

paragraph. It may be objected by our sceptical friends, for whose benefit more especially these essays appear, that we are somewhat influenced by partisan partiality in giving so much of the argument on one side and so little on the other. Think again, friend objector. A child may ask a question, or a simpleton may propose an objection, requiring volumes of reply. It is always fair and equitable in any advocate to bring up the strongest objections in the most condensed form against the system he designs furthering, and then oppose them with all the vigor of his power.

Besides, Are you not acquainted, Mr. Sceptic, with the strength and potency of your own cause? Is it necessary for us to furnish you with arguments when you boast of so many already? Were we so benevolent, you would scorn such favors! We therefore only present so much of the objection on the part of infidelity as gives occasion and proper direction to the argument on the part of christianity. This is reasonable—this is honorable. You, O man of doubts, already perceive the justness and fairness of this course, or will at least on further reflection.—Listen then again to the Doctor of Aberdeen :—

“In proposing his argument, the author [ Mr. Hume ] would surely be understood to mean only *personal* experience; otherwise, his making testimony derive its light from an experience which derives its light *from testimony*, would be introducing what logicians call a circle in causes. It would exhibit the same things alternately, as causes and effects of each other. Yet nothing can be more limited than the sense which is conveyed under the term experience, in the first acceptance. The merest clown or peasant derives incomparably more knowledge from testimony, and the communicated experience of others, than in the longest life he could amass out of his own memory. Nay, to such a scanty portion the savage himself is not confined. If that therefore must be the rule, the only rule by which testimony is ultimately to be judged, our belief in matters of fact must have very narrow bounds. No testimony would have any weight with us that did not relate an event similar at least to some one observation which we ourselves have had access to make. For example, that there is such people on the earth as negroes, could not, on that hypothesis, be rendered credible to any one who had never seen a negro, not even by the most numerous and unexceptionable attestations. Against the reception of such testimony, however strong, the whole force of the author's argument evidently operates. But that innumerable absurdities would flow from this principle, I might easily evince, did I not think the task superfluous.”

As the privilege has not been given the Doctor to enter into close combat upon the subject of miracles, we shall grant him this opportunity when we hear one more objection from Mr. Hume. It is in these words :—

“As the violations of truth are more common in the testimony concerning religious miracles, than in that concerning any other matter of