

and thereby arraign omnipotence itself. The simple answer to this silly and senseless objection is, that omnipotence has nothing to do with the matter. It were as wise to represent God as regulating the planets by *persuasion*, as it is to speak of his converting a soul by *omnipotence*. The peculiarity of the Spirit's work is this: whereas God the Father's part in the scheme of mercy was to sustain the rights of Deity, send the Son, and superintend the whole plan, this, implying no intervention of creature-wills, is *irresistibly* accomplished; and whereas God the Son's work was to make atonement—also independent of creature-wills—this, too, has been *irresistibly* accomplished; but the Spirit's work being to bring this salvation in contact with rebel souls, in such a way as to offer no violence to their wills, here is a province with which the element of mere omnipotence has nothing whatever to do—a province in which the Holy Spirit deals with man as an agent will-endowed and free. How rational then to expect, in the different phases of human conduct in response to the Spirit's working, varieties, anomalies, and mysteries of iniquity, the true explanation of which every modest and right-minded man ought to be content to postpone till the day of the revelation of God's righteous judgment, when the secrets of all men shall be judged according to the gospel.

3rd. And finally, it is objected that to make the Spirit's influence resistible, is to detract from the *glory* of his work. We retort the charge: It is the *irresistible* theory that truly detracts from the moral glory of the Spirit's work. To employ a simple illustration: Here is a rebel army, and here are two ways in which it may be disarmed, say, which is the most glorious? One is to rout them, or put them down by a superior force; the other is this: A venerable citizen or statesman faces the rebel host in the wildest tumult of its power; he looks forth on it, like the sun on a turbid sea; and before the weight of his character, the strength of his arguments, the genial power of his kindness, and the moral majesty of his mien, their tumultuous fury subsides into a calm. In the name of all the moralities, I ask, which of these descriptions of influence is the more glorious and august? If the former be imposing, is not the latter a true instance of the morally sublime? Such is a feeble illustration of the moral glory of the Spirit's work as he moves in might and in majesty over the souls of men, and without using one element of force, or doing violence to a single will, converts Sauls into Pauls, persecutors into preachers, and hell-haunted souls into "habitations of God."