

ness and fairness of their inferences, and would, therefore, be a different rule of action in different men; a conclusion which cannot be maintained by any sober person.

T. Your answer is forcible; but you may add, that if man had been left to infer the will of God from the works of nature, and the course of God's government of the world, without a *direct revelation*, there is nothing in either to indicate that God ought to be worshipped; that he will hear our prayers; that there is a state of future rewards and punishments; or that God will pardon those who have broken his laws, or how that pardon must be sought. On all these subjects, which are essential to *morality, religion, and hope*, the works of nature and the dispensation of Providence are totally silent: and thus there could have been no *system of complete and influential morality, and no authorized religious worship, and no hope beyond the grave, without an express revelation*.

Y. All this appears very manifest; and yet I hear much of the sufficiency of *human reason* to discover the being and perfections of God from his works, his will respecting us, the immortality of the soul, and other important subjects.

T. This is the constant theme of infidels; and yet do you not perceive that none of them have gained their knowledge of these truths from *reason*, but that they are all indebted for them to *revelation*?

Y. Certainly this is the case with the Deists of the present age; but how does that apply to the philosophers of Rome, Greece, Egypt, and other ancient countries?

T. Just as forcibly. Not any of the most enlightened of them, whose writings remain, or whose opinions we know, ever pretended to be the discoverers of these truths. They speak of them sometimes believingly, sometimes doubtfully, but always as