ignatius lived in the second century. The last chapter of the "Revelation" is the end of my Bible; and I care not how novel any doctrine may be considered so long as it is taught in the Scriptures; nor how old if not taught there,—the former shall be received and the latter rejected. *Not two hundred years old!* Why, is not error well-nigh as old as time? And I could mention

fifty errors concocted in the professing church under the Christian name, and all of them above two hundred years old.

12. "*Surely it is not wise to speak contemptuously of that way of preaching which God has so highly honored, and which his most useful servants have adopted.*" It is impossible to speak too contemptuously of this remark, as shall appear by another from the same author. "*Now, brethren, if I were to look through the annals of Zion, I could bring forth a long list of holy, devoted, and useful men, (who lived and died like Christians and ministers) who maintained invariably the inability of man. 'Now these worthies, whose names alone would almost fill my book, all maintained that man was unable to be and to do what was right;' (that is, as Mr. C. explained it, to repent and believe;) 'many of them differed about other things, here they met. But I ask, what heroes have arranged themselves under that banner which is inscribed with man's ability? Why all the moral preachers, all the wolves in sheep's clothing, the Pope of Rome, with all his cardinals, bishops, &c., &c., and about the brightest of the whole group, Armenius and his successors, all whose mighty doings and lofty buildings I firmly believe will lose their only foundation when the mighty angel cries, 'Babylon is fallen, is fallen.' Ask then, brethren, what the Lord's ministers whom he taught and honored, believed.*" The weight of either of these testimonies on the subject is not so much as the small dust of the balance; but viewed in juxtaposition as coming from one pen they are thoroughly contemptible.

Mr. C.'s concluding remark is so impertinent, and destitute of proof, and is withal, so immodest from him, that I will not trust myself to reply. I pass therefore to consider briefly those Scriptures whereon he founds his practice of universal invitations and commands. And first in order stands,—

"Seek ye the Lord while he may be found, call ye upon him while he is near. Let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts, and let him return unto the Lord and he will have mercy upon him, and to our God, for he will abundantly pardon. For my thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways, saith the Lord:" Isa. lv. 6—8.

Mr. C. is no sciolist on this subject; and, considering his long acquaintance with the arguments adduced against his new views, it is truly surprising he should introduce this Scripture as a warrant for those views. Why did he not disprove the explanations already given? But if the same things must needs be said again, to silence such sickening cavils, and to disprove such sad perversions, let it be observed, the pronoun "*ye,*" in ver. 6, intends, (in the judgment of Mr. Fuller, also,) the very same persons as the phrase "*every one,*" in ver. 1. "*Every one*" is the nominal to the pronominals "*ye, your,*" &c., down the chapter. Whatever is intended, the *thirsty* are addressed. This, so far as this Scripture is concerned, destroys Mr. C.'s first position. And that the Gentiles are intended by the