


For Bp: Ordeudork.

From his aff<sup>te</sup> Brother,





# AN ESSAY.

CONTAINING

OBJECTIONS AGAINST THE POSITION OF A PERSONAL ASSURANCE OF THE PARDON OF SIN, BY A DIRECT COMMUNICATION OF THE HOLY SPIRIT:

WITH

## NOTES,

OCCASIONED BY A PAMPHLET CONTAINING REMARKS ON THE ESSAY, UNDER THE NAME OF "A REPLY."

---

BY W<sup>M</sup>. WHITE, D. D.

BISHOP OF THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH, IN THE COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA.


---

*PHILADELPHIA:*

PUBLISHED BY MOSES THOMAS, NO. 52, CHESTNUT STREET.

Printed at the Office of the United States' Gazette.

1817.



## PREFACE.

---

THE following Essay, which, with similar documents, was penned for the perusal of theological students under the immediate notice of the author, was published some months ago, in a periodical work entitled: "The Christian Register," edited in New York. The Essay has been lately attacked, in a pamphlet under the name of "A Reply," edited by some person who signs himself J. E. Of the considerations in the Essay, many which were judged to have a weighty bearing on the subject, have been passed over, or but slightly noticed, in the pamphlet. Probably, there would have been thought no call for the present publication, if the Reply had not ascribed to the Essay some matters not expressed in it, and not admitted by the author.

This property of the pamphlet, is especially remarkable in its disjoining of a passage in the Essay, from the place which it occupies immediately before the first appendix; and by commenting on it, as if it were a part of the second appendix. In consequence of this, what was said indefinitely of some facts which had fallen under the immediate notice of the present writer, is construed to have been levelled by him at the body of professing Christians, to which J. E. announces himself to belong.

In his title page, he had contemplated the Essay and its appendices, as distinct objects: by which, besides the propriety of the thing, he had pledged himself to bestow on each object its appropriate attention.

Perhaps, it was in retaliation for this elicited occasion of offence, that the author of the Reply considered himself as warranted in the charge found in the beginning of his work, of the want of ministerial fidelity in the author of the Essay; and of the consequences, in the religious state of the congregations immediately under his pastoral care: for this is the result of what is there said. Perhaps there may have been meditated an act of Christian charity, in the caution given to those congregations against their pastor, in the application of the scriptural rule—"By their fruits ye shall know them." But on the ground of his ideas of decorum, he would consider it as very humiliating in any minister of the gospel, and very degrading to his flock, should he regard such a call, to the bringing of his or of their concerns before the publick eye. The author of the Reply will hardly endeavour to excuse himself from this personality, by his having kept out of sight the name of the object of his attack. He was too pointedly designated, to remain unknown: Or, if there were a chance of this, it was prevented by advertisements in the newspapers.

Although, in the above instance, the conduct of the author of the Reply cannot be accounted for, from what



he alleges concerning the theological obscurity and the unusual phraseology of the Essay; yet, the author of the latter ought to have the modesty to admit, that there may be in this respect a fault escaping his own penetration, and to the correction of which he is incompetent. On the other hand, if he should suppose, that he has sometimes written with perspicuity; and that, in his opponent, there has not been, in various instances, on this particular question, discernment to distinguish between two subjects not the same; the sentiment, it is to be hoped, although the decision of a party in his own cause, would not, if incorrect, be out of the reach of the plea of the infirmity of human nature.

On every such occasion as the present, the author has made it an object to avoid the language of incivility. In the opposite performance, some expressions wear such an aspect to his mind, as to confirm him in his disrelish of such writing. If he has strayed from his own rule in any instance, it will be an inconsistency more to be lamented by him, than any of which there is the shadow of proof in the Reply.

## ADVERTISEMENT.

---

THE author wishes to acknowledge, most unequivocally, that in the following Essay, as edited in the Christian Register, there have been two inaccurate quotations; which are here corrected in their proper places, not without notice of what was in the first edition. To the best of his judgment, the mistakes make no difference in the argument: But justice to two authors exacts the present acknowledgment.

The Essay is dated July 25, 1814. Not long after, it was sent to a friend in New York, at his own request. It remained in his hands, until late in the year 1816; when, at the desire of the same friend, consent was given to its being published. The author of the Reply supposes, that through the whole intervening time, there was an opportunity of maturing it. The supposition was not unnatural; but is a mistake.

# SOME OBJECTIONS

AGAINST THE

POSITION OF A PERSONAL ASSURANCE

OF THE

## *PARDON OF SIN,*

BY A DIRECT COMMUNICATION OF THE HOLY SPIRIT.\*

FOR the conveying of the clearer idea of the error objected to, it may be proper to state what is conceived to be scriptural truth, concerning the subject.

When it is considered independently on personal application, the only ground of it is in the revelation made to the world by Jesus Christ and his Apostles. It is “the Gospel,” as contained in Holy Scripture, which is “the power of God unto salvation:” and the knowledge of this gospel is brought to us, in the same way with that of any other subject: for—“faith cometh by hearing.”†

The question occurs—How is the individual to be satisfied of his interest in the promises of this gospel? The correct answer is here conceived to be—By a correspondency of the state of his mind, which is a subject of consciousness; with the requisitions of the gospel, which are a subject of revelation.

For further elucidation, the sentiment shall be given, as expressed more at large by Archbishop Usher in his

\* See note A. † See note B.

Body of Divinity. He asks the question—"Is it not necessary to justification, to be assured that my sins are pardoned, and that I am justified?" The answer is—"No, that is no act of faith as it justifieth, but an effect and fruit that followeth after justification: for no man is justified by believing that he is justified, for he must be justified, before he can believe it: and no man is pardoned by believing that he is pardoned, for he must first be pardoned, before he can believe it. But faith, as it justifieth, is a resting on Christ to obtain pardon, the acknowledging him to be their only Saviour, and the hanging upon him for salvation.

"It is the direct act of faith that justifieth, that whereby I do believe: it is the reflect act of faith that assures; that whereby I know I do believe, and it comes by way of argumentation thus:

"Major; Whosoever relieth upon Christ, the Saviour of the world, for justification and pardon, the word of God saith, that he, by so doing, is actually justified and pardoned.

"Minor; But I do rely on Christ for justification and pardon.

"Conclusion; Therefore, I undoubtedly believe, that I am justified and pardoned."

In contrariety to the test laid down by this excellent person, it is imagined, that there must, or at least may be, a direct and personal assurance to the mind of every believer. For here comes into view a difference among the advocates of the position: some contending, that the assurance spoken of is of the essence of faith; and others going no further than to say, that it is highly desirable and to be laboured after. The whole of this is here de-

nied. But it is not denied to be a fruit of the Spirit, in like manner with the other fruits associated with it in Gal. v. 22. They are all alike produced by that suasive and insensible operation of the Holy Spirit, of which we are no otherwise conscious, than through the medium of the gracious habits of the mind: any more than we have a knowledge of the wind, except by its agency in nature. John iii. 8.\*

There is no degree of satisfaction from this source, to which the devout mind may not attain, by the dint of holy endeavour and desire: but it is a very different matter, from that contended for on the other side.

In relation to the latter, it will be acknowledged by the advocates of it, to be, if true, at least one of the most important points in the Christian Revelation: and this must be allowed especially by those, who affirm it to be an attendant on all true conversion. Such persons, if they be ministers of the gospel, can never sincerely offer Christ to sinners, without advertising them of so indispensable an evidence to be looked for. They cannot dwell on the duty of self-examination, without insisting on this as of its essence. It is indeed difficult to say, on what subject they can pass over this doctrine, consistently with fidelity. And most of all, in their ministerial intercourses with the sick or with the sorrowful, it can hardly be kept back without the hazarding of their salvation.

On the property of the opposite theory, that in addition to the supposed truth of the position, it must be held to the last degree important, will very much depend the

\* See note C.

validity of the objections to be now made to it, which are as follow:

1st; When the fore-runner of the Messiah “preached the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins,” not a word appears to countenance the sentiment in question. He admonished some of his hearers, to manifest the sincerity of their repentance by its fruits: and he applied his doctrine to various descriptions of persons, according to their respective states of life. How happened he to pass unnoticed what is pleaded for as the most decisive and an indispensable evidence?\*

2dly; When Christ himself “began to preach, and to say, the kingdom of Heaven is at hand,” the presumed accompaniment of all sincere repentance was unnoticed by him. There is not the least suggestion of it in his parables, nor in any other of his set discourses; among which, that on the Mount may especially be appealed to. In a few instances, there proceeded from his lips the assurance—“Thy sins are forgiven thee.” But this, far from proving the tenet, is in contrariety to it. The principle, that no more causes are to be looked for than are sufficient for the effect, is as reasonable in the department of grace, as it is acknowledged to be in that of nature. The inward assurance would have rendered the outward one superfluous †

3dly; In the Acts of the Apostles there are many places, wherein silence as to this point speaks as powerfully as could have been done by any words in contradiction to it. We may take the interview of St. Peter with Cornelius, or of St. Philip with the Ethiopian eunuch, or of St. Paul with the jailor, or in any of his ad-

\* See note D. † See note E.

dresses to Jews or Gentiles: and the advocate of the position may be asked—What he would think of a minister of the gospel, who in any one address to a sinner, and professing to tell him what he must do to be saved, should he be silent as to the inward voice in question? The want of the notice of it, is especially conspicuous in St. Paul's account of his own conversion. No inward voice announced to him the forgiveness of his sins; in aid of the outward voice of Ananias, exhorting him to wash them away in baptism: this divinely instituted sign being judged by that holy man, to be evidence sufficiently satisfactory of the inward grace promised to accompany it.

4thly; In regard to the texts alleged out of the epistles, there being very few, is a presumptive circumstance against the construction given to them on the other side. What would the advocates of the opinion think of one consenting with them in it; and yet, in his address to persons of different descriptions, so limiting his notice of it, as would be proportionate to the spaces which his doctrine is supposed to occupy in the sacred records? Such a person, would consistently be considered as unfaithful in his ministry. The whole of the present argument being bottomed on defect of evidence where it must be expected to have been found, the examination of the texts is for the present passed by; but they shall be attended to in an appendix. It is remarkable, that almost every one of them is from the writings of St. Paul. Now this is the apostle, who, being called by his especial designation to vindicate the rights of the Gentile Christians, was necessarily led, in giving the evidences of their vocation, to use language easily drawn aside to a subject which is analagous, but not the same. In order

to discern his meaning, it is necessary to attend to the drift of his argument, and to the peculiarity of his style.\*

5thly; The advocates of the position, would do well to account for the silence of the apostle on the subject, when he is giving directions to ministers concerning their official duties. To pass over his charge to the clergy of the church of Ephesus, and his instructions in his first Epistle to Timothy; it will be especially proper, to attend to what Titus is directed to say to the people under his charge. There are sundry heads of instruction; and doubtless, some of them have respect to very important evidences of a state of grace. But it will hardly be alleged, that the evidence in question appears to have occurred to the mind of the apostle.†

6thly; Another fact, is the frequent reference in scripture to tests, which, according to the opposite tenet, are unnecessary. On this ground, every charge to self-examination might have been spared: and so might every reference to the fruits of righteousness, as evidences of a religious state. So far as respects the manifesting of real piety to the world, there might still be reason to refer to the conduct, as descriptive of the state of mind. But this would be known to the party himself, independently on the graces and the works produced by it. Therefore these, however important in themselves, are unimportant in the view of acquiring a knowledge of our state.‡

7thly; Although scripture is the only test of divine truth; yet it is generally acknowledged, that the primitive faith is of use in ascertaining the sense of scripture. It would seem too great hardihood to affirm, that the knowledge of the most essential point of Christian theology

\* See note F. † See note G. ‡ See note H.



was buried in the grave of the last of the apostles: and yet it is not here recollected, that a sentence or a scrap of a sentence has been brought from any of the early fathers; in favour of a position, held to be all-important in the doctrine of grace. In particular, why does it not appear in the apologies of Justin, Tertullian, and others? These were considered by all Christendom, as sufficient expositions of the faith: why is the matter in question wanting? They knew nothing of it, either as Christian doctrine, or as heresy.\*

8thly; From the primitive Church, let there be a transition to the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States: not as evidence of divine truth; but as what ought consistently to be acknowledged, by those who call themselves its members; and especially by its ministers. It will not be pretended, that either her articles or her other institutions countenance the doctrine: on the contrary, there are many of them essentially defective, on the supposition of the correctness of it. For instance

“The visitation of the sick.” It is not rash to affirm, that on the said supposition, the framers of this service, and especially of the exhortation in it, were Christians in name only. The same censure applies to the services for baptism, and to that for the administration of the holy communion. None, without the stamp required, should be considered as a proper subject of the latter ordinance, nor any adult of the former. Or rather, none of any description; because baptism, in this case, ought not to be administered to infants, in a church, which considers the outward sign as testifying the subjects of it to be—“Members of Christ, children of God, and inheritors of the kingdom of Heaven.”†

\* See note I. † See note K.

9thly; In religious books, the authors of which are wedded to this tenet, we read much of the varying state of mind in the same persons, as to their assurance of a state of grace. This accords with what we know of the rising and the falling of the animal spirits; and with the effect thereby produced on the views which men take of their temporal concerns, and of whatever is interesting to them in the state of the world: but it ill agrees with the confidence, supposed to have been produced by a divine communication, and yet so liable to be shaken by doubt.\*

10thly; The vacillations and inconsistencies of opinion which have attended the profession of the doctrine, are fruitful of the suspicion of its unsoundness. There are none who have laid so much stress on it as the Methodists; whose inconsistencies will be especially considered in an appendix. The tenet is distinctly taught in the institutions of Calvin. But in the words of one of his successors, Turretine, the doctrine is reduced to the more moderate position, that the assurance in question is received by every child of God, some short time at least before his death. The professor gives no scriptural authority for this: and it is observable of all who depart from the absolute necessity of the requisition, that they find themselves immediately deserted by their texts, even according to their own mistaken interpretation of them; and are obliged to open the door more or less wide, according to their different dispositions to indulgence, and without any alleged authorities from scripture.

When the Westminster Confession was framed, the doctrine had become so far pared down in England, that its being essential to a state of grace is expressly given

\* See note L.

up in the 18th chapter. By the approved writers of the churches adhering to that confession, the opinion of the necessity of the test has been generally abandoned. A few names shall be mentioned. Mr. Baxter (*Practical Works*, vol. i. p. 876, and vol. ii. p. 875) cautions his readers against supposing, that assurance can be perfect in this life.\* The late Dr. Witherspoon, in his *Discourse on Regeneration*, in the 1st volume of his works (p. 175 and 176) gives us the point as an essential of a state of grace.† If the position be true, there is

\* The sentiments of Mr. Baxter on the present point, seem to have been for some time unsettled; but at last to have been fixed on the ground taken in the present essay. To prove this, the following extract is given from his "Review of his Religious Opinions;" being here copied from the *Christian Observer* for August, 1807.

"Though the folly of fanaticks tempted me long to overlook the strength of this testimony of the Spirit, while they placed it in a certain internal assertion or enthusiastick inspiration; yet I now see that the Holy Ghost, in another manner, is the witness of Christ, and his agent in the world. The Spirit, by the sanctification and consolation assimilating the soul to Christ, is the continued witness to all true believers."

† Dr. Edwards, in his *Treatise on Religious Affections*, cites with approbation the following account of the sense of a former Divine; whose authority he often introduces as of great weight with the churches of New England.

"The late venerable Stoddard, in his younger time, falling in with the opinion of some others, received this notion of the witness of the Spirit, by way of immediate suggestion; but in the latter part of his life, when he had more thoroughly weighed things, and had more experience, he entirely rejected it; as appears by his *Treatise of the Nature of Saving Conversion*, p. 81." Then Dr. E. quotes from Mr. S. as follows. "The Spirit of God does not testify to particular persons, that they are godly. Some think,

hardly a more delusive work than Dr. Doddridge's "Rise and Progress of Religion in the Soul:" the nakedness of which is especially apparent in the 13th chapter. From some passages of this Divine in his Family Expositor, he would seem to acknowledge there being such a

that the Spirit of God doth testify it to some; and they ground it on Rom. viii. 16. The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God. They think the Spirit reveals it, by giving an inward testimony to it, and some godly men think they have experience of it; but they may easily mistake. When the Spirit of God doth eminently stir up a spirit of faith, it is easy to mistake it as a testimony. And that is not the meaning of Paul's words. The Spirit reveals things to us, by opening our eyes to see what is revealed in the word. The Spirit discovers the grace of God in Christ, and thereby draws forth special actings of faith and love, which are evidential; but it doth not work in way of testimony. If God does but help us to receive the revelations in the word, we shall have comfort enough without new revelations."

The above, and the extract made from Mr. Baxter in the last preceding note, are here strongly recommended to the notice of any young clergyman, who may be disposed to propose the question to people, whether they have received the witness of the Spirit. If, like those eminent men, at a more mature period of life, he should discover his error, who knows how many, in the meantime, will have been inspired by him with a false confidence?

It would have been easy to have multiplied extracts to the same purpose with the above, from the Treatise of Mr. Edwards on the Affections. At p. 258, he gives an explanation of Rom. viii. 16, altogether inconsistent with the opinion here contradicted. And at p. 267, he speaks of it as follows—"Many have been the mischiefs that have arisen from that false and delusive notion of the witness of the Spirit, that it is a kind of inward voice, suggestion, or declaration from God to man, that he is beloved of him; and pardoned and elected or the like, sometimes with, and sometimes without a text of scripture; and many have been the false and vain, though very high affections, that have arisen from hence. And it is to be eared, that multitudes of souls have been eternally undone by it."

source of evidence as that in question, but gives up its being essential to a religious state. The true course, is to abandon it altogether. If we look beyond the churches adhering to the Westminster Confession, there is not here known to be a vestige of the position in any of them, with the exception of the methodists. Neither the Confession nor the Catechism of the Church of the Netherlands, and of other Calvinistick churches, savours of the doctrine. It is unquestionably wanting in the Confession of Augsburgh.\*

To all that has been said, there will be objected the experience of many, who testify to an assurance of salvation received in the manner in question. Doubtless, a man cannot be surer of any thing, than of what passes in his own mind: that is, of its passing there, without its being a test of the reality of the object to which it corresponds. The baptists of Munster, about the time of the Reformation, and the 5th Monarchy Men, in the beginning of the reign of Charles II. professed to act in obedience to divine calls, distinctly perceived by them: and their respective conduct, however atrocious, plainly showed that their belief was agreeable to their profession. To take a more respectable comparison: there have been many of unquestionable integrity, who have been confident of divine calls to go from England to America, and from America to England, to preach against the sacraments and the ministry of the Christian church, and against various doctrines, supposed to be gospel verity by those for whom this essay is designed. If in the cases mentioned, the possession of feeling is not in itself a proof

\* See note M.

of the source from which it is supposed to come, so neither in the other.\*

The present writer has had occasion, during half a century, to remark the effect of the sentiment objected to, on those whose religious impressions began with the belief, that it is a matter to be laboured after and prayed for. Some of them have settled down in a consistent profession of Christianity; but always, so far as is here known, in silence as to the tenet in question, if not in open disavowal of it. Others have rejected, together with it, all regard to religion in any shape; which they have loaded with the odium of their former temporary delusion. A third sort have degenerated into the cast of character, which continues the language of enthusiasm without its sensibilities; and in which there is an indulgence of those passions, which the most conveniently admit the cover of a religious profession. There have been also persons who have gone on through life, hankering after an assurance which they do not affect to have received. And of these, some have been perceived to be apparently devout, without the consolations wherewith religion ought to be attended; while others have lived either in indifference or open sin, still hoping that their day of effectual visitation would come, and not a little hindered from seeking it in gracious affections, by the error with which the subject had been incumbered. On the whole, the influence of the opinion is here judged to be pernicious. If it have been permanently entertained by any truly estimable people, the same has happened to many gross corruptions of Christianity; faith in which has been coincident with their earliest sensibility to spiritual subjects. †

\* See note N. † See note O.

Here, the writer of this will again put in a caution, against his being understood to deny the possibility of a Christian's knowing that he is within the terms of the gospel covenant. Faith and repentance are exercises of the mind, and subjects of consciousness; and the assurances of the acceptance of them in the gospel, are unequivocal. There may be counterfeit appearances of these graces; and their reality must be known by their effect of a godly, a righteous, and a sober life, proceeding from a corresponding bent of the will and the affections. The knowledge thus obtained, admits of degrees: and this accords with the property of grace, whereby it may be continually progressive. Even they who contend for what they call assurance, are so incautious as to talk of its degrees. It is true, that on the ground here contended for, satisfaction must be interrupted by sin, in act or in affection: but according to the other theory, it suffers abatements, and from causes not to be defined.

The uses to which the author of the foregoing discussion wishes to apply it, are as follow:

If it should meet the eye of a clergyman of the Protestant Episcopal Church, favourable to the rejected position; he is affectionately entreated, to consider the objections which have been opposed to it; and, next to the question of the sense of scripture, and of that of the primitive church, to weigh well the circumstance of its being unknown in the institutions of his communion, and alien from their spirit.

If it should be presented to any person, conscious of the desire of being assured of an interest in Christ; the author approves of so holy a thought: and he advises that the object be sought, not immediately, and by en-

deavours to excite sensibilities which may suggest the idea of the solicited good, on insufficient grounds; but by jealousy of sin in every shape, and by a good life; not consisting in a varnish of the exterior conduct, but as the result of a right state of the affections.

If there should be a reader, who relies on an inward testimony, supposed to have been formerly given, but now suspended by a state of sin; he is here cautioned against a delusion, which may drown him in perdition.

Finally; if this essay should be read by any one, who believes that he has received assurance in the way in question, but adorns the doctrine of his God and Saviour; let him cultivate, more and more, what has been here contended for as the sure ground of satisfaction, when taken in connexion with the corresponding testimony of scripture. The pious Scougal has said, that he had rather have the evidence of religious graces, than the assurance of an Angel, that his name was written in the Book of Life. It is here believed, that the more this species of evidence is cherished, the greater will be the indifference to the other. But should the error be retained, it will be harmfulers to the supplanter; although it may cause him unintentionally to mislead others.\*

*July 25, 1814.*

W. W.

\* See note P.



## FIRST APPENDIX:

### *Explaining the few Texts, alleged in Favour of the Position.*

THE writer of this may possibly have met with texts, besides those to be here considered. If such should occur, it is trusted, that a mere inspection of them will show them to be irrelative.

Romans viii. 16, speaks of "the Spirit's bearing witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God." It is here thought, that the true sense of this passage cannot better be given, than in the words of Dr. Macknight, a very respectable Calvinist, in his late work on the epistles. He paraphrases the place thus—"Also the Spirit itself, bestowed on us in his extraordinary operations, beareth witness with the filial dispositions of our own minds, that we are children of God." That there are two witnesses spoken of, is the concurrent sense of able commentators (see Doddridge and others) and if so, its relativeness to the position disappears.

In order to guard against this, some have wished to alter the translation thus—"to our spirits:" on which the said Dr. Macknight remarks in a note—"This translation makes no alteration in the sense; provided, by the Spirit's witness, we do not understand a particular revelation to individuals; but the common witness which the Spirit bears, by producing filial dispositions in the hearts of the faithful."

There are, however, these objections to the change.

1st; It is not so much in agreement with the evident sentiment; which calls for two witnesses.

2d; It does not agree with the usual force of the Greek preposition “*συν*” joined with “*μαρτυρει*,” the former answering to the preposition “*cum*” in Latin. It is true, that in composition, it has sometimes only the effect of additional energy to the verb: but as Grotius (quoted in Pool’s Synopsis) remarks, it will scarcely ever be found that, with the compound word, there is not a conjunction of testimony, either of man or of scripture. To the contrary of this, Rev. xxii. 18, has been mentioned: but Griesbach amends the text, by leaving out the preposition; as, in his opinion, not justified by the manuscripts. The compound verb is used in Rom. ix. 1. But the apostle there appeals, first to Christ, as having announced the rejection of the Jewish people; and then to the inspiration of the Holy Ghost within himself, of which the continual heaviness of his heart was an adjunct. So in Rom. ii. 15, we read of God’s bearing of witness in the works of the visible creation; and of the consciences of men consenting therewith, in censures or in acquittals.

3d; The present translation, and not the other, harmonizes with the design of the apostle in the Epistle to the Romans; which was to prove the right of the Gentile Christians to the benefits of the Christian covenant. This could never have been proved by a testimony to their own minds. But the testimony of God in miraculous gifts, bestowed as well on Gentiles as on Jews; and a correspondency with this in a conformity to the holy requisitions of the gospel, was to the purpose; which was the convincing not the Gentile converts them-

selves, but those who questioned their right to church-communion.

2 Cor. i 21, 22, speaks of "anointing" and "sealing:" which still refers principally to the extraordinary operations of the Holy Ghost. But we further discern "the earnest of the Spirit in our hearts:" for the explanation of which see the next text.

Eph. i. 13 and 14. Here we read of "the sealing of the Spirit of promise," and of its being "the earnest of our inheritance." The Spirit of promise is the Holy Ghost, in his gifts begun on Pentecost. By these the Ephesians had been sealed as a church. The sealing took place *after* they believed: which shows, that it was unconnected with any matter necessarily attached to the forgiveness of sin. The sealing by a miraculous effusion might well be considered as an earnest or a pledge of a future inheritance of the faithful in Heaven. It is said to be "in our hearts," because of its holy influence, in the elevating of affection and of hope. The earnest is addressed to the heart; but is given by the Spirit, through the medium of the wonderful works whereby Christianity was established. (See Doddridge on the Place.)

2 Tim. iv. 8, St. Paul speaks with great confidence of the treasure, laid up for him in heaven. But on what is this confidence grounded? It is not any inward voice or feeling, but partly on the retrospect of the good fight of faith; and partly on the near prospect of his "departure," which was "at hand."

Heb. vi. 11, speaks of "the full assurance of hope." The word translated "full assurance," "*πληροφορία*," has two senses in the New Testament—accomplishment,

and—conviction of the understanding. The latter is the meaning in this place, as in Rom. xiv. 5. 2 Tim. iv. 17. Col. ii. 2. and 1 Thes. i. 5. Dr. Campbell, in his note on Luke i. 1, charges Theodore Beza with giving a precedent to Protestant Churches, of drawing the word from these its proper significations, to the denoting of a mere persuasion of the mind.

V. 19. Hope is called “an anchor to the soul, sure and steadfast.” In the original, there is no word answering to hope, which is therefore printed in italicks. But the word occurs in the verse immediately preceding; where it stands, not for hope in the mind, but for the ground of hope in the promises of God. This ground is sure and steadfast.

2 Pet. i. 10. We are here exhorted to “use all diligence, to make our calling and election sure.” It has nothing to do with assurance in the mind. The Greek word “*θεβαιαν*,” signifies “steadfast” or “permanent,” as in Heb. ii. 2, and elsewhere. The calling and election of the Hebrews had taken place; but diligence was necessary to its continuance.

1 John v. 10. He that believeth in “the Son of God, hath the witness in himself.” The passage is generally quoted under the erroneous supposition, that “the witness” is a person. No such thing. It means the same with “testimony.” The Greek is “*μαρτυριαν*.” It is the inward testimony of the graces of the heart, combining with the outward testimony to which the apostle had appealed of “the Spirit, the water, and the blood.” But if we amend the text from some of the most respectable of the manuscripts (see Mills) adding after “*μαρτυριαν*”—*τω θεω εν αυτω* (for *εαυτω*) the proper rendering will be—

hath the testimony of God in him: that is in the Son proved to be a real person (the subject in question) by the three credentials in the 8th verse—the Spirit, the Water, and the Blood. This gives peculiar pertinency to the latter part of the verse now commented on—“He that believeth not God”—meaning in that his testimony presented to the senses—“hath made him a liar, because he believeth not the record that God gave of his Son ”

*Remark.* How barren of proof must be the position in question; when, on a point so very important, it produces texts so few in number; and so easily rescued from perversion, by attention to the contexts and a due consideration of the terms!\*

\* See note Q.

## SECOND APPENDIX.

### *Of the Inconsistency of the Methodists, on the Subject.\**

IT was suggested under the 10th objection, that the controverted position has not been taught as a doctrine and in its extent, by any religious society except the Methodists. This induces the present writer, as a tribute to what he conceives to be evangelical truth, to notice their inconsistency. He goes on the subject the more readily; because it is the very point, on which Mr. Wesley broke with his brethren of the Church of England. It is stated by himself, to have been on the question of inward salvation, now attainable by faith: but it must have been by faith as defined by him, and as essentially including, or rather consisting in the impression here treated of. Contemporaneous with the event referred to, there are so many sermons in print, of bishops, and of other eminent men in the Church of England, explicitly laying down not only the doctrine of justification by faith alone, but by this as working by love, the principle of all inward and outward obedience; that there can be no room for the supposition, of Mr. Wesley's having been ejected from English churches on that account. He preached a familiar doctrine; but there may have been novelty in the terms in which he clothed it. †

In his Appeal (p. 33) he declares, that he and his brother had been Pharisees, from the beginning of their

\* See note R. † See note S.

ministry in 1729, to the year 1737. They were then awakened by a preacher of the Church of the "Unitas Fratrum," of the name of Peter Bohler. It is evident from the narrative, that they wanted what was considered by him and by themselves, as the assurance of faith. And yet it is remarkable, that in a subsequent conversation with Count Zinzendorf, the leader of that people, he gave to Mr. Wesley a directly contrary decision on the point. This is related in Dr. Whitehead's *Life of Mr. Wesley*, vol. ii. p. 82.

Mr. Wesley's conversion, was considered by him as having taken place on the 24th of May, 1738 (*Whitehead*, vol. ii. p. 79) when, he says, an assurance was given him by Christ, that he had taken away his sins.

In the account of the conference in 1767, it is decided by the body—"That all Christians have such faith as implies an assurance of God's love, appears from," &c.—citing some texts. And it is expressly said—"No man can be justified and not know it." (*Whitehead*, vol. ii. p. 215.)

Many things to the same effect, may be found in Mr. Wesley's *Appeal*: but the reverse now follows.

According to Dr. Whitehead, between the years 1745 and 1747, there took place a correspondence between Mr. Wesley and a person under the assumed name of John Smith, who is said to have been "a clergyman of considerable abilities, and probably of high authority, if not the highest in the church." The historian supposes, that this correspondence had some\* influence on Mr. Wesley's mind; and that it occasioned

\* In the former EDITION, the word was "great."

a letter to his brother given at large, in which, on the present subject, he says—"I allow, 1st, that there is such an explicit assurance: 2dly, that it is the common privilege of Christians: and 3dly, that it is the proper Christian faith, which purifieth the heart and overcometh the world: but I cannot allow, that justifying faith is such an assurance, or necessarily connected therewith." And he goes on to give his reasons.\*

That during Mr. Wesley's life, the Methodist system became less tenacious on the point, the present writer thinks he could clearly show from sundry matters in "A Vindication of the Minutes," by Mr. Fletcher—a book approved of by Mr. Wesley, and much extolled by his Society.† But it is rather thought proper to adduce authority from a more recent account of their principles, in "A Portraiture of Methodism," by Jonathan Crowther. He lays it down as a tenet of the Society; but adds as their opinion—"There may be exceptions in some extraordinary cases, occasioned by extreme ignorance, the influence of bodily complaints, or the violence of temptation." That each of these causes may have powerful effects on the exercises of the human mind, and especially such of them as are influenced by changes in the state of the animal spirits, is obvious. But that they can be impediments to the voice of God speaking to our spirits, ought not to be admitted.‡

\* See note T.

† Mr. Fletcher, in his *Vindication of the Minutes* (p. 83) says—"Do we not see hundreds, who, when they have reason to hope well of their state, think there is no hope for them?"

‡ In Dr. Adam Clark's *Commentary*, now re-printing in this



On the whole, how unstable is a doctrine, which, however for a while held up as essential, is sure to expose its unsoundness; and, if not renounced, must be clogged by distinctions not alleged to be found in the Word of God; but dictated by imperious necessity, in order to account for what passes before the eyes of its advocates.

It will not be irrelevant, to state the difficulty Mr. Wesley was put to, in order to make out the consistency of his position, with the doctrine of the Church of which he was a minister. He does not profess to have found it in the liturgy or in the articles: but he fastened on the Homilies. And yet, these being but a larger explication of the articles, it is not natural to expect to find an highly important doctrine not hinted at

country, there is a remarkable evidence of remaining attachment in his Society, to the construction of Rom. viii. 16 here objected to. He considers "with our spirit," as the same with "to our understanding;"—"the Place"—says he "or faculty, to which such information can properly be brought." The word "Πνευμα," rendered "Spirit," is evidently used to denote our spiritual nature generally—not the understanding in particular. This faculty is expressed, not by that word, but by "νοῦς," or by "διανοια," or by "συνεσις," or by "φρον." The distinction is especially conspicuous in 1 Cor. xiv. 15. "I will pray with the spirit, and I will pray with the understanding also."

Such forced constructions only show the importance of the text, to the support of a favourite opinion. The truth is, that the one cannot stand without the other. But to make it to the purpose, there is the necessity, either of combining the two witnesses into one, or of making a translation not warranted by the original: as in the instances of John Wesley and Adam Clarke; although their renderings differ from one another. Had the doctrine been correct, it would have been found over the whole face of scripture.

in the one, taught clearly in the other. [The place relied on by Mr. Wesley, is "The Homily of Salvation;" which says—"The right and true Christian faith is, not only to believe the holy scriptures and the articles of our faith are true, but also to have a sure trust and confidence to be saved from everlasting damnation by Christ: Or, as is expressed a little after, a sure trust and confidence which a man hath in God, that his sins are forgiven, and he reconciled to the favour of God." The Homily is correctly quoted by Mr. Wesley: But when he afterwards undertakes to state the substance of the above account of faith, he expresses it in the proposition—"Faith is a sure trust which a man hath in God, that his sins are forgiven:" As if this were the essence and the whole of such an act of the mind. The Homily contemplates other matters, as comprehended in its object. This is made the more explicit by the context; which speaks of faith in Cesar's Commentaries, and of such as may be possessed by devils.]\* But whether

\* In the former Edition, instead of what is between the two brackets, it was as follows—The place relied on by Mr. Wesley, is in the Homily "Of Faith;" inadvertently quoted by him (in his Appeal p. 27) from the Homily "Of Salvation;" in which the words are not found, although there is something to the same effect. The Homily says concerning faith—It is "not *only* the common belief of the articles of our faith—this Mr. Wesley omits—"but it is also a true trust and confidence of the mercy of God, through our Lord Jesus Christ." By the omission noticed, the passage is made to represent the very essence of faith as consisting in the confidence spoken of. But what is principally to be remarked on, is the disregard of the context; which speaks of a species of faith consisting in barely believing what is related in

the confidence spoken of be an internal suggestion from the Holy Spirit, or arise from a comparing of our inward state with the outward testimony of scripture, the Homily does not say.\*

Considering the error guarded against in the Homily; it is hazardous to give it a construction, which may bring under the weight of it a doubting and disconsolate person, who neither questions the sufficiency of the merits of the Redeemer, nor has any hesitation to rest on them for salvation, but desponds greatly—perhaps from some erroneous opinion, and especially the opinion here in question—that of the necessity of waiting for some sensation, which may be construed into a divine communication.

It is worth while to notice in what way the Homilies speak, when the question now at issue is in contemplation. To show this, the Homily for Whitsunday shall be quoted.

Some one is supposed to put the question—“How shall I know, that the Holy Ghost is within me?” The answer is “Forsooth, as the tree is known by the fruit, so is also the Holy Ghost. The fruits of the Holy Ghost, according to the mind of St. Paul (Gal. v.) are these—Love, joy, peace, long suffering, gentleness, goodness, faithfulness, meekness, temperance, &c. Contrariwise, the deeds of the flesh are these—Adultery, fornication, uncleanness, wantonness, idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, debate, emulation, wrath, contention, sedition, heresy,

scripture: in like manner as there is a belief of what is related in Cesar's Commentaries. In opposition to this, we must have faith in a dispensation in which we feel an interest.

\* See note U.

envy, murder, drunkenness, gluttony, and such like. Here is now that glass, wherein thou mayest behold thyself and discover, whether thou have the Holy Ghost within thee, or the spirit of the flesh."

Has the Church been unfaithful, in pointing to this source of satisfaction, and in being silent as to the other? It is here confidently believed, that she has not; although the contrary is the case, on the presumption of the truth of the proposition which has been denied.\*

W. W.

See note V.

---

Besides the two corrections of the former publication noticed in the proper places, there are the following corrections of typographical errors, found in the first publication of the Essay:

Page 18 line 14 "character" for "characters."

Page 26 line 1 "10th" for "9th."

Ibid line 18 "obedierce" for "obediencies."

Page 28 line 5 "purifieth" for "pacifieth."

Page 29 first note "he" for "ear."

Ibid second note "συνεσις" for "δυσεσις."

Ibid "διασεια" for "διαβοσεια."

## NOTES.

---

### NOTE A.—Page 7.

The first comment of the Pamphlet, is on the title of the Essay: which is bent to another meaning than that designed, by printing the two members of the sentence in different characters. The Author of it had no other idea of personal assurance, than as the individual is interested in offers designed for all by whom they may be accepted: the interest to be tested, as described in what follows from Abp: Usher. With the help of italicks and a suitable comment, the title is made to speak a sense contradicted by the general tenour of the Essay—that of a species of application which the Author is alleged to have admitted, and then accused of not preaching to his congregations. The neglect of personal application, in the proper sense of the expression, he would have acknowledged to be an essential defect in a Minister of the Gospel, and a professedly christian people.

The mistake produced by the comment on the title, may be illustrated thus: Some one may be supposed to lay down the following position—"There has been a refutation of the Essay of W. W. by a reply of J. E." A second person may be supposed to deny the position, in the form in which it has been presented. A third may step in, and, putting the latter part in italicks, may say to the second—You acknowledge that the Essay has been refuted, but you deny it's having been done by J. E. Would this be a fair interpretation?

It was intended by the Author of the Essay, to contradict the assurance of pardon, as coming immediately from the Holy Spirit, or as predicated in the Gospel individually. But he did not deny the application of the benefit to the individual believer, on the general ground of the promises of the Gospel, with his knowledge of the state of his own mind, and under the ordinary operations of the Holy Spirit.

## NOTE B.—Page 7.

In the reply, there is imputed to the Author of the Essay a very censurable opinion, which he has not only not expressed, but against which he has carefully guarded. It is, that “the written word merely is the power of God unto Salvation, without the influence of the Holy Spirit applying it to the heart.” There would have been no room for the representation; if, with the repetition of the text of Scripture, there had been given the circumstance, that the subject was declared to be spoken of—“independently on personal application.” Even after the omission of that clause, the effect would not have been accomplished, if there had been given the text as in the Essay.—“Faith cometh by hearing,” in connexion with the text above recited: for then, there would have been perceived to be as much room for the criticism on the other side, had it been levelled at the apostolick writer of both these texts; who says not a word of the agency of the Holy Spirit, in either of the places.

After these omissions of important clauses in the paragraph, it is prepared for the bolder step of an addition. Accordingly, in the next paragraph of the Reply, the Author of it, by a train of sentiment which perhaps may have been satisfactory to his own mind, lands himself on the conclusion—but instead of declaring it as such, affirms it to be a statement of the Author of the Essay, which it is not,—that “no other causes are necessary” (meaning to salvation) “than a knowledge of the Gospel:” defined to be attained to by men of corrupt minds, and taught in schools and colleges. Before his coming to this conclusion, he misunderstands a maxim which he impliedly impeaches; considering it as interdicting two or more causes, each of which contributes its share of the effect, and no more.

With all this omission and addition, the paragraph becomes a sufficient ground of a report, which has accordingly gone forth, and is of course believed by those who will take it on the credit of the author of the Reply, that the author of the Essay has denied the influence of the Holy Spirit of God.

## NOTE C.—Page 9.

In exhibiting the passage from Archbishop Usher, it was considered agreeably to his intention, as a sufficient test of a gracious

state. When the author of the Essay spoke of "contrariety" to this, it was in the character of a test. The author of the Reply, professes to hold the subject in perfect concordance with Usher. How can this be, when the Syllogism is conducted to its conclusion, without comprehending what is called for by the position referred to in the title page? The quotation from Mr. Wesley, concerning the testimony of our own spirits, is nothing to the purpose; when there is the unequivocal declaration, that this must be preceded by another testimony, adequate to the effect?

For the clearer display of the distinction, let there be a reference to the Sermon of Mr. Wesley, on Rom. 8, 16, to which the Reply has directed the attention (p. 10.) It shall be given from Jon. Crowther's portraiture (p. 166.) "The testimony of the Spirit is an inward impression on the soul, whereby the Spirit of God directly witnesses to my spirit that I am a child of God: that Jesus Christ hath loved *me* and given himself for *me*: that all my sins are blotted out, and that I, even I am reconciled to God." The passage is introduced by its being said—"It is hard to find words in the language of men, to explain the deep things of God." A tenet, thus acknowledged not to have been delivered in definite language in the Scriptures, is made the distinguishing property of a theological system. But taking the testimony of the Spirit as defined, it makes no part of the syllogism of Archbishop Usher: which is accordingly represented as defective, in point of argument. This is the "contrariety" intended in the Essay.

The author of the Reply infers from the paragraph under notice, that the author of the Essay did not consider the assurance spoken of as "desirable." If, with this word, there had been set down, as in the Essay—"and to be laboured after," the reader would have perceived, that the former is used in a sense different from that exhibited. We do not say of every thing in itself valuable, that it is a proper subject of desire or wish. The acquisition of riches, in right of heirship, may be an estimable change in the condition of a man: but if he be conscientious, it has not been the object of his wish or desire. As to any thing impossible, or for the expectation of which there is no ground to desire it, is folly.

The author of the Reply is dissatisfied with the test of "gracious habits," as laid down in this place; and pronounces it to be inconsistent with correct ideas of justification. Concerning this, it is asked—"Are we conscious of it, at the time that it takes place, or not till some time afterwards? And, if not till some time afterwards, how long?" &c. There will be laid a ground for answers to these questions, in what is to be quoted from Dr. Paley's Sermon on Conversion.

In the Reply it is supposed, that in the Essay, an improper use is made of the words "sensible" and "insensible:" and it is asked, whether the agency of the wind in nature, is the one or the other. Answer: The word "agency" being taken in its usual sense, as signifying "a quality of action," or "the state of a being in action;" that of the wind is insensible, or not an object of sense. But, not so is its effect or action, on the organs of our bodies. In like manner, of the agency of the Holy Spirit, as is remarked in the Essay, we are no otherwise conscious, than by possessing the gracious habits of the mind, which are subjects of spiritual sensibility. This is conceived to be in agreement with John iii. 8.

The author of the Reply is pleased to say, that there are those, who, with himself, regret that the author of the Essay should waste the remains of his life "in labouring to demolish so evangelical and precious a doctrine," as that contended for. His defence must rest on fidelity to his ministry; and on the mischiefs observed by him in the course of it, as stated in a succeeding part of the Essay. As to the doctrine's being "evangelical and precious;" that is, as is here supposed to be the meaning, fruitful of consolation; there would be more room for the affirming of this, if it were not so very susceptible of the fluctuations of doubt; as is confessed by its most distinguished advocates, from Calvin downwards. Mr. Wesley's seasons of heaviness, are acknowledged by himself; without its being said to be owing to "the quenching and the grieving of the Spirit," as is suggested of such cases by the author of the Reply (p. 27.)

When such a man as President Edwards, as quoted in the Essay, says of the doctrine—"It is to be feared, that multitudes of souls have been eternally undone by it;" the saying being the result of much observation of its effects, as the history of his life may show;



it ought not to be uninteresting to the conscience of a minister of the gospel, in giving counsel to a candidate for the ministry, to warn him of an error which he is so likely to encounter, not merely in theological disputation, but in its intrusion into some of the most trying circumstances of the members of his future flock.

NOTE D.—Page 10.

The author of the Reply remarks truly, that the accounts of the ministry of the Baptist are short; and that it is said—“Many other things preached he unto the people.” The question is, not whether all the things which he preached have been recorded; but, whether divine inspiration have kept back a communication, which enters into every branch of the Christian life; and which would have occupied no more space than some of the addresses there recorded, on minor points of Christian doctrine, and with varieties suited to his respective auditors.

The author of the Reply has added another answer; it being such, as that if he be a qualified organ of his society, reveals a limitation of the tenet in question, which the author of the Essay either never knew, or has forgotten: so that his not noticing of it, must be attributed to his want of information, and not to his want of candour; as is supposed, with the concession that it may have been from oversight.

“The Evangelists unanimously declare” (says the Reply, p. 13) “that he” (the Baptist) “proclaimed to the multitudes who came to his baptism, I indeed baptize you with water to repentance—but he that cometh after me, shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost.” Certain it is, that there never occurred to the author of the Essay, any other exposition of the above text, than that recorded in Acts xi. 16, as proceeding from the mouth of St. Peter; or rather, as implied in the words of our Lord himself, recited and interpreted by that apostle. If this be not enough, his exposition of the meaning of the Saviour is more precise in the fifth verse of the first chapter of the same book, in the reference to the approaching event of the miraculous descent of the Holy Ghost: which is further explained by the narrative of that event, in the second chapter. It will hardly be alleged, that it gives an account of any such testimony as that taken above from Mr. Wesley.

Notwithstanding the Reply's pronouncing that "it will not serve W. W's. purpose, to say that the baptism of the Holy Ghost, here promised, was to be of an extraordinary nature, or to be confined to a few;" the latter presumes, that whatever operation of the Divine Spirit was begun on the day of Pentecost, was not a common privilege, except through the medium of its effects; but of an extraordinary nature, and confined to a few, as appears from the fourteenth verse; although the resulting benefit was that of the whole church, and therefore reasonably held out by the Baptist, as an object of expectation to multitudes. The stream of interpretation in the Christian church, limits the first effusion to the apostles: and if, with some, we extend it to the one hundred and twenty disciples, it will not follow, that all Christians are comprehended; much less, that the wonderful event has any reference to the matter now at issue.

The author of the Reply impliedly acknowledges, that the personal assurance contended for by him, began on the day of Pentecost: being therefore irrelevant to all holy men under the Old Testament; and, under the New, until that period, to all the personal attendants on the Saviour. Perhaps, it was with an apprehension of the consequences of the concession, that there was added in a note the citation of John vii. 39; with explanatory words, which do away the force of it—"The Holy Ghost was not given"—not so clearly and fully as afterwards—"because that Jesus was not yet glorified." Dr. Doddridge, who seems to have been respected, and justly, by the author of the Reply, would have supplied from his Commentary, the following explanatory words—"In that extraordinary manner." In that manner, the Holy Ghost had not been given at all. And if, as the Reply seems to suppose, he had been so given, although "not so clearly and fully as afterwards;" it throws a cloud over the whole theory, in relation to antecedent time. For then, the assurance must have been less clear and less full: that is, the state of mind, whatever it may be, loses the property of assurance.

NOTE E.—Page 10.

The author of the Reply (p. 14) again makes light of the maxim, of looking for no more causes, than are necessary to the effect.

The maxim is dictated by reverence of divine wisdom; and, although more immediately applied to the operations of nature, may reasonably be transferred to the department of grace. Man, in his defect of judgment, may put into action two mechanick powers, for an effect to which one of them would be competent. Not so, Omnipotence. The author of the Reply uniformly speaks of the maxim, as though it interdicted two or more causes, contributing to any effect. The meaning, as understood by the author of the Essay, admits of a multiplicity of partial causes; in such a way, as that if any one of them be withdrawn, the effect will not follow. It is believed, that two distinct forces keep the planets in their orbits; each of which is in part the cause, and the two united are the causes of the whole of the effect.

It must have been under a different impression, that the author of the Reply notices Heb. vi. 17, 18. The Divine Being is there said "to have confirmed his promise by an oath:" two immutable things, "in which it was not possible that God should lie." What was this for, but to bear down the resistance of human incredulity? Divine wisdom, would not have put forth a waste of energy in both, if the first of them had been equal to the extensive use contemplated.

Thus it is contended, in the interpretation of Rom: viii. 16, that miraculous gifts of the Holy Ghost, conferred indiscriminately on Jewish and on gentile christians, concurrently with suitable dispositions of mind on the part of the latter, were sufficient evidence, in opposition to the prejudices of the former, of release from subjection to the ritual law. But a divine communication to the mind, made with such circumstances as to be relied on, would want no confirmation of a miracle to the same effect, for the satisfaction of those immediately concerned. If, as the author of the Reply supposes, the outward expression of the forgiveness of the paralytick was principally for the conviction of the bystanders; it is strange, that this should be recorded by three of the Evangelists, and that not one of them should record the essential part of the benefit to the person the most concerned, in an inward assurance of pardon. Be this as it may, there is irrelevancy in confounding the subject, with the question of consolation resulting to the patient. The author of the Reply, remarks, that

the paralytick "could have enjoyed no more consolation from a mere outward assurance that his sins were forgiven, without being *sensible* of it, than he could from an outward assurance that his body was healed, without feeling it." There is added—"It might as well be said, that when Peter said to Eneas, Jesus Christ maketh thee whole, it was impossible for him to feel it." Can there then be overlooked the circumstance, that inward feeling may be excited by outward communication? On the contrary supposition, a condemned criminal cannot indulge satisfaction from tidings of his pardon, although communicated by the proper officer, and under the seal and the signature of state.

But the author of the Reply thinks, that our blessed Saviour did suggest the doctrine occasionally, and in set discourses. Some texts are alleged, as being thought to the purpose. Certain it is, that the author of the Essay never conceived of them as what would be brought forward in deliberate argument, on the question now at issue. But being given on the other side, doubtless as a specimen of the many, which, it is said, are to the purpose, there shall be some notice of them in another place.

NOTE F.—Page 12.

The author of the Reply (p. 17) joins the 3d and 4th objections. He rejects the term "an inward voice;" which had been used in the Essay, in a passage given as synonymous with "inward suggestion or declaration." Mr. Wesley made use of the word "impression." The subject might have made it manifest, that the word "voice" was used metaphorically: and however rejected on this occasion, it occurs often in discourse, as applicable to the present question.

The Essay is charged with sophistry, because, in reference to the preaching of Christ and his apostles, it asks of a dissentient—"What would he think of a minister of the gospel, who, in any one address to a sinner, and professing to tell him what he must do to be saved, should be silent as to the inward voice in question." For answer it is said—"I think that a minister of the gospel might tell a sinner what he must do to be saved, without saying any thing about an inward voice, and even without telling him of this personal assurance. For this is not what a sinner has to do, it is

God's word, and, in conjunction with the witness of our own Spirit, is the comforting *evidence* of our salvation. In answer to this it is not perceived, that on the question—"What shall I do to be saved," the knowledge of the fruit of the inquiry can be foreign to it. Be it, that the giving of the personal assurance must be the work of God: the endeavouring to obtain it, is represented as resting with men. So say Divines of the Westminster confession; and so says the Instrument itself. If Arminian Divines think otherwise, they carry this point further than the advocates of the Calvinistick theory. But whatever be the mind of the author of the Reply, it is here conceived, not to speak the sense of his society. At the beginning of their new plan, in the persons of the deceased John and Charles Wesley, and in the endeavours of their instructor to direct their attention to the assurance in question, there is no appearance of its being thought a work to be left wholly to God. Neither does this seem to have been thought of, when an admonition was given to the present writer, on the subject of preaching. If the author of the Reply deliberately thinks as he has here written, he must think differently from Mr. Wesley, in the 3d minute of the conference of 1770; and from Mr. Fletcher, in his vindication of that minute from p. 47, to p. 54. In the minute it is said, that nothing is more false than the maxim, that a man can do nothing in order to justification. And, according to Mr. Wesley, this is instantly followed by the impression. The two being thus connected, the labouring for one is the labouring for both.

The author of the Reply, in going on to the acts, still confounding the subject with that of miraculous gifts, thinks it worth his while to cite the case of Cornelius in the 10th chapter, and from thence he passes to the case of St. Paul, in the 9th chapter. That there must have been, in each of these cases, consolation suited to it, is not denied. The question is, as to the manner. The author of the Reply will hardly say, that there is any thing like the intimation of acceptance, which Mr. Wesley states to have been given to himself. But when the author of the Essay had described Saul as called on by Ananias to wash away his sins in baptism, it was added—"This divinely instituted" sign being judged by that holy man, to be evidence sufficiently satisfactory of the inward grace promised to accompany it."

Here the author of the Reply steps in with a syllogism, thus represented as the logick of the author of the Essay—"No more causes are to be looked for, than are sufficient for the effect. But baptism is an evidence of inward grace *sufficiently satisfactory*. Therefore, no other evidence is to be looked for." The error of confounding "cause" with "evidence" being put out of view, let it be remarked, that the minor of this syllogism, was never expressed by the person from whom it is said to have proceeded. His position was not a universal affirmative, as it is represented to have been, but predicated of the individual—Saul. There is no hesitation to avow the sentiment, that the position is true of all fit recipients of the rite of baptism. It may be considered as implied: but this did not warrant the swelling of what was said of a particular character, into a general proposition.

The above, may be an answer to the charge of inconsistency from the author of the Reply, between what is said concerning baptism, and the maxim of no more causes, than are necessary to the effect. God acts through the channel of his own institution; agreeably to which, there is required fitness in the recipient. As the light of the sun, although a cause sufficient for the effect of making the objects of the material universe visible, requires an atmosphere, and an eye possessed of the sense of seeing, so the ordinance of baptism, comprehending the visible sign and the invisible grace, although sufficient for the effect of engrafting into grace, requires to be administered to a person within the contemplation of divine wisdom in the appointment.

It should be noticed, that the Essay was penned for the perusal of some theological students, who were presumed to be acquainted with the philosophical maxim introduced. This circumstance, and the obvious meaning of the words, seemed to render explanation unnecessary.

On proceeding to the epistles, the author of the Reply is dissatisfied with the assertion, that there are but few alleged to the purpose of his tenet. The author of the Essay conceives of himself, as having exhibited all alleged by men of the most name, of those by whom the tenet has been publicly advocated. That the zeal of some may have carried them further, is very probable; and made the more so, by the real meaning of the few texts incidentally introduced in the Reply.

The author of it, in remarking on its being said in the Essay, that every one of the texts was taken from the writings of St. Paul, ought to have noticed its having been also said, that his special designation, and the subjects to which his mind was especially directed, led to language liable to be bent to subjects analagous to, but not the same. Let this be illustrated in a single instance. To combat the prejudice of subjecting the gentile Christians to the ritual law, it was pertinent to oppose the truth contained in the Old Testament, that, before the giving of the law, there had been the predestinating of Jews and gentiles, to be congregated in a participation of the gospel; and that thus they were elect or chosen, as a body, as had heretofore been the case with the progeny of Abraham only. It was hardly possible to disclose this design, without the use of language easily misconstrued, to what has been called the irrelative decrees of God, in reference to individuals.

As to the other apostles; it is in vain, that the author of the Reply would account for their silence, from the circumstance, that their epistles were "chiefly devoted to subjects of morality, the correcting of errors, or general topics." Any of these, might have admitted of the introduction of the position in question, had it been deemed correct. The appeal may be confidently made, whether there would be similar allowance in favour of any minister, who, admitting the truth, should not make it prominent in his preaching. The author of the Reply has anticipated this appeal, and answered to it, in his fourth page.

#### NOTE G —Page 12.

The solitary text noticed (p. 22) in opposition, is Titus iii. 5—8: "Not by works of righteousness, which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and *renewing of the Holy Ghost*, which he shed on us abundantly, through Jesus Christ our Saviour; that being justified," &c. It never occurred to the author, to deny the regenerating grace of baptism, nor the renovating which can proceed only from the Holy Spirit of God, nor his being shed in religious graces. But what relation this has to the position contradicted, the author is utterly at a loss to conceive. The identifying of it with what goes before, is the taking for granted of the matter to be proved. Of

commentators, there shall be referred to Dr. Doddridge only: who certainly saw no such sense in the passage, as, on the other side, must have seemed to be conspicuous.

NOTE H --Page 12.

When it is said in the Essay, that there is frequent reference to tests, which, according to the opposite tenet, are unnecessary; it is meant, and this is the strict interpretation of the words, that the non-necessity of the test in question may fairly be inferred. The meaning was not, that the superfluity of either was held on the other side. Here again, the author of the Reply (p. 23) charges the author of the Essay with maintaining, that "baptism alone is an evidence of inward grace, *sufficiently satisfactory*." He never said, nor thought so. It was said to be satisfactory, in the case of penitent and believing Saul.

In this part of the Reply, the author of it protests against what he represents as *a postulate* in the Essay, that "the truth of any doctrine, however important, depends on the *multitude* of texts by which it is supported; and that the *silence* of the inspired writers respecting it, in *some places*, where *we* may suppose it *ought* to have been mentioned, if true, when it is mentioned in other places, is any valid argument against it." No such postulate, is in the Essay. And, as to what was said, the Reply has given a help to explanation. The author of the latter has charged the author of the other, in regard to a Christian privilege supposed to have been admitted by him, with not pressing it in many more discourses than a certain other subject, which, by the by, he does not remember ever to have discoursed on from the pulpit. The argument is here conceded to be good, if the terms be mutually understood, and if the application have been made with truth. It is wished to clear the apostles of a charge made, whether true or not, on the author of the Essay. If the latter should prove, that he had sometimes, although seldom, complied with what has been held up to him as a duty, would this relieve him from the charge? It evidently would not; either in his own opinion, or in that of the author of the Reply. So, concerning a few texts from scripture, and those taken from places in which other subjects are prominent, it is meant, not that the texts are to be undervalued, but that it is more



likely they should be misinterpreted, than that there should be seldom inculcated so important a matter, as that in question must be confessed to be, if correct.

NOTE I—Page 13.

By the author of the Reply, this objection is slighted, as being vague. It could not have been otherwise, in the case of a general negation.

However unnecessary may be recourse to the fathers, in the estimation of the author of the Reply; it did not seem so to the author of the Essay, when he was penning it for the perusal of theological students of a church, which indeed knows no other standard of truth than Scripture, but which, on any question concerning the sense of that code, on a point supposed to be very important in the system, lays great stress on opinion held in the earliest ages, and supposed to have been transmitted to them by the apostles. At the time of the reformation, the church of England took this ground to great advantage: resisting the overbearing plea of antiquity, by going up to antiquity still higher. At the present day, the Roman catholick church lays so much stress, on some things truly alleged to be found in writers of the fourth century and downwards, as sometimes makes a serious impression on inquiring minds: and, as on the present subject, it has been urged with effect, that the earlier writers knew nothing of such matters, either as truth or as heresy. The like use has been made of the same mean, in reference to our Lord's divinity and atonement: and further, to some matters in what is called the Calvinistick system; against which Mr. Wesley set himself with great zeal.

The author of the Reply, will not attempt to account for the silence of Justin and Tertullian, until it be duly proved. It was impossible to prove it in the Essay, but by making their folio volumes a part of it. The Essay had said—"and others:" on which it is remarked—"We cannot tell why it does not appear in them, until we know who they are." The answer is short. Their names may be found in any of the ecclesiastical histories.

The Reply refers to Mr. Wesley's appeal, on the subject of the fathers. After a reperusal of the portion of it supposed to be

meant, from p. 40 to p. 68 of the first part of "the further appeal," there is not perceived reason to revoke what was said from general recollection, that it did not furnish a sentence, or the scrap of a sentence, alleged in favour of the doctrine in question. In the pages alluded to, seven texts of Scripture are discussed; of which one only—Rom. viii. 16, can be plausibly said to be pertinent to the present point. Mr. Wesley does indeed bring a passage from Chrysostom and another from Athanasius, to prove, that adoption to be the sons of God is not peculiar to the first Christians, but common to believers. This is not the point at issue. It is, whether the general declarations of God in Scripture, resting on an extraordinary display of Omnipotence [although not independently on the ordinary influence of the Holy Spirit on the mind] be the ground on which the individual, repenting and believing, is to conceive of himself as brought within the sphere of adoption; or this must be communicated to him personally, by an immediate communication of the Holy Spirit. Neither Chrysostom nor Athanasius applies the doctrine to this point, nor does Mr. Wesley state that they so apply it. On the contrary, however decisively he delivers this property of his doctrine in other places, he keeps it out of view in the present place. It was not necessary to the question between him and his opponent; who had contended concerning all the texts in the discussion, that they were merely descriptive of the spirit of the Christian system, in comparison with that of the Jews; and that they belonged only to the apostolick age.

NOTE K.—Page 13.

Does the author of the Reply suppose (p. 26) of the reference in the Essay to the institutions of the Church of England, that it can be invalidated by the opinion of any bishop who may be named by him? There is however peculiar infelicity, in bringing in the name of Bishop Pearson for this purpose: Which is proposed to be shown below.

NOTE L.—Page 14.

It will not be irrelevant to remark the circumstance, that this objection has not been noticed in the Reply, in the point of view in which it is conceived to stand, except incidentally and in a note.

The construction is, that it could not have been prominently noticed, without an acknowledgment of the fact; and that it could not have been acknowledged, without great abatement of the advantage claimed in favor of the position, of its being "precious and evangelical:" on account, as is here supposed, of its consolatory tendency.

There is however another subject, to which the objection has been misinterpreted—(p. 27) that of *quenching* and *grieving* the Holy Spirit by unfaithfulness. Without entrenching on that subject, the contemplated case may be perceived to originate, sometimes in temporal distress, and sometimes in a disordered state of the nerves. On such occasions, be the approach to what the author of the Reply calls "a partial derangement" more or less; of which nothing had been said in the Essay; the author of it denies the charge of ascribing to the maintainers of the position, their "contending for nothing more than a casual emotion." He does not doubt, that they contend for the graces of the heart, and for a correct course of life. But he supposes, that they also contend for, as the beginning of the Christian life, what may be—to use the words furnished in the Reply—"Nothing more than a casual emotion, depending on the ebbing and flowing of that undescribed something, which he" (the present writer) "calls the animal spirits." Yes, undescribed; because, as to the expression, it is understood in common discourse; and because the describing of the subject falls within the province of the Anatomist.

#### NOTE M.—Page 17.

The author of the Reply (p. 28) recriminates with the charge of "vacillations and inconsistencies of opinion:" which he takes up, as if it were intended of the oppositions of individual Divines. It was designed of changes in the belief of bodies of men: of whose sense, in some instances, although not in that of the Church of England, individuals may be considered as the organs.

Of the charges of inconsistency on the present writer, he will only remark, that so far as concerns the doctrine of his church, the only proof alleged is the misrepresented opinion of a single bishop. As to the Church of England, the reference recommended in the pamphlet to Mosheim, in proof of "vacillations and inconsistencies,"

will certainly show, that there have been different interpretations of her articles, by different Divines. But such differences are wide of the present point. The seventeenth article says, that the godly consideration of predestination is full of comfort "to godly persons, and such as feel in themselves the working of the Spirit of Christ, mortifying the works of the flesh, and drawing up their mind to high and heavenly things." On the question, whether predestination be founded on faith and works foreseen, of which the article says nothing, there have been opposite opinions, without a vestige of vacillation in the church. But if she, after saying as above, had defined the doctrine in the same terms in any other of her institutions, and then applied it as full of comfort to those, who feel in themselves an impression of the pardon of their sins; it would have given occasion to a question, independent on that of a conditional or an unconditional decree: and there would have been a vacillation, unfavourable to the admission of the first affirmed confidence as a religious test.

The author of the Essay, under the tenth objection, has made a reference to the standards of the most eminent of the Protestant Churches, and to the opinions of some eminent Divines, not of his own persuasion. Of all this, the author of the Reply has taken no notice. It might have been expected, from the respect expressed by him for Dr Doddridge, that there would have been an endeavour to rescue this Divine, from what ought to have been considered a reproach. To make the reference the more definite, let it rest on the thirteenth chapter of the book named in the Essay. With this, let there be taken a book of like celebrity with the same body of Christians, and lately reprinted in this city—"Boston's Fourfold State"—1st head of 3d state. It is not forgotten, how little argument is allowed by the author of the Reply to the circumstance of silence, except when the interpretation of it may help to a personal attack on a minister disapproved of by him. But it is here conceived, that in some cases, not excepting the case of a defective preacher, silence may reach the highest grade of sinfulness. If a guide, after voluntarily presenting himself to a traveller, with the proffer of informing him of the road to the object of his intended journey, should be guilty of an omission, tending to mislead at the outset; it would be acceptable; however accurately the rest of the road might be portrayed.

Perhaps it was to counterbalance the weight of such authorities as the above, that the author of the Reply has introduced the names of Bishop Pearson, Dr. Paley, and Dr. Buchanan—three Divines of the Church of England.

The passage brought from Bishop Pearson, is not to the purpose of the position. No consistent member of the Episcopal Church, objects to the terms "assure," "earnest," &c. as applied to a religious state. The question relates to the manner, in which the work is accomplished. It is a great oversight in the author of the Reply, that in the passage quoted, he marks the word "because" as emphatical; without perceiving, that it is adverse to his object. The Galatians had become sons of God; and *because* they were sons, God had sent forth the Spirit of his Son into their hearts." Dr. Doddridge has well paraphrased on this passage.

Let Bishop Pearson's Exposition of "I believe," be read; wherein he professes to give a full account of the act of faith; or, let there be read, what he has delivered under the article of "The Forgiveness of Sins:" and it will be difficult to find any thing to the purpose of the position; or, in the case of deficiency where it ought to be found, to defend the American bishops in enjoining on students of theology the reading of the book. This, to be sure, is only silence: but it is the silence of Bishop Pearson; who would not have omitted what was essential to his subject.

Of all the sermons on Conversion, ever perused by the present writer, the last which he should have expected to see quoted to the purpose of the position, is that of Dr. Paley. The learned author, not far before the passage quoted from him, contemplates two sorts of persons: those to whom conversion, and those to whom improvement is to be preached. The former, under two subdivisions, are they of whom the passage quoted in the Reply, and many other excellent things, are said. After this, the preacher goes on to his second sort of persons, thus—"But I am willing to believe, that there are very many Christians, who neither have in any part of their lives been without influencing principles, nor have at any time been involved in the habit and course of a particular known sin, or have allowed themselves in such course and practice. Sins, without doubt, they have committed, more than

sufficient to humble them to the dust; but they have not, to repeat the same words again, lived in the course of any particular known sin, whether of commission or neglect, and by deliberation and of aforethought, allowed themselves in such course. The *Conversion* therefore, above described, cannot apply to, or be required of, such Christians. To these we must preach, not conversion, but *improvement.*”

The distinction sustained in this passage, had been before more largely insisted on through four pages, beginning with the second paragraph of the sermon. Doubtless, Dr. Buchanan had well weighed the sense of it, before he quoted it in a note to his sermon, entitled “The Star in the East.” This excellent person was discoursing of the conversion of the Hindoos. He knew, that in the country which he had visited, there had been made converts by name, to whom the leading truths of Christianity had never been disclosed. And he knew, that in his own country, there were Christians in profession only. But it was his desire, that the projected conversion of which he was discoursing, might be congenial with the spirit of the religion to be disseminated. To this purpose, the quotation from Paley was pertinent, while it is irrelative to that of the Reply.

It may be now proper, to look back on the questions proposed under note C concerning “Justification.” If the principles of Dr. Paley be correct, there is a proportion of Christian people, with whom the former took place at their baptism; as is affirmed in the third part of “The Homily of Salvation.” As to persons converted from a life of sin, they may reason concerning their state, in some such way as that propounded by Archbishop Usher. Hence their assurance, unbounded as respects the faithfulness of God: of which there needs not to be any abatement as to the future, except what may arise from such considerations as where it is said—“Let him that thinketh he standeth, take heed lest he fall.” On the promises of God in scripture, the dependence should be unreserved, both as to the present and as to the future. Still, in consideration of the source of danger intimated, it is of importance to look forward to gracious habits: and in proportion to the stability of these, should be the absence of fear.

## NOTE N.—Page 17.

Although this has been passed over by the author of the Reply, it is a very important consideration. There has been already given Mr. Wesley's definition of the testimony of the Spirit of God, consisting in a certain impression made on the mind. It is impossible the impression should be more strong, than is testified by pious and virtuous men and women, to be on theirs, inciting them to the preaching of opinions, considered by both of the parties on the present question to be contrary to scripture. There is also the fact of incitement to wicked actions, in which the agents considered themselves as obeying the calls of vehement impression. Instances are given in the Essay: to which there shall be added, the single instance of Ravallac; who, at the moment of his plunging the dagger into the body of Henry IV. of France, and for a long time before, was persuaded of a divine monition to the deed. This man gave no other evidence of insanity, and could have had no other motive, than that professed by him—the preventing of a war, judged to be adverse to the interests of the Pope.

## NOTE O.—Page 18.

The present writer will not return the charge of illiberality, made on the part of the author of the Reply, by a heavier charge, but hopes, it was from some cause not easily conjectured, that he delayed his comments on this part of the Essay, to the conclusion of his own production. It would be easy to show, how much depends on juxta-position. People of different religious societies, become distressed under the weight of the tenet in question; taken up, as is here conceived, not from the reading of the scriptures with the aid of prayer, as the author of the Reply advises the congregations of the author of the Essay to read them; but from unscriptural preachings and books. The author of the Essay, disclaims reference to any individuals of the methodistick persuasion: for, although the society were incidentally mentioned under the tenth objection; the reader was there referred to an appendix, for further notice of them. It was natural, for the author of the Reply to make a similar arrangement of his matter. His not doing so, gives an aspect to the passage unintended in the Essay. That it is so exhibited in the Reply, appears in the circumstance, that the

author of it describes the people connected with him, as under accusation (p. 40) and as pleading—"Not guilty." He might have spared his remark, against arguing from particulars to generals. What was designed as argument directly bearing on the point, is arranged under ten heads. But it is not uncommon, after reasoning against a dogma, to point out its consequences.

Although, as the author of the Reply remarks, "recrimination is no defence;" yet it would not have been unwelcome to the author of the Essay, had the other entered on what he calls—"a fair comparison of the practical effect of the opposite doctrine." This may be stated to be, that a man is to know his safe state, only by his possessing of the graces of the Christian character, and by their effect on his life; taken in connection with the declarations of divine mercy, in the Scriptures: which are now, what the witnessing of the spirit in miraculous gifts was to the first Christians; it being the same witnessing under another form. If this doctrine have been productive of evil, it is more than has come to the knowledge of the present writer.

#### NOTE P.—Page 20.

What has been said in the preceding note, may be applied to the notice taken by the author of the Reply, of the uses contemplated by the Essay. The author of it never intended to charge the methodists with "reliance upon any inward testimony formerly given, but now suspended by a state of sin." Nor could such a sense have been extorted, but by the dislocation of the passage.

When the sentiment cited from Scougal was approved of by the author of the Reply, he does not seem to have perceived, that the said excellent man held the test delineated by him to be the highest evidence of a gracious state. He probably considered the assurance of an angel, as more weighty than an impression on the mind. At any rate, his test, although acknowledged to be good as far as it went, was evidently imperfect, according to the test laid down by the author of the Reply, in this place.

The same author (p. 42) has indulged himself in sarcasm on the last sentence in the Essay. To prepare for this, he has kept out of view the sentence immediately preceding; and even an essential part of the sentence, the rest of which he has quoted.



Had he given it fairly, there would have been no room for his animadversion. The harmlessness of the error to the individual, was made dependent on conformity to the test laid down by Scougal. Without such a mutilation of the passage, it would have been impossible to display it, as overturning observations made during half a century.

NOTE Q.—Page 25.

The author of the Reply, has incidentally, in different places of it, produced a few of the many texts, which he thought pertinent to his purpose. He might have found scores of them, which have as much bearing on the subject. As a specimen, there shall be exhibited the first two: and let it be remembered, that they are intended in direct proof of the position contradicted in the title page.

Luke xi. 13. "If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children; how much more shall your heavenly father give his Holy Spirit to them that ask him?" No question has been raised of the efficacy of prayer; the benefit being such, as we are warranted in praying for. And, as to the mention of the Holy Spirit; the introducing of it is an additional instance, of a tendency to confound his ordinary with his extraordinary operations. If the latter be designed, why was it said—"The Holy Ghost was not yet given, because Jesus was not yet glorified?"

1. Cor. ii. 12. "Now we have received not the Spirit of the world, but the Spirit which is of God, that we might know the things that are freely given to us of God." In the Essay, there is no denial of the agency of the Holy Spirit on the human mind. The question relates to a communication specially defined, and the alleged manner of its being made. What we know of the things of God, should be known both notionally and experimentally: and the Essay had given no occasion, to introduce the respectable authority of Dr. Doddridge to that effect.

It is thought unnecessary to notice the other texts; and especially those from which it is endeavoured to elicit the tenet in question, by embodying it with the effusion on the Day of Pentecost. Any good commentator will give an explanation of them, wide of the application in the Reply.

## NOTE R.—Page 26.

It is thought proper to state the ground, on which the author of the *Essay* thought it no reasonable cause of offence, to refer to the theology of a particular denomination.

This is a liberty, which it is customary for a writer to take with the tenets of any church, for the elucidation of what is supposed to be religious truth: and reasonably; because every church publishes its faith to the world, and wishes it to be influential.

There is no church, with which greater license of this sort is taken, than with that of which the present writer is a minister: and when it is done in fair argument, and not rancorously or indecorously as sometimes happens, it may be dissented from, while, at the act itself no offence is taken, so far as is here known.

In the following appendix, it has been presumed to contradict a tenet of a large body of professing Christians. The tenet is acknowledged by their advocate to be theirs. If he has denied some statements produced, the question of their correctness ought to depend on evidence; concerning the weight of which, neither of the parties can make himself a judge for the other. But no aspersion was intended either of the body, or of any individual of them: although there must be confessed to be the appearance of it on the face of the *Reply*; owing to the management complained of in the preface and in the last note but one. It was thus, that the author of the *Reply* found an opportunity of charging the author of the *Essay* with being “not only uncharitable, but unjust.”

## NOTE S.—Page 26.

The Rev. John Wesley, is represented as persecuted in the *Essay* beyond the grave. Is there in it an expression personally disrespectful to that divine? It is trusted, that there is not. But when opinions are published to the world, intended to have and having an effect on its religious state; to interdict a temperate discussion of them, whether the promulger be deceased or living, would be the taking of a very extraordinary stand in relation to a favourite character.

The author of the *Reply* thinks (p. 31, note) that there is inconsistency in objecting to Mr. Wesley's doctrine, because of the dress in which it was clothed. If this be all, it may have been a

ground of objection. Should a prince so dress himself, as to be mistaken for a beggar; or a woman of reputation, so as to be mistaken for a prostitute; in each of the cases, or in its opposite, the consequences might be serious. There may be similar misconstruction of doctrine.

To prove that the tenet in question was a new doctrine, either in substance or in dress, it will be sufficient to appeal to Mr. Wesley himself, in the minutes of a conference, held under his superintendance in 1770; of which there is a well written vindication by his friend—the Reverend Mr. Fletcher. In the minutes, after a statement of the doctrine of salvation, “not by the merit of works, but by works as a condition,” it is asked—“What have we then been disputing about, these thirty years?” The answer is—“I am afraid, about words.” “He might have said, I am sure of it,” is the remark of Mr. Fletcher (p. 68.) The round number of thirty years carries back so near to the time, when, according to the appeal, the denial of the pulpits was owing to the preaching of inward salvation by faith, that the question at this period, must have been adjudged at a later period to have been a dispute about words. At least, Mr. Wesley feared its having been so; Mr. Fletcher was sure of it; and these things are said in a work written by the one, and countenanced by the other. This being the case, there is not the inconsistency in the author of the *Essay*, although charged on him in the *Reply* (p. 32, note) of “at the same time opposing Mr. Wesley’s doctrine, and maintaining that of the Church of England.” If there be any errors of which the author of the *Essay* supposes himself not chargeable, one of them is a departure from the doctrine of justification by faith, as affirmed in the eleventh article of his church, and as is more largely explained in “*The Homily of Salvation*,” referred to in the article. As to Mr. Wesley, if, for a long course of years, as he seems to concede, he delivered the doctrine in such a dress, or with such adjuncts, or, as he says in a place to be quoted below, by “tacking to them a position which was not true”—a fact displayed at large, in “*The Vindication of the Minutes*,” there is no design of detracting from the merit of subsequent acknowledgement and revocation.

Praise is also due to Mr. Fletcher; who defends the said minutes, on the ground of the spreading of antinomian principles, “like

wild-fire," in some of the societies: impliedly the effect of the error of thirty preceding years. He goes on (p. 25—28) lamenting the consequences, in the abounding of carnal confidence, of ambition, of worldly mindedness, of spiritual blindness, of formality, of the neglect of relative duties, of knowledge without experience, of selfish views, and of the want of heathen morality. There is too much of all these, under every form of profession. What they are here noticed for, is the acknowledged cause of them, in an error confessed to have its origin, about the time when Mr. Wesley was excluded from the London pulpits. And yet, in the appeal printed in 1738, the exclusion is said to have been owing to "the preaching of inward salvation, now attainable by faith." If it mean, as the words seem to express, justification by faith, and deliverance from the inward dominion of sin, attainable by the influence of the same principle; this was so customarily preached in the Church of England, as of itself to render it probable, that there was included in the position something beyond what is visible in the letter of the complaint.

NOTE T.—Page 28.

On the question of the testimony of Dr. Whitehead, the competency of his authority is material. Any contradiction of his statements, on the part of the society to which he belonged, is not here known. That physician was one of three persons, to whom Mr. Wesley left his papers by will. It is generally understood, that after the other two had surrendered them to their colleague, for the writing of the life of the deceased, there arose a controversy between them; partly pecuniary, but principally on account of the biographer's refusal to subject his work to their control. His disapprobation of the secession then lately made in America, which appears in his book, may account for its not having the stamp of the approbation of the society. Had the brother of the deceased, the Reverend Charles Wesley, been the survivor and the biographer, the same objection would have lain. For when, above thirty years ago, he put into the hand which now writes, a pamphlet issued many years before by his brother and himself, containing reasons against separating from the Church of England, he said with emphasis—These are so many reasons against what has been

lately done in America. But enough of this, as the author of the Reply has not directly denied, that reliance may be placed on the statements of Dr. Whitehead.

After reconsidering the passage quoted from him, containing a thesis in a letter of Mr. Wesley to his brother, it is still conceived, that the view of it in the Essay is correct. Mr. Wesley proposes the question—Is justifying faith a sense of Pardon? He takes the negative. In the succeeding discussion, under the first head, he sets forth the importance of the question, and the extreme on each side. Under the second head, he professes to define justifying faith and a sense of pardon, going on, in the words quoted in the Essay, to deny that justifying faith is an assurance of pardon, or necessarily connected therewith. Under the third head, he gives reasons from Scripture and experience. Under the fourth and last head, he answers objections; the third of which is—“We have been exceedingly blessed, in preaching this doctrine.” The answer, which ought to have been exhibited by the author of the Reply, is especially worthy of notice. It is—“We have been exceedingly blessed in preaching the great truths of the gospel, although we tacked to them, in the simplicity of our hearts, a proposition which was not true.” What was this untrue proposition? It was—“Justifying faith is an assurance of pardon, or necessarily connected therewith.” Compare this with what is said in the appeal (p. 26) “Faith implies assurance.” Other like sayings might be produced. Is there any difference of sense, in those two positions? And is there not, in each of them, the identical doctrine which was preached in 1738, and deliberately revoked in 1747?

Mr. Wesley goes on to answer an objection, grounded on what is here believed to be a misinterpreted account of the sense of the Church of England, which he had quoted many years before, as in agreement with the sense of the matter then entertained by him, but which he supposes to be contrary to his present opinion. Accordingly, he appeals from it, to “the law and the testimony.”

What though the discussion of the thesis was proposed in a skeleton, to be filled up by his brother: the outlines must be supposed to have been weighed by the proposer; and especially so must have been the result, in which he speaks in his own person.

The sense of Dr. Whitehead on the subject, was evidently the same with that of the author of the *Essay*: which appears in the prefacing of the latter by saying, in reference to the unknown person under the name of John Smith—"I think it had some influence on Mr. Wesley's mind." Between the words great and some, there must be confessed a difference. The latter ought to have been in the *Essay*: and the only apology of the author for his inaccuracy, is the impression on his mind from the perusal of the work, that what the pen of an intimate friend called some, was indeed great. Whether there be cause of the impression, will be seen in what is to follow.

Dr. Whitehead records, that in the month of July, 1747, when Mr. Wesley wrote the letter, the controversy with John Smith was drawing towards a conclusion. In the pages immediately preceding, there are minutes of four conferences; the last of which was in June of the same year. One of the questions is—"What is faith?" The answer, after defining justifying faith, adds—"Immediately the spirit bears witness, thou art pardoned," &c. If this be not a necessary connexion, what words could have been more expressive of such a circumstance? Under the answer to the next question, it is affirmed, that no man can be justified, and not know it. Let this be compared with the skeleton, and let them be reconciled if possible.

If the skeleton be still supposed to have been misrepresented, there is confirmation of the sense given of it, in a reproving letter in the year 1768. (Whitehead vol. 2, p. 310) to a preacher of the name of James Morgan. This man had given offence, by preaching that all mourning penitents were in the favour of God. Mr. Wesley holds to the general rule—"They who are in the favour of God, know they are so." But he concedes—"There may be some exceptions. Some may fear and love God, and yet not be clearly conscious of his favour. At least, they may not dare to affirm, that their sins are forgiven." Could Mr. Wesley have been now of the same mind, as when he said—"Faith is a sure trust which a man hath in God, that his sins are forgiven?" Or when he sanctioned the above cited minute of a conference—"Immediately, the same spirit bears witness, thou art pardoned?"

The following, is from the life of Mr. Wesley by John Hampson. He had ceased to be a member of the Society, but continued to esteem its founder. He quotes (vol. 3; p. 50) from Mr. Wesley thus—"Near fifty years ago, the preachers were not sufficiently apprized of the difference between a servant and a child of God. They did not clearly understand, that every one who feareth God and worketh righteousness is accepted of him. In consequence of this, they were apt to make sad the hearts of those, whom God had not made sad. For they frequently asked those who feared God—"Do you know that your sins are forgiven? And upon their answering no, immediately replied—then are you a child of the devil." For the above, Mr. Hampson quotes Mr. Wesley's Sermons, without noticing the place. Accordingly, the passage is given on the authority of the said biographer. If he be correct, and if we set aside all question as to the distinction between a servant and a child of God; can it be conceived, that Mr. Wesley would have written in this manner, before the correspondence with John Smith?

In Mr. Wesley's Journal, November 27th, 1750, published in 1756, he enumerates sundry faults found by him with the doctrines of the "Unitas Fratrum." The fourth point is—"That there is no such thing as degrees in faith, or weak faith; since he has no faith, who has any doubt or fear." It is added—"How to reconcile this with what I heard the Count say at large, that a man may have justifying faith, and not know it, I cannot tell." In the Essay, there is noticed the contrariety of Count Zinzendorf's testimony to that of Peter Bohler, and Mr. Wesley's adherence to the latter. Is there no evidence, that he had changed his ground? The question of the consistency of the Count, is irrelative to the present purpose.

The relevancy of what follows, must depend on the correctness of the reasoning of the writer, from the facts to be stated: which have weight on his mind, disposing to the admission of the positive evidence offered, to prove there having been a change in the mind of Mr. Wesley.

In his appeal (p. 10) he notices as follows—"Infants indeed our church supposes to be justified in baptism, although they cannot

then either believe or repent. But she expressly requires both repentance and faith, in those who come to be baptized when they are of riper years." Consistently with this, he makes the following entry in his journal, in the year 1738—"I believe, till I was about ten years old, I had not sinned away that washing of the Holy Ghost, which was given me in baptism." And his friend Mr. Fletcher, above forty years afterwards, states more at large (vol. 2, p. 149 and 195) the doctrine of justification of infants in baptism, precisely as it appears in the institutions of the Church of England. It seems to follow, that during the opening of the understanding of an infant child of God, and during the progress of a religious education, and during continuance in grace as in the case of young Wesley—and who can say, that his integrity, or another's in a like state, might not have continued—it is impossible there should take place a species of assurance, declared to be given with an incipient state of grace, and with that only. The inference is, that of the two opinions, one of them must eat out the other. The work of Mr. Fletcher, must have had the approbation of Mr. Wesley. Concerning the first check, it is said in the preface to the second, that he had read it in manuscript, and—let it be noticed to his honour—that he had expunged every tart expression. How far this statement should have weight on the present question, must be left to the judgment of every reader.

If Mr. Fletcher, in saying (p. 83) as quoted in the Essay, with many things to the same effect, and (two pages after) in describing the lamentable courses of many, consequent on their declarations that they were justified and sanctified in a moment, did not lay less stress on assurance of an immediate communication of pardon, than had been laid on it in the original profession, he has expressed himself in terms very liable to be misunderstood: which ought not to be easily admitted, of so clear headed a writer. One passage from him, was given in the Essay: which was prudently passed over in the Reply; it being very little in unison with the commendation, of "the precious and evangelical" tendency of the doctrine.

Without travelling further into the work of Mr. Fletcher, it may suffice to take up the matter as delivered by Jonathan Crowther. The author of the Reply says (p. 36) that exceptions prove



the rule. Yes; where the exceptions themselves are first established. But there are some rules, admitting of no exception: as—“This is the love of God, that we keep his commandments:” and—“Let no corrupt communication proceed out of your mouth.” The rule cited in the Reply—“He that believeth not shall be damned,” must have been intended of those only, in whom the exercise of faith was possible. It was no more possible to idiots and infants, who are mentioned as exceptions, than to sheep or horses.

The Reply defines the exceptions of Jonathan Crowther, as comprehending bare possibility. This does not seem to be the meaning. To begin with ignorance. If this be an exception in any instance; it must especially apply, where the knowledge of there being such a test is wanting. If the distinction had been admitted by Mr. Wesley, how safely might he have abstained from the self-reproach, of having been a Pharisee through so long a tract of time! In the whole of which, although spending much of his time in the study of the scriptures, and in prayer for the right understanding of them, he does not appear to have heard of the matter in question, until he learned it from Peter Bohler. When learned, it took such firm possession, as not to yield to the contrary instruction of his superiour—Count Zinzendorf.

The article of bodily complaints, must be supposed to include such as rest on the nervous system: which has so great an influence on the movements of the mind, as to dispense with all concern in the business in a numerous class of persons.

The violence of temptation is so indefinite an expression, that it is difficult to know what sort of persons, if their religious desires be otherwise correct, may not hold the impression to be unnecessary in their cases. For every man knows “the sore of his own heart,” and no other man can judge of the force of his temptation.

In regard to all these impediments, it seems unreasonable to suppose, that they can be bars against the energy of a communication from “the Father of our Spirits.” It was no part of the original theory of Mr. Wesley; nor can it now, consistently, be a part of the theory of those, who consider exception as a bare possibility.

Concerning the note on Dr. Clarke's Commentary, the author of the Essay will not return to the author of the Reply his compliment of the thick fog. It will be more consistent with the ideas of decorum entertained by the former, to say that the latter, under the astonishment which he confesses to have seized him, has misunderstood the kind of inconsistency intended to be affirmed. It consisted of a doctrine originally preached without the limits, to which it was now submitting. It does not follow, that the majority may not adhere to the doctrine in its first shape. If this be the case, which is neither affirmed nor denied, the greater is the inconsistency of the esteem in which Mr. Wesley's later as well as earlier positions are held; and of the approbation, which, it is said, is extended to the work of Jonathan Crowther. When Dr. Clarke, after quoting the words "with our spirits," puts as synonymous "to our understanding," it is as much as saying, that the words admit of being so translated; which is not correct. As to what follows in the same note, of the influence thereby exercised over the operations of the soul generally, the same may be the effect of what comes through the medium of the senses. If the author of the Reply possess such a knowledge of the Greek, as to be able to show, that "understanding"—call it either translation or interpretation—answers to "spirit" in the English Bible, he will add to the publick stock of criticism. Or, if he can make out the use of the word by Dr. Clarke, to be the same with that of Mr. Wesley, as follows; it will be the discovery of an agreement not very obvious.

For Mr. Wesley's translation, to which he the most inclined, although he says he will not contend for it, there may be reference to Jonathan Crowther's Portraiture, p. 165. The favoured translation, not supported by the original, is "beareth witness to our spirits:" which, in the next page, is clearly distinguished from the rational testimony of our own spirits, and said to precede it. If this be not to combine two witnesses, or, what is in effect the same, to ascribe to one the testimony predicated concerning both, how could it have been done more significantly? It is true, that Mr. Wesley goes on to speak particularly of the rational testimony of our own spirit, and to sustain it by texts. But there is not one of

them, that has an especial bearing on an incipient state of grace. Therefore, in that crisis, there must be a combining of two witnesses; or else a confining to one of what is said of both, in order to constitute the testimony in question. This is without any faulting of Dr. Clarke's construction of the pronoun "*autro*," which is conceived to be correct. The word "ear" was a typographical error. The nonsense of "ear said," would have been considered by most Repliers, as excusing them from any remarks predicated on an opposite construction.

NOTE U.—Page 31.

While the author of the Essay is desirous of acknowledging in the most explicit manner, that he has unintentionally given a partial quotation of what Mr. Wesley transcribed from "The Homily of Salvation;" it seems the more surprising, that after an accurate quoting of the Homily, and thus qualifying the reader to judge of the correctness of the interpretation, he should, a few lines below, give a defective summary of the very passage he had been reciting. He quotes as follows—"The right and true Christian faith is, not only to believe the holy scriptures and the articles of our faith are true; but also to have a sure trust and confidence, to be saved from everlasting damnation through Christ." Of this, Mr. Wesley says to his opponent—"You are a member of the Church of England—Are you? Then hear the Church. Faith is a sure trust which a man hath in God, that his sins are forgiven." Is there no difference between the Homily, and the construction thus given? The latter, makes faith to consist in the sense of forgiveness. The former, lays down the ground of the subject in scripture, and the articles of our faith. It is impossible, under a right knowledge of these, to exercise faith and repentance; and not entertain a sure trust, in the mercy of God through Christ.

NOTE V.—Page 32.

It has not a little confirmed the present writer in his opinion of the incorrectness of the controverted position, that on many occasions of stating his objections to persons with an opposite bias, they have combated them in his presence and in subsequent report, by identifying them with other matters; from the imputation of

which, his most positive declarations have not been sufficient to relieve him. Into this track they are conceived to fall, often with the best intentions; partly from the law of association, which, in their minds, connects the favourite tenet with every thing spiritual in religion; and partly from the untenableness of it, when brought to the test of scripture. Hence, the denying of it is said to be the denying of the forgiveness of sin—of inward salvation—of vital godliness, &c.

It is more remarkable, that there should be the same error in the deliberate writing and printing of a pamphlet. But the misconstruction is chargeable on the Reply. What else could have occasioned the author of it to hold up the author of the Essay, as denying the influence of the Holy Spirit, in making the gospel “the power of God unto salvation” (p. 5)—as setting aside the necessity of knowing the things of God, both notionally and experimentally (p. 12)—of favouring the want of feeling of the pardon of sin, such as would have been the cases of the Parlytick and Eneas, in the not being sensible of their cures (p. 15)—of making light of the conversion of the heart (p. 9)—and of considering baptism as evidence of grace, sufficiently satisfactory (p. 20.) All these are now disavowed, and it is denied that they are in the Essay: and yet, if the Reply were stripped of every thing of the sort, and of the observations founded on them, it would be reduced to a very small size.

The first of the said erroneous tenets, the author of the Reply seems especially desirous of fastening on the author of the Essay. And yet, it is directly contradicted in a passage, on the page next to that which was the subject of remark. The same stands in this republication, at the head of page 9th.

On the last of the same tenets, the author of the Reply (p. 20) has again shown his management of italicks. The words in the Essay are—“Evidence sufficiently satisfactory, of the grace promised to accompany it.” No grace is promised to any other adults, than such as are penitent and believing. With the help of italicks, put to the preceding part of the clause, the eye is drawn from the words which follow. By this, the mind becomes prepared, in the next sentence but one, for what is unhesitatingly given as the opinion of the Essay, that “baptism is an evidence of inward grace,

*sufficiently satisfactory:*” there being left out the circumstance of promise, which might have recalled the attention to the intended objects of it. It is in this part of the Reply, that the author of the Essay is suspected of the want of *spiritual* discernment; a talent not to be coveted, in the sense of being occupied as above. The preceding charge has not yet spent itself: for, with the repetition on the 23d page, that “baptism alone is evidence *sufficiently satisfactory,*” it is made a ground of the inference—that “every charge to self-examination might have been spared, and every reference to the fruits of righteousness, as evidences of a religious state.” This is fair reasoning; and not the sophistry, which is one of the articles of accusation, brought against the author of the Essay. But while he acknowledges the correctness of the inference, he is not envious of the *spiritual* discernment, which made the fancied discovery of the premises.

From the repetitions of the aforesaid passage of the Essay, in a mutilated state in the Reply, there is ground for the suspicion, that the author of the latter was especially desirous of loading the former with the stigma, of arrogating to the mere ceremony of baptism, the power of conferring grace. Let there then be again noticed, although at the expense of repetition, the occasion supposed to have been given. The person spoken of is Saul, formerly a sinner, but now penitent and believing. This case being contemplated, the proposal of Ananias, recorded in Acts xxii. 16, was stated to be sufficient ground of an assurance of forgiveness, without an inward voice to the effect. The author of the Reply, rejects this expression. Let it be abandoned, although furnished by Mr. Wesley, as may be seen in the extract from him by Jonathan Crowther, p. 168, l. 24. Let there be taken “impression,” or any other word of the same founder of the society. But let there not rest the imputation of extending the remark to any person, in a state of known sin.

The taking of such courses—that is, the identifying of the denial of the tenet with extraneous matter; although there may not always be the accompaniments which the author of the Reply so liberally employs; is here conceived to be the only way, in which the tenet itself can be plausibly maintained. The author would consider it as a failing in himself; were he possessed of much

sensibility on the subject. But he does not affect, to be indifferent to it. The Reply notices, that passages of authors may be cited, without due regard to connexion. This happens, sometimes by mistake, and sometimes by design. Whether by mistake or by design, it is seldom so glaring as in him who makes the remark, when he cites the authorities of Dr. Paley and Dr. Buchanan, in order to aggravate the charge of the dispensing with the conversion of the heart. The same fault is still more unjustifiable, when he strips sentences of clauses essential to their respective senses; of which the result, so far as can be accomplished, is the loading of the accused party with the odium of denying truths, acknowledged by him habitually in the use of the offices of his Church.

There may be errors in the making of quotations, which the writer of this ought to be the more ready to concede, on account of an error made by himself, in the quoting of Mr. Wesley; although not having the effect of ascribing to him any opinion which he can be supposed not to have entertained. But when, as at present, mutilations of sentences are many, and uniformly tending to lay the charge of opinions inconsistent with the integrity of the Christian faith, it must be consolatory to a mind not wishing to be uncharitable, that the author of the Reply has laid the ground of an apology for himself, in his professing not to understand the phraseology of the author of the Essay: in whom, it would be rash to calculate the degree of the obscurity of his performance.

He does not know, whether such allowance ought not to be claimed by himself, in his interpreting of the controverted position, as maintained by Mr. Wesley. The said eminent man, however generally intelligible, has given, at different times, what seem to be such different views of the same subject, that perhaps he may have been occasionally misunderstood. In the appeal, faith itself is defined to be assurance of the forgiveness of sin. In a work quoted by Jonathan Crowther (p. 162, l. 4) assurance is said to be "of the essence of faith, or rather a property thereof." To be of the essence of the subject, is not exactly the same with the being itself: and to be a property of it, supposes the existence of the subject to which the other is superadded. An impression, is still further from the original definition: because the fact of forgiveness

must exist in the Divine mind, before there can be made an impression of it from that source, on the mind of the person forgiven. When at last it comes to the point stated in the Skeleton, that assurance is not necessarily connected with faith, the original matter is removed beyond the reach of an ordinary understanding.

Perhaps, even the author of the Reply found some difficulty in determining at what spot to take his stand, on the ground of these minute distinctions. He has not proceeded with Mr. Wesley, to the last mentioned of his opinions: but he has gone (p. 33) to the extent of acknowledging a difference between the doctrine of justifying faith, and that of the sense of pardon. This cannot be called the last thought in his pamphlet; but, in imitation of the talent for comparison displayed in the last paragraph but one, the liberty is taken of considering it as the best thought. In the said paragraph, although there is a mutilation of the last sentence in the Essay, it was not with the design of making the author odious. The only design, in this instance, was to render him ridiculous. To accomplish this, it was necessary to disengage the sentiment from two qualifications, intended to accompany it. It ought in justice to be noticed, that these may have been overlooked, during the astonishment in which the author of the Reply confesses himself to have been thrown on this occasion, as on another.

Had he, on recovery, reviewed the passage, he might have perceived a warrant for it, in what St. Paul has said (1. Cor. iii. 11—15) in his comparative valuation of different materials, laid on the same foundation. On the ground of this authority, there shall now be a repetition of the last sentence in the Essay, enlarged in language, but not in sense; and for the aiding of the apprehension of the author of the Reply, with the qualifications which he has overlooked, made the more conspicuous by being printed in italicks. The astonishing sentiment is, that should an advocate of the rejected tenet, be *possessed of the fruits of the Spirit in his heart and in his life*, his opinion will not exclude him from the covenanted mercies of the gospel, although it may not be *harmless in its influence over others*.

## ERRATA.

- Page 7, line from bottom 6, wanting “—.”  
10, 2, for “Etheopean” read “Ethiopian.”  
13, 20, wanting “—.”  
16, last line, for “eared” read “feared.”  
35, line from bottom 2, comma misplaced.  
41, line 1, for “word” read “work.”  
43, line 23, for “truth” read “tenet.”

---

For Sale, by Møses Thomas,

*The following Works of the same Author:*

**Lectures on the Catechism of the Protestant Episcopal Church: with explanatory Dissertations. 4 vol. 8vo.**

**AND,**

**Comparative Views of the Controversy between the Calvinists and the Arminians. 2 vols. 8vo.**



A

# REVIEW

OF THE

QUESTION OF A PERSONAL ASSURANCE

OF

PARDON OF SIN,

BY A DIRECT COMMUNICATION OF THE HOLY SPIRIT;

IN AN ESSAY AND NOTES ON THE SUBJECT; AND IN A REPLY AND A FARTHER  
REPLY TO THE SAME:

THE TWO LAST BEING UNDER THE SIGNATURE OF  
*JOHN EMORY,*

A MINISTER OF THE GOSPEL, OF THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

WITH

AN APPENDIX,

ON THE NOTICE OF THE SUBJECT, IN THE QUARTERLY  
REVIEW BY THE REV. E. S. ELY, A. M.

---

BY W<sup>M</sup>. WHITE, D. D.

BISHOP OF THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH, IN THE COMMONWEALTH OF  
PENNSYLVANIA.


---

PHILADELPHIA:

PUBLISHED BY MOSES THOMAS, NO. 52, CHESTNUT STREET.

Printed at the Office of the United States' Gazette.

1818.



## PREFACE.

That the present pamphlet is a review of the three pamphlets preceding it, is owing to a persuasion on the mind of the author, of its being the best way of sustaining the object of the essay: an opportunity being thus given of showing, how lightly some material points have been touched, and how some have been overlooked on the other side; and of putting out of view much matter, that has no bearing on the question. In fact, the author is of opinion, that, if so disposed, he might express unqualified assent to the greater part of the "Farther Reply," without the surrender of a particle of his own argument.

As, in the preface to his former pamphlet, he declined the degrading of the congregations under his care, by complying with a call to bring their concerns before the publick; he now extends the determination to the Episcopal Church at large; which the replier, in his second work [p. 26—29] has thought proper to hold up to view, in a disadvantageous comparison with the body of professing christians to which he belongs. But, the present author is considered as having thrown the first stone. This is not so; and it is evident, that if the replier so construed the second appendix to the Essay, he did not calculate on its being perceived by his readers:

which appears in his disjoining of the appendix from its proper place. No one will deny the privilege of a writer, to chuse the arrangement of his work. The complaint is, that there was a deviation from the form chosen, in a single instance; not to be accounted for, by any thing on the face of the transaction; other than the giving of the appearance of an attack on a body of people, to what was written in reference to a single point in their religious system.

The consideration of heavy charges against the orthodoxy of the Essay, having been forced on the author of it, there may be propriety in this place, to say something of the attendant personality.

The Farther Replier considers it as a circumstance taking off the edge of personality, that he was answering an anonymous pamphlet. Had there been a desire to remain unknown—which was not the case—such secrecy was prevented by sufficient intimation of the person, without the mention of his name. That an individual was in view, is evident over the whole fourth page of the reply. He is described as a person advanced in years; as having ministered to the same people through a long course of time, and in page 13, he is thought to be “high in office:” terms doubtless designed to be expressive of his presiding in the church of which he is a minister. These things, taken in connexion with a reference to the Episcopal Church all along, left no doubt as to the

object of the attack. Besides, it is supposed capable of proof, that the authorship had been communicated on credible authority. Under these circumstances, it was hardly worth while to reject responsibility for the appearance of the name in the newspapers; although in this there would have been more consistency, had there been accounted for its appearing in several papers, during several successive days. In all this, whatever may have been the indecorum, there would have been no injury; but for the groundless constructions to be noticed in their proper places, and still contended to be correctly fastened on the Essay.

The author has reached a period of life, when he ought to be able to say like St. Paul—"With me, it is a very small thing that I should be judged of you, or of man's judgment." But it is something, although comparatively very small, and it has not escaped attention, not only that the charges of the Replier will be read in this city, by many who will never read the answers to them; but also that they will travel to districts, in which not a copy of the answers will appear.

In the preface to the former pamphlet, the author professed the design of avoiding the retaliation of incivility. But the "Farther Reply," [Note to p. 15] adduces an instance, in which it is intimated, that the line of conduct has been departed from. It is, where the bad effect of a serious charge was apprehended [Notes, page 34] on

the minds of those who would take it on the credit of the Replier. The author supposes it not too much to expect, that among people to whom he has been ministering forty five years, his avowing in print of sentiments in contrariety to what he has been delivering to them from the pulpit and otherwise, through that long tract of time, would not be believed on the credit of a stranger. At the same time, it was not overlooked, that many, not entertaining either favourable prejudice or the contrary towards either of the parties, would be reluctant to suppose of any minister of the Gospel, his preferring of such charges against any other minister, without at least specious ground for the procedure. This took place in sundry instances for a time, and was soon corrected, as the author has been credibly informed.

Let it be remembered, in reference to the credit of the Replier, that how far his charges, in the judgment of charity, ought to be ascribed to mistake, was left at large. Even if it should be conceived, that the faulty spirit, often generated by controversy, had its operation in the case; there would not, necessarily, be the charge of intended falsehood. It is a matter not in itself impossible, that this spirit may have generated personal resentment, where the parties have been otherwise unknown to one another.

## A REVIEW

OR

# THE QUESTION, &c.

*Section 1.—Of the title of the Essay.*

IT denied the position of a personal assurance of the pardon of sin, by a direct communication of the Holy Spirit. The property of “direct” was to distinguish from another species of satisfaction, noticed not far below, in which there is explicitly confessed the agency of the Holy Spirit. The property of “personal” was to distinguish the contradicted assurance, from those cases of it in scripture which were personal, but through the medium of the senses. This species of personal assurance, seemingly imputed to the author but rejected by him, was any thing which may be imagined, like those instances of it from the mouth of the Saviour in person. The replier triumphs, in having gained an acknowledgment to the above effect. But there would not have appeared any ground for this; if there had been thought a call to give, with the acknowledgment, the following words designed to qualify it.—“He did not deny the application of the benefit to the individual believer, on the general ground of the promises of the gospel; with his knowledge of the state of his own mind, and under the ordinary operations of the Holy Spirit” [Essay page 9.]

In regard to the benefit, it is attempted in the Farther Reply, to fasten on the author an inconsistency with what he had said in a former publication, which speaks of a drawback in proportion to experience of deficiency. The meaning is, that in the promises of God, there should be confidence without reserve; but that in proportion to deficiency, there should apply the admonition—"Let him that thinketh he standeth, take heed lest he fall." For the sake of any reader, who may wish further exposition, there shall be here a reference to a lucid one given by Dr. Witherspoon, vol. 1. p. 176.

There may be degrees of the assurance on the latter point mentioned above, but not on the former; which is the species contended for on the other side, and to be without drawback, in compliance with the terms "assurance" and "much assurance," as supposed (*ibid*) to be distinguished in scripture. There is no such distinction there. It was stated in the Essay [page 23] on what is here supposed the uncontradicted authority of Dr. Campbell, that the word translated "full and much assurance," always means either conviction or accomplishment. "Assurance" is not from any word of the same root; and, as an affection of the mind, is commonly denoted by the words expressive of belief.

*Section 2.—Of the state of the question.*

It is announced in the second paragraph—"independently on personal application," meaning, not that there existed such independency; but, that for the space of a few lines, and for the sake of distinctness, the connexion of the two subjects was to be put out of view. The



second sentence of the paragraph, is an amplification of the first; and although the former has been treated as not having any bearing on the latter, it is by a very singular species of criticism. In the second paragraph, there comes in the question, as it relates to application to person: and as one of the concurring grounds of satisfaction was the consciousness of the party; the short discussion does not conclude, without recognising it to be “produced by the suasive and insensible operations of the Holy Spirit; of which we are no otherwise conscious than through the medium of the gracious habits of the mind, any more than we have the knowledge of the wind, except by its agency in nature.”

Nothing further appearing of the displeasure of the replier with the word “insensible” as introduced in this place; it may be hoped that he apprehends the meaning, and is reconciled to the use of it. In the Reply, it was treated as indicative of material error.

The second paragraph, has been here considered in connexion with the initiatory sentence of the former one, in order to show the entire want of ground in the imputation to be noticed. In this first paragraph, the Essay, speaking independently on personal application, which was to be provided for below in the second paragraph, goes on to say—“It is the gospel, as contained in Holy Scripture, which is the power of God unto salvation; and the knowledge of this gospel, is brought to us in the same way with that of any other subject.” Here it is, that there comes in the charge of the unsoundness of the author. He added, indeed, in order to show that he was speaking of the outward word only—“For faith cometh by hearing.” The Farther Reply pleads, that this being

only a reason of what went before, there was no obligation to repeat it. The obligation is not affirmed on any other ground, than that it would have enabled the reader to judge of the merits of the imputation. What avails the stress laid on the word "for?" as if the reason given for an affirmation, may not be explanatory of it. There is a set-off, in the author's having omitted the words of St. Paul—"To every one that believeth." They made no part of his intended statement of a single question, in the next paragraph. In distinguishing, whatever is superfluous tends only to embarrass. The author, never contemplated the denying of the agency of the Holy Spirit, in the act of faith. Had he been of that mind, he might have brought in the words with the mental reserve of a Pelagian; and might have recollected, that, according to his theory, faith is produced by the unassisted action of the natural powers of man.

The bolder step of adding to the terms of the Essay, is repelled by the replier in his second work, by alleging that it was the deduction of his own argument in the first. The words are—"the knowledge of other subjects may be attained to"—implying the knowledge of this subject also—"without the influence of the Holy Spirit." Had this been given as the deduction of the replier, and not as the sense of the essayist, there would have been no pertinency in the comment, that the knowledge in question may be attained to by "men of corrupt minds and reprobate concerning the faith." Who knows not, that a charge may be made in the form of an inference?

There is the more notice to be taken of this way of writing, as it appears often on the faces of the two replies. The way is this—the replier, in the beginning of his remarks on some point, states it in the words of the person against whom he writes. But in the issue, he brings in the contradicted principle, still holding it up as maintained on the other side; and by a small but important variation of the words, not likely to be noticed by any other than a very attentive reader, gives a different complexion from that intended.

There shall be given an instance similar to the above, and on the present subject. The Farther Reply (page 13) taking it up, not as in the Essay and early in the notes, but as briefly glanced at in note V. (page 64) vindicates himself against the charge of “representing the author of the Essay as denying the influence of the Holy Spirit in making”—the meaning in the Essay is the Holy Spirit’s making, and not the author’s making—“the gospel the power of God unto salvation.” The replier ascribes to the words an absurd sense, not intended; and then as if to fix it, varies the sentence to—*on account of his holding &c.* The words in italicks, are not the author’s; but they help to give the air of unreasonableness to a supposed sense, which ascribed a very improbable censure to the pen of the replier.

To return to the charge in question: why should he have exercised his ingenuity on clauses of sentences and on words, in order to find out a sense in contrariety to what was before him, in language not to be misunderstood, of the agency of the Holy Spirit in man’s salvation. It appears in two places in the beginning of the Essay; and more fully, in the last paragraph of the

second appendix to it. Independently on those passages directly to the point; the charge is sustained by such a wire-drawing, as, if applied to the scriptures, might convict them of heresy in innumerable places: particularly in the only two passages, as yet under notice—of both which it might be pretended, that the apostle meant no more than such a gospel, as is attainable by men of corrupt minds, and received by such a hearing, as is given in schools and colleges; a meaning charged by the replier on the present writer, on no better ground. For the apostle has not guarded against misconstruction, by the mention of the Holy Spirit in these places.

The replier's charge of the author's want of fidelity in his ministry, appears (page 4) in the deduction of a certain doctrine from the terms of the title of the Essay, and in an appeal—introduced in the not uncommon form of inquiry—to the fact of its not being preached by him who held it. An admonition to do this, was fairly considered as implication; especially when taken with the reference to an Aquila or a Priscilla, to qualify for the work. The Farther Reply [page 7] distinguishes between the positive and the hypothetical: the latter of which only, is applied to the religious state of the congregations, with which the essayist is connected. But does not every one know, that it is common to insinuate reproaches not to be misunderstood, under the forms of hypothesis? If any one can construe the words—“By their fruits ye shall know them”—taken in their connexion, in any other sense than as containing a caution against the essayist to his hearers, let the replier have the full benefit of whatever judgment and impartiality may belong to the construer. Let the same be

conceded to the interpretation of any person, who cannot perceive the charge of unfaithfulness, when the replier on his third page “supposed”—if the word be preferred to “alleged”—the belief of a certain species of assurance: when on the next page, he intimated, that, if preached, there must be the fruits of it among the hearers: and when he asked—“Is this the case”—adding, “the friends of this doctrine will be very happy to learn that it is.”

The Farther Replier denies, that he either alleged or supposed. That he did not use the words, is conceded. But that he made an effort to prove it by his management of italicks, is manifest. The species of proof is no longer continued: but it remains on record in the Reply.

In another place, the author is charged with inaccuracy more properly. The Farther Replier [page 15. N.] truly affirms that the advice on the subject of prayer, stated in the notes [page 51] was not given. The advice is always good; but, if it had been given as incorrectly stated, would not have been well-timed. The impression was too hastily admitted, from an expression on the 25 page of the reply.

The author did not consider as offensive, the charge of being theologically obscure to strangers. He would rather wish to receive instruction on the point, although it may be too late in life for profit. But he does not perceive any connexion between this, and the obscurity referred to in the Farther Reply [page 8] manifested in his having been misrepresented by well-intentioned persons, as denying in conversation forgiveness of sin, vital godliness, &c. The fact was better accounted for

[page 64] from an accidental association of ideas. The differences between the subjects were thought very clear, although known to be confounded from that cause by certain descriptions of persons: among whom, however, he did not expect to find a person coming forwards, without contradiction, as the mouth of a numerous society,—see reply, page 40, two last lines.

In like manner as above, some people, still with the best intentions, represent the use of forms of prayer, as necessarily destitute of every thing spiritual in the exercise; others charge their Christian brethren, with de-crying meetings for the special purpose of prayer, when the thing objected to is a species of prayer, not accounted either rational or scriptural; and others would even deny there being any spiritual influence on either the prayers or the preachings of the replier himself, merely because he has set times for those exercises; and especially, if he should avow the revolving of the subjects of them previously in his mind.—It is not from real obscurity on the points respectively. At an early period of the life of him who now writes, he was in danger of being considered as an atheist, by an aged woman not wanting in esteem for him; for no other reason, than that in relation to some recent incidents related by her as unequivocally the deeds of witchcraft, he endeavoured to convince her that there was no such art, and that the facts might be traced to natural causes. It was the result of a false association of ideas, as in the other cases.

*Section 5. Of the test of Archbishop Usher.*

The substance of it is, that a man, conscious of the exercise of faith and repentance, may infer on the war-

rant of the promises of God in scripture, that his sins are pardoned. The position on the other side is, that there must be what is called sometimes an impression, sometimes a voice, sometimes a feeling, sometimes, as in the Reply [page 6] a consciousness, and always a something direct and personal from the Holy Spirit, to the effect. The replier professed to hold the subject not in contrariety to Usher, but in accordance with him. It was answered, that to make out this, he ought to have shown, not merely that he does not contradict the test given, but that he has not added to it, thereby representing it to be insufficient. This interpretation is not controverted in the "Farther Reply;" but there is produced a passage from the same work of the pious and learned prelate, which, if the construction were admitted, would prove him inconsistent with himself. The place given, does not either speak of or imply a direct and personal communication of the Holy Spirit. It is "the Holy Ghost is in the hearts of God's children,"—yes, in their hearts, through the medium of what he produces there—"the pledge of Christ's preference,—the witness of their adoption—the guide of their life—the comforter of their soul—the seal of their redemption—the first-fruits of their Salvation." Can any conceive, that these things have a bearing on the question of a direct communication? If there should be such, let them attend to the next question and answer [page 86] concerning which it is to be hoped, that although so near, they did not meet the eye of the Farther Replier.—"But how are you assured, that you have the Spirit?" says the archbishop, precisely to the present point. "Answer:

because it hath convinced my judgment—converted my soul—and having mixed the word with my faith”—evidently in that conviction and conversion, from which faith cannot be separated—“it has become as life to quicken me—as water to cleanse me—as oil to cheer me—as fire to melt and refine me.” It will be pertinent to remark the coincidence of the train of sentiment of the archbishop, with that of his church in the homily of Whitsunday. The author will not hesitate to add—with his own sentiments, as delivered on the first page of his former work.

Bishop Pearson is again introduced in the Farther Reply [page 14 ] The author stated in his notes [page 49] that this sensible prelate, under the first article of the creed, had given an account of faith; and under another article had explained forgiveness of sin, in ways inconsistent with the opposite theory. When the Farther Replier, without notice of these facts, can permit himself to present from the same work another passage; it may be left to speak for itself, under the general remark that it is nothing to the purpose.

One of the last authors expected to have been produced in favour of the position is Dr. Hammond, as his name appears in a note of page 77. If any should doubt of the contrariety of the sentiments of this divine to the position in the title page, there might be reference to many passages in his commentary: but notice shall be confined to the thirteenth paragraph of his short postscript on divine illumination prefixed to it. The quotation on the other side, has no bearing on the subject.



*Section 4. Of the Essayist's first objection to the Position*

This objection was grounded on the fact, that John the Baptist, although the object of his commission was to preach the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins, never intimated such a test of it, as is contended for on the other side. This is not contradicted; but it is alleged, that he pointed to the Messiah's future baptism by the Holy Ghost. It was remarked in answer, that on such a ground, all the saints of old are left without the benefit: for as to the distinction between a less and a greater degree of clearness; it has not only no place in the promise of what happened at Pentecost, but leaves behind the question of assurance. Here is a difficulty, not attempted to be resolved by any of the texts in the "Farther Reply," extending from page 46 to 50. There is however among them one text, having especial relation to the ministry of the baptist. It is [Luke 1. 77] "To give knowledge of salvation unto his people, by the remission of their sins," and it is contended, that an experimental knowledge is contemplated. Certainly, none other is available: but may not theoretick knowledge fall on minds, which the other shall never reach? Else, what shall we make of the saying of St Paul [1 Cor. 8. i.] "knowledge puffeth up, but charity edifyeth?" If this should be unacceptable from the present pen, let the same be taken from the pen of Dr. Doddridge; where, paraphrasing the text from St. Luke, he has it—"To give the knowledge of eternal salvation to his people, in directing them how they are to obtain the forgiveness of their sins." To be made to know the way is one matter: to reach the benefit, is another.

*Section 5. Of the second objection.*

It affirmed, that the position is not to be found in the discourses of our Saviour. There is nothing produced to the contrary, except those places in the gospel of St. John, in which the Saviour promises what was accomplished at Pentecost. It would be tedious repetition, to go on to prove, under each of these texts, that it is irrelative to the subject.

But it is contended, that in the case of Eneas, Acts 9. 34 and of course in similar cases in the gospels, there must have been an inward sense of pardon. Who doubts it? The question is, whether the said inward sense may not have been produced by the speech of the Saviour, or of an Apostle, taken in by the ear? This is a point, which does not come within the notice of the Replier. As to the agency of the Holy Spirit in the way of application, it is wide of the question of direct communication.

In the passage under review, what is meant by the feeling of Eneas? If it be of his bodily cure, it is foreign to the purpose. If it be of the forgiveness of his sins, there is not a word concerning it. The probability, perhaps the presumption may be, that this was so: in which case, his repentance and faith must be presumed also. All these things being presumed, it was natural that he should have a joyful feeling, consequent on his new state. But there is a manifest difference between this, and the feelings being the evidence of his pardon and the warrant for his assurance; which is the matter understood on the other side.

Under this head, there arose the question between the two litigants, as to the admission of more causes than are necessary to an effect. There is a philosophical

maxim, forbidding this. When the author supposed the meaning of the maxim to be obvious, he thought the terms were so. When he expected them to be obvious to students of theology in particular, he meant, not the terms, but the truth of the proposition, as an axiom not requiring proof: for it is the shape in which it meets the eye, in systems of natural science. That the meaning of the words themselves were out of the view of the Replier while he was writing, appears in his continually confounding of the two ideas of a single cause and a sufficient cause. He now [page 19] rests the correctness of his statement on the 14th and 15th pages of "The Reply." On those pages, the present author is willing to rest the propriety of his own statement. There are two cases; in the former of which, neither of the given forces was equal to the effect; and in the latter, both were contemplated as necessary by divine wisdom: and yet in each case, there is held to be a contradiction of the maxim, that no more causes are to be admitted, than the effect in question requires. What is especially remarkable, in the first of the above instances, the fall of a house is supposed to be owing partly to winds and floods, and partly to the insufficiency of its foundation: whereas the maxim relates entirely to divine agency, and has no bearing on any effect, to which the unskillfulness or the ignorance of man contributes.

The Farther Replier thinks [page 16] that he has retorted the author's maxim on himself, in the case of Eneas—the outward assurance rendering the inward feeling superfluous. There is still a misunderstanding. The feeling supposed to have been possessed, must have been the effect, and not the cause. The author's

use of the word "impossible" for "superfluous," was an unimportant inaccuracy; because according to his views, which were undertaken to be given in that place, superfluous and impossible were the same. The whole argument on the other side went on the presumption, that an inward feeling consequent on assurance, cannot be the effect of an outward declaration of it: or why was this represented as designed principally for the conviction of the beholders, and not for the satisfaction of the patient?

It is asked [page 16] Why, if the author of the Essay admits an inward and spiritual feeling, does he not avow it? He thought he had avowed it on the first page of the Essay, in speaking of being satisfied of an interest in the promises of the gospel; on the next page but one, in speaking again of a satisfaction which could have been none other than spiritual; and in the last page of the performance: for how can there be any other than a spiritual possession, of the fruits of the Spirit spoken of? The "Farther Reply," on the next page, goes on in such a way, as to manifest a confounding of feeling consequent on the pardon of sin, with evidence of the fact supposed to be bottomed on feeling. It should be remembered, that the former of these was not the subject of the Essay; which was limited to the disproof of the error of the latter.

If the opponent of the Essay can satisfy those concerned, that he has not contradicted Mr. Wesley and Mr. Fletcher, in affirming on the eighteenth page of his former pamphlet, that, assurance being the work of God, the sinner has no need to be told of it, with a view to its being sought by him; it is here a matter of

indifference. But let it not be admitted that the second pamphlet [page 20] is correct in representing as the sense of one of the notes to the Essay, that according to the said two divines, the communication of the Holy Spirit is the work not of God, but of the sinner. If any other reader can elicit the same reproach from the following words in note F [page 41] let him have the full benefit of his ingenuity—"Be it, that the giving of the personal assurance must be the work of God: the endeavouring to obtain it, is represented as resting with men." Then for evidence of this fact, there is reference to the divines of the Westminster confession; and to Arminian divines, especially Mr. Wesley and Mr. Fletcher

It is to be lamented, that there has been so much to say of a philosophical axiom, brought incidentally into the question. This would probably not have happened, if there could have been drawn from the discourses of the Saviour, any thing which had an evident bearing on the controversy.

*Section 6.—Of the third objection.*

It is the non-appearance or the position, in the acts of the apostles—especially its being wanting in that of Cornelius, that of the Ethiopian, that of the jailor; and further, in the addresses to the Jews and Gentiles. In all this, there is supposed to be a set-off in Acts 2. 4—5, 9. 31—and 11, 16. There is not a syllable in them, which applies to any other subject than that of Pentecost, except in the second, where the comfort of the Holy Ghost is spoken of. Let that passage be taken with the comment given in connexion with it. There is nothing

inconsistent with this declaration, in the Essay or in the notes to it. If the "Farther Reply" had copied from a concordance all the texts which have a reference to the Holy Ghost or Spirit, and given comments on them from approved authors; the whole might have been made as much to the purpose, as the text above given.

The case of St. Paul, unexpectedly to him who adduced it, has produced a question on the subject of baptism. He has said, that this divinely instituted sign was considered by Ananias—evidently meaning in alliance with the repentance and faith of Saul—sufficient evidence of grace promised to accompany it.

By what process of mind, the place of Ananias was taken possession of by Saul, in the imagination of the opponent, is not here within the sphere of conjecture. In the passage referred to, the former was the speaker; and the latter passed no judgment on the subject. What the Essay said of a particular case, has been understood to be a general position. Not only so, the "Farther Reply," in a way of writing against which the reader has been already cautioned, after a deduction of its own, brings in the issue not as its own deduction, but as the doctrine of the essayist, thus—"He maintains that baptism alone is sufficiently satisfactory; and that no more causes are to be looked for, than are sufficient for the effect." He never maintained any such thing, detached from the state of a known individual; although he acknowledged it to extend to all fit recipients. The affirmed universality of the proposition, is the consequence of separating a sentence from that immediately preceding it: which led to the disregard of the distinction between the cause of any effect; and a circumstance of the sub-

ject, by which, of itself, the effect could never have been produced.

*Section 7.—Of the fourth objection.*

It relates to the paucity of texts found even in the épistles; although the subjects are sometimes such, as produced incidentally sayings, which may be drawn aside to the purpose of the position.

Of the texts in the "Farther Reply," that which takes the lead is Rom. 8. 16. So much has been said of it in the first appendix to the Essay, that it shall not be here discussed again. But it is worth the while of a curious reader to notice the constructions interfering with one another, of those who hold it so important to their theory. Mr. Wesley [Crowther page 165] prefers the translation—"To our spirits," although he says he will not contend for it. Here is one witness only: but Dr. Coke in his commentary calls for two witnesses; although under the testimony, he does not comprehend the miraculous effusion, as do Doddridge and others; Dr. A. Clarke, varying from both Mr. Wesley and Dr. Coke, states the testimony of the spirit as given in the intellectual faculty. Such is the issue of plans of interpretation, resulting from disregard of the drift of the argument of the apostle: which was to prove to the Jewish christians, that their brethren, the Gentile christians, had been owned by the common Father of both, in the effusion of miraculous gifts: an effusion, which under the ordinary operation of the spirit, had also manifested itself in its holy influences on the minds of the latter, by a child-like confidence suited to the beneficent spirit of the gospel; and illustrating its superiority to the preparatory dispensation of the law.

Answer to note of the "Farther Reply," page 53. Agreeably to the correction in said page, the note of Dr. Clarke is "in" and not "to" our understandings: but there is no difference in sense; because the Holy Spirit would in vain witness in, if not to. Be it, that the understanding is made the medium to the feelings. The latter are sometimes addressed by another course, and especially on the present subject.

That Mr. Wesley preferred "to our spirits," is here thought evident, although he considered the contending for it as not necessary to his purpose. This was not yielding it. If he put "with" into his notes, it may have been from mature consideration, and only shows a more extensive variety.

After all as the witnessing of the spirit might have been, through the instrumentality of his miraculous effusions, to the spirits of the gentile christians; there would be nothing conceded on the present point, by the admission of the interpretation. The holy agent addressed the minds of the gentile christians through the medium of their senses. But the argument of the apostle requires reference to the conviction of the Jewish christians.

This is the only objection to the rendering of Parkhurst; who however, after his translation adds—"not by any *direct impression* or *immediate testimony* communicated to the soul, but, as the Apostle speaks v. 14. by *leading* us in our lives and conversation, &c."



It will be pertinent to remark a partial representation of the sentiments of the present author, from lectures on the catechism formerly published by him [page 239] in which it is said—"What miraculous effusion was to the infant church, the authentick record of it, and other evidences of Christianity are to believers of the present day:" From which the "Farther Replier" deduces the inference [page 51]—"that to believers of the present day, there is no other witness of the Spirit, than the scriptural account of those miraculous effusions." How happened it to escape his consideration, that these miraculous effusions were in confirmation of the gospel preached by apostolick men? Answerable to the gospel so preached, are the records of it now in our possession: and answerable to the effusions are the credible narratives of them and other evidences of christianity.

Further, as in the gospel age, the inward cast of character of the believers, produced by the ordinary operation of the spirit, concurred with the miraculous effusion in demonstrating their adoption, and in being its seal and pledge; the same cast of character, produced by the same operation, and in concurrence with holy scripture, reaches to the same effect.

In defence of the opposite exposition of the text, there is produced the authority of archbishop Tillotson, where, discoursing on John 7. 39, and noticing the text in question, he says—"that it is *a testimony within us*, that we are the children of God." He speaks, further, of the seal, the pledge, and the earnest of the Spirit: But his meaning is evident in another place not far before, where it is said—"The Spirit of God, dwelling in good men and evidencing itself by its genuine fruits and

effects, the graces and virtues of a good life, is said to be the pledge and earnest of our future inheritance." The archbishop contends for an immediate influence of the Holy Spirit. But for what object? Is it a direct and personal assurance of pardon? No: But it is to the effect of 'an inward power, strength and assistance communicated to christians, to all the purposes of holiness and obedience.'" There are two sermons on John 7. 39; and they are as inconsistent with the opposite theory, as any thing in the Essay. When Dr. Doddridge is quoted to the same effect, why is it not shown, that by internal and gracious operations, giving assurance &c. was meant an immediate communication of pardon?

The general tenour of the writings of the archbishop, would refer his interpretation to the fruits of the spirit. Certain terms had been explained by him, in the conclusion of the first of the two sermons: They are repeated early in the second, without the explanation; and so taken up, and bent to a meaning in contrariety to it. There is a similar misdirection given below to the same excellent person, in a comment on 2 Cor. 1. 22; which speaks again of a seal, an earnest and a pledge. These are referred by the archbishop to the operations of the Holy Spirit: but they are sufficiently explained by him in what immediately follows. After discoursing of the operation of the high agent in prayer, in peace, and in consolation, the statement is made more at large than will here suit for a quotation, that "although it is hard, if not impossible, particularly to distinguish between the motions of God's Spirit and those of our own minds; yet we are assured of the existence of the supernatural principle from its effects and from the declarations of scripture."

Rom. 5. 5. When the present author gave the interpretation referred to of this text, it was such as seemed called for by the argument of the apostle. But it was not intended to deny, that the love existing in the divine mind was manifested to the hearts of believers, by the operation of the Holy Ghost; nor if, in contrariety to his opinion, the proper construction be the love of God in the hearts of believers, that the sense was excited by any other cause. The text ought not to have been produced on this occasion, without notice of the effect of the initiatory words of it.

Rom. 8. 9. 8. 15. 14, 17. The first and second of these texts refer to the ordinary operations of the Holy Spirit, in holiness of heart; and the last of them refers to the same Spirit, in the fruit of holy joy. There is nothing of direct communication in these things; and they are explained accordingly by Doddridge. To the same purpose with the latter of the texts, is 2 Cor. 13 14, and 1 Thess. 1. 5 and 6. 1 Cor. 2, 12. The same commentator explains it of the information and regulation of the mind, in opposition to carnal views. This, and not the sentiment of the position, is what he meant by *notionally and experimentally*.

2. Cor. 1. 22. He interprets the sealing and the earnest, of "the gifts"—doubtless meaning in miraculous effusions; as he explains in other places—and "the graces," which produce an anticipation of heaven in the heart. The same interpretation may be given, on the same authority, of Gal. 5. 14. and of Eph. 1. 13.

Gal. 4. 6. That all good in the heart is ascribed to the operation of the Holy Spirit, is not here disputed. The place refers especially to the good disposition of the

heart, so produced, which consists in a confidence like that of a free man, distinguished from the fear and distance of a slave. This also is the interpretation in the paraphrase so often referred to above, and made the more manifest by the reference to Selden in a note.

Heb. 6. 4. Doddridge explains the only terms quoted thus—The “heavenly gift, is the illumination by christian knowledge: and the being made partakers of the Holy Ghost,” is the possession of his miraculous communications. The unquoted expressions of “tasting of the good word of God and the powers of the world to come,” refer to “affectionate impressions” on the minds of the Hebrews—not consisting in a direct and personal assurance of pardon, but—“awakening in them a conviction of sin, desires after holiness, and resolutions in favour of it.”

1 Pet. 1. 12. “The Holy Ghost sent down from heaven”—“with such visible glory”—says Doddridge—“and testifying his continued residence among us, by such wonderful effects.”—2. 3. When the commentator so often here quoted, gave the pertinent comment, in the “Farther Reply,” he did not think of interpreting the text to the purpose of that work. On the contrary, the testifying spoken of, was the “knowing the sweetness there is in Christ, and how suitable he is to the necessities and desires of an awakened sinner;” all which might be from the preached gospel, under the ordinary influences of the Spirit.

1. John 3. 24. According to the author here so much respected, the abiding of the Spirit, is his “producing in our souls by his gracious operation the image of God, and forming us to an intimacy with and nearness to him:”

Which is commonly known under the name of sanctification.

1 John 4. 13. "He hath given us of his Spirit: "operating by his gracious influences," says the same commentator.

1 John 5. 6. "It is the Spirit that beareth witness." The extraordinary communication of the Spirit to his servants, is the most glorious communication of all," says the same excellent person.

10. It is surprising that a man possessed of the learning of Dr. A. Clarke, should have furnished the "Farther Reply" with a note on this text, grounded on the supposition, that it speaks of the person of the Holy Spirit. "Witness," in this place, is the same with "Testimony;" which may be the fruits of the Spirit in the heart.

Philipp. 1. 9. It is evidently cited, for the sake of the word "sense" in the margin of the large bibles, considered as the same with judgment: as if sense or feeling may not be excited by other than direct communication. The same author refers to the "feeling" or "*perception*" of the social ties spoken of before: but marks the latter of those words emphatical; for which the reason must have been, his thinking it the most agreeable to the original, as it certainly is.

When the present author made use of a negative form of argument, founded on the silence of the Gospels, the Acts, and the Epistles, he did not anticipate a text to be alleged from the Apocalypse. But as such an authority is adduced in the "Farther Reply," it may not be improper to notice it in this place.

Rev. 2. 17. It speaks of "hidden manna," and "a white stone"—to be given "to him that overcometh,"

with reference to dangers that will beset the righteous through life; and therefore not to be expected, until the battle shall be over, and the conquest gained. Accordingly, in other messages to the churches of Asia, it is—“He that overcometh and keepeth my words unto the end,” and “to him that overcometh, will I give to sit down with me in my throne, &c.” If the interpretation here given should be unwelcome from the present quarter, let it be taken, although it must be to the same effect, in the commentary so much noticed above. It may be seen at large in the paraphrase, the note, and the improvement. It is not meant to deny, that the text may with great propriety be applied, in an accommodated sense, to an anticipation of the heavenly Canaan. But it is not the sense, as it stands in scripture.

It has been a painful task, to show the irrelevancy of the above texts; of the greater number of which it must still be here believed, that they were never before presented in formal argument—although they may have been in declamation, in favour of the contradicted position. It would be easy to show, that in general, the commentators relied on in the “Farther Reply,” do not come up to the sense which it was written to sustain. But it was thought best to confine the attention to a single commentator, respected on both sides of the present question.

The Farther Replier was under a mistake, if he understood the Essay, as representing Dr Doddridge of his opinion in any part of his commentary. The meaning was, that his interpretation was not so pointedly applied to the conviction of the believing Jews, as the argument of the apostle requires. Of some of the texts in the first appendix to the Essay it seems, that if they

had been adduced by men of name, it was unknown to the Farther Replier. They are eight in number. Four of them are produced by himself. Of the remainder, three may be found applied to the doctrine of assurance, in the notes attached to the larger editions of the Westminster confession, which have been so long considered by many able men, as a store-house of authorities. Of the only remaining text, 2 Tim. 4. 8, the Replier ought not to suppose it improbable that it has been produced to the point, when he himself has argued from confidence in an uninspired but holy man, like that expressed by St. Paul, that it is evidence in favour of the position.

*Section 8.—Of the fifth objection.*

It is bottomed on the silence of St. Paul on the subject, in his instructions to Timothy and to Titus, concerning the ministry. On the other side, there is produced the text—“These things I will that thou affirm constantly.” What things?—Among others, there is “the washing of regeneration,” inward cleansing and the outward sign of it, belonging to the commencement of the sincere profession of Christianity—and “the renewing of the Holy Ghost”—which ought to be “day by day.” The irrelevancy was shown in the notes; and the text, as given in the Reply, still stands as the only place alleged against the objection.

*Section 9.—Of the sixth objection.*

It turned on the uselessness of any other test, according to the tenet in question. This is misinterpreted in the Reply. It was not meant, that the tenet disowned every other test; but the meaning was, that any other

was unnecessary, on the ground so taken. The duty of self-examination may exact much deep thought, and much nice discrimination: But what occasion for them—still meaning, in the single point of ascertaining religious state—if there be the shorter road of consulting a testimony in the mind? The matter seems to have been dropped in the “Farther Reply,” and may be so here.

*Section 10.—Of the seventh objection.*

In the Essay it was said, that the author of it had never met with a scrap from any of the fathers, even advanced in favour of the position. He cannot say so, any longer: but with what propriety they are now produced in the “Farther Reply,” is the question.

It begins its discussion of the present subject, with retorting on the Essayist, and asking, where is his test to be found in them of the witness of the Holy Spirit, at first in miraculous effusion, and since in the scriptures? Answer: no where in the form of a disputed point, but wherever they refer to those oracles, in concurrence with the fruits of the Spirit in the heart: of which there is abundance of evidence, not likely to be denied, in their homilies and other writings.

To give a damper on the whole argument, authorities are produced, intended to invalidate any testimony from the fathers.

The first, is that of Dr. Haweis; in what he himself calls “an impartial history of the christian church.” There could hardly have been produced a more incompetent witness: and if any reader wishes to know how cheap his name is held by those who consent with him in his theology, many proofs might be referred to; but at



present, there shall be notice of those only to be found in the first volume of the Christian Observer. The index of names will direct to the places. The misrepresentations of this divine, in respect to the Fathers in particular, have been pointed out by many persons: The truth is, he measured their respective worth by the standard of his Calvinism.\*

\* On the authority of this divine, there are given in the "Farther Reply" two anecdotes of two very respectable prelates, in themselves to their credit, but designed to manifest sentiments on their death-beds, inconsistent with those of their preceding lives. The truth of the anecdotes requires better evidence, than their appearing from the pen of Dr. Haweis. He may have believed them; but many know how much the English prints abound with fabrications of this sort, concerning distinguished persons.

The above are about as much to the matter in hand, as when the Farther Replier goes out of his way, to vent his prejudices in telling of "sinecures," and of the popular—not the ecclesiastical—Phraseology of "livings."

Did it never occur to the retailer of these and many such things opprobrious to the church of England, to how much greater an extent he has carried his unprovoked attack, than could have been chargeable on the present author, even had he brought before the publick a particular body of professing christians, independently on their theology? which has not been done by him.

The author takes the opportunity of declaring, that he has no design to deny, in regard to a considerable proportion of the English clergy, there being room for the remarks quoted in the 32d and following pages of the Farther Reply, of the neglect of grounding christian morals on christian doctrine. May such remarks as those of bishops Lavington and Horsely, have their due effect: For without the latter of these subjects, the gospel is not preached; and even the former, severed from it, is little more than a name.

The much more respectable Dr. Mosheim is brought to testify against the Fathers, in two long quotations; in which, the only matter to the purpose is, that "they did not succeed so well"—meaning as in their writings against the pagans—"in unfolding the true nature and genius of christianity." There is a difference between success in unfolding the doctrines of the system, and testifying to what they are: in which, the testimony of the Fathers would not have been lightly spoken of by Dr. Mosheim. It should be remembered, that he is speaking of controversial writers; and that therefore,

It is a pity to charge the fault, as is done in a cited authority, on archbishop Laud; who has enough in his character, not to be defended. It has been more reasonably accounted for, as introduced in the reign of Charles the second, by an affected contrariety of those who had for some time filled the pulpits; many of whom ran into the opposite extreme, of preaching doctrine without morals.

There is no inconsistency with this acknowledgment, in what is said in the notes [page 56] and remarked on in the Father Reply, [page 32] that the doctrine said to be preached by Mr. Wesley, was customary. It can be shown, in printed sermons of many distinguished men in the intervening times. If the mass of clergy are to be judged of from them, the number of correct preachers must have been great. As to the extent of *customarily*, it is not to be estimated either by the author or by his opponent, although put in italicks by the latter. Where is the record of such a custom, as that of denial of all the pulpits, for preaching justification by faith? What defensible sense can be put on Mr. Wesley's words—"inward salvation now attainable," other than release from the dominion of sin and subjection to gospel righteousness? But under the unusual phrase, may there not have been included the proposition, which after having been preached for thirty years, was acknowledged by him not to be true?

what he says has no bearing on writings addressed to the heart, and intended to govern the conduct—such as the epistles of Clement and Ignatius. Even in regard to controversial writers; the historian, a few pages before, had made a material distinction between disputed doctrines, concerning which only they wrote; and the undisputed, which, he says, “are very rarely defined with accuracy, by the ancient writers, so as to point out to us clearly, what their opinions concerning them were.” If the views here taken of the Fathers, be correct; the point in question, must have been one of the undisputed. If so, either it was unknown, whether in the shape of truth, or in that of heresy, as affirmed in the Essay; or it was universally held, and therefore passed over by the controversial and other writers in silence. The argument is, that the matter was too important to every individual, to admit the latter supposition.

It is hardly necessary to say much to prove, that the writings of the early Fathers may have been sufficient expositions of the faith, in the sense of laying all essential points before the emperours and senate, and other strangers to the system; and not in the unfolding of the several doctrines lucidly, and with apposite reasonings. This is the merit denied to them by Mosheim.

Monsieur Daillé, the learned French protestant divine, who is supposed to have written with the greatest effect against the improper use of the Fathers; and who has been thought, by men of equal intelligence with himself, to have carried the matter to an extreme; in the conclusion of his celebrated work, opens his mind concerning them as follows. After praising their exhortations to holiness, and the solid proofs found in them of the fun-

elemental principles of the christian religion, he goes on in these words—"But now, besides what has been hithertosaid, we may, in my opinion, make another very considerable use of the Fathers. For there sometimes arise such troublesome spirits, as will needs broach doctrines devised out of their own head, which are not at all grounded upon any principle of the christian religion. I say therefore, that the authority of the Fathers may very properly and seasonably be made use of, against the impudence of these men, by showing, that the Fathers were utterly ignorant of any such fancies, as these men propose to the world. And if this can be proved, we ought certainly to conclude, that no such doctrine was ever preached to mankind, either by our Saviour Christ, or by his apostles. For what probability is there, that those holy doctors of former ages, from whose hands christianity has been derived down unto us, should be ignorant of any of those things, which had been revealed and recommended by our Saviour, as important and necessary to salvation?"

The censures cast by Monsieur Daillé, when no actual case was in his view, shall not be here applied to the case in hand. But there is the wish, that it may be seriously compared with the rule laid down by him; and further, that there may be a consideration of the extent, in which the making light of it gives advantage to the Romanists on the one hand, and to Arians, Socinians, and even Deists on the other.

The first Father cited is St. Clement, who says—"A full effusion of the Holy Ghost was upon you all." Doubtless, he meant not the miraculous effusion on all, but the ordinary operations of the Spirit. The question

is—how were they manifested? Answer: not in direct and personal communication of pardon; but, as is evident in the long paragraph of which the words are part, and in the other long paragraph before it in the epistle, in the performance of various social duties, in regard to which the addressed church had recently become delinquent. Mr. Milner, from whose history a comment is given on the place, had reason to complain of those, who branded with the name of enthusiasm the doctrine of the Spirit's work on the heart, and the experience of his consolations in the soul: but it is here supposed very improbable, that he would have lent his name to the support of the position at issue. He wrote his history, with the design of being more attentive to the traces of piety in the several ages, than to facts prominently dwelt on by historians generally. It is remarkable, that a work should be so often quoted with approbation in the Farther Reply; and yet, that this should not produce from it a single extract, in which the mind of the writer is declared in favour of the sentiment of the position.

It is so irrelevant, to cite the epistles of the venerable Ignatius, where he speaks of God's dwelling in us as his temples, and the having a feeling of it; which may well be interpreted of the fruits of the Spirit, and of his presence manifested therein; that there is thought to be no need of any further remark on his authority.

Clement and Ignatius, were of the first century. Justin, of the second, in his examination previous to his martyrdom, professed before the judge a certainty of his salvation. Many have done the same: some, with very little cause apparent to the world; and others, as in the case of the venerable martyr, on the ground of the promises

of the gospel, and through the mercy of God in Christ; compared with the gracious habits of their souls, and not without their being manifested in act; although mingled with infirmity. It is perhaps owing to the said profession of Justin, that Dr Haweis [vol. 1. page 189] “hopes”—shame on the double faced compliment—“that the root of the matter was in him.” It may be accounted for by passages in Justin, confessedly unfavourable to Calvinism.

If, in the quotation here given from Milner, the putting *again* in italicks, were designed to convey the idea of reiterated assurance; it is wide of any thing within the view of that author. Perhaps it may not have been intended; but as the intimation may be understood by the reader of assurance, there may be propriety in mentioning, that the “again,” twice introduced, was with a reference as well to a suspension of the persecution, as to the revival of the courage of the accused.

The passage from Cyprian, is for the proof of sudden and entire conversion. Who can reasonably doubt, that a sinner, under conviction of the error of his ways, and resolution to reform, breaks off immediately, not merely from this or that sin, but from all his sins? This is evident in Cyprian’s specifying of the exchanges of expense for parsimony, of costly for common apparel, and of ambition for retirement. They are changes of habit, begun at once, and doubtless from a change of heart. Here was the place, for this celebrated bishop to speak of direct and personal assurance. But where is it?

There follow quotations from Origen; concerning adoption, so often spoken of in this controversy. Mr. Wesley, is quoted as saying that the places cannot re-

late to miraculous effusion. Certainly not: but may they not relate to the ordinary operation of the Holy Spirit?

Mr. Milner thinks favourably of Novatian, although guilty of what is acknowledged in the place to be an unjustifiable schism. His character is foreign to the present question; and the quotation from him may be consented in, without injury to the argument.

The Farther Replier has gone into the fourth century; and has produced many and copious passages from an eloquent writer—Macarius. These are places, in which if any where, the position is to be expected: although notwithstanding the many clauses marked by italicks, it can hardly be required to show, that there is nothing in them to the effect.

The last citation, is from the celebrated Chrysostom. Is it still necessary to repeat the acknowledgment of the ordinary operations of the Holy Spirit, in producing the sense of adoption? As for what this Father may say of “amazing throes &c.” it is well known, to what extent he has carried his rhetorical figures. Romanists deduce the doctrine of transubstantiation, from such places as where he speaks of the people dyed red with the blood of the Saviour, during the celebration of the eucharist. Had he held the position now in question, it would have been tanght and dwelt on over and over in his numerous homilies. In which of them can it be found?

Bernard, of the twelfth century, was a great and good man: but to notice his sayings, taken in the Farther Reply from Mr. Wesley, would be a repetition of what has preceded.

*Section 11.—Of the eighth objection.*

This was addressed, exclusively to professors of the Episcopal church; and it was affirmed, that there was nothing in her institutions to the purpose of the position. Mr. Wesley thought he had discovered it, in a sentence of the homily of salvation. His construction of the sentence was denied; and stress was laid on the circumstance, that, repeating the leading sentiment in the existing controversy, he dropt a material part of the sentence. The repetition is called by the Farther Reply, a summary. What is designed as such, should contain all the essential parts of the matter to which it relates. In the present instance, there is wanting the essential clause of a reference to the holy scriptures. To this there shall be here added, that the part of the homily resorted to by him (the third) was not the part of it in which the doctrine of justification by faith is the most pointedly laid down. This is done in the second part; in which justifying faith is defined to be with true repentance, hope, charity and the fear of God. Accordingly when, in the third part, the homily distinguishes its subject from the case of devils, for whom Christ did not die, it requires “confidence in Gods merciful promises”—meaning in the scriptures; these, combining with the graces spoken of in the second part, must be contemplated as the ground of confidence, not only not requiring the direct communication, but rendering it needless.

In the Essay, it was represented to be strange, that so important a position, if held to be true, should creep only into a sentence of a homily. To supply this defect, it is thought by the Farther Reply, to be in the seventeenth article, in the prayer for ascension day, and in sundry of the homilies.



If it be found in the seventeenth article, where may it not be found? The article pronounces its subject full of comfort, to those who “feel in themselves the working of the Spirit of Christ, mortifying the works of the flesh and their earthly members, and drawing up their mind to high and heavenly things.” What are the matters mentioned, but the fruits of the Spirit? And in what else is his Spirit said to be felt?

The collect for ascension day, prays for “the sending of the Holy Ghost to comfort us; and that we may have a right judgment in all things, and evermore rejoice in his holy comfort.” Is there a sentence in the Essay or in the notes, which denies these benefits to be the result of the operation of the Holy Spirit?

It is extraordinary, that there should be quoted the homily for Whitsunday, without notice of the passage on the last page of the second appendix to the Essay in answer to the question—“How shall I know that the Holy Ghost is within me?” It is equally so, that in quoting the homily of the resurrection, it should be overlooked, that the seal and the pledge are predicated of those only, who “be replenished with all righteousness.” In this fruit of the Spirit, consist the seal and the pledge. The homily on reading the scripture says—“In reading of God’s word, he profiteth most, that is most inspired with the Holy Ghost.” It may be, in his ordinary influences. There follows a sentence, concerning the non-necessity of human and worldly wisdom, for the understanding of the Holy Scriptures. It ought to have been stated, that this is said of those, who pleaded their ignorance to dispense with reading. But by reference to note I. it seems to have been understood, as if

to the purpose of dispensing with human literature in the clergy. Nothing can be further from the argument of the homily.

The homily for Rogation week, says—“If we *feel* our conscience at peace with God, *through remission* of sins,” &c. This is so far from being designed of the species of assurance contended for, that the party is supposed to have been within the christian covenant, and to have fallen from it. In the event of restoration, the words above apply. Doubtless, the remission of sins, through the instrumentality of the promises of the gospel, and under the operation of the Holy Spirit, is a subject of feeling. The homily on faith, speaks of it as producing feeling: but whoever shall consult the place will find, that it is in continuing in thanksgiving and praise to God.

The homily on certain places of scripture, says—“Godly men feel inwardly God’s Holy Spirit, inflaming their hearts with love.” Yes: for love, the fruit of the Spirit, is evidence of his presence.

Surely, the Farther Replier had better have continued with Mr. Wesley, to rest the matter on the single sentence of the homily of salvation. And yet, the former supposes that some good would result, from printing passages such as his, without note or comment. It would be the way to mislead. The publishing of the homilies at large, as is done within these few years, is more fair. How came it into his mind, to compare his proposal with the publishing of the whole bible, by the societies instituted for that end. The latter is calculated to prevent and correct mistakes: his project would create them.

*Section 12.—Of the ninth objection.*

It was founded on the evidence apparent in religious books, that the assurances spoken of in them, and described with its alternate changes, agrees with what we know of the same sort in the rise and the fall of the animal spirits. In the "Reply," this became blended with two points, not contemplated by the author. Having explained himself in note I. (page 44) and finding nothing further in opposition, he puts the subject out of view: not without entreating all concerned to consider, how unsafe must be a dependence which fluctuates with the humours of the body, and even with the changes of the atmosphere. Let it not give offence to any virtuous person, when the author adds, that in some, formerly impressed by religious sentiments which had lost their influence, he has known sensibilities connected with the subject to be revived, by the use of wine or of ardent spirits.

*Section 13.—Of the tenth objection.*

It was grounded on the vacillations and inconsistencies of opinion, attendant on the profession of the position. Here came into view a difference suggested in the beginning, between those who considered the matter in question as essential to faith, and those who held it to be attainable but not essential. The author, contemplating principally what he thought the error of the Methodists, and wishing to give a caution against that especially, to those for whom the Essay was designed, referred their theory to an appendix. The Replier clearly saw the line of discrimination, when he began the controversy at this point: but in the character of the Farther Replier, he has lost sight of it.

In treating of the doctrine in the lower form, whether he were exact in his conception of it, this is not the place to inquire. But he is persuaded, that no intelligent advocate of the Westminster confession will take offence, at the views which he has given of the opinions of some of their most prominent divines. The two Replies are silent on the names of these men, with one exception.\* If the author labours under grievous error, so did they. One of them—Mr. Baxter—was especially worthy of notice in those two performances, on account of the honour in which his memory was held by Mr. Wesley. Of this, the following sentence only shall be given from his journals [vol. 3. page 10]—“Surely, one page of that loving, serious christian, weighs more than volumes of this bitter sarcastick jester,”—meaning a dissenting minister, and some work published by him.

\* The exception is of Dr. Doddridge. He was noticed in the Essay, as abandoning the necessity of the test; and it was remarked, that on the ground of the necessity, there could hardly be a more delusive work, than his “Rise and progress of Religion in the Soul.” In the Reply, this was rebutted by nothing more than his commendation of Mr. Wesley’s *Farther Appeal*, by writing on the title page of it—“How forcible are right words.” Who would not suppose, that the *Farther Appeal* sustained the principle in question? But it contains nothing to that effect. And yet the *Farther Reply* (page 90 N) remarks on the present authors, in attention to this circumstance in the notes. It was because he thought the tract, and of course the commendation of it, foreign to the point for which the name of Dr. Doddridge was introduced into the Essay [page 16] The tract commended by him, is occupied by animadversions on abounding irreligion and licentiousness, on the delinquencies of professors of religion, and on a defence of the then early plan of preaching of Mr. Wesley and those who acted with him.

It may be supposed not susceptible of denial, that there is nothing in the Essay more directly contrary to the position in question, than the sentiments of Mr. Baxter as given in a note to page 15.

Under this objection it was noticed, that with one exception, that of the Methodists, there was not known a vestige of the position in the confession of any church: the confession of Augsburgh, and that of the church of the Netherlands and other calvinistick churches, were referred to. There was no notice of this, in the first pamphlet on the other side: but in the second, there is produced the single exception, of a confession edited in 1784, by the respectable body called "Unitas Fratrum." Concerning this, the author is not prepared to speak definitely. But he will remark, that some expressions in it—which may perhaps be explained differently—are contrary to what Mr. Wesley was taught by the founder of that society—count Zinzendorf, as given in the Essay, page 27.

This modern confession is professed to be founded on that of Augsburgh, which contains nothing of the contradicted position. If it do, why is not the evidence produced from the source, and not thus at second hand? It is impossible.\* Equally so, is the presenting of it from the confession consented in by all the Calvinistick churches on the continent of Europe, and by the

\* The sentiments of the confession are considerably dilated in the apology for it, by Melancthon who had drawn up the apology itself. In the apology justification by faith is dwelt on at greater length, under the second head: But it is also barren of matter, the purpose of the Replies.

churches descended from them in this country. Let these facts be compared with the importance of the position, if correct.

*Section 14 — Of the other supposed communications, compared with that in question.*

When two subjects are compared in argument, if they agree in the point on the account of which the argument is constructed, it ought not to be offensive, because of disagreement in other points. In the comparisons in question, the single point is the full persuasion of the parties, of communications to their respective minds. The matter is noticed in the "Farther Reply" page 35.

Mosheim, there cited, is concise on the cases of the Anabaptists of Munster. From larger accounts of them it might be made to appear, that in the beginning, their leaders were remarkable for sanctity and correct lives, and so esteemed by Luther. It was not until they were drawn to place full reliance on revelations in their minds, that they were carried to the length of building a government on the basis of their extravagances. That these should be characterized by the names of phrenzy and madness, is consistent with usual phraseology; but could not have been designed by Mosheim to describe the men as mad, strictly speaking: for their measures show the contrary.

As for the Fifth-monarchy men, they were certainly, as Mosheim says, wrong-headed and turbulent enthusiasts; but sincere in their profession: which is evident, in their exposing of themselves to what all besides must have seen to be sure destruction. They certainly believed, that they were acting under a commission to

begin the reign of Christ on earth. It must be of a safe state an indecisive test, which cannot give the same certainty to a wrong headed as to a reasonable man.

Ravaillac is represented as a madman. He does not appear in that character in the records of his trial, which may be seen in Sully's memoirs. It is also said, that he had been expelled the religious order, of which he was a lay brother: but it should have been added, that his expulsion was for no other cause than his visions: which, as appeared after the fact and not before, had all a relation to the murder to which he thought himself admonished.

In regard to the more respectable comparision introduced, the "Farther Reply" denies the cases to be parallel: because of the light within, held on one side, and the rule of scripture on the other. This does not touch the point, in which the cases agree. Let there be selected a given number from each of two descriptions of persons: Let those selected be of the same respectability, for virtue and intelligence: and let them be equally free from madness; unless, in either case, the thing in question should be so accounted; which would be to presume, and not to argue. One set declare, each of them for him and herself, that they have received individually a direct assurance of the pardon of sin, which they do not allege to be personally addressed to each in the written word. The other set as explicitly testify, that each of them has received an injunction distinctly presented to the mind, to make a journey or a voyage for the propogating of what is conceived to be errour on the other side; yet contended by the professing party, to be not contrary to any thing which the written revelation contains: the truth of which they do not deny, but

represent to be in agreement with the inward light. Is there not, so far as the conscience of each individual is concerned, as much ground to act on in regard to the one subject of revelation, as in regard to the other?

The author, not many years ago, was informed by a man of unquestionable sincerity in religion, in relation to a complaint by which he had been long afflicted, that it had been removed by a remedy suggested to his mind, in a divine impression. On being questioned, whether he really believed this to be the source of his recovery, he answered in the affirmative, with great confidence.\*

Such a revelation, limited to the assurance of the pardon of sin, is what was meant in the lectures on the catechism [page 40] referred to in the Farther Reply [page 16] under the expression—special faith. The place has been quoted imperfectly. The words are—“This must mean, either the discerning of a special interest in redemption, not indulged to all—and then it is an unwarrantable limiting of the mercies of God; or a sensibility to the interest which we possess in common with others; *and then it is true but useless: for a general proposition includes all the particulars of which it is affirmed.*” The Farther Replier omits the words in italics: which gives an opportunity, at the end of the paragraph, to ask the question—“Is there then all this no evidence of favouring a want of feeling of the pardon of sin? The modern error, of the sensibilities of which the primitive

\* Oliver Cromwell is recorded as one of those, who have construed an extraordinary impression as an admonition to duty. On some occasion, one of his chaplains [Mr. Howe] delivered his mind in opposition to the principle; and was ever after coldly treated by the Protector, on that account.



church was said to know nothing, is not, as the reader is led by the mutilation to suppose, what gives sensibility to the interest which we possess in the gospel promises; but the representing of the sensibility of the interest, as confirmation of the reality of it.

*Section 14.—Of the dislocated passage in the Essay—  
page 18.\**

This part of the Essay professed to give some general facts, relative to the effects of the position, and the result of the observation of the author. Complaint was made in the notes, that the Replier referred his notice of this place, to be brought in with his remarks on the second appendix: thus giving to the former the appearance of being designed against the manners of the body of which he is a member. It was denied to have been intended. The Farther Replier [page 28] professes to accept the denial. But what he gives with one hand, he takes back, as it were, with the other [page 24] in the implied charge of design in the separating of the two subjects, and the distant station of one of them from the other. This is suspicion in answer to a charge of fact. There is no circumstance sustaining the suspicion; because of two subjects, one of which was to be especially treated of, it was natural to speak of the point in which they were supposed to agree; and to refer the other

\* It is imagined in the Farther Reply [page 22] that the resulting mistake was guarded against by notice of the page in the Christian Register: as if it could have been expected, that readers generally would inquire for that periodical work, merely to ascertain the order in which it is answered in the Reply; or, even in perusal of the former, would detect the management in the latter.

point, to be exclusively treated of in another place: which harmonized with the object of the Essay.

The only colour which can be given to the effect produced by the dislocation complained of, must be in the presumption, that the author knew little or nothing of the fruits of the controverted position, except as they may appear among the people now contemplated. He saw much of it, before there was a single congregation of them—at least as he supposes—within what are now the United States. In the year 1767, there was raised in this city a ferment, of which he witnessed the beginning, the progress, and the speedy end, on the particular point. There are persons living, who cannot have forgotten it. In one congregation, not episcopal, it having been notified that there was to be a sermon preached in opposition; the author attended, and listened to a discourse of an hour and a half, from a clergyman well known and esteemed among them. It was from what happened at the said period, that there was acquired the earliest information of the mischiefs originating in the matter in question; and promoted by groundless confidence in some, and by distress in others; either from a mistaken cause, or, where real cause may have existed, from its taking of a wrong direction. Can it be supposed, considering the profession of the author, his present time of life, and his intercourses with divers descriptions of people, that with a view to the present subject, he has occasion to inspect the peculiar manners of the religious society whom he has been accused of traducing? He certainly has not.

The author, after the facts given on observation, applied them to certain uses; of which there needs to be said

no more, than what relates to a passage given from Scougal. Being misunderstood, it was explained by amplification in a note P. [page 52] not without intimation, that it was conceived to be perfectly intelligible in the Essay. In the Farther Reply [page 9] the contrary is contended to be the case; as is said to be confirmed by the sense of sundry judicious persons to whom the passage was shown—among them, a friend of the author. What is here said ought to have weight with him, were he sure, that with the passage, there was shown the sentence immediately preceding; which includes within the contemplation of the paragraph those only who “adorn the doctrine of their God and Saviour.” The harmlessness to the party, was rested on this circumstance.

Why should it be thought impossible [ibid] that a person of the above description may hold an error harmlessly to himself; and yet that it may do harm to others, by its legitimate consequences not perceived by him? It is of frequent occurrence in religion.

*Section 15.—Of the Methodists, as brought into notice by the dislocation of the passage in the Essay.*

The Farther Replier [page 22] denies his having announced himself as of the body of the methodists; and even under his character as an advocate, they now come in, only among the mass of those called the accused. Let it be inquired, how this matter stands in the Reply.

At page 28, there begins a professed vindication of them, against what are represented as the unjust and uncharitable attack in the Essay. The vindication is continued to page 33; and then, notice is given of the discontinuance of it, with the promise—“The vindication

of the Methodists as a body, shall presently be resumed." At the end of page 40, the intervening subject is dropped; that of the Methodists is resumed; and the accused plead in the person of the Replier—"not guilty." Was it to be supposed, that any man, without contradiction, would have taken such a liberty with a body of professing christians, to whom he was an alien? And would it not have been indecorous towards the publick, who might be listening to an enemy, under the mask not of a mere advocate, but of a representative? This was not the fact, but the contrary could not have been reasonably supposed, except on the presumption of an implied—it must be confessed there was not an explicit—assumption of authority?

It is somewhat mysterious, that the Farther Replier, after dislocating a passage, and giving it the appearance of being predicated of the Methodists and of them only; should contemplate it as if standing in its proper place; and after remarking on it accordingly, should describe the larger body of those whom he calls the accused, as pleading "not guilty" in his person. He did not commit himself to this extent, in his first publication; and it is now a greater liberty, than would have been the doing of the same without express or implied authority, in behalf of the body of which he is a member.

But it is intimated [page 26] that on the supposition of the author's not levelling of his charge especially against the said body, the pernicious effects of the principle, according to the account given of it, must be expected to manifest itself in their characters. This does not follow. He expressed his belief, that some subjects of the error settle down in christian conduct, and in

silence on the point. Others were said to have abandoned, with the principle, religion in every shape; and whatever number there may have been of these, they may be supposed to have left the society, or to have been disowned by it. Even the clause at the end of the statement, may be seen, to have put some out of the reach of the supposed charge. Of the two intervening particulars the author will only say concerning the first, that he has no data on which to calculate its extent—for he supposes some portion of it to exist in every religious society; and in regard to the other, that instances of it have been within his personal knowledge. Let it be again remembered, that the arguing from a doctrine to its apparent consequences, ought not to be too curiously carried into consideration of persons; as there may be the resistance of counteracting causes. Mr. Wesley and his associate ministers, were very free in pointing out what they thought fairly drawn consequences from doctrines held by many, whom they would have acknowledged to have been good men; and on whose personal characters, they were far from considering themselves as casting reproach.

When the author said, that he had no reference to any individuals of the methodistick persuasion; the meaning was, as the context may show, that contemplating the matter as existing in different religious societies, he put particular persons out of view. Were he called, by any existing circumstances, to the work of identifying worthy members whom he has known of the said persuasion, it is what he would comply with much more willingly.

*Section 16.—Of Mr. Wesley.*

It would be a subject of regret to the author, if he should be found to have treated the memory of this divine, with any thing so much like personal indecorum, as the short notice of his brother bordering on the scornful—in the Farther Reply, page 86. There is only claimed the privilege, carried to a great extent by Mr. Wesley with others, of calling in question a point in his theology. Even against the authority of the elder brother, there was an unintended offence of the Replier, in the positive disallowance of the expression—“an inward voice.” The error is now revoked, under the plea that the expression was rejected “not as to every use of it, but as to its being the point in question.” But it was to the point of direct communication, that the expression was introduced in the Essay (page 11) and that it was of course contemplated in the Reply (page 18.)

If the author had accused Mr. Wesley of Antinomianism—for this is the construction (page 31) of which the representation in the notes is thought susceptible—the charge would have been unjust: but it was not made. If it should appear from the Essay and the notes, that the doctrine of Mr. Wesley, unintentionally on his part, produced Antinomianism in others, even this was not presented as a charge; but arose incidentally, from the acknowledgments of himself and Mr. Fletcher, brought to show the change of opinion in the former. The matter stands thus: Mr. Wesley, in 1770, reminds his conference—“We said in 1744, we have leaned too much to Calvinism:” and proceeds to specify wherein. How far Calvinism is truly represented or to be charged with the consequences, is not the ques-

tion. The particulars are in regard to man's faithfulness—working for life, and—doing, in order to justification. In 1744, there had been a drawing off from the ground on these points; and now, in 1770, a more distant position is to be taken. The measure is vindicated by Mr. Fletcher, relatively to each of them. How is this done? He tells sir Richard Hill, his opponent [page 24] “You know by sad experience, that at this time, we are in danger of splitting on the Antinomian Rock.” And he goes on, through four pages, speaking in the person of Mr. Wesley, to describe the miserable shipwrecks which the same rock had occasioned in some of the societies: and he states the error to have spread like wild fire. At the end of the speech put into the mouth of Mr. Wesley, Mr. Fletcher reverts to the cause of all the mischief—in Calvinism, as he supposes. Soon after (page 36) he takes up the three particulars stated in the minutes, and discourses of them at large; still under the aspect of there having been formerly erroneous views of them, which originated in Calvinism and ended in Antinomianism. The Farther Reply (page 30) represents what was said in the notes to this effect, as injurious to the characters of the said two divines. It will not be expected of the author, to transcribe 40 or 50 pages into this pamphlet. But he appeals confidently to the judgment of every impartial person, who may take the trouble of comparing those pages with what is here written. It is a very irrelevant comparison made of the subject (page 31) with the abuse of the doctrine of St. Paul, and the check given by St. James. Had the former renounced his doctrine, from perceiving that it had led by direct consequence to the error, the parallel would have been to the purpose. In

that case, the seed sown was good, and an enemy sowed tares, as is set forth in a metaphor on the other side. But in the case in hand, the tares, not intentionally but through human infirmity, were sown with the wheat; and so acknowledged to have been by the sower.\*

It is no wonder, that Mr. Wesley should have found a difficulty, which was conceived to be apparent, where he prefaces his definition of the testimony of the spirit thus—"It is hard to find words in the language of men, to explain the deep things of God." The matter was not to explain, but to define a doctrine; which scripture, if it be true, must be supposed to have placed within the comprehension of every believer and of every seeker. When Mr Wesley went in search of it to the deep things of God, he travelled beyond scriptural bounds.

The author's confession of his oversight, in citing Mr. Wesley's extract from the homily of salvation, is thought imperfect. It is not alleged, that he is thereby charged with any doctrine not held by him. The author thought himself the more entitled to indulgence in the above particular, as Mr. Wesley himself makes an oversight in that very passage; first quoting the homily correctly, and then repeating the words partially, and with a variation of the sense. The Farther Replier calls this the giving of a summary: but who knows not, that a true summary contains all things necessary to the matter abridged? Whereas in the present instance, there

\* Among the questions and answers at the conference of 1747, there is as follows—"Have we not leaned too much to Antinomianism? We are afraid we have."



was left out the reference to the scriptures; the ground, with the concurrence of present state of mind, of an assurance of pardon. How can it be said that the acknowledgment is imperfect, because it did not specify a revocation of Mr. Wesley's omitting of the context? If the homily was quoted correctly by him, as the republished Essay declares (page 30) either the context was unnecessary, or was given: which made the notice of it of no moment. The author denies, that he either believed Mr. Wesley to have been "designedly guilty of the alleged omission," or has said any thing to that effect. It seems (page 36) that the paragraph bore the aspect to the mind of the Farther Replier: but this is one of his many suspicions.

It seems, that if the acknowledgment had been as ample as the demand on the other side exacted, the mischief had not spent itself, because of intermediate injury. There could have been no injury, except in point of accuracy, and that in a single instance: and the Farther Replier ought not to be quick sighted in this particular; lest some one should imagine and describe all the evils within the bounds of possibility, which may result from his introducing of the names of many eminent persons, as holding an opinion contradicted in their writings: and by some of them in the very places, from which there have been partial quotations, given to produce a contrary impression.

There remains a concern of the present author, respecting both Mr. Wesley and the Farther Replier. It is to show, in regard to the former, that there has been proved the only inconsistency having a bearing on the

present controversy; and, that the proof has been admitted on the part of the latter.

According to his statement (page 39) the question of change of ground by Mr. Wesley is, either his change of the definition of faith, or his giving up of the position in question. In regard to this, the Farther Replier answers—and the present author has said nothing to the contrary—“No, never.” But as to the other, it is the very point on which the present controversy began, although now unequivocally surrendered, after having been as unequivocally maintained in the Reply, page 29. The point is, that Mr. Wesley ceased to be of the first of the two descriptions of persons mentioned in the beginning of the Essay (page 8) and took the same, or some like ground, to that attributed to those of the second description.

A difference was stated, as existing among the advocates of the position in the title page: “some contending that the assurance spoken of is of the essence of faith; and others going no further than to say, that it is highly desirable and to be laboured after.” Under the tenth objection (page 14) the methodists are said to lay especial stress on the controverted opinion: it being designed, as what follows in the second appendix shows, and as is evident in the disjoining of them from another description of persons, to class them of the first of the two descriptions. In the said appendix, they are again introduced; and the design is avowed of showing an inconsistency between the opinion of Mr. Wesley adopted in 1737 and illustrated in his own person; and sentiments expressed by him after a correspondence with an unknown person, under the fictitious name of John Smith.

Under the head of the precedent opinion of Mr. Wesley, may be mentioned (Crowther page 162) his declaring of assurance to be \* “the essence or rather a property of faith:” the last expression being short of the other; yet required to constitute the subject of which it is predicated. Of this testimony of the spirit it is affirmed (ibid. 166) that it “must in the very nature of things, go before the testimony of our own spirits.” Again (appeal page 26) “faith implies assurance.” Many like sayings might be cited; but the last of them, shall be what was decided by a conference shortly before the correspondence with John Smith, which says—“immediately” —on the act of justifying faith—“the Spirit bears witness—thou art pardoned.” These strong declarations are not denied to have been made.†

\* The author quoting this expression, dropped the word “of” to the injury of his own argument, because to be “the essence” of any matter, is more than to be “of its essence.” The Farther Replier seems to have had an opposite conception of the omission (page 40 note.)

Immediately before the words quoted, is the conviction that Christ *loved me and gave himself for me*—being put in italicks, to show that the individual must know it in his special case; and immediately after the sentence from which the quotation is given, there is an express application of the whole to the doctrine of assurance. And yet—says the Farther Replier—“He does not mention the doctrine of assurance at all, as the reader who will examine the place, may find.”

† In the Farther Reply [page 43] the author is blamed for limiting the affirmed assurance, as if predicated of an *incipient* state of grace *only*. The language is still believed to be correct, but the meaning has been misunderstood. The word *only* was to distinguish, not from the subsequent possession of the supposed benefit, but from its being subsequently begun. Under the former circumstance, the contemplated assurance must be considered not as given but as continued.

There follows the change of ground. In Mr. Wesley's letter to his brother, soon after the correspondence, he acknowledges, that the proposition so long maintained—"Justification is an assurance of pardon or necessarily connected therewith, is not true." In his letter to James Morgan, he concedes—"Some may fear and love God, and not be clearly conscious of his favour." In one of his journals, he finds fault with the "Unitas Fratrum," for denying degrees in faith. In another of his journals quoted by John Hampson, and not contradicted, there is a censure on branding any person as a child of the devil, for answering no, to the question—Do you know that your sins are forgiven? And Mr. Fletcher, writing under the eye of Mr. Wesley, asks (page 83) "Do we not see hundreds, who, when they have reason to hope well of their state, think there is no hope for them?" The Farther Replier could not find these words in his edition: but they are in that of the author, published in Bristol in 1772, by W. Pine, and now open to any one who may have the curiosity to inspect it.

Can any one be blind, to the differences resulting from these opposite statements in addresses to convinced sinners; and to persons continuing for years—perhaps during life—fluctuating between doubt and hope? Very many have been the cases, in which the want either of the knowledge or of the application of the distinction, has been the cause of the anguish of despair. This consideration is rendered the more important by the circumstance, that according to the account of the conference held in 1747 (Whitehead, vol. 2, page 222) "a great majority of those who believe," and who, of course have received an assurance, said by Mr. Wesley to be

as clear as the blaze of the sun (Crowther page 167) "fall more or less into doubts and fears."

What signifies the distinction taken by the Farther Replier (page 40) between a connexion "immediate as to the order of the operations of grace," and another "in the essential nature of the two things?" The great distinction here taken, is as applicable to cases occurring in life.

His difference between genus and species (page 38 note) is not correctly applied. In the present case, the only true faith is in the promises of God in scripture, addressed to a suitabable state of mind. The distinction of genus and species is an excrescence on the subject.

As to the Replier; on his first notice of the Essay's mention of the Methodists (page 9) he quotes it saying—"There are none who lay so much stress on it;" that is, on the position in its plenitude, and he adds soon after—"They glory in it."

The object of the second appendix, was to show an inconsistency, in relaxation from the absolute requirement. The Reply admits of no such inconsistency; and in order to prove that there was none in Mr. Wesley, discusses his letter to his brother, giving a maimed representation of it, denying any further exception than that of mere possibility. Even this, may be considered as an entering wedge into the original system; but it was contended to come under the adage—"an exception proves the rule."\*

\* After all this, the Farther Replier does not hesitate to say (page 43) that the question is not, "whether Mr. Wesley or the Methodists have been consistent in their doctrine, or have vacillated."

Behold, how enlarged the ground becomes in the Farther Reply. In the texts, and in the quotations from the homilies and from modern authors, were the concession made of their applying to the position generally, they would still be irrelative to the theory, as it stands between the Methodists, and those who consent with them in the position, but do not affirm it of every believer. Again, of four facts produced on the 58th and 59th pages of the notes, to demonstrate the change of mind in question, the Farther Reply takes notice of one only; and that, in a way not interfering with the design for which it was produced. To crown all, Mr. Wesley himself is brought in, conceding—“*possibly* some may be in the favour of God, and go mourning all the day long”—owing, as he supposes, to disorder or to ignorance. It has not escaped observation, that where Mr. Wesley says *possibly*, the word is stamped with italicks: apparently, to identify it with the barely possible case in the Reply. The possibility of Mr. Wesley, admitted of an indefinite number; and related, not merely to the absence of the benefit at the moment of conversion, but to the continuance of the privation to the end of life.

Independently on all the above concessions, the change of ground might have been rested on where it is said (page 39) “what ground is meant? If it be this definition of faith”—meaning the very definition which gave beginning to the controversy—“The answer may be, YES.”

In reviewing the facts above, unnoticed in the second pamphlet, it seemed, that in regard to the letter of Mr.

Wesley to his brother, the passing of it over might with much more reason be charged with injustice to the memory of the former, than the author's omission of what he thought an unimportant context of the same person. He intended the letter to be a revocation, of what had been taught by him for 30 years; and Dr. Whitehead could not have omitted it, without desertion of the duty of a biographer. If, during the present controversy, any person should read of the incident, only as it stands in the Replies, and should presume them to be correct; it must be natural for him to imagine, that the letter was merely of the nature of a collegiate exercise, and for the display of ingenuity in argument; that Dr. Whitehead had indiscreetly given it to the world, as the exhibition of deliberate opinion; and that the present author had been trifling with his readers, in laying stress on it. In all this, the result of the Replies would have been counteracted, if only there had been contained in the first of them; or if, after having been pointed out there had been acknowledged in the second of them, these few words as part of a quoted sentence—"We tacked to them"—the truths of the gospel—"a proposition which was not true."

*Section 17.—Of authors, cited on the other side.*

It is intended to say very little concerning them, in addition to what has been said of a few of the number, in the preceding pages. The object at present, is to appeal to the judgment of every intelligent reader, in proof of the impropriety of providing so much food for the appetites of prejudiced and uninformed minds; to many

of which the passages will appear to the purpose, merely from the circumstance of being so adduced: although, in general, they have no bearing on the position; much less on the profession of those, who are a subdivision of the persons of whom the position had been predicated.

To illustrate the remark, let there be supposed the two following cases in civil life.

A principle, deeply interesting to the just claims of the executive authority, is brought into question. One man writes to sustain it. Another writes on the contrary side; and to enlist the partialities of his readers, loads his pages with what various persons have correctly written concerning abuse of power.

The second case: A principle relative to the liberty of the citizen, and his security against oppression, is brought on the carpet. One man writes in defence of it; and another writes on the contrary side; but enlarges his book with matter from approved writers, on the miseries produced by popular licentiousness.

The appeal may be made to all who have any knowledge of the world, whether in the first of the cases, the leading writer would not be loaded by many with the reproach of wishing to change the government into a monarchy—perhaps into a despotism? and whether, in the second, there would not be the charge of a design to overturn law and government?

The opposite effects would be greatly aided, by an artful management of italicks: in the former case, inviting especial notice to every word expressive of tyranny; and in the latter, to whatever carried in its hand the brand of faction.



There is an analogy to the stated cases, in the whole of the third part of the Farther Reply; and the unfair circumstance attached to the case, may be traced through all the three parts of that production: so that many a reader, perceiving the stress laid on every word savouring of spirituality in religion, will take for granted, that this is the very thing denied in the Essay.

The author hopes he has shown, of some eminent men quoted on the other side, that they have been greatly misrepresented. It is believed that the same is true of the greater number of those, who have not been named in this review. But the task shall be limited to two of them—bishop Taylor of the church of England, and Dr. Watts of the dissenters.

The former, in his treatise entitled: "Unum Necessarium, or The Doctrine and Practice of Repentance" [ch. 9, sect. 6. paragraph 69] writes thus—"Unless God be pleased to draw the curtains of his sanctuary, and open the secrets of his eternal counsel, there is no other certainty of an actual pardon, but what the church does minister, and what can be prudently derived from ourselves. For to every such curious person this only is to be said. Do you believe the promises? That if we confess our sins and forsake them, we shall be pardoned and saved. If so, then inquire, whether or no thou dost perform the conditions of thy pardon. How shall I know? Examine thyself, try thy own spirit, and use the help of a holy and wise guide. If, after all, thou answerest, that thou canst not tell whether thy heart be right, and thy duty acceptable; then sit down and hope the best, and walk in as much light as thou hast," &c.

Before the quotation from Dr. Watts in the Farther Repley, there is given what ought to be an antidote to a false impression from it—the distinction between the extraordinary and the ordinary operations of the Holy Spirit. Nevertheless, to show the contrariety of the views of that eminent divine to the position now the subject, the following extract is presented from his tenth discourse.

“We may infer from this discourse the value of a solid and regular knowledge of the person of Christ, and his gospel. It lays a good foundation for our first faith, and afterwards, for its growth to a steady assurance. What is the reason of the perpetual doubts and dependencies of some christians, that have made a long profession of the gospel? Whence is it, that they are alarmed at every turn and trouble, as though all were lost? How comes it to pass, that these hurries of mind should return so often, and almost overwhelm some pious souls, that walk carefully and humbly with God? Is it not, because their faith has been too much built on sudden and warm affections, without so solid a ground of regular knowledge? When persons of a weaker mind have felt a strong and divine impression from some particular scripture, or from some bright sentence in a sermon which had displayed the grace and salvation of Christ, they have made this inward sensation the ground of their hope; they have fed still upon this cordial, and lived upon this support. And whensoever these warm impressions return, they trust in Christ afresh, and rejoice sensibly in his salvation: but they can hardly give a rational account what their faith is, or why they believe;

and when these extraordinary supplies fail them, they sink, and tremble and die.”

There may have been remarked additional evidence of the surrendry of the point, begun on by the Replier—the necessity of a direct communication, agreeably to the original doctrine of Mr. Wesley. The present author supposed much to have been gained by establishing subsequent sayings of the said divine, inconsistent with the stand at first taken. But the Farther Replier has at last got so far from it, as to bring in a long list of learned divines, not one of whom says a sentence to his original purpose; while yet he pronounces them to be “many of the greatest and best of men, who may be ranked among the brightest ornaments of the christian church.” May it not be hoped, that during the progress of this controversy, there has been a vacillation of the mind of the Replier, from the views with which he opened?

*Section 18.—Of conversion and baptism.*

These subjects have been needlessly brought into the controversy; and therefore it is designed to be more brief on them, than their importance would otherwise require. They should be passed over; were it not, that the author is desirous of repelling some injurious statements; and of not appearing to shrink from the odium of holding an opinion, which the Farther Replier, without any bearing on the matter in hand, seems solicitous to draw from him.

In the Reply [page 8] there was introduced a passage from Dr. Buchanan, in favour of spiritual conversion, and citing Dr. Paley in its support. The first part of the passage from Paley, went to the same point. It

seemed enough to show [notes page 49] that the Essay had not denied it. But now, the Farther Replier comes with the residuc of the passage from Paley, which had been considered by the author as a meer circumstance; and which, as well as the other, he had never thought of denying—that a man cannot stop short in a course of sin, and turn to God, without being sensible of it, nor without remembering the process of mind issuing in the change. In the extract from Dr. Buchanan, there is nothing giving the idea, that this was the sentiment for which, principally, the passage of Paley was introduced.\*

The question of conversion being thus obruded, the Farther Replier [page 11] has resorted to printed lectures on the catechism by the present author; who is thought to have laid in them a ground for conclusions, which may be considered as they regard either adults or infants.

In regard to adults, the author finds himself under the necessity of repeating the declaration in the Essay, of his never having imagined of any of them, being not fit recipients, that they were converted or regenerated, by undergoing the ceremony of baptism. But if, on account of what ought to be, and of the agreement between the

\* The introduction of the passage from Buchanan, warranted the author to suppose, that the conversion of sinners, in the point of its being seated in the heart was represented as having been denied. There being cause of the supposition, he had a right to convey the idea entertained of the charge, either under the expression of “dispensing” with the subject, or under that of “making light” of it. Both of them apply; without any such material difference of sense as to the matter in hand, as is imagined on the other side.

sign and the thing signified, the scriptures and the church connect the two; there can be no impropriety, in his doing of the same. See Acts 22, 16. Rom. 6. 3, 4. 1 Cor. 12. 13. Gal 3. 27. Col 2. 12.\* Tit. 3. 5. 1 Pet. 3. 21. There is no difficulty, arising out of the case of a baptized hypocrite, afterwards becoming a sincere convert. The grace designed for the sincere only, has been signed and sealed to him eventually and on condition, but in a way the most likely to aggravate his condemnation. Justification may be possessed, before the baptismal act. Still, in the eye of man, and in that of God independently on good desire, the state is inchoate, and the church does not recognise it, until the concluding act. †

\* The Farther Replier, denies the universality of the application of this text to baptism. It would be rash to affirm, strictly speaking, that there are no dissentients. But of the four mentioned, three have been consulted—the other being not at hand—and are found noticing the above connexion: without—what was not meant—the severing of baptism from the “putting off the body of the sins of the flesh;” this being the thing intended to be signified by the sign. The construing are sufficient for what—as the object in the lectures—to show the agreement between circumcision and baptism; of course, the extension as much of the one of them as of the other, to infants; and further, their not remaining, subsequently to their admission to the christian covenant, under the condemning effects of the sin of Adam.

† The Farther Replier [page 88] dwells at considerable length on the uncertainty as to the point of time, when, on the principles of the author, a believer may begin to account himself in a safe state. There is much more certainty in this matter, on the ground taken in the Essay over the first two pages of it, than on that of the Replier to it, after desertion of the necessity of a divine communication on the first act of faith. Although the sub-

It is in regard to the other particular, that the author foresees an irreconcilable difference between his theory and that of his opponent. The former does not hesitate to avow the belief, that of those who are baptized in infancy, no other conversion is ever afterwards required, if, as they grow up, they are restrained from a state or life of sin. Instead of being inferred, it might have been made a charge from the first dissertation attached to the lectures. But in this case, it would have been incumbent to repel the same sentiment, as given in the passage quoted from Paley, with its enlargement in the notes [page 49] and from Mr. Wesley, in the same notes (page 59 and 60) from his journal (*ibid.*) and from Mr. Fletcher (*ibid.*) 40 years afterwards, under Mr. Wesley's eye. If the last mentioned did not mean what he said of baptism, it makes no difference; because infants, being justified, as he affirms them to be, must remain so, until apostatising to a state or life of sin. The Farther Replier may take his choice of the words.\* He has noticed

ject is confessed to have been rested at the nineteenth page of the Essay on the assurances of the gospel and present exercises of the mind, the ointment is spoiled by the dead fly of the requisition, that the reality of those graces must be known by the effects of a godly, righteous and sober life. Is it possible the Farther Replier should be ignorant, that in this particular, as in various other ways, a man may not know what manner of spirit he is of?

The Farther Replier has given a specimen of his logick—page 18—still confounding “cause” with “evidence,” as in the Reply. With this exception, his syllogism may be agreed to: it being understood, that the concurrence of the state of mind with the promises of God, in an ordinance of his appointment, is the evidence in question.

\* He [page 30 note] sarcastically ascribes the un-

that the author, having used the former word in his lectures, takes the latter in his notes. In approved dictionaries, one of the senses given to "life," is "the present state or condition of a person." If a man be in a state of disregard of God, is not this a life of sin? There was no use in the criticism, unless it were to charge the author with sinking the christian state into a prudential regulating of the exterior.\*

But it is noticed, that in the lecture, the position is made, of there being no new power of the mind, bestowed in baptism on the infant. Are there any, on the believing adult? Does not the difference between his former and his subsequent state consist in contrariety of disorder and of good government, in the exercise of his natural powers? Let there be taken the appetites of hunger and thirst: what an immensity of vice, is the result of disorder in them! And yet, where is the difference between the saint and the sinner, except that the former is under the control of a supernatural principle, keeping those appetites in subjection? Let the distinction be transferred to all the bodily and to all the mental powers, and the conclusion will be the same.

derstanding of what Mr. Fletcher says of baptism, to the law of association. The solution is admitted: and the associating circumstance, is declared to be Mr. Fletcher's having been in the habitual use—which is supposed to have been the case—of the office for infant baptism in the book of Common Prayer.

\* In making a man an offender for a word, there is a right to expect, that the objector should understand it. In conversation and in books, there are often included both heart and action under the term—"the christian life." It is even the name of a large work, formerly much read by religious people, and certainly comprehending both of the subjects.

It is objected, that the church of the author requires faith as the instrument of justification. The same church, in the homily quoted by Mr. Wesley, and in the part quoted (the third) contemplates baptised and justified infants, as the same. She does not limit the latter word, although it is often applicable, to a precise point of time. It would be impossible to show, at what moment Abraham began to be justified. For although we know he was so, when he "offered Isaac his son on the altar" (James 2. 21.) and when another of his acts was "imputed unto him for righteousness" (Rom. 4. 3.) it hinders not his having been in a justified state, when at the call of God, he "went out" from his own country, "not knowing whither he went." [Heb. 11. 8.] There are many who revolt at the bearing of this subject on the condition of baptised infants: but they ought to be aware, of the door they thus open to the error of excluding infants from baptism. It is difficult to perceive, how the admission of them can be defended on any other ground.

The Farther Replier, has made a most unwarrantable use of that part of the first lecture, which interprets the baptismal promise: putting between inverted commas, and commenting as if one subject, on two distinct branches of the promise, stated to have been introduced into the primitive church at different periods of time. In the lecture, there is occupied more than a page, in explaining the expression—"the devil and all his works." Then follows the expression—"the pomps and vanities of this wicked world:" but what is said of this, is interpreted in the Farther Reply, of the two subjects alike. The passage of that work ought to have



looked back to the exposition of the precedent expression, and forward to the exposition of another—"all the sinful lusts of the flesh." This is not said with the view of evading the insinuation made in the form of putting a question, of countenancing improper customs of the world, not coming within the limits "of impiety, cruelty and sensuality." The words, as the connexion shows, are applied to the second of the three branches of the promise. And yet, if under the head of cruelty there be understood, as there may be, every unjust act, the words comprehend the whole. When an apostle has summed up the positive branches of duty, under the heads of "living godly, righteously and soberly in this present world;" the opposite may be considered as forbidden in sufficient extent, in the terms above mentioned: notwithstanding their being put in italicks; to show the low standard of morals, supposed to be advocated by the author.

Independently on the injustice done to himself in this particular, he is apprehensive of the danger of there being some persons, who would welcome his theory on that account; and perhaps allow of some little weight in his name, towards the sanctioning of it. If there should be any such persons among his readers, he now declares to them, that his mind is far different from the representation which has been made of it in the two *Replies*. He knows of no acceptable worship, besides that which is "in spirit and in truth;" and of no morality, coming within the covenant conditions of the gospel, besides that answerable to the "holiness of heart, without which no man shall see the Lord."

## AN APPENDIX,

*On the notice of the Controversy in the Quarterly Review, by the Rev. E. S. Ely, A. M. (now D. D.)*

The Rev. Reviewer having unequivocally declared, that the doctrine of the Essay is the same with that of himself and his church; there would not seem a call for any comments, were it not that he good naturedly proclaims "a little controversy" with the Essayist, relative to the representation made of the opinion of Calvin; courteously inviting information on that point.

The differing from that very eminent person, cannot be a source of pleasure to the author. On the contrary, it would gratify him to be convinced of his mistake, if he have incurred any. As yet, however, he sees no cause to change his mind: for on again consulting the Institutions, he thinks that the principle in question may be found, where the Reviewer looked for it in vain, in the second chapter of the third book.

The parties are agreed in the fact, lamented by the Reviewer, that Calvin states assurance as of the essence of faith. Accordingly, the little controversy is brought within a little compass. It is, whether, according to Calvin, assurance be through the medium of the word, applied generally to believers by the ordinary operations of the spirit; or it be by direct communication, addressed to each individual, for him or her self.

The author does not undertake to inform the reviewer of any passage, in which it is said—"An assurance of pardon is given to an individual, by a direct communication of the holy spirit, by an inward suggestion of something

not recorded in the bible.” The matter thought to be seen in the work of the reformer, is his contemplating of an assurance which may exist independently on any particular passage in the bible, applied concurrently with the consciousness of state of heart, to the individual case. That “faith is communicated through the appointed means of grace; so that we come by this faithful assurance, by the reading, hearing, and contemplating of the gospel,” would no more have been contradicted by Mr. Wesley, than by Calvin. The latter, begins to open his mind on that point, in his 6th section. But, that there is any place in the chapter, which founds the assurance pleaded for on a comparison of the state of the believer with the terms required in the gospel—as in the test of Usher—is what the author cannot discover. The want of something to this effect, seems to imply the resolving of the assurance into divine and direct communication.

At the end of the 7th section, there is a definition of faith; which, seen under the distinction taken above, may be made to square with the one or the other of the theories compared. Before the opening of the terms of the definition, there are preliminary observations: among which, there are some which may be made to harmonize with the exceptionable position, but it is conceived—not with its opposite. One of the places referred to, is where it is said (Section 11) “the Lord to render the guilty of the reprobate more manifest and inexcusable, insinuates himself into their minds, so far as his goodness can be enjoyed without the spirit of adoption.” It would seem inadmissible, in relation to the reformer, that he contemplated the Holy Spirit’s applying of the

promises of scripture, to states of mind to which they are not suited, and for which they were not designed. Direct insinuation, may be thought to interfere less with the constituted economy of the gospel, in its great end of application to the faithful; although, as well in the one line as in the other, in contrariety to the views here entertained of the dispensation of grace.

If, from the reprobate, we pass to what is said of the elect in the 19th section; all that we read of contemplating the divine face, placid and serene, as the immediate effect of faith; and of arriving, afterwards, at a nearer, more certain, and familiar view; looks much like an immediate manifestation, and not like that which is through the medium of the word. Very different from Calvin's view of the Deity, was that of St. Paul in 1 Cor. 13. 18. This was in the instituted economy of the gospel, represented by the metaphor of a glass. There is nothing like it in the other.

It may be worth the while of the reviewer, to consider the section but one before. It describes the fluctuating states of mind incidental to believers, in terms so very like to those of the advocates of direct assurance, as renders it difficult to distinguish between him and them: and with both, they are without any visible dependence on the intellectual faculty. That doubts and fears may, with good cause, arise in the believing mind, is evident. But to render them worthy of attention, there should be the correspondent sense of delinquency. The feelings described by Calvin, like those of Mr. Wesley, seem to be much dependent on animal organization: the effects of which so mingle with the consciousness of unfaithfulness, as to occasion the suspicion of

there never having been the light, compared by the one of those divines to the blaze of the sun; and by the other of them, to the contemplating of the divine face placid and serene. The difference between them is, that according to the theory of Calvin, there can be no such loss of the benefit, as is entire and final; and that in the opinion of Mr. Wesley, there may be both.

There is no desire of establishing the above as the opinion of Calvin. It was incidentally introduced in the Essay, as a matter supposed not to be denied. Accordingly, the notice of the subject is now dismissed, unless in the event of conviction of error: in which case, there would be propriety in communicating the change of mind to the reviewer.

The author, has no fault to find with the exhibition of his opinions in the review; except, that where it is said [page 11] on the subject of assurance—"which is not given to all but enjoyed by some," he wishes it had been—"which is attainable but not possessed by all."

In relation to instances of injurious construction in the Reply; it was a confirmation of the opinion, that no ground had even inadvertently been laid for them in the Essay; to find the same sentiment in the impartial decisions of the reviewer.

The author is thought [page 13] to have used an unphilosophical, although common expression, concerning the state of mind of an individual, in saying, that it "is a subject of consciousness:" for, "consciousness can have no other, than a present operation." In the case of a man, labouring at this moment under conviction of sins committed—say a year ago—and sincerely repenting of them; is it possible, that his consciousness of the present

state of his mind can be altogether independent on his recollection of the past? Mr. Locke [book 2 ch. 27. section 16 and 17] makes the idea of self, dependent on consciousness, connecting the past with the present.

But stress is laid on the contrariety of the expression to "modern mental philosophy." Perhaps there is no modern more eminent in the department, than the late Dr. Reid of Edinburgh. This profound and luminous writer [Essay 3. ch. 6] dissents from the theory of Mr. Locke, as did another eminent metaphysician before him—bishop Butler. Dr. Reid distinguishes between recollection and consciousness; and between what constitutes identity, and the evidence of it to the mind: the confounding of which, he takes to have been the error of Mr. Locke. But although recollection and consciousness are distinct acts of the mind does, Dr. Reid deny, that the subject of the one may be feelings, produced by the exercise of the other on past transactions? There is nothing to this effect; or showing, that we may not properly speak of being conscious of present penitence, although it be for sins formerly committed. For any thing here known, there may be modern philosophers, although it is supposed that they would not be respected by the reviewer, treading in some such track in relation to the mind, as that of one of Moliere's doctors in relation to the body; who conceded that the heart was formerly on the left side, but contended that modern anatomy had placed it on the right.

Does it not border on the hypercritical, when the review [page 8] quoting the Essay as saying, that the assurances in the gospel of the acceptance of faith and repentance are unequivocal, wishes it to have been ra-

ther said of persons who possess those graces? Use is the law of language. If a son, having lived in disobedience to his father, have become penitent, and complied with the conditions of forgiveness, should we hesitate to say, that the father had accepted of his sorrow for the past, and of his promises for the future? And would not the acceptance of his person be understood?

The Review [page 20] has given a candid and true construction, of the words introducing a quotation from Dr. Witherspoon. "Us" for "up," was a typographical error; and, as conjectured, was not in the original publication.

Although the author has no personal concern in the two concluding pages of the review of the two pamphlets; he hopes, there will be no impropriety in noticing them. They present a pinching difficulty, intended of the theory of the Replier, in its contrariety to the doctrine of the final perseverance of the saints. It is not here wished, to convert him to the belief of that doctrine: but it is not perceived in what way he can resist it, and retain his theory of a direct communication. The author distinctly recollects, that in the discourse mentioned in the preceding publication [page 50] as listened to in 1767, the respectable preacher laid stress on the said doctrine; not as a matter to be then proved, but as the acknowledged doctrine of the church in which he stood.

## CONTENTS.

Preface	-	page 3
Section	1. Of the title of the Essay,	7
	2. Of the state of the question,	8
	3. Of the test of Archbishop Usher,	14
	4. Of the Essayist's 1st objection to the position,	17
	5. Of the 2nd objection,	18
	6. Of the 3rd objection,	21
	7. Of the 4th objection,	23
	8. Of the 5th objection,	31
	9. Of the 6th objection,	Ib,
	10. Of the 7th objection,	32
	11. Of the 8th objection,	40
	12. Of the 9th objection,	43
	13. Of the 10th objection,	Ib.
	14. Of the other supposed communications compared with that in question,	46
	15. Of the dislocated passage in the Essay	49
	16. Of the Methodists, as brought under notice by a dislocated passage in the Essay,	51
	17. Of Mr. Wesley	54
	18. Of authors cited on the other side,	63
	19. Of conversion and baptism,	67
Appendix.	-	74

---

## ERRATA.

Page 34 note: end of line 4—for "of" read "to."

40—line 15, for "nim" read "him."

" line from bottom 2, for "ascention" read "ascension."

43 line from the bottom 2, for "Repler" read Replier."

45 note: end of line 2, for "apology" read "confession."

" last line insert "to."

49 line 6, for "14" "15."

" line from bottom 5, for "change" read "charge."

51 line from bottom 12, for "15" read "16."

54 line 1, for "16" "17"





