

them. But they do not. While St. Paul permits the Corinthians to "Covet earnestly the best gifts:" He, in the same breath says "But I shew unto you A MORE EXCELLENT WAY." And the great Apostle shews of what comparatively little importance all "Gifts" and "orders" are, when contrasted with the substantial, changing, happyfying, essential truths of the Gospel. He shews what is this "more excellent way" for he immediately adds "Though I speak with the tongues of men and of Angels—though I have the Gift of Prophecy—though I understand all Mysteries—though I have all knowledge—and though I have all Faith, so that I could remove mountains; and HAVE NOT CHARITY (or Love) I am nothing. I am become as sounding brass, or a tinkling cymbal!!!" Lo, here is the amount of the Riches of Irvingism, calculated by God Himself! Here is the full Gospel weight of that of which Irvingites make their boast! When laid in the balances of the Sanctuary; and weighed against the soul-converting truths of the Sanctuary—Iringism "kicks the beam." It is altogether lighter than vanity."

"Behold I am against them that prophesy false dreams saith the Lord—and cause my people to err by their *lies*, and by their *lightness*—I sent them *not* saith the Lord." Jeremiah 23 chapter 32 verse.

The "False Apostles"—"deceitful workers" of Irvingism not only cause the people "to err" by their "false dreams" and "lying wonders," but they also cause the people to err by their "lightness." Serious, trust-worthy persons have informed me, and are ready to prove, that, Irvingite teachers make the "Pearl of great price" a standing Jest! That wherever the *imparted* Grace of Christ was spoken of—they would break out into fits of laughter! and thus bring ridicule instead of argument to support their cause.

In 2nd Corinthians 1st chapter, the Apostle "Blesses the God of all comfort." Says that "He was comforted of God"—that "His consolations are bounded," and when speaking of these consolations by which he was supported in connection with his Ministry and travels, he asks "Did I use *lightness*?" Nay Paul—that be far from thee—thou wast not an Irvingite.

The Irvingites pretend that their church possesses infallibility, and, of course, that they "speak the same thing," yet how does it happen, that their Gospel is "Yea and Nay." Mr. Irving has written in explanation and defence of his principles; and so has Mr. Burwell (whose case demands the sympathy of every feeling mind) yet Mr. Caird says "He regrets that Mr. Irving ever wrote—and wishes that Mr. Irving had not left a line upon the subject!" If Irvingism has the infallibly deciding "Voice of Prophecy" in it—how comes it then, that Mr. Irving was in favour of one course and Mr. Caird in favour of another, and a *contrary* one? Besides, was not Mr. Irving the father of them all? And if any of them had "tongues—Miracles" *Infallibility*, &c. must not Mr. Irving have had them? But Mr. Irving has *written*—and Mr. Caird says he ought *not* to have written! then—must not Mr. Caird teach falsely?

But reason good—that—they wish that their principles were not *written*—for, their gospel, is not "yea and amen"—They seem to shift their ground according to the change and conveniency of their circumstances—like (what is said of) the Camellion, they change to the colour of whatever necessity happens next to them—they "purpose according to the flesh"—with them, there is not only "yea, yea" but also "nay, nay."—Then (when Mr. Caird first came) it was "Miracles"—and now (when they have not those miracles) it is "Angels, Principalities, and (infallible) powers" against which I now "wrestle," and a fall they shall have in every rationally scriptural Judgment; but perhaps as they have no *written* creed, they may yield to necessity, again shift their ground, and DENY what (it is well known,) they have already taught!—or—rather, I should say—have merely *asserted*.