

to before; takes away its aversion, makes it willingly not only go but run after what it bore the greatest aversion to before. It enters the affections, makes them rise from the ground, gives them such a divine touch that, though they may through their fickle nature be carried at a time by force another way, yet they never rest but point heavenward. It comes to the soul, sunk under the pressure of unrelievable distresses, sticking in the miry clay, refusing comfort, and in appearance capable of none, it plucks it out of the clay, raises it out of the horrible pit, sets its feet upon a rock, fills it with joy, yea, makes it exceeding joyful, while even all outward pressures and tribulation continue, yea, are increased. It enters into the soul, lays hold on the reigning lusts to which it formerly had submitted, and that with delight; it tries and condemns those powerful criminals, makes the soul throw off the yoke, and join in the execution of its sentence against and on them. Now, where the case is as thus stated, how can the soul that feels this powerful word, that comes from the Lord Most High, do otherwise than fall down and own 'that God is in it of a truth?'

---

NOTE B, P. 14.

Hume's "Argument on Miracles" is to the effect that, while it is contrary to universal and uniform experience that a miracle should occur, it is quite in accordance with experience that testimony (on which alone we must depend for proof of any reported miraculous fact) should be false; and that, therefore, no testimony can have such force as to prove a miracle. Hume admits that "there may possibly be miracles or violations of the usual course of nature of such a kind as to admit of proof from human testimony," and supposes an instance, while he thinks no such instance can be found in the records of history. But he contends that his argument applies with full force against a miracle in connection with any system of religion. In any such case, he says, a reported miracle is not only to be rejected, but to be rejected "without examination" of any testimony by which it may be supported.

However plausible the argument may appear, it would be difficult to find in any writer of name so large an amount of fallacy compressed into so small a space.

It is to be noted, in general—1. That, if the argument is sound, it must apply *universally*, and not be limited to miracles in connection with religion. If any discrimination is to be made,