

ness which does not belong to you. After acknowledging the honor I have done you, in placing you in one of the "niches of fame" in my "*Man of Sorrows*," you give the following note, at the bottom of page 22. "I beg leave to assure the public, that it is with extreme reluctance, that I use the sacred appellation "*Man of Sorrows*," a term which belongs so exclusively to our adorable Redeemer, and which perhaps, never was employed in reference to any mere human being, until Mr. J. published his life." Perhaps, sir, you will allow me to "beg leave to assure the public," that you carry your *best side outside*; and allow me the privilege of examining your *inside*. You "with extreme reluctance use the sacred appellation, "*Man of Sorrows*;" Why did you use it?—What has it to do with the present controversy?—your name is not once mentioned in it: but the truth is, your thirst for revenge is so great, that nothing less than my total ruin will quench it. And you may depend upon it, that your thirst will never be allayed in my destruction; for God will never leave me in your hand.—2. Tim. 4, 18. But let us hear your own objection to the term. "A term which belongs so exclusively to our adorable Redeemer." Indeed!—And pray sir, where did you get the term "*REVEREND*" from?—"a term which so exclusively belongs to our adorable (MAKER and) *REDEEMER*!" If you were acquainted with the *BIBLE*, you would certainly know, that it is a term which belongs to *GOD alone*; and so *sacred* is that "*name*" we find it but once recorded throughout the sacred page; and for your information I would point you to the one hundred and eleventh Psalm, and the ninth verse, and would then ask, is it with "extreme reluctance" that you suffer yourself to be called by *that name*?—and call others by it, when you know it belongs "exclusively" to *GOD*! Had my book been called "*THE Man of Sorrows*," the definite article might have made it objectionable, and even then it would have been but a name applicable to the Redeemer, as *MAN only*, and *not as GOD*. I think, Sir, if you will take the trouble to search your "*BIBLE*" you will find that the Prophet Ezekiel is called, "*son of man*," about *eighty-nine* times; and our "adorable Redeemer" is called by the *same* "*term*," by the Evangelists, about *eighty* times. But no where in the Scriptures is any man called "*REVEREND*;" and still you have no "extreme reluctance" in being called by that "*term*,—which perhaps never was employed in reference to any mere human being until" *men* arrogantly