











THE  
SPIRIT OF LIBERTY;

OR,

JUNIUS'S LOYAL ADDRESS:

BEING A

KEY TO THE ENGLISH CABINET;

OR, AN

Humble Dissertation upon the Rights and Liberties  
of the Ancient Britons.

HUMBLY ADDRESSED TO HIS MAJESTY.

---

By JUNIUS, Junius.

---

Secure the MUSE may sport with Names of Kings,  
But MINISTERS, my Friends, are dangerous Things;  
Dangerous indeed—why should we think in Change,  
To see the SENATE sink into a change?

*We call our Fathers Fools—so wise we grow,  
No Doubt our wiser Sons will think us so.*

POPE.

---

LONDON:

PRINTED BY WILLIAM SAVAGE, WEDFORD BURY,

FOR A. KIDWELL, 24, BERWICK STREET, SOHO, AND  
S. LEE, 70, FETTER LANE;

AND SOLD BY

SHERWOOD, NEELY, & JONES; GALE & CURTIS; AND BUTTON.  
PATERNOSTER ROW;

JONES, NEWGATE STREET; CROSBY, STATIONERS' COURT;  
AND BY ALL BOOKSELLERS IN THE UNITED KINGDOM.

---

1809.



TO THE

## King's Most Excellent Majesty.

*Most Gracious Sovereign,*

IT is recorded in the British annals, to the immortal honour of CONSTANTINE the GREAT, who was an Emperor, a King, and a Briton born, that he made the happiness of his subjects his peculiar care: that his laws breathed tenderness to the unfortunate, and at the same time were replete with the Spirit of Liberty: That the Senate was established in its ancient splendour, and therefore he was justly styled, by the ancient citizens of London, the deliverer of the city—the founder of peace—and the restorer of public wealth.—He was brave, affable, and polite; possessed of the talents of Julius and the liberality of Titus; far from sullyng, by examples of austerity, the glories of his victories.—'t'houg' an EMPEROR, yet being a Christian, a Prince, and a Briton born, the particular share of his attention was bestowed for the happiness of this Island, and the prosperity of the city of London, which was then (though so early) no mean city, being remarkable for its extent, riches, and magnificence.

Then, Most Gracious Sovereign, as a Christian Prince, as a Briton born, as one nearly allied to your people, as one dear to them in affection, as their King, their Father, and as a Sovereign, hear and relieve them, when the voice of the people to their Sovereign, is as the speech of the woman of

Tekøah unto David, who fell on her face to the ground and did obeisance, and said, Help, O King!

For it now remains, ROYAL SIR, not matter of doubt and consideration, but of fact and demonstration, that not only the forms but the very essence, strength, and spirit of the constitution is violated, and the dear inheritance of the liberties of the people destroyed; by a dominion of arbitrary power, in assuming a Power to determine upon the rights of the people and their representatives, by no other rule but that of their own inclination, and would fain persuade us, they do this for your Majesty's honour and the good of the people. But, what is this but to add hypocrisy to violence and artifice to oppression? A just disgrace they find attends it; and, indeed, much of it (through an over-ruling ministerial power) cleaves to the honourable assembly of both houses, which ought to be the constant object of attention, reverence, and affection.

In this case, ROYAL SIR, where can an affectionate, but afflicted, people go but to the bosom of their affectionate SOVEREIGN? Where can disinherited children fly but to the breast of their ROYAL FATHER, their friend, I had almost said their brother? None can now relieve them, nor restore their rights, but their ROYAL SOVEREIGN, either by bringing back their legal but banished representative, or by dissolving the unconstitutional house, which entirely depends upon your Majesty's pleasure, the exertion of your Majesty's power, and affection for your people; which is the only source they fly to for relief, and the only anchor hold of their safety; therefore it is that they will, as a privilege that is dear to them, and what they have an indubitable right unto, namely, to request, address, and remonstrate to the Throne, till they have the pure undictated answer of your Majesty's heart, which is the united wish and desire of your Majesty's loyal subjects; who have frequently anticipated the joy of your Majesty's favour, upon the foundation of these humble but heart-felt addresses already made; especially as their ap-

plication were so full of affection and loyalty to their SOVEREIGN, and presented in a mode so agreeable to the rights of the constitution of the kingdom; and it not meeting with that reception they hoped for from the affection of their King, and from their rights as a people, they neither can nor will impute it to any other cause than the arts and management of those who have no other means left to vindicate their conduct to their Sovereign, than by misrepresenting the complaints and desires of the people, when it is too evident that neither the most sacred and dear rights of the people, nor the honour of your Majesty's crown, has been the object of their strict attention and care; who ought in duty, in affection, and by every tie of gratitude and power of confidence placed in them, be the natural guardians of both; as the public welfare calls for the one, and the gems of your Majesty's peace and crown calls for the other.

But as your Majesty's happiness is not only to rule and reign, but to bless the people with peace, they cheerfully hope that they shall yet be happy in your Majesty's paternal favour; whose honour, whose glory, whose crown is engaged to make them the most happy people upon the earth; therefore they are far from being hopeless but that their fresh prayers and supplications, when spread before the THRONE, as the royal sceptre of liberty, or before the August assembly, by their feeling faithful representatives (who are the stewards of the nation's right, and the guardians of their liberty) will be heard with the redress of every grievance, and the restoring as the basis and bulwark of their happiness; as the very sinews, nerves, and strength of the constitution, their essential right of election (which now stands violated in the face of the sun) and secure that right which is so dear to the people and so securing to your Majesty's crown, from every future violation; by which means the affections of your Majesty's subjects will not only be restored, but re-established in your Majesty's person as their prince, their King, and Sovereign.

And as your Majesty has been pleased not only to engage himself, by all the solemn ties of his coronation oath, to maintain inviolably firm the rights of the people, but to renew those engagements by his royal word and promise afresh, in his last most gracious speech, that at all events it should be your Majesty's first and constant care to watch over the interests, and to preserve undiminished the rights of your people, permit me, ROYAL SIR, with humble reverence to say to your Majesty, as the Patriarch Jacob did to a mightier monarch, when pleading his promise, do as thou hast said ; for it is not, most Gracious Sovereign, suspicious and groundless complaints, but matters of fact proved again and again, by reason, by argument, and by law, which is the cause of the discontents and complaints of the people.—They are robbed of their dearest right—of their being a free people—of their dearest privilege of having a free representation—and of their dearest enjoyment of having a free determination by the law—of their dearest liberty in having free access to the ear and heart of their royal Sovereign and father ;—all which at present is almost lost by the undue zeal and force of m——r——l power.—But as your Majesty has directed them, to make your Majesty's subjects sensible, that it is your Majesty's constant attention to promote their happiness, it may be (but, Oh ! how happy if) they they will hearken to your Majesty this sessions, in promoting your Majesty's gracious desire, in restoring the first rate liberties of the people, in maintaining our excellent constitution, not by force and authority, but according to the ancient Magna Charta, by admitting (without private influence or mercenary ends, but purely out of love to the people) the plain and genuine sense of the law to take place ; this alone and nothing less than this, will convince the people, that it is your Majesty's constant attention to promote their happiness ; and if they should withhold this (however seeming strong their affection may appear to your Majesty) it will be impossible for us to be a happy people, or your Majesty to be a happy Monarch, with every

submission of duty as a servant, with all the ties of loyalty, love, and affection as a subject to your Majesty's person and government, united with a tender feeling sensation for the affliction of the nation, that every division may be healed and every right restored, when the alarms of war so loudly call for it—May your Majesty have the wisdom, as an angel of God, to discern the perfect law of liberty, and not like king Rehoboam, who forsook his father's friends, and answered the people roughly, *2 Chron. viii. 16.* But like king Solomon, who said to the God of heaven, *2 Chron. i. 10, 11, 12.* *Give me now wisdom and knowledge, that I may go out and come in before this people; for who can judge this thy people, that is so great?—And God said to Solomon, because this was in thine heart, and thou hast not asked riches, wealth or honour, nor the life of thine enemies, neither yet hast asked long life, but hast asked wisdom and knowledge for thyself, that thou mayest judge my people, over whom I have made thee king:—Wisdom and knowledge is granted unto thee, and I will give thee riches and wealth, and honour, such as none of the kings have had, that have been before thee, neither shall there any after thee have the like.*

That your Majesty may enjoy this happy blessing, and the people their inestimable privileges, the following essay, upon the rights of the people, and more particularly upon the perfect law of liberty of those ancient people called Christians, is laid,

With all due reverence and submission,

At your Majesty's royal feet,

As your Majesty's most humble servant,

And devoted loyal subject,

JUNIUS, Jun. a Briton born.

PRIVATE VILLAGE.





## POLITICAL TALE.

---

THEOPHILUS is a gentleman of a genteel fortune, amiable in his person, and of a fine genius; whose time, thoughts, and talents, are much spent in free inquiries after Truth, not believing every thing he hears for fact, nor immediately (as many are) transported with flights and fancies; nor sunk into dejection, by the power of imagination, but deliberately weighs and ponders things, whether they are political, philosophical, scriptural, or practical.

PHILAGATHUS is a gentleman of more advanced age, who is well learnt by daily observation, and striking demonstration, into the nature, ground, and truth of things—things political, according to the season of the times, or rather from a more noble view, have engaged his attention and solid inquiries, though philosophy, in all its beauties and branches, is pleasing and familiar to him; yet it seems that divine truths, because of their majesty and grandeur, of their glory and greatness, of their authority and ancientness, of their conciseness and conspicuousness, of their peace and felicity, have the ascendant in his esteem: but, in the field of his knowledge, being happily blessed with ease and freedom of access, and being dispossessed of those formal airs of pride, and forbidding stiffness of carriage, which too often attend knowledge (when known), this makes *Philagathus's* company much desired, and often sought after.

It happened that these two gentlemen met together some

little time ago, at Mount Pleasant, where, after a short interview, their conversation soon turned upon politics; when *Theophilus* very freely asked *Philagathus* (not being satisfied with the conduct of some in exalted power) what he thought were the criterions of an unfaithful and unhappy ministry; likewise what may be the mischiefs that flow from that ministry when they are more great than good?

To this question *Philagathus*, upon a short pause, observed that an unfaithful ministry and unhappy court-favourites were those, who with much seeming affection, flatter their prince for the sake of his royal favour, to feed their ambition with pride and power; or to supply their avarice with the affluence of the nation: to obtain this it is easy to see how supple their addresses, how sedulous their application; and men (who before were reputed wise in the station they were in) becoming greedy of honour and avarice, can sacrifice their time, bow with patience, and undergo an attendance or court-slavery, more grievous than an Algier galley-slave, to obtain an end unworthy their trust, base to their prince, and treacherous to the people, which soon appears when they abandon all thoughts of public wealth and peace, but what is subservient to their private Interest; then it is plain, that their integrity retires and gives place to their fortune, and that all their aims and study is to promote their own private views, even at the expense of their own characters, their prince's honour, and the liberty of the people.

To support this, they think that pride and absolute power is necessary; and to avoid contempt (not being able to render themselves respectable) they study by their power to render themselves feared: for their ambition being granted, they aim, in effect, to rule the nation by their own power and pleasure, rather than by the laws of the land: for, according to the settled fixed charter and constitution of the kingdom, the pleasure of the king in union and consent with both houses of parliament is essentially necessary to establish any one act as a law to the subjects. Yet, notwithstanding this, the liberty of the

people may be destroyed and the law of the land violated, when a ministry, or a set of men who are first-rate favourites at court, either for the sake of ambition, or for the sake of the profits they enjoy, dictate to their king, or aim either by power, places, or promises, to influence a majority of either house to coincide with their measures, not thinking it safe that there should be any in authority who are not influenced by their power, and more especially when it strikes at the liberties of the people. Then it is evident that the ministry, and not the K—g, reigns, and that their arbitrary law is a rule to them ; and therefore they make it a law to the people, which is too evident the case, when they assume to direct judges, to bias justice, to bestow places according to their own interest, making not only all places of profits, honour, and trust, to depend at their sole pleasure : but in cases more notorious, such as pardoning of murderers, rewarding the guilty, forbidding of juries, confining in prison, and overthrowing the freedom and right of election, the very essence of the subjects' right, and all that is dear to them as a people.

But by thus abandoning the true interest of their country, and playing with the laws of the land, making them pliable to their wills, they thereby effectually destroy the original rights and liberties of the people ; and rather than fail therein they endeavour to reduce his Majesty's honest and loyal subjects to a passive obedience by the cruel high-hand of the military power.

Thus, an arbitrary ministry, by their arbitrary measures, seldom or ever fail (if they can have their own way like *Rehobam's* evil counsellors) to ruin King, State, and People ; forgetting that their will and pleasure is not a law to a free people, though it may be a law in their own House. That they are not (designedly) placed there to rule, dictate, and reign according to their will, but to maintain the liberties of the people according to the law already established.

As there is a golden rule, or royal law, which is *to do unto others as we would they should do unto us* ; but suppose, I was

to ask a nobleman, **How**, my lord, would you like to have your lordship's house broke open by violence, and your lordship's property taken away by force, accused and punished and denied a trial by a Jury of peers; to have an only Son murdered, and the murderer screened from justice; and when murderers were fairly tried by law and condemned, yet pardoned, if not rewarded; to be chosen repeatedly a member, yet denied a place in the house, is not the very spirit of the law and privilege of the people violated? Is this, think you, my lord, consistent with the laws of the land or the liberties of a free people? If not, why were such measures taken, or why are such measures aimed to be supported? Perhaps, the time was when you would have abhorred these things; but, alas! how hard is it for greatness to pursue honest and safe methods in power! What wisdom, uprightness, and integrity does it require for the potent to stand safe upon the top-round of the ladder of honour, without espousing some sordid interest and destroying the liberties of the people? Alas! by what insensible degrees are the favourites of a court brought to consent (either by example or persuasion) to those actions and measures which they once, perhaps, boldly declared against with the highest indignation?

But, this being once done, then they, for their own preservation, powerfully insinuate themselves into their prince's favour; and having once possessed themselves of his mind, they seize upon all the avenues to his royal person, and render the royal seat almost inaccessible: but if with difficulty, and by right and privilege, which they cannot overthrow, access is found to the royal ear, and the grievance of the people is represented in the most feeling manner, united with the strongest ties and proofs of loyal affection to his person and family, only asking of him what they, as his children, his subjects, and as Britons have an indubitable right to enjoy; and what their king has, by promise, and by the very oath that settled him upon the crown, engaged and bound himself to maintain. Yet, alas! all their grievances are represented

to him as shadows, and all their remonstrances as the fruits of an affrighted imagination. With this apprehension he receives their petitions with a cold indifference, and therefore no wonder that they are answered with the same silence. By this means a ministry robs a king of his chief glory, and the people of their dearest privilege; no wonder then, if the spirits of an injured people are set in a proper resentment against such thieves and flatterers.

To this *Theophilus* replied: sir, a king cannot be without his ministry, nor well live happy without some favourite ones.

PHILA. True; therefore, a Prince who aims to live and reign in the hearts of his people, ought (for his own honour, and for the good of his subjects) to be exceeding careful who he chooses for his counsellors and confidants; because he places much of his own dignity, as well as his people's rights in their hands. Therefore, strict inquiry should be made into their abilities, not to take up with a general sufficiency of knowledge (which is common to most men) but such who are great in understanding, and enjoy a peculiar fitness and qualification for such a post, to discharge with honour and credit the high trust committed to them; not to take those to be the *Senators* of the nation, that stand next in favour, or are by a particular favourite recommended; for there are many grandees of a kingdom who are remarkable for their greatness and barrenness, and resemble certain high mountains which are entirely fruitless, never producing either herb, plant, or tree; though at a distance, they seem to touch the heavens with their stately tops; Yet their barrenness, with all their heights, renders them despicable. And surely there is nothing that more recommends a prince's judgment, nor is there any thing of more importance to his own safety and peace, and the growing felicity of his people, than a discreet choice of his ministers; that they are such who have the true spirit of the law and the liberty of the people at heart.

But, as your inquiry was, what may be the mischiefs arising from an ill placed ministry, I answer they are no less fatal than various; and to sum them all up, is almost as difficult as to prevent them: For if the ministry are ignorant, they ruin the state, their master, and themselves, by their ministerial weakness, and for want of understanding in those things which are essential for the honour of the King, and the security of the peace and privileges of the people.

If they are treacherous, then they, with all their seeming zeal for their King, sell the public wealth and peace for the sordid sake of money. If they are of bad principles, their aim will be to banish truth from the palace, to mislead the mind of their prince by flattery, to misrepresent the petitions, requests, and remonstrances of the people, by art and subtlety. They exhaust the royal treasure by profuseness, and rob the king of that bright jewel and royal diamond which once shone so bright in his crown, *viz.* that pure flame of loyal affection which lustred so bright in the hearts of his people to him: For, while with vain pretences they would seem to make him more exalted in power than his forefathers, they unhappily render him less loved at home, and consequently less revered abroad. But, this is the case when an unhappy ministry have committed some extravagancies upon the rights of the people, and being greatly (not to say justly) the objects of their contempt, their thoughts are then spent, not so much (it is to be feared) to serve their royal master, but as we say, to save their own necks; so that in all their counsels they then consult not his advantage, but their own defence? What care they how much the people are provoked, and their liberties infringed, so they are but supported. For there can no greater evil attend a king, a people, a state, or kingdom, than an arbitrary despotic ministry, which is the source of so many evils to a free people which we now feel: But methinks there are some distant hope, some glimmering rays, that this evil will cease; that the affectionate sovereign of his

people sees where his own honour and essential dignity, his people's safety and tranquillity lie; and that he will remove the evil, and grant them every privilege that he is bound by all the ties of affection, and sacred bonds of his coronation oath, to maintain: or it may be, we may be near the eve of an alarming storm from a neighbouring power, which will soon change the face of things; besides, that truly noble and patriotic speech of Lord *Chatham* and others, having left the ministry defenceless, there remains nothing else but either for them to resign, or to restore the rights of an injured people: but like *Paul* in another case, they seem to be in a strait betwixt two, having a desire to depart, which to choose they know not, but to think abide they will be more needful for us, either to correct us for our murmurings and complaints by the iron rod, or to show their fidelity in restoring the privileges of the people; if they restore them not, Heaven have mercy upon them; but their future steps will only reveal this.

Upon this conversation there was an intimate and free familiarity commenced between *Philagathus* and *Theophilus*; upon which *Philagathus* told *Theophilus*, that he was going a journey to the ancient city of Salem; that of all cities in the world it was the most remarkable for its foundation, glory, and privileges; whose foundation is more firm than mountains of marble, whose walls are more secure than rocks of brass, whose gates are solid pearls, whose ministry are all kings, whose laws are love, whose privileges are perfect liberty, whose provision is life, whose water is wine, whose inhabitants are all kings sons, whose employment is felicity, and whose enjoyment is perfect happiness. This city abideth for ever, and is beautifully compacted together, being the palace royal of the great King, whose wisdom, power, and glory is superlative; whose Queen I have heard, is a perfection of beauty, and is clothed with embroidered robes of wrought gold: in short *Theophilus*, to incline you to go with me, I can assure you, without any hyperbole, that the walls

of this city are of Jasper, the city itself is of pure gold; has twelve foundations, and twelve gates garnished with all manner of precious stones; and every foundation is a pearl; the twelve gates are twelve pearls, and the street of the city is pure gold, as it were transparent glass: it needs neither the sun to shine by day, nor the moon by night; for there is no night there, and the summit of glory does enlighten, and the inhabitants walk in the light thereof among the beds of spices, in the orchards of delight, by the river of the water of life, among the trees of the garden, which yield all manner of fruit, insomuch that the very leaves are for the healing of the nations.

Upon this grand and magnificent description, *Theophilus* was like one lost in a rapture, and said, O charming place! O palace of delight! I never heard of such a city before; Where, O where, may this city be found? I would travel from sea to sea, and from rivers to the ends of the earth, to see its beauty, to behold its glory, and enjoy the privilege of being a citizen there.

To this *Philagathus* said, my dear *Theophilus*, you need not feel a painful moment respecting your desired felicity; for the gates of this city are open night and day, and the King himself invites you.

Dear *Philagathus*, you transport me with discoveries, and command all the powers of my soul into admiration: What! the gates open night and day, and the King invite strangers to come in, and I not know it? but alas! How should I know it? I know not the way thereto.

PHILA. What, my dear *Theophilus*, not know this city, nor the way thereto? Where have you been? What has your time, your soul, and thoughts been employed about.

Here *Theophilus* blushed, and sunk away almost in silence; but he only said, let the time past suffice; may I not now enjoy the felicity my ardent mind so much desires? But, alas! I knew not the way; but, dear *Philagathus*, is the way plain, or is it dark and intricate?



PHILA. The way is as plain as Heaven can make it, for it is the King's Highway; yet it is, by observation, upon the traditions of our fathers and others, who are called guides, they treading in general in the steps and traditions of their fathers, frequently rendered by them so dark and intricate to strangers, that many lose their way; and others who have a true zeal, by hearkening to them, find it very intricate indeed.

THEOPH. Alas! dear *Philagathus*, this has been my case, for surely I seek felicity with a true zeal; but lo! I have so been embarrassed by the multiplicity of these guides, and led into their wild wanderings and traditions, that in short the path hath appeared so intricate, that I have been as one lost in a labyrinth to find the way; insomuch that sometimes I have thought either there was no such city, or that these guides rather perplex than rightly direct strangers.

PHILA. It is true, there are many that take upon them the characters of guides, being appointed unto it by men who know but little of the way themselves, and therefore they are very dark in directing strangers: Pray, who have you called upon for directions?

THEO. Why Sir, I called upon one *Barlamine*, who was noted to be an infallible guide; he told me the way was passable, but very difficult to find: He led me this way and then that, then through dark windings and turnings; then to this Saint and then that, who he said were the best guides; but they never spoke a good word to me. At last he told me, perhaps, I might not get there while I lived; but by that time I had been a month dead there was no fear, upon a suitable remembrance, but I should get there: but being weary of this guide, I went to another; one *Mr. J. Wesley*, whom I had heard great talk of, that he had an universal love to strangers, and that he had guided many thousands to this city; but lo! when I came to him he distressed me; for though, at first, he told me the way was free for all, yet,

when I came to know what way this was that was free for all, I soon found that all might be lost, that it was a way that none could go, it being round a mount that was all on fire; and he likewise told me that the King had done immense hurt to travellers by laying an impediment in the way, therefore I thought my journey unnecessary; however, I thought I would call on one more, who has been accounted a particular guide, Mr. *Whitfield*, he seemed to give me much encouragement, by telling me that the way was open and free, and that the King himself often encouraged travellers by giving particular aids to them, and directions that they might not be discouraged because of the way; yea, so liberal was he, that he frequently offered me the King's favour for my encouragement. Here I thought that his zeal and affection led him too far, and therefore it rather discouraged than encouraged me; for I thought surely the King's favour was his own prerogative to give, and therefore I looked upon it as lavish words without knowledge, which I was the more confirmed in from his own lips; though he was so free of his offers of the King's favour, yet he told me again and again, that I could receive no favour unless the King gave it me; then thought I, this is love and lavish zeal indeed; for if he had none to give, nor no right to give, why did he offer it me? And if it was the King's right and power to give his own favours, why did he amuse me with offers, when he could, I find, give nothing, nor could I receive any thing? Nay, sometimes he would tell me that I must strive and labour mightily to get into the way, and to keep in the way: Now, dear *Philagathus*, you tell me the way is as plain as Heaven can make it; O tell me! How it is; if you have been speaking to me by figures, speak now plainly, my dear Sir!

To this *Philagathus* replied, since, *Theophilus*, your desire is so earnest to know the city, the way to it, and the glory of it, I will speak no more in figures, but I will speak plainly.

The ancient city of *Salem* is the Church of the living God, where he reveals the blessings of his love, and the riches of his grace to his people; which revelation, for its ancientness and antiquity, for its clearness and conspicuousness, for its authority and majesty, for its variety and beauty, for its perfection and glory, exceeds all that can be said, that words can declare, or languages express, by way of eminence called the oracles of God; therefore it is written, *In Judah is God known, his name is great in Israel; in Salem also is his Tabernacle.* *Salem* signifies peace: It was the ancient seat of *Melchisedec*, who was king of *Salem*, king of righteousness, king of peace. It was afterwards called *Jerusalem*, where the temple of God was erected, being built upon mount *Moriah* and mount *Zion*, where the worship and ordinances of God were performed and solemnized, according to the divine command; therefore the Lord chose it for his dwelling-place, and said, here will I dwell, because I have desired it, as it is written, *His dwelling-place is in Zion;* for there was contained *the adoption, the glory, the covenants, the giving of the law, and the promises.*

**THEOPH.** What might I apprehend by the foundation of this city being more firm than mountains of marble?

**PHILA.** Because the foundation of the church, upon which all her hopes and salvation is built, is nothing less than God himself, in the security of his everlasting love, called the rock of her salvation; which is revealed in Christ, as a sure foundation; therefore she says, *God is my salvation, I will trust and not be afraid.*

**THEOPH.** Wherein are the walls of this city more strong than brass?

**PHILA.** By the walls of this city, I mean the security of the church of God. Hence it is written, *We have a strong city: salvation will God appoint for walls and bulwarks,* which walls of salvation are nothing less than the perfections, power and promises of God, engaged for the safety of his people.

THEOPH. What may I apprehend by the gates being of solid pearls?

PHILA. As gates are the ways of entrance to a city, and as these gates are said to be of pearls, it may denote the preciousness of the divine promises and blessings of heaven, by which we enter into the kingdom; hence it is said unto *Zion*, "Thou shalt call thy *gates, praise*;" denoting, that the open and free way of salvation, by the person, righteousness and blessings of Christ, are gates of praise to the city of *Zion*.

THEOPH. Who may I apprehend by the senator being wisdom?

PHILA. The LORD JESUS CHRIST, whose name is the wonderful counsellor; inasmuch as the foundation of the church's security, the walls of her salvation, and all the blessings of grace and glory, was the plan of his own infinite mind, as the fruit of his love, called the wisdom of GOD.

THEOPH. Wherein does it appear that his laws are love?

PHILA. Inasmuch as all the citizens of this city are received by love, drawn with love; and the statute law of the city is love,—love to his name, to his person, to his word, and to one another: A new commandment, says he, I give unto you, that ye love one another, as I have loved you.

THEOPH. What, by their privileges being perfect liberty?

PHILA. By their privileges being perfect liberty, from the power and dominion of every adversary, is owing, entirely owing, to a marvellous act of grace, by the King of Glory. These citizens were originally free, being, by adoption, heirs to every privilege, promise, and blessing, it being all settled upon them in the bosom of their Father's love; but by the subtlety of *Satan* their hearts were drawn away into sin and transgression, against their dear Sovereign; for

which there was placed a flaming cherubim or sword, which guarded the way to this city ; in this situation they had lost their freedom or liberty to enjoy their privilegē, though they had not lost their right of heirship or inheritance to them : In this circumstance, lo ! the King of Glory himself appears for them, his love being stronger than death unto them. He therefore undertook to make a mutual exchange between them and their condition, by taking upon him as an advocate, their cause ; as a representative, their persons ; as a surety, their debt ; as a sacrifice, their crimes and punishments ; as a warrior, their redemption and final victory ; which he fully accomplished, for his own arm brought salvation : for by this mutual exchange, or his engaging his heart to approach to God for them, whatever was his, became theirs, namely, his holiness, righteousness, life, death, resurrection, intercession, and glory ; and whatever was theirs, became his, as a surety to satisfy for, and as a conqueror, to triumph over : namely, their sins, enmity, and transgressions, which he died for, and by the atonement of his own blood, removed them into oblivion, never to be found any more ; and as their Redeemer, he having power to lay down his life, and power to take it again, he rose in triumph from the dead, having put away sin, conquered *Satan*, and triumphed over death, by the sacrifice of himself. Death hath no more dominion over him ; for it is written, *death came by sin*. But when sin was removed, death had no more power : therefore he rose in full triumph over sin, death, hell, and the grave. This being the case, the privileges, or in other words, the love of God in all its blessings becomes as free in its communication to the citizens of *Zion*, as though they had never sinned nor offended, because his love to them never was changed ; therefore they think much of their privileges, but little of their enemies, for what has sin, or *Satan*, or death, or hell to do with them, who are heirs of heaven : sin has nothing to do with them, by way of condemnation, for they are dead indeed unto sin ; *Satan* has nothing to do with them,

for they are delivered from the hands of the strong man armed ; death, I mean the second death, has no right to them, for that is swallowed up in victory ; and as to hell, it can claim no authority over them, for they are not heirs of hell, but heirs of heaven : 'tis true these enemies may, and do, daily disturb them, but cannot destroy them ; therefore they think as little of them as the children of *Israel* did of the *Canaanites*, who said of them in all their formidable appearance, *Their defence is departed from them, and the Lord is with us: Fear them not.* O death, say they, where is thy sting ? O grave, where is thy victory ? thanks be unto GOD, say they, who giveth us the victory ; then you know, dear *Theophilus*, it is no matter what the enemies are : thus you see that the way to *Zion* or *Salem*, the city of our LORD, is as plain as Heaven can make it, by faith in the person, righteousness, atonement and resurrection of the LORD JESUS, who is the standard of his Father's love, the highway which GOD has exalted for the people. " I am, says CHRIST, the way, the truth, and the life ; no man cometh unto the Father but by me : I am, says he, the door ; if a man enter in by me, he shall go in and out and find pasture."

THEOPH. Dear *Philagathus*, it gives me infinite pleasure to find the way of life is so plain, and the path so precious ; this is surely fulfilling the counsel of Heaven, who says, *Isa. lxii. 10. Go through, go through the gates, prepare you the way of the people, cast up, cast up the highway, gather out the stones, lift up a standard for the people.* Herein is love, not that we loved GOD, but in that he loved us, and gave his Son to be a propitiation for your sins : but that is not all, you told me, dear *Philagathus*, that all the inhabitants of this city were kings, how is that ?

PHILA. They are kings by virtue of their union and relationship to the king of glory, being joint *heirs with Christ*, and therefore a kingdom is prepared for them, and a crown of glory given to them ; hence they are said to be made kings and priests unto GOD and his Father.

THEOPH. What may I apprehend by their provision being life, and their water being wine?

PHILA. By the provision being life, I mean the bread of life, the word of life, the manna of life, the food of life; and, by the water being wine, I mean the wine of everlasting love, which flows from the throne of GOD and the Lamb, to the church; for the scriptures say, his *love is better than wine*.

THEOPH. Wherein does it appear that the employment of these inhabitants is fulness of felicity; and their enjoyment perfect happiness; and that their security abideth for ever?

PHILA. Their employment is praise, love, and thankfulness to their KING, which is fulness of felicity; and their enjoyment is the love, favour, and blessings of their KING, which is *perfect happiness*; and their happiness abideth for ever, as it is fixed on the unchangeable love of the KING of Glory to them.

THEOPH. What may I apprehend by this city being compact together, and the palace of the great KING?

PHILA. I mean that the saints or citizens of *Zion*, are *lively stones*, or spiritual persons, being built or united together in spiritual things, as a spiritual house, in spiritual ordinances, spiritual blessings, spiritual discipline; and are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, JESUS CHRIST being the chief corner stone, in whom all the building fitly framed together, groweth up to a holy temple in the LORD; in which respect the church is a compact city, or spiritual building, from CHRIST, the foundation, to the top-stone, it being the pure workmanship of grace, called an habitation of GOD through the spirit; and in the Psalms, the city of the great KING, because it is said the Lord is in *Zion*, and her KING is in the midst of her, the name of the city shall be called *Jehovah Shammah, the Lord is there*.

THEOPH. What, by the KING being wisdom, love, power, and beauty; and the QUEEN being all glorious, and her raiment of wrought gold?

PHILA. It denotes the beauty, love, and perfections of the Lord Jesus Christ, as the King of Glory; and the Union of the church to him in his love, beauty, perfection, and glory, as his bride and spouse, she being appointed as the Queen, to the same glory with the King, and taken as the bride out of himself, the bridegroom, as *Eve* was taken from *Adam*; she is in him the image of himself, and likeness of his glory, being a perfect beauty from his brightness; therefore said to be all-glorious, that is, in his glory; as the church's glory and Christ's is but one; as the glory of *Adam* and *Eve* was but one; or they were not twain, but one flesh: this is a great mystery, but I speak concerning CHRIST and his church.

THEOPH. What may I apprehend by the walls of the city being of pearl, and the city itself being of pure gold?

PHILA. By the walls of this city being of pearl, it may denote the preciousness of the walls of salvation; and the city being of pure gold, may denote the glory of the church, shining in all the glories of JEHOVAH's love, in its foundation, in its communication, in its revelation, and glorification; compared to pure gold for its majesty, glory, and grandeur, being the glory he had fixed for her, ordained her to, and brought her to the enjoyment of, as the fulfilment of his own love to her in the person of CHRIST; therefore he is said to make the place of his feet glorious.

THEOPH. What may I apprehend by the city having twelve foundations, and twelve gates, garnished with all manner of precious stones?

PHILA. As the twelve tribes of *Israel* were the foundation of the Jewish church, so the twelve apostles were the ministerial foundation of the gospel church, and the twelve gates are the same; the apostles being ministerial gates to the city, by opening the way of peace, life, and salvation by Jesus Christ, declaring no other things, than what *Moses* in the law and the prophets did write, that there was no other name given under heaven whereby we could be saved: by these gates being gar-



nished with all manner of precious stones, may denote the preciousness of their ministerial gifts, whereby they made the savour of CHRIST'S name manifest in every place.

THEOPH. What may I apprehend by the streets of this city being of pure gold, as it were transparent glass?

PHILA. By the streets being of pure gold, it may serve to show us, that all the paths in *Zion* are precious to the saints; that all the turnings and windings in providence, and all the avenues and ways of divine blessings that the saints are called to walk in, they are like streets of gold, for their preciousness and glory, because it is the King's highway, in which he walks, where he meets with them, and communicates his favours unto them, and this is what makes them shine like transparent glass; for there is such a clearness conspicuousness, and brightness therein, that they reflect a glory upon the saints, and a glory to them, because they shine so richly with the glory of CHRIST'S person, the beauties of his nature, the perfections of his name, that they are like a transparent glass, in which they behold the glory of the LORD, and are thereby changed into the same image from glory to glory.

THEOPH. But, how is it that this city needs neither the sun to shine by day, nor the moon by night?

PHILA. This shows, my dear *Theophilus*, the superlative glory of the church above all the glory of this sublunary life, which depends upon the revolution of the moon, and the daily course of the sun, blessings in themselves sweet and desirable; but, Oh! the blessings of the church arise from a glory infinitely more high in its nature, more secure in its foundation, and more lasting in its duration: being not temporal, but spiritual blessings; not sublunary or failing, but eternal and unchanging; called *spiritual blessings, in heavenly places, in Christ, and an eternal weight of glory.*

THEOPH. What may I apprehend by the LORD being an everlasting light?

PHILA. Because it is said, the name of this city shall be called *Jehovah Shammah*, which signifies, *the Lord is there;*

that is, the LORD is there by the divine revelation in the light of his person, in the light of his love, in the light of his glory, and all the blessings and promises of his grace.

**THEOPH.** What may I apprehend by the Lamb being the light thereof?

**PHILA.** By the Lamb we are to understand the LORD JESUS CHRIST, who is the light of life to the church; inasmuch, as he is the glass of glory, of all the saints enjoy, seeing the light of all the divine perfections shine in him; being the brightness of the Father's glory, the sun in whom all the beams and rays of the Deity centre, the object in whom all the glory of the Godhead shines, from whom the light of life, love, peace, adoption, grace, and glory, blazes forth as a light to lighten the Gentiles, and the glory of his people Israel.

**THEOPH.** Who may I apprehend by the inhabitants, who are said to walk in the light thereof?

**PHILA.** The inhabitants of the church we shall find, if we consider them ever so early, to be believers in the Messiah; for even Adam, who was a figure of him who was to come, believed in the Messiah as the seed of the woman; and the marriage of Adam with Eve, in a state of innocency, was, as the Jews say, a figure of the King Messiah and his church, which union and oneness we consider the church in, in all ages; but as CHRIST was, according to the flesh, to come of the seed of Abraham, so his church, under the temple worship, was of his seed, called the seed of Abraham, and owned by GOD to be his peculiar treasure; to whom, says the apostle, belongeth the covenants, the glory, the giving of the law, and the promises: but CHRIST being according to the flesh, near a-kin to us Gentiles as well as to the Jews, as it is written, Boaz married Ruth, who was a Gentile, by whom he had Obed, the father of Jesse, who was the father of David, of whom concerning the flesh, CHRIST came, who *is God over all, blessed for evermore*; and from this union, and kindred relation to CHRIST, the *blessing of Abraham came upon the Gentiles,*

that the promise of salvation may be sure to all the seed: as says, the apostle, *If ye be Christ's, then are you Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promises*: for CHRIST removed the partition-wall, and by his death he *rent the veil in twain, and blotted out the hand-writing of Ordinances that was against us, taking them out of the way*, thereby both Jew and Gentile become all one in CHRIST JESUS.

THEOPH. As the church, under the Old Testament dispensation, was called the seed of Abraham, the children of Israel, to distinguish them that they belonged to the LORD GOD of *Israel* in a peculiar manner; but what is the peculiar character of the church, seeing they are both Jew and Gentile?

PHILA. As the Jews were, in a scriptural sense, called the seed of Abraham, from their believing in the LORD GOD of Abraham; so both Jew and Gentile are, in the New Testament, called Christians, from their believing in CHRIST, taking their scripture name, or spiritual character, from him in whom they trust. The Jews were called Israelites from Israel; but the Gentiles are called Christians from CHRIST; for as the Jews had a natural union and relation to the person of Israel, by virtue of which union and kindred they were called Israelites, or the seed of Israel; so the Gentiles, by virtue of their union to CHRIST and their near relation to him, and believing in him, they are called Christians, or his seed, his offspring, &c.

THEOPH. But, did all Jews and Gentiles belong to CHRIST when he came?

PHILA. No, no, my dear *Theophilus*, it was only those that loved his name, adored his person, who were given to him, and trusted upon him for salvation; as it is written, *To as many as believed, to them gave he power to become the Sons of God, even to as many as believed on his Name*: but to the disobedient he was a stone of stumbling, or a rock of offence, the stone which the builders refused, though the head stone of the corner: But, says the apostle, *Unto you therefore that believe, he is PRECIOUS*.

THEOPH. Dear *Philagathus*, what is believing in CHRIST; I have heard much about it, but I really, some how, know little of it: I have been called to believe, to believe, to believe, and when the preacher has come down a little from the mountain of his pathetic exhortation, and has defined to me what I was to believe, I found it was to give my assent to the truth of the Scriptures, Ah! thought I, Why so earnest to make me believe what the devils believe, and what I never denied? There were others who told me, I must believe, it was my duty to believe, and that if I did not believe, I must be damned; yet, they told me, I could not believe unless GOD gave me power. Ah! thought I, what a wild jangle of words are these! I must believe, I cannot believe; if it is as they say, that GOD works both, both to will and to do of his own good pleasure, why do they exhort me to do that which I have neither power to will nor will to do? Therefore, my dear *Philagathus*, remove this anxiety and suspense from my mind, tell me what believing in CHRIST is?

PHILA. It is, indeed, a mournful consideration, that the King's highway of salvation is rendered so dark and obscure by the phraseology and traditions of men; for it is evident, that it is as easy to believe as it is to breathe; nay, that we can no more help believing and live, than we can help breathing and live. For believing is nothing less nor more, than seeing, knowing, loving, and trusting in an object;—as, for instance, I see the sun in the firmament by its own light, I feel its heat, I see the life it invigorates the vegetables of the earth with, and knowing this, by continual demonstration and evidence, I can no more help believing the truth of it, than I can help breathing and live; and therefore, I cannot but prize, love, or value the sun, as it is a fountain of such blessings to the universe; and consequently I cannot but place my dependence upon it, for the continuation of the blessings it does daily afford. Now I call this believing a natural faith, because it is from natural knowledge, and centres in a natural object; and this is all by seeing, feeling, and enjoying,

but if I had no eyes I could not see it ; nor sensation, could I feel it ; nor knowledge, could I enjoy it. And this is the very case with regard to believing in the LORD JESUS CHRIST ; for we can never believe in him till the eyes of our minds are enlightened by divine light, to see the light of the glory of CHRIST'S person in his beauty and perfection ; in his name, nature, and love ; in his doing, dying, and sufferings ; in his death, righteousness, and intercession : when we thus see him described in the glass of the divine revelation, we cannot help then but believe this fact, that JESUS is *the Christ of God*. Such a light springs from him, that it commands us to believe ; such a glory, that it attracts us ; such love, that it draws us ; because we see, by divine light, every blessing in him as a complete Saviour and salvation to us, *viz.* holiness to adorn us, righteousness to justify us, a sacrifice of atonement for us, a resurrection of power and intercession of prevalency with GOD for us ; under this view the soul having spiritual life, and from this spiritual life, a feeling sensation of the want of every blessing in CHRIST to make it happy ; therefore, it cannot but rejoice at such glad tidings, *that to us a Saviour is born, which is Christ the Lord*. It believes it with admiration, as the oracles of GOD, and depends upon it for its eternal salvation : thus faith is a spiritual knowledge of CHRIST in his person, name, and love ; in his grace, righteousness, and redemption ; and a soul that thus knows him, cannot but love him for his beauty, love, and perfection ; for what he is in his name, nature, and glory ; for what he has, as the head of life, grace, and salvation ; for what he has done, in doing, dying, and suffering ; and for what he is now doing, in ever living to intercede, and for what he has promised to do, when he shall come to be admired in all his saints, and glorified in all them who believe. Now where faith sees such a desirableness in the object, and love finds such a complacency in him, as one *full of grace and truth*, as it cannot but love such an object, because of his loveliness, so it cannot but trust him, because of his faithfulness to his

promise, his word, and his oath; which is as an anchor to the soul both sure and stedfast, reaching to that within the veil; —likewise, all the names and characters which he bears in the divine revelation, tend much to encourage the soul in its dependence upon him, namely, his essential characters as Jehovah Elohim, Jehovah Jireh, Jehovah Jesus; his near and relative characters, as the King of Glory, as the Head of life, the Bridegroom of the bride, the Husband of the spouse; his salvation characters, as the Surety, the Saviour, the Redeemer, the Advocate, the Conqueror, the Intercessor, Jesus, the Christ, the Anointed of God; his metaphorical characters, the Tree of life, the Bread of life, the Water of life, the Fountain of life, the Strength of Israel, the Rock of salvation; all which sets him forth as a firm foundation to the soul, as the only encouragement for faith to trust upon him for all, seeing that it is the delight and office of CHRIST, (as *Immanuel, God with us*) to save to the uttermost them that *come unto God by him*. Thus, believing in CHRIST is nothing less nor more than a knowledge of him, a love to him, and trust in him; which knowledge, as it is supernatural or heavenly, is the gift of GOD, the power of the HOLY GHOST, or the life of CHRIST made manifest in the soul; for faith cannot exist without its object, nor be prior to it, or of longer continuation: for faith is not something distinct from CHRIST, no more than the rays of light are distinct from the sun; for as the rays of light and heat are the effects of the sun's power, so faith, as it comes from CHRIST, is the life of CHRIST, in us; and as it centres or returns to CHRIST, it is nothing but the light and love of CHRIST returning to its own centre: and as it centres in him, namely in person, perfections and promises; in this respect CHRIST is called the object of faith, and as it is his gift, he is said to be the author of faith; but as this heavenly light is revealed to us and dwells in us, it is no less than that *Christ is in us the Hope of Glory*.

THEOPH. How plain is truth! How precious are the Scriptures, when they are explained free from the dark obscu-

rities and traditions of the fathers! But, dear *Philagathus*, do not those who love CHRIST, and believe in his name, give some evident proof of the truth of their love to him?

PHILA. O yes, yes verily and of a truth, both in confessing his name, and in being submissive and obedient to his commands; hence, says CHRIST, *If ye love me, keep my commandments*: and his command to his disciples was, *Teaching them to observe all things that I have commanded you*; and he that hath my commandments, and keepeth them, he it is, that loveth me, says CHRIST: *And he that loveth me, says CHRIST, shall be loved of my Father, and I will love him, and will manifest myself to him.*

THEOPH. What are these commandments of CHRIST, that I may be found in the practice of them?

PHILA. I am glad, my dear *Theophilus*, to find that your faith works by love; it is the divine character of a true faith in the word of GOD. The commandments of CHRIST are evident in the volume of the book, in which they are sometimes called his statutes, his laws, and ordinances, which are particularly described in his commission to his disciples. *Mat. xxviii. 19, 20. "Go, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost—teaching them to observe all things, whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo! I am with you alway, even to the end of the world. Amen.* The evangelist Mark, thus records it, *Mark xvi. 15, 16, and he said unto them, go into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature: he that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved; but he that believeth not, shall be damned.* Agreeable to this we find, the apostles went forth, preaching the word, which chiefly consisted in declaring the resurrection of JESUS from the dead. *Acts ii. 36, &c. therefore, said Peter, let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made the same Jesus whom ye crucified both Lord and Christ. Now, when they had heard this, they were pricked to the heart, and said unto Peter and the rest of the apostles, men and brethren, what shall we do?—Then Peter said unto*

*them, repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost:—for the promise is to you and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call: then they that gladly received his word were baptized, and the same day were added to them about three thousand souls, and they continued stedfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, in breaking of bread, and in prayers.*

From hence, it is evident, that the pure gospel (and not the minister's offers of grace) is to be preached as a revelation of truth even to sinners; let all the house of Israel know, assuredly, that the same JESUS, whom ye crucified, is both LORD and CHRIST. Now when they heard this, they were pricked to the heart; and well they may when they remembered what they had said, namely, his blood be upon us and our children; therefore they said unto Peter and the rest of the apostles, *men and brethren, what shall we do?* As though they had said, if his blood be upon us and upon our children, what will become of us, and what will become of them? what shall we do, if he be risen from the dead, and made both LORD and CHRIST? how shall we stand before him? what will become of us and of our children? *men and brethren, what shall we do?* They did not ask what to do by way of excuse, or to extenuate their crime, but what they should do to be saved from their guilt; neither did they ask, in a law sense, as though they could do any thing to save themselves from that guilt that lay upon their consciences; for they knew that as JESUS was the true Messiah, that all sacrifice for sin was done away by the sacrifice of himself; therefore they speak under the greatest anguish and distress of mind, of what would become of them and their children,—Peter said unto them, repent, and be baptized in the name of JESUS for the remission of sin.

Here let it be observed, that they were pricked to the heart, and spoke from life and a feeling sensation of the want of pardon and forgiveness; therefore Peter's direction to



them, was not to them as sinners, in the natural enmity of their mind, but to them whose hearts were sensible of their misery; and therefore he points forth the way of mercy,—*repent*.—Now repentance is an acknowledgment of having done wrong, in a natural way, and springs from life or the tender feeling sensations of the mind;—so spiritual repentance is a feeling sensation, or conviction of having done wrong,—and this flows from a spiritual light, life, and understanding of the evil of sin,—*saying, against thee and thee only have I sinned, and done this evil in thy sight*: and to show that this repentance is not a shadow, form, or appearance, or an empty show of words, we find that he adds,—*faith, love, and obedience* to the LORD JESUS CHRIST. Repent, says Peter, but, is that all? no, for he says, and be *baptized* every one of you in the name of JESUS for the remission of sins. Now these acts carry in them, as I hinted, *faith, love, and obedience*, the grant, criterions, or marks, or genuine characters of true repentance, even of that repentance which is unto life; for first, the apostle's direction to them was, to have in view the redemption of their souls, which includes faith. Second, it was to be done in the name of JESUS, which denoted love to him, and in reverence to his command, which denoted a filial fear and obedience to him, being baptized.

THEOPH. What! is baptism the peculiar command of CHRIST, and the ancient evidence of true faith in him, and love to his name?

PHILA. Yes, sure, for it is the peculiar commission of CHRIST to his apostles, *Mat. xxvii. 18, go, teach all nations and baptize them. He that believeth and is baptized, &c.*—Hence Peter said immediately to those pricked to the heart, *repent, and be baptized*. They well knew it to be the commission of their LORD, for it is written, *Jesus made and baptized more disciples than John. John iii. 26.*

THEOPH. But why did John baptize?

PHILA. Because, CHRIST, as the true Messiah, was to be made manifest to Israel by baptism, as John saith, *John i. 31,*

*But that he should be made manifest to Israel, am I come, baptizing with water :* and he is from his office emphatically called John the baptist, because he thereby (as the prophet Esaias saith) prepared the way of the LORD, and made straight his paths, *Isa. xl. 3. Luke iii. 3, 4.*

THEOPH. But wherein did the baptism of John manifest CHRIST to be the true Messiah to Israel ?

PHILA. It was a manifestation of the truth of it to himself. *John i. 32, 33, and John bare record, saying, I saw the Spirit descending like a dove, and it abode upon him—and I knew him not ; but he that sent me to baptize with water, said unto me, upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending, and remaining on him, the same is he.—*Which was exactly fulfilled in CHRIST, when he came from Galilee, to John, to be baptized of him, which is a living testimony of the truth of his Messiahship. *Matt. iii. 13, 17, “ Then cometh Jesus from Galilee to Jordan, to John, to be baptized of him,—but John forbid him, and said, I have need to be baptized of thee, and comest thou to me?—and JESUS answering, said unto him, Suffer it to be so now, for thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness ; then he suffered him.—And JESUS, when he was baptized, went straightway up out of the water ; and lo ! the heavens were opened unto him, and he saw the Spirit of GOD descending like a dove, and lighting upon him : and lo ! a voice from heaven, saying, this is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased.”*

Here, dear *Theophilus*, you see how exactly the prophetic views that John had, and what Jehovah had said unto him concerning the Messiah, were accomplished in him ; this was a satisfaction to John of the glory of his person, and the dignity of his office, *John i. 30, this is he of whom I said, after me cometh a man which is preferred before me, for he was before me. I saw and bare record that this is the Son of God.—*But was this satisfaction for John alone ? no, no, it was that the Messiah might be made manifest to Israel ; therefore came he baptizing with water,—as it is written, *John iii. 23, and*

*John also was baptizing in Enon, near to Salem, because there was much water, rivers, or confluence of water.*

Now the word baptism is well known, by all the learned in the Latin, Greek, Hebrew, and English languages, to signify, according to its true etymology, to dip, immerse, or overwhelm: I remember that Leigh, that great Grecian, who wrote so much upon the scriptures, as a critic,—says truly in his *Critica Sacra*, that its native and proper signification, is to dip into water, or to plunge under water; and cites the scriptures where it was so used. But why need I go to human witnesses, when we have clouds of better witnesses than these,—for it is evident that John himself so understood it, from his choice of the place where he administrated this ordinance. *John iii. 23, and John was baptizing in Enon, near Salem, because there was much water there;* and it is evident that the Jews themselves so understood it, who were to be baptized, as it is written, *and they came to him and were baptized;* and the manner how, is as clear as the sun beams. *Mark i. 5, and were all baptized of him IN the river Jordan, confessing their sins;* and it is remarkable and ought never to be forgot by the followers of JESUS, that he so understood it, who hath left us an example that we should follow his steps. *Mark i. 9. And it came to pass in those days, that Jesus came from Nazareth, in Galilee, and was baptized of John IN Jordan, not at or near, but in Jordan: therefore it is added, and straightway coming up out of the water.* Thus truth shines so bright, that to add arguments to prove it, is like attempting to add light to the sun; only I would just observe, that the disciples and those who came to Jerusalem to worship, understood it in the same light, without the least doubt, that when Philip preached unto the eunuch (who had been at Jerusalem to worship JESUS,) what fruit and effect it had upon him is plain. *Acts viii. 36, 38.* And as they went on their way, they came to a certain water, and the eunuch said, See, here is water! what doth hinder me to be baptized? And Philip said; if thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest: and he said, I be-

lieve that **JESUS CHRIST** is the **SON OF GOD**: you see with the heart he believed unto righteousness, and with his mouth he made confession unto salvation. And he commanded the chariot to stand still, and they went **DOWN** both **INTO** the water, both **Philip** and the eunuch, and he baptized him.

**THEOPH.** Sir, the Majesty and the Power of the scriptures I must own are too powerful for my prejudice, the scales begin to fall from mine eyes; but granting you that baptism was only administered, according to the gospel, by immersion, wherein doth this manifest **CHRIST** to **Israel**.

**PHILA.** I humbly apprehend that it is a manifestation of **CHRIST** in his person, as he dwelt in the bosom of his Father's love,—in his own love to his people,—in his sufferings for them,—and in its being a standing memorial of his love to them.

First, as baptism signifies to immerse into, put under, or cover over with water; and as water is particularly a scripture emblem of the love of **GOD**; and **John** came baptizing with water, that **CHRIST** might be manifest to **Israel**, namely, in the love that he, as the **King** and head of the church, and mediator had, with the **Father** before the world was; for he was, in a spiritual sense, baptized in the love of the **Father**, as one put into and immersed in his love, with the highest complacency and delight. This, says he, is my beloved **Son**, in whom I am well pleased, my delight, mine elect, my chosen, my anointed one, in whom my soul delighteth,—hence it is written, the **Father** loveth the **Son**, and hath given all things into his hands. And, says **CHRIST**, thou lovedst me before the foundation of the world. Again, *John* i. 18. No man hath seen **GOD** at any time, the only begotten **Son**, which is in the bosom of the **Father**, he hath declared him:—Thus **John** came baptizing with water, that **CHRIST** might be manifest to **Israel**, in the glory that he had in the **Father's** love, as the divine **JESUS**.

Secondly, he was likewise made manifest thereby in the

glory of his own love to Israel ; for he was as one baptized, or immersed in love to poor sinners,—insomuch, that he calls them the desire of his heart, and the delight of his eyes : that when sacrifices, and offerings, and burnt-offerings, thou wouldest not, and in these, said he to his Father, thou hadst no pleasure, then said he, lo ! I came, in the volume of the book, it is written of me to do thy will, Oh ! my GOD : that when he saw that sin, death, and hell ; that men and devils were set against him, as the LORD'S anointed. What then, why all his heart and thoughts were baptized, and immersed in love to his people ; therefore, he says, *Hos. xiii. 14, I will ransom them from the power of the grave ; I will redeem them from death. O death, I will be thy plagues : O grave, I will be thy destruction ; repentance shall be hid from mine eyes, for the day of vengeance is in mine heart, and the year of my redeemed is come. Isa. lxii. 4.* And when he took a view of the sufferings of his soul for them, that he must live for them, that he must die for them, that he must rise for them, that he must conquer sin, death, and hell, for them ; in a word, that he must go through the swellings of Jordan, and bear their sins, their crimes, and the wrath of GOD for them : such was his love to them, he did not withdraw, but gave his back to the smiter, and his cheeks to them that plucked off the hair ; because his love to them, was such that waters could not quench it, nor floods drown.—Thus John came baptizing with water, that he (that is, the Messiah) might be manifest to Israel in the glory of his own love to them, for he says, *as the Father hath loved me, so have I loved you.*

But, thirdly, it was likewise that he might manifest his love in the sufferings of his soul for them,—for he poured out his soul unto death, and made his soul an offering for sin ; being as one baptized, immersed, or overwhelmed in soul and body for them : O how moving, melting, and as one overwhelmed does he express his sorrows ! Now is my soul, says he, exceeding sorrowful, even unto death ; and being in an agony, he prayed the more earnestly, and his sweat was as the drops of

blood falling to the ground.—Father, save me from this hour; but for this end was I born, and for this end came I into the world. I am a worm, and no man; reproach has broken my heart, I am full of heaviness: I looked for some to take pity, but there was none; and for comforters, but I found none; the sorrows of death have taken hold upon me; I am poured out like water, and all my bones are out of joint; my heart is like wax, it is melted in the midst of my bowels; my strength is like a potsherd; my tongue cleaveth to my jaws, and thou hast brought me to the dust of death:—for dogs have compassed me; the assembly of the wicked have enclosed me, they pierced my hands and my feet: I may tell all my bones; they look and stare upon me; they part my garments among them, and cast lots for my vesture: but be thou not far from me, O LORD! O my strength, make haste to help me. But under these overwhelming sorrows, does he forget his church, his bride? no, for he says, help me, deliver my soul from the sword, my darling from the dog; that is his church, his bride, his spouse, which he here calls his soul, from her near union with him, and relation to him, they were not twain but one: he loved her as his own soul; his life was bound up in her life; therefore he says, deliver my soul from the sword, no punishment must light upon her; no sword must pierce her; she is my soul, my darling, my only one, my choice one; therefore my darling must be delivered from the dog, that is, from Satan. Though CHRIST fore-knew all these sufferings, and saw the sorrows of his soul, which he was to endure for his people; yet so immersed was his heart in love to them, or, if you please, baptized in love for them, that he said, lo! I come: O amazing love! Well may the church cry out with wonder, Who is this that cometh from Edom, with dyed garments from Bozrah, this that is glorious in his apparel: I, says he, that speak in righteousness, mighty to save. But, to show you that his love was stronger than death, he says, when he saw the decree gone forth, which was, awake, O sword, and smite the

man. Well, says he, if ye seek me, let these go their way,—and he set his face to go up to Jerusalem, and said, I have a baptism to be baptized with, and how am I straitened till it be accomplished! The cup that my Father hath given me to drink, shall I not drink it.

O boundless, boundless love, beyond degree,  
The offended dies—to set the offenders free.

Thus, *Theophilus*, you see that John came baptizing with water, that the sufferings of CHRIST's soul might be made manifest to Israel.

But the grand design of the whole of John's baptism, appears to be this, *viz.* that it may be a standing ordinance in the church of GOD; whereby CHRIST might be made manifest to his Israel, in all ages of the church, in his love to them, and in his sufferings, death, and resurrection for them, and of their love and obedience to him:—that the baptism of CHRIST, is a lively figure of his sufferings, death, and resurrection, is so clear, that it will not admit of a doubt; and is called his death and resurrection, in the same sense that the bread and wine in the LORD's supper is called his body and his blood: the bread that we brake, is it not, says the apostle, the communion of the body of CHRIST? and the cup which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of CHRIST? so we may say of baptism, is it not the emblem, the figure, the representation of our communion with CHRIST, in his sufferings, death, and resurrection: hence, says the apostle, *Rom. vi. 3, 4. Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ, were baptized into his death; that is, we were immersed by the Holy Ghost, through the operation of faith, into the sufferings, death, and atonement of the LORD JESUS, as the only foundation of our hope for pardon, peace, and salvation; therefore the apostle adds, we are buried with him by baptism into death: for as the high priest, under the law, upon the day of atonement, went into the holy of holies with the names of the children of Israel. Exodus xxviii. 29. And Aaron shall bear the names of the*

*children of Israel, in the breast-plate of judgment, upon his heart, when he goeth into the holy place, for a memorial before the Lord continually.* So that when Aaron stood before the LORD, you see, *Theophilus*, that the people stood with him, tho' not personally, yet relatively, for he was their high-priest; and representatively, for he had their names upon his breast-plate; and above all affectionately, as their names were upon his heart; so that when the LORD saw Aaron he saw the people in him, but all this was only a shadow or figure of him that was to come. For the LORD JESUS CHRIST, upon the great day of atonement, when he poured out his soul unto death, he had the names of his people upon his heart; that when he was baptized, or overwhelmed in sufferings for them even unto death, or as one buried in death, they were then buried with him in the same baptism unto death, for the LORD saw all the sufferings of his people in the sufferings of the Messiah; which denotes our relative union to him, and our fellowship with him in all the blessings of his sufferings: for being buried with him, denotes, that all our sins were buried in his death; and as his death came by his being baptized in the sorrows of his soul, and in the sufferings of his own blood, and we buried in him by that baptism; it denotes our washing, cleansing, and salvation thereby, it being such a lively figure thereof, as saith the apostle Peter, the like figure whereunto even baptism doth save us; not the putting away the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience towards GOD, by the resurrection of JESUS CHRIST.

THEOPH. Dear *Philagathus*, you not only persuaded me, but as it were command me, to believe—the Majesty of the scriptures; the glory of the command, the brightness of the example, and above all the glorious end designed thereby, that I feel the same rapture the eunuch did, when he said, see here is water! what doth hinder me that I may not be baptized? but are there any more spiritual glories contained in this ordinance?



PHILA. Yes, for it is not only a representation of his sufferings, death, and burial, but of his resurrection from the dead; for as CHRIST was overwhelmed in sufferings, buried in the grave, and then rose from the dead;—so the believer, when he is brought to see the place where the Lord lay, he views the ordinances as an emblem of the death, grave and resurrection of JESUS, therefore, says the apostle,—*being planted together, that is in baptism, as a figure, in the likeness of his death, we shall also be in the likeness of his resurrection, that as CHRIST was risen by the glory of the Father, we should henceforth walk in newness of life.* In a word, or to hold forth the word of life, baptism, according to the pure revelation of truth, the command of GOD, the example of CHRIST, and the practice of the Apostles, is a most glorious emblem of the whole of salvation, even from regeneration to that of glorification; hence, said Ananias to Paul, *Acts xxii. 16. Now why tarriest thou? arise, and be baptized; washing away thy sins: calling on the name of the LORD:*—Not to wash them away meritoriously, that is the blood of CHRIST; or influentially, that is the spirit of CHRIST; but representatively, as baptism is an emblem of CHRIST'S death, and resurrection; or it is manifestly a washing away of sin before men and angels, as it gives an evidence to them of the truth of our faith in his death, for the washing away of our sins; of the truth of our love to his person, being baptized in his name, of our obedience to his commands. Go, says he, *teach all nations, baptizing them;* which ordinance all the primitive saints beheld with such beauty, privilege, and satisfaction, that they all with joy embraced it; no one that ever I read of, had ever the least objection to it; no sooner were they called by grace, than they declared the truth of their faith, by being baptized in the name of JESUS, for the remission of sins.

This was the case of the first gospel, or New Testament church, that ever was settled; for when they were pricked to the heart for what they had done to the Lord of life and

glory, they said to Peter and the rest of the apostles, *Men and brethren, what shall we do?* and Peter said unto them, *Repent and be baptized*, every one of you, in the name of JESUS, for the remission of sin; as though he had said, if ye will prove to us, to ourselves and to the brethren, the sincerity of your repentance, and the truth of your faith and love to the Messiah whom ye have crucified and slain; show it by obeying his commands, who sent us to *teach and to baptize all nations.* Acts ii. 41. *Then they that gladly received the word were baptized:* And this was the case of the Eunuch, Acts viii. 36. *And the Eunuch said, See here is water; what doth hinder me to be baptized? And Philip said, if thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest; and he said, I believe that JESUS CHRIST is the Son of GOD; and he commanded the chariot to stand still, and they went down both into the water, both Philip and the eunuch, and he baptized him:—*And so satisfied was Paul of the truth of this, that when Ananias said unto you, (him) *arise, and be baptized, why tarriest thou?* it is said, Acts ix. 10, *And he arose, and was baptized.* This shows that every appointment of CHRIST, and every ordinance which bears his name, his stamp, and authority, are dear to them that love him, not only as means which lead to glory, but as part of their glory in the house of their pilgrimage.

THEOPH. But, dear sir, was this the practice of all the New Testament churches?

PHILA. You may well ask the question, when you take a view of the divisions of the churches at this day; and how fond and zealous they are for the infant tradition of their fathers: but, *Theophilus*, as your satisfaction is my joy, let us go to the testimony of Truth, which cannot err, and like the noble Bereans, let us search the scriptures whether the things spoken are so or not.

First, the church of Jerusalem; which was the first gospel church that was planted, where, we find, that neither the Apostles', nor yet Peter's hearers, were at any difficulty or doubt respecting the formation of the church, or the visible

members of it, which undoubtedly they learnt being Jews, from John's ministry, *who came baptizing with water, that CHRIST might be made manifest to Israel*; they came to be baptized of him, as you have it in *Matt. iii. 5.* &c. Then went to him all Judea, and all the region round about Jordan, —and were baptized of him in Jordan, confessing their sins. This is the first place we have the word baptism mentioned; and here we have the light of truth as clear as the noon-day respecting the subjects of it, that they were such as confessed their sins; and the administration of it, that it was by immersion IN Jordan, not at Jordan, nor upon the banks of Jordan, but IN Jordan: but there were two sorts of people that came to him, the one confessing their sins—and another which did not; to these what did John say? but when he saw many of the Pharisees and Saducees come to his baptism, he said unto them, Oh, generation of vipers! who has warned you to flee from the wrath to come? from these words it plainly appears, that John, whose name signifies the grace of GOD, that he preached the grace of GOD and the salvation by the Messiah; which was particularly made manifest to Israel by baptism; for, I ask, *Theophilus*, what do you think could induce the inhabitants of Jerusalem and of Judea, to come confessing their sins, and to be baptized, unless they saw a blessing propounded to them thereby, which appears plain; for it is here called a fleeing from the wrath to come, which must be understood not of their fleeing to John, for he was no Saviour, nor to Jordan, for that could not really wash away sin; therefore, they must have something much higher in view, which was faith in the Messiah, by John's baptism; because it was a lively figure of his suffering, death, grave, and resurrection, *Rom. vi. 3, 4.* And in this sense only they could be said to flee from the wrath to come. But, John seeing some come to him whom he knew, as a prophet, that had no faith in the Messiah, or love to him; these he calls a generation of vipers, because of that poison of enmity that lurked in them to CHRIST; to these he says, who warned you? did GOD? no! did your con-

sciences? no! did I? no!—therefore, go bring forth fruits meet for repentance, that is, let the fruits which attend repentance be first seen, which is love to the Messiah,—as though he had said, do you think to enjoy a right to baptism, as you do the temple-worship by being Abraham's seed? think not to say within yourselves we have Abraham to our Father, for whatever right it gave you under the law, it gives you none under the gospel; for God is able of these stones, to raise up children to Abraham: denoting, by way of irony, that the stones had as much right to a gospel ordinance, as they had, or that any one can have, by saying they have such an one or such an one to their Father; for if Abraham, who was the father of the faithful, could give them no right as children,—what right can those children have, I wonder, by virtue of their parents, who have not such a father to boast of? and the reason is plain; for says John, the ax is laid to the root of the trees, namely, the trees that were planted in the temple from Abraham; not one is spared, therefore every tree which bringeth forth not good fruit, namely, the fruit of love to the Messiah, is cut down by the gospel dispensation; for none but lively stones, believers' spiritual souls, were taken into the church; and therefore when Peter said to his Jerusalem hearers, repent and be baptized: It was the same as John said,—bring forth fruits meet for repentance; for obedience is the true fruit of repentance; and the apostles understood it to be the same, and so did the hearers, for it is written, *Acts ii. 41. Then they that gladly received the word were baptized.* From these were formed, or organized a gospel church; therefore it is said, the same day there were added to them—that is, the disciples (mentioned *Acts i 15.*) *three thousand souls,—and they continued stedfastly in the Apostles' doctrine, in fellowship, in breaking of bread, and in prayers.* You see here is first receiving the word gladly,—then baptized,—then church fellowship, continuing stedfastly in the Apostles' doctrine, in breaking of bread and in prayers. Thus, you see, that the first New Testament church, or the Jerusalem church, called by some

the mother church, was formed of Baptist, or baptized believers in CHRIST.

THEOPH. Was the same order observed in all the New Testament churches ?

PHILA. Yes, see Second (the church of CHRIST at *Samarina*) of whom it is said, *Acts*, viii. 4, 5, 6, &c. *Therefore they that were scattered abroad went every where preaching the word—then Philip went down to the city of Samaria, and preached Christ unto them; and the people with one accord gave heed unto those things which Philip spake, and there was great joy in that city. When they believed Philip preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized both men and women.*

Thirdly, the church at *Cesarea*; which you will find was formed originally from *John's* ministry and baptism, *Acts* x. 24, &c. *And the morrow after they entered Cesarea, and Cornelius waited for them, and had called together his kinsmen and near friends: now therefore we are all here present before God, to hear all things that are commanded thee of God. Then Peter opened his mouth, and said, the word which God sent unto the children of Israel preaching peace by Jesus, he is Lord of all—that word you know which was published throughout all Judea, and began from Galilee, after the baptism which John preached—How God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost; and we are witnesses of all things which he did both in the land of the Jews and in Jerusalem, whom they slew and hanged on a tree, him hath God raised up and showed him openly; not to all the people, but unto witnesses chosen before of God, even to us who did eat and drink with him after he rose from the dead—and he commanded us to preach unto the people, and to testify that it is he which was ordained of God to be the Judge both of the quick and dead:—to him give all the prophets witness, that whosoever believeth in his name shall receive the remission of sins. While Peter spake these words, the Holy Ghost fell upon all them which heard the word; then answered Peter, Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized, seeing they*

have received the Holy Ghost as well as we? and he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord. But,

Fourthly, the church of CHRIST at Philippi; which was formed, or united together, upon the same order, as the church at Jerusalem, *Acts xvi. 12,—15.* Paul, speaking of his travels, says, *And from thence (namely from Neapolis) to Philippi, which is the chief city of that part of Macedonia, and a colony: and we were in that city, abiding certain days; and on the Sabbath we went out of the city by a river side, where prayer was wont to be made; and we sat down and spake unto the women which resorted thither;—and a certain woman, named Lydia, a seller of purple, of the city of Thyatira, which worshipped God, heard us, whose heart the Lord opened, that she attended unto things which were spoken of Paul; and when she was baptized and her household, she besought us, saying, If ye have judged me to be faithful to the Lord, come into my house, and she constrained us.* The consequence of which was more disciples to CHRIST, more spiritual stones in the church-building. *Ver. 32,—34, And they spake unto him the word of the Lord, and unto all that were in the house; and he took them the same hour of the Night, and washed their stripes, and was baptized, he and all his, straight-way:—And when he had brought them into his house, he set meat before them, and rejoiced, believing in God with all his house.*

**THEOPH.** The power of Scripture, and the example of the saints, commands my attention; give me leave, dear *Philagathus*, to go through the churches, was the church at Corinth formed upon the Jerusalem plan?

**PHILA.** It is remarkably observed of the church of Corinth, *1 Cor. xi. 2. That they kept the Ordinances as Paul had delivered them.* Who they were that kept the ordinances of the LORD, Paul himself tells you, that they were the church of GOD, and what they were composed of, *1 Cor. i. 2. Unto the church of God, which is at Corinth, to them that are sanctified in Christ Jesus, called to be saints, with all that in every place call upon the name of Jesus Christ our Lord, both theirs and ours.*—And how these Corinthians came manifestly to be

sanctified and to be saints, he tells you, *Acts xvi. 1, &c.* *And after these things Paul departed from Athens, and came to Corinth,—and entered into a certain man's house, named Justus, one that worshipped GOD, whose house joined hard to the synagogue; and Crispus, the chief ruler of the synagogue, believed on the Lord, with all his house;—and many of the Corinthians hearing, believed, and were baptized.* These, Paul calls the church of GOD, the saints at Corinth,—and he tells you that he himself baptized Crispus and Gaius, and the household of Stephanus.

Time would fail me to tell you of the church of CHRIST at Rome; only I would just hint that they were all baptized believers in CHRIST, *Rom. vi. 3.* *Know ye not, says Paul, that as many of us as were baptized unto Jesus Christ were baptized into his death—buried, says he, with him in baptism into his death.*—And upon their love to the LORD JESUS, and obedience to him, who commanded the apostles to teach them, and to baptize them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. He thus writes to them as such, *Rom. i. 7.* *To all that be in Rome, beloved of God, called to be saints, grace to you, and peace from God our Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ; I thank my God, through Jesus Christ, for you all, that your faith is spoken of throughout the whole world.*—Thus you see, *Theophilus*, that all the churches were formed, or were united together, according as the Lord had commanded them, *Matt. xxvii. 19.*

THEOPH. What, were the churches of Galatia, the church at Ephesus, and the church at Colosse, all formed of baptized believers in the apostles' days?

PHILA. Yes, sure; for the apostles have but one pattern, one example, one faith, one LORD, one baptism, and one command; therefore the apostle says to the church at Galatia, *1 Gal. iii. 26, 27.* *“ For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus, and then points out where the truth of their faith appeared; for as many of you as have been baptized in Christ, have put on Christ.*

To the church at Colosse he thus writes, *Col. i. 2.* *To the saints and faithful brethren in Christ, which are at Colosse, grace be unto you and peace from God the Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ.—We give thanks to God and the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, praying always for you since we have heard of your faith in Christ Jesus, and of the love which ye have to all the saints.* And wherein their faith appeared in CHRIST he tells you, chap. ii. 12. *Buried with him by Baptism, wherein ye also are risen with him through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead.*

Of the church of Ephesus it is thus declared, *Acts xix. 1, —4, 5.* Paul having passed through the upper coast to Ephesus, and finding certain disciples, *Then said Paul, John verily baptized with the baptism of repentance, saying unto the people, that they should believe on him who should come after him, that is, on Christ Jesus.* On which account he calls them the saints which are at Ephesus, and the faithful in CHRIST JESUS, *Eph. i. 1.* And those who were the gifted brethren among them, he calls them the elders of the church at Ephesus, *Acts xx. 17.*—In a word, all the bishops and pastors, overseers, and elders, deacons and members, they were all what we now call Baptists, or the Scripture calls baptized believers, who in those days were called Christians, from their being followers of CHRIST, *Acts xi. 26.*

THEOPH. Dear Sir, what! was there no presbyterian church, no independent church, no episcopal church, no seceder, no sandemanian churches, in the apostles' days?

PHILA. No, no, not one; no, not one.

THEOPH. Dear Sir, where have I been, or rather, where has my bible been? that I have been so pleasingly carried away with superstition, traditions and inventions of men; especially to be so exceedingly zealous of the traditions of my fathers, that I thought I could lay down my life for them? I am lost with astonishment! I am confounded with silence?

PHILA. This is often the case, *Theophilus*, of those who



believe and receive things as they are handed down to them by men, taking all for granted that such and such say, and are like a vapour carried away by the faith of others; or in the familiar phrase, their faith is pinned upon the sleeves of others, and so they rather believe what others believe, than what GOD himself declares,—for ignorant zeal is so ardent in its pursuit of religion, in the path of its forefathers, that it is like hunger, it will break through a stone wall: this was Paul's case, who was exceedingly zealous, but, says he, I did it ignorantly; and this was the case of Israel, of whom says the apostle, "I bare them record that they have a zeal for GOD, but not according to knowledge," that is, not according to the knowledge of the truth as it is in JESUS.

THEOPH. If this be the case, how precious is the advice of our dear LORD, where he says, "Search the Scriptures, for in them ye think ye have eternal life." How noble were the *Bereans*, who searched the Scriptures daily, whether the things spoken by Paul were so or not!—But, sure sir, the persons you have been describing as the primitive saints, as baptized believers in the name of JESUS, cannot be the persons, whom we so frequently hear called, by way of reproach, by the name of Anabaptist?

PHILA. Yes, they are successively the same people, who are followers of the same example, obedient to the same command, and walk by the same rule; but they are, to the shame of Christians be it spoke, who either ignorantly, enviously, or traditionally call them anabaptist, most ignorantly not knowing the Scriptures concerning them; some enviously, for if the Baptists are right, it tells them that they are wrong, and therefore they speak enviously of them, and many call them so traditionally, because they hear others call them so, but they can't tell for why they call them so; but the more understanding part of mankind call them Baptists, from their profession of baptism, belonging to none but those who have faith in CHRIST, and to be administrated by immersion. As to the appellation

of Anabaptist it is a name of reproach given them by some ignorant people, or envious people, who suppose them to re-baptize, when they neither hold nor practise any such thing; for as CHRIST was baptized but once, and as the disciples baptized but once, so they own and practise but one baptism;—agreeable to what the apostle says, one faith, one LORD, one baptism.

THEOPH. Alas! alas! how are even those who profess to know their bible imposed upon, even by those who bear the name of teachers in Israel; we complain of the church of Rome, keeping their people in ignorance, and thereby keeping them ignorantly zealous of their superstition, but how near akin we are I will not say,—only I would just ask my dear *Philagathus*, if baptized believers in JESUS have continued ever since the apostles' days,—or in a more familiar phrase, if there has always been a people called baptists since the apostles' days?

PHILA. There is no doubt to be made respecting all the churches after the apostles' days being settled, according to the order of the gospel baptist church at Jerusalem; for you see the church at Samaria, Cesaria, Philippi, Corinth, Galatia, Colosse, Ephesus, were all believers, baptized in the name of the LORD JESUS: and since them, throughout all ages of the church, there have been people of the same faith of believer's baptism, and of the same order respecting the administration of it, though perhaps not under the name of baptist, for in Paul's time they were not called baptists, but Christians, or disciples of CHRIST.

But since the apostles' days the church of GOD has gone through amazing scenes of persecution, and thereby have been scattered throughout all nations, that we find even in Peter's time, that the saints were much scattered in providence; therefore he directs his epistle to the saints scattered abroad throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, Bythynia, &c.—And among these, and from these primitive be-

lievers there has been a succession of them to the present day ; though, as I hinted, perhaps not called by the name of baptists; as they are now, but by the name of some one eminent among them ; as the followers of Calvin in his doctrine are called Calvinists ; and others are called Lutherans from being followers of Luther, though they both agree respecting the foundation of the Christian's hope, being the righteousness and resurrection of CHRIST.

THEOPH. Sir, if the succession of the baptists appear to be from the apostles' time, it will much revive their ancient glory, and give a singular satisfaction to those who love to honour the truth.

PHILA. I will allow that the persecutions of the church, and the scattered state of the saints through afflictions, may render it a little obscure, yet I think not so obscure as to be questioned as to the truth of it ;—however this may be, I think there are no fools nor ignoramuses so great as to attempt to prove an independent church, an episcoparian church, a Presbyterian church, a Seceder church, or a Sandimanian church, from the apostles' time ; nor any since but by the mingling the pure ordinances of GOD with the inventions of man : And as all the churches in the apostles' days were, without doubt, what we now call baptists' churches, but then christian churches, so I think it easy to prove they have continued ever since, though at times under obscurity, through violent persecution ; yet the LORD had always his thousands by him who had not bowed the knee to Baal. From among our own countrymen, the ancient Britons, some rays of the gospel may appear to shine even from the apostles' days ; and though little is to be found from their own writers, nor for some ages after CHRIST's death, being a rude and barbarous people, and an island so distant from the continent where arts and sciences were first known ; though I rather think that the ancient Britons had a method of preserving the memory of things, as well as other nations, but that it was destroyed by Gregory, bishop of Rome ; by the cruel agency of

one Austin, a monk, and his minister, Ethelfred, as may appear.

The first account we have of the ancient Britons is from the Romans, their first conquerors, in which it appears very probable that they were a people of some fame and prosperity in some respect, or it would never have induced the Romans to have attempted a conquest:—Speed, that ancient historian, tells us, in his history, that the Romans found them a barbarous, savage people, with naked bodies and painted skins; from whence their name came, BRIT paint—TAIN a region, hence called Britons; that they were heathenish idolators, undoubtedly like the rest of the heathen nations round about.

But it is remarkable, that, so powerful an operation had the gospel of CHRIST, when it was first preached to them, that the zeal and life of it continued many ages, that when they were successively conquered in their turns, first, by the Romans, then by the Saxons, then by the Danes, and lastly, by the Normans, that they were able to conquer their conquerors by the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God; I mean to bring many of their enemies (under each conquest) over to the faith of the gospel. The first account we have of the entrance of the gospel of CHRIST into Britain, is by our countryman, one Gildas, the most authentic of all our ancient British historians, who in his book called, *De Victoria Aurelii Ambrossi*, affirmeth that the Britons received the gospel under Tiberius, the emperor, under whom CHRIST suffered; and that many evangelists were sent from the apostles into this nation, who were the first planters of the gospel, which in another book, he says, remained with them until the cruel persecution of Dioclesian the emperor, about 290 years, in the third century.

Out of an ancient book, of the antiquities of England, Mr. Fox tells us, page 139, part 1st, that we find the epistle of Eleutherius written to Lucius, the king of Britain, in the year 169, by which it is plain that Lucius had embraced the faith of CHRIST, and that he had wrote to Eleutherius, for the Roman laws to govern by;—in answer to which Eleutherius, in his

pistle says, " You have received, through GOD'S mercy, in the realm of Britany, the law and faith of CHRIST; you have with you both the parts of the scripture, out of them, by GOD'S grace, with the council of your realm, take ye a law, and by that law, by GOD'S sufferance, rule your kingdom of Britain."

So early an author as Tertullian, says, in his book contra Judæus, " that there are places in Britain, which were inaccessible to the Romans, but were subdued to CHRIST," that is, by the power of his banner, which is love.

*Origen*, in his fourth Hom. on Ezek. says, " the power of GOD our Saviour is even with them, which in Britain are divided from the world." As Britain is an island surrounded with water, it may be said to be divided, as it is separated from the continent, which was the seat of learning and knowledge. It may be said to be separated or divided from the world, and this appears to be a fulfilment of the prophecy of the Redeemer's glory in Britain, *Isa. xlii. 4.* " *He shall not fail nor be discouraged till he hath set judgment in the earth, and the Isles shall wait for his law. Ver. 10. Sing unto the Lord a new song, and his praise from the ends of the earth, ye that go down to the sea, all that is therein, the Isles and the inhabitants thereof.*"

*Barleus*, in Cent. 1. Fol. 97, says, " That the British church received the faith, whence it was that Chrysostom and others, of the Greek fathers, make such frequent and great mention of the British isles, their reception of the gospel, and the divine sense they had of the power thereof, that the churches were exactly constituted according to CHRIST'S pattern."

*Jeffery*, of Monmouth, in his book De Bretannorum Gestis, Cap.4, tells us, " That in the country of the Britains, christianity flourished even from the apostles' time, among whom was the preaching of the gospel, sincere doctrine, and living faith, and such form of worship as was delivered to the churches by the apostles."

**THEOPH.** As the history of our ancestors affords a peculiar pleasure respecting their genealogy and pedigree, how much more an account of the ancientness of their faith and order in the gospel; how long did they enjoy this privilege?

**PHILA.** Till the conquest of the Saxons; for, as the same historian says, "That while the British churches possessed the country, they kept themselves sound in the faith, and pure in the worship, order, and discipline of CHRIST, as it was delivered to them from the Apostles by the Evangelists.

"But, in the year 448, the English Saxons began to possess Britany, and in about the year 593, made nearly a complete conquest of the Britons; then they began to settle their form of government or heptarchy: about three years after this, Gregory, Bishop of Rome, sent one Austin, the monk, into Britain, to bring the Saxons into a conformity to the church of Rome,—and the Britons with them; but at this time the ancient Britons, for peace and security, as there were continual invasions upon their rights, since the descent of Julius Cæsar, retired and dwelt in Wales; hence it is that the Welch bear the name of the ancient Britons; here they had two principal seats for religion, one at Bangor, on the north, and one at Cair Leon, on the South. In Bangor was a college for learning, containing above two thousand Christians, who dedicated themselves to the LORD, to serve him in the ministry as they became capable; hence they were called by the Saxons the Monks of Bangor, not that they gave themselves this name, for they were zealous opposers of the Popish Monks; neither were they ever reduced to any ecclesiastical order, for they were for the most part, Laymen, who laboured with their hands, married, and followed their lawful callings in business.

But some of them, in a particular manner, whose spirits the LORD fitted and inclined to his more immediate service; these devoted themselves to the study of the scriptures, that

they might understand the scriptures in order for the work of the ministry." O! how happy had it been, if the churches had never departed from this gospel rule;—then we should have men mighty in the scriptures, in the work of the ministry, instead of which we have many men mighty in learning, but ignorant of the scriptures, think, vainly think, they have a right to the ministry, when, alas! they have no understanding in the visions or truth of God's word; therefore, the prophecy of the prophet Isaiah says to them, *Isa. xxix. 11. And the vision of all is become to you as the words of a book that is sealed, which men deliver to one that is learned, saying, read this, I pray thee, and he saith I cannot, for it is sealed.*" But to return, as I hinted, that Gregory, bishop of Rome, had sent Austin, a monk, to reduce the Britons as well as Saxons to the obedience of the church of Rome, he, a few years after he came, kept a council near Worcestershire, where he invited these ancient British ministers, as Barleus observes, to which some came, when he invited them to embrace the rites and ceremonies of the church of Rome, and to join with him in preaching and in administrating in the same way;—but they zealously refused and became great opposers of Austin, as their ancient bard, Taliessin, in his Welch verses, records, which is recorded in the chronicles of Wales, page 254; and translated by Fuller in his Ecclesiastical History, book 1. Though they have not the beauties of poetry, yet, as they have the true spirit of zeal and piety, which to our purpose is far better, I will mention them:

Wo be unto the priest! unborn,  
 That will not cleanly weed his corn,  
 And preach his flock among:  
 Wo be to that shepherd! I say,  
 That will not watch his fold away,  
 As to his office doth belong:

Wo be to HIM ! who doth not keep  
 From Roman wolves his sheep,  
 With staff and weapon strong :

But upon the ancient Britons refusing to hearken to Austin, he then began to be more moderate, and to draw them by degrees : he said to them, as Robert Fabian, in his history relates, since ye will not assent to my best generals, assent you to me, especially in three things: first, in keeping Easter-day in the form and time as it is ordered : second, that you give Christendom to children : third, that you preach to the Saxons as I have ordered you, and all the other disputes I shall suffer you to amend and reform among yourselves. But they would not hearken to him, nor give the least countenance to his proposals, for which, as our author observes, Austin said to them, that if they would not, he would bring upon them the revenge of death by their enemies, which he accomplished accordingly, by exciting the Saxons against them to their dispersion, and in a great measure to their ruin, as to that purity, harmony, and simplicity, which then appeared among them.

**THEOPH.** Was their college at Bangor destroyed ?

**PHILA.** Yes, that ancient repository of Christians was destroyed, and these ancient Britons driven further into Wales, among the mountains, for safety : The relation of it you have from Humphry Lloyd, that learned Welch Antiquarian, in his Breviary of Britain, page 70.

In Denbighshire, says he, near the Castle of Holt, is seen the rubbish and relicks of the monastery of Bangor ; while the glory of the Britons flourished, in the same were above two thousand monks (a name of reproach, which, probably, the Saxons gave them : Or, if not by reproach, it was a name in custom among them from Rome, for men devoted to religion :) These men, says our author, were very well ordered, and learned in the scriptures, divided into seven parts, daily



serv<sup>ing</sup> GOD: among whom those who were simple and unlearned, by their hard labour provided meat and drink and apparel for the learned, and such who applied themselves to their studies; and if any thing was remaining, to be given to the poor. This place sent forth, as our author observes, many hundred excellent men: but by the envy and malice of Austin, that arrogant monk, and the cruel execution of his minister Ethelfred, those ancient Christians and worthy men were destroyed, even the whole house, from the foundation, with their library, by fire and the sword. Thus far the ancient Britons, who suffered this bloody tribulation from the church of Rome for their zeal to truth, and conforming to the primitive pattern of the New Testament churches, as they had received it from the apostles.

THEOPH. Did these ancient Britons practise the baptism of believers?

PHILA. I think there cannot remain a doubt of it when we consider how early they received the Gospel, even in the reign of Tiberius, and from the evangelists sent by the apostles; and that one cause of their cruel persecution by Austin, stirring up the Saxons against them, was their refusing to administer baptism to infants in the seventh century, because they had no command nor example for it in the book of GOD.

Another reason that infant baptism was in no sense in practice among the ancient Britons, is plain from Constantine the Great, the son of Constantius, the Emperor, and who was born in Britain, in the year 305, yet was not baptized till he professed faith to CHRIST, and love to his name, nor for long after, as is declared by Hugo Grotius in his annotations on *Matt. xix. 14*, who saith, it was no small evidence that the baptizing of infants many hundred years after CHRIST, was not in the Greek church; because not only Constantine the Great, the Son of Helena, a zealous Christian, yet Constantine, her son, was not baptized till he was far advanced in years, which is a clear proof that the ancient Britons did

not practise the baptizing of infants ; for if any infant on earth had a right to baptism, Constantine must, seeing that his father, Constantius, called by some Constance, the emperor, and his mother, Helena, were Christians ; and Helena is supposed to be a daughter of Coil, king of the Cumbrian Britons, and said to be one of the brightest ornaments of the island.

Likewise the unity and correspondence that there was between the ancient Britons and the Gauls, or French Christians, who were afterwards called Waldenses. These Christians, or Waldenses, had, like the ancient Britons, erected colleges, or places, where they united and lived in large bodies or assemblies, among whom many were appointed to teach and preach the gospel. So that when Pelagius appeared, and spread his Pelagian error of man's natural free will to good, instead of God inclining by his power and grace, the will to that which is good, *Psal. cx. 3*, the ancient Britons, to suppress this error, sent to their brethren in France, who sent them Germanus and Lupus who were mighty in the scripture ; and were not only serviceable to suppress the error, but were very useful in the conversion (an ancient phrase for regeneration) of many ; and they baptized great multitudes, upon a confession of faith, in a river near Chester.

Another incontestable proof is, from Austin the monk, the pope's legate, and their cruel enemy, who was so ignorant of the rite of baptism to infants when he first came to Britain (and because he could not find it in his bible), that he wrote to Pope Gregory to be resolved in it : see his tenth interrogatory *Ex. Decreto. Greg. Lib. I. Council Tom. II.*

Another instance of the ancient Britons' practice, we have in the seventh century after they were so distressed by the Saxons, that the son of the king of Britain was baptized upon his embracing the christian faith ; and that Paulinus, who appears to be an English prelate, baptized in the river Trent both men and women at noon-day ; *Bede, L. ii. C. xvi. Cent. vii. 145.*

Thus you see that the beauty of the primitive practice of the apostles, continued among the ancient Britons; and as they were drove by their cruel enemies the Romans, Saxons, Dances, and Normans, to reside among the mountains in Wales for their safety, no doubt, but they, as far as they had liberty, continued the ordinances of the LORD, as they received them;—and what is still more, we find there was a christian unity and correspondence between them and the ancient Christians in France, who were afterwards called Waldenses, these are said by Morland (in his preface to the French bible, the first bible that ever was printed) “To have always had the full enjoyment of the heavenly truth contained in the holy scriptures, ever since they were enriched with the same by the apostles themselves, having in fair manuscripts preserved the bible entire in their own tongue, Morl. His. page 14.”

Another writer says, that the LORD JESUS had his choice church visibly existing among the chosen and holy generation of people called Waldenses, inhabitants of the valleys of the Alps, and other parts of France and the continent; and from thence they, with their followers, who were many, had their free recourse from France, Holland, and Germany, as the English chronicles make manifest; for in the time of William the Conqueror, and his son, William Rufus, it appears that the Waldenses did abound in England, as Bishop Usher tells us in his book of the state and succession of the church, page 242. Nay, he further adds, that not only the weak people in the country villages, but the nobility and gentry in the chief towns and cities, were infected with the doctrine of the Waldenses; nay, so far had their doctrine spread, that one Lanfranc, who was archbishop of Canterbury, in the time of William, and Rufus, his son, undertook to write a book against them:—and in Henry the First’s time the bishop tells us, that the Waldenses, of Aquitain, did, about the year 1100, spread the doctrine all Europe over, and in England in particular; and from these Waldenses sprung the

Lollards, from one Walter Lollard, a great preacher among them in England, in Edward the Third's time, from whom sprung the famous English morning star in the ministry, John Wickliff, who was a graduate in Merton college, Oxford, and a baptist, and taught in Edward the Third's reign, in the year 1371, that believers, after the example of CHRIST, should be baptized in pure water; and that it was not lawful for believers, who had received the baptism of the Spirit, to neglect the baptism of water, Fla. Illyricus Catal. Test. page 403, from whom Bishop Usher begins the English Reformation. As he translated the bible out of the Latin into English, which is the first English bible we have, he taught, that no rule or ceremony ought to be received into the church, which is not plainly confirmed by the word of GOD. Fuller, page 132.

Joseph Vicecomes, in his *De Rit. Bapt. Lib. ii. chap. i.* says, as to believers' baptism, no one ever doubted thereof, witness the monuments or writings of the fathers, as well as the scriptures, especially the Acts of the apostles; but as for infant baptism, he tells us, among many more of the fathers, that John Wickliff witnessed against it:—and Bishop Burnet says, it was pursuing this principle that gave rise (the prelate should have said revival) to the baptists in Germany, for there were many there before;—however, this is certain, that there were among the followers of this great man, both in Bohemia and in England, many baptists, sometimes called Wickliffites, but most commonly Lollards, as Wickliff sprung from them.

**THEOPH.** Dear sir, as your knowledge and declaration of truth claims and commands my whole attention, give me leave to ask, how was it that Wickliff, being our English star and reformer, could spread the reformation in Bohemia?

**PHILA.** Some have thought that he fled for safety to Bohemia, to escape the rage of the English clergy, who had conspired together to take away his life. But it is remarkable, that after their designs and plots, he lived a long time without

death, bonds, banishment, or imprisonment; writing, teaching, preaching openly, drawing both prince and people, scholars, and the unlearned, nay, almost all, after him. He began to defend his opinions when young, and continued till he was very old, constantly retaining and maintaining the same, some few excepted, which he refined more and more as he grew in years;—therefore the reformation in Bohemia seems not to be from his going there, but rather as Mr. Fox tells us a gentleman being at Oxford, upon his return back to the university of Prague, took with him many of Wickliff's books, and communicated them to Mr. John Huss, who was an eminent preacher there, who, by reading them, embraced the sentiments of Wickliff, and became a zealous defender of them, and so became a great reformer, whose followers were called Hussites.—Though others think, and not improbably, that as Queen Ann, the wife of Richard the second, was a Bohemian, the sister of the king of Bohemia, who brought many Bohemians with her as servants, who were in profession Waldenses; these persons, being the same in principles as Wickliff, conveyed many of Wickliff's works to Prague, by which means so much light and truth was promoted in Prague and Bohemia.

But the followers of Wickliff were, as was hinted before, called Lollards from Walter Lollard, their preacher, and were so much persecuted, that the prison they were sent to in London was called Lollards' tower: yet, at times, they had much favour with their prince and the court, particularly in the reign of Richard the second and Edward the third, in one of their reigns, as Mr. Fox tells us, that a book of conclusions for reformation was exhibited to parliament by the Lollards.

But in the reign of Henry the fourth, they were cruelly persecuted, because they would not (having no command or example) baptize their new-born infants, Duch. Mart. fol. 774.

In the reign of Henry the fifth, they were cruelly used, be-

ing first, namely Lord Cobham and thirty-eight more, hung up in chains, and then burnt: hence the place is, to this day, called Tyburn, from tying them up, and then burning them after, *Fuller's Eccles. Hist.*

In the reign of Henry the sixth, four hundred of them suffered great hardships, many of them death, for slighting infant baptism, and saying, that the children of believing parents, or baptized believers, need not be baptized, and if they died without baptism they might be saved: the same the Baptists hold now, in opposition to the church of Rome, which holds that they cannot be saved without baptism; for this, and more popish tenets, which they denied, they suffered greatly. *Fox's Acts*, Page 867, 868, 869, and 918.

In Edward the fourth's reign, the Lollards suffered death; and likewise in Henry the seventh's reign, their sufferings were much increased.

In the reign of Henry the eighth, the persecution of the Baptists was at particular times very fierce, through the instigation of the Popish party: and it was no wonder at all, for the Pope, namely Pope Innocent, had appointed infant baptism, and enjoined it as absolutely necessary; for, without it, says the Romish church, they cannot be saved. Now the Baptists denied it, because CHRIST had not commanded it, and said they may be saved without it; for it was never appointed for them, much less to save them: but for this and other Popish tenets, which they denied, they had warrants issued out against them, convocations met, and orders were given to suppress all books that helped to explain the scriptures, especially Wickliff's, Frith's, and Tindal's because they contained the principles of the old Lollards, or the new reformers, or, as the Papists called them by way of reproach, Anabaptists. In this Papist, Protestant king's reign, for so I call him, many suffered in 1528, seven Baptists came over from Holland, were apprehended and imprisoned; two of them were burnt in Smithfield, *Stow's Chron.* 576. In 1535, twenty-two Baptists were apprehended, and ten put to death,

*Vox's Acts*, vol. ii. p. 315. And in 1539, sixteen men, and fifteen women were banished for opposing infant baptism, and what was more they going to Delph in Holland were pursued and prosecuted for being baptists, as they reproachfully called them Anabaptists, and put to death for the same; the men were beheaded, and the women drowned, for holding no other things than what CHRIST taught and the apostles did write;—for which twenty-eight persons were put to death the year before, *Duch. Martyrol.* lib. ii. p. 123.

But in the reign of Edward the sixth, who was, though very young, a glorious patron to the gospel, and restored the knowledge of the Scriptures in their mother tongue, yet there was about his court too much remains of a popish persecuting spirit, both in Ridley and in Cranmer too; though the banished Baptists returned home, and those who were recluse then appeared and published their doctrine; and though there was in Edward's time an act of general pardon, yet the bigotted party got the poor Baptists excepted, and indeed, several of their chief men were convened the 2d of April, 1549, to appear in Paul's church, before the bishop of Canterbury, and others, where some were admonished, and others sentenced to a punishment. *Heylin's Hist.* p. 73.—And *Hugh Latimer* says in his Lent Sermons, that many Baptists were burnt in divers towns in England, and died martyrs cheerfully, and makes mention of one town where were more than five hundred of them dwelling; indeed at this time they were pretty numerous, and the power of the clergy were very low, as to their support: in-somuch, that the bishop of Ely showed at court, that unless a better reward and encouragement for their labour was given them, they could not continue in their pastoral function, but must turn to some other employment, for there were many clergymen who had been obliged to take an occupation, some were taylors some were carpenters, and some kept alehouses, *His. Pref. part 2, lib. p. 202.* This I mention

because it is so often cast upon the Baptists that their teachers are tradesmen and mechanics: so it was once with the church of England; and so with the church of Rome; and so it was with Paul, that his own hand ministered to his necessities, and this is the honour of every teacher in Israel, where there is a necessity,—but this is by the bye,—yet I can't help observing, that, in Edward's reign, when some were put to death for heresy, even by Protestant bishops, which was not only astonishing, but a cruel shame to them; for why do they so much complain of the Papists burning for what they call heresy, and they do the same?—However it happened that a poor ignorant woman was condemned: Cranmer and Ridley persuaded the king to sign the death warrant, which he long refused, and when he did it was with tears, saying to Cranmer that if he did wrong, it was in submission to his authority, and that he should answer for it before God, which struck the archbishop with terror, and he was unwilling to execute the sentence, but lo! after a long confinement, she was executed, which it seems was owing to Mr. John Rogers, the divinity reader in St. Paul's church, to whom a friend, supposed to be Mr. Fox himself, who begged him to use his interest with the bishop to save her life, urging that she affected few with her opinion, but if she died for it many would be thinking of it; besides the cruelty of it, and coming so near the torments of the papists, and so contrary to the mercy and gentleness prescribed in the gospel: to which Mr. Rogers said, "Burning alive was no cruel death, but easy enough." To which Mr. Fox said, with great vehemence (striking Rogers's hand, which in a friendly manner he held), "Perhaps it may so happen, that you yourself shall have your hands full of this mild burning." And so it came to pass, for Rogers was the first man that was burnt in Queen Mary's bloody reign,—though a good man, yet a just rebuke for his unchristian zeal—but we have a good deal of such zeal as this in our good men now-a-days.—This, I speak to their shame.



THEOPH. What account have we of the Baptists in bloody Mary's reign?

PHILA. The Baptists appear to be many in Mary's time, and were in the year 1557 imprisoned for first preaching against infant baptism, because it was antiscritural, secondly, because it was first commanded by the Pope,—thirdly, because CHRIST commanded teaching to go before baptism. *Fox's Acts*, vol. iii. p. 606. In this bloody reign, in the two first years, were eight hundred persons put to death for religion, and many of them Baptists, for it cannot be imagined that the Papists, who had in this reign the ascending power, would favour those who had stood as a bulwark against them in all ages: and this appears plain in the examination of Mr. Woodman, before the Bishop of Winchester, in the church of St. Mary, Overy's, Southwark. Thus the bishop said, "Hold him a book, if he refuse to swear, he is (as he was pleased to call him by way of reproach) an anabaptist, and shall, says he be excommunicated. *Fox*, p. 1578, first edit.

In Queen Elizabeth's reign, though upon the whole called a good queen, yet unhappily for her and her subjects, she retained many in her privy council who were privy counselors in Mary's reign, and there appeared too much despotic power in her over the lives and consciences of her people, for Dr. Wall says, "About the 16th year of Queen Elizabeth's reign, a congregation of Dutch Anabaptists were discovered without Aldgate, London, whereof twenty-seven were taken and imprisoned, and the next month one man and ten women were condemned. But to reprieve them from so cruel a death, Mr. Fox wrote a moving melting letter to the queen, mentioning much the mildness of the church of CHRIST, but though she used to call Mr. Fox father, she was an undutiful child—for she denied him the favour as to their lives; for the writ, *De Heretico, comburendo*, which for seventeen years had hung only up in terrorem, was taken down and put in execution upon two Baptists who were burnt at Smithfield:

and by the instigation of Dr. Some, a man of note, who by his art, and false representation of the puritans, as a people dangerous to the state, to the queen's honour, to the church, to the universities, and that it was time to look into it; with these black huggens he frightens the court into the persecuting spirit of Mary's reign: and the queen by a proclamation orders all baptists, or, as they reproachfully call them, anabaptists and hereticks to depart the land, whether foreigners or natives, under the penalty of imprisonment and loss of goods,

Upon this many of the dissenters, puritans, and baptists went abroad, so that there was at this time but very few dissenters of any denomination that dared to appear; perhaps there had not been fewer baptists in England, at one time for a thousand years before,—for it is evident that in King James's reign, in the beginning of it, though there were some baptist churches, yet but few, but in 1608, in the sixth year of James's reign, one Clapham thus writes in his book called *Errors on the Right Hand*, that the baptists taught that repentance must precede baptism; and that when any one joins them, the baptist says, the dew of Heaven be upon thee, And that when any one says, I am of opinion that there is no true baptism on earth, the baptist is said to reply, "Say not so, my son, the congregation I am of can and doth administer true baptism." This shows that there were some congregations professing apostolick baptism.

Besides, in the 16th year of James's reign, there was an excellent piece published in the Dutch language, *A plain and well grounded Treatise on Baptism*, that with so much clearness and authority both from scripture and antiquity, proves the baptizing of believers, and disproves of that of infants, that it was printed in English; but as in this reign those who refused to conform to the church of England were called puritans, and suffered as such; and the baptists under that name shared the same persecution with the rest; that many, both puritans and baptists, were obliged to fly to America for

the sake of peace: but there was one thing particularly happened in this distracted situation near the close of it, which I will relate if not burdensome to *Theophilus*.

THEOPH. By no means burdensome, as every means which Providence has taken for the continuation of the truth will be delightful.

PHILA. It is this: Mr. Hutchinson tells us, that the professors of religion at this time being wearied with the yoke of superstitious ceremonies and traditions of men, and corrupt mixtures in the word and worship of GOD: it pleased the LORD to break these yokes by a strong impulse upon the hearts of his people, to convince them of the absolute necessity of a reformation in the worship of GOD; upon this many godly people met together, to seek the LORD by fasting and prayer, that he would show them the pattern of his house, the going out, and the coming in thereof;—and were resolved by the grace of GOD not to receive or practise any piece of positive worship, which had not precept or example in the Word of GOD;—and infant Baptism coming of course under consideration after long search and many debates among them (for they were not Baptists) it was found to have no place in the Scriptures, the only rule and standard to try doctrines by; but on the contrary, a mere innovation, yea, the profanation of an ordinance of GOD; but seeing so many godly men were of a different persuasion, it was proposed not to be insisted upon, but, Oh! what fears, tremblings, and temptations, did attend them lest they should be mistaken, and thereupon they would gladly have had their brethren gone along with them in following the ordinance purely, as God in his word directed them; but when they saw there was no hopes, they concluded that a Christian's faith did not stand in the wisdom of men, and that every one must give an account of himself to GOD; therefore they resolved to practise accordingly as they had received the truth from the word of GOD.

Mr. William Kiffin's account, who lived in those times, and was a leader among those of that persuasion, strengthens

this; his words are, that many sober and pious persons, belonging to the congregations of the dissenters about London, were convinced that believers were the proper subjects of baptism; and that it ought to be administered by immersion or dipping the whole body into the water, in resemblance of the burial and resurrection of CHRIST according to *Rom. vi. 3. 4. Col. ii. 12.* And that they often met together to pray and consult about this matter, and what method they should take to enjoy this ordinance in its primitive purity: for though there were at this time many baptists in judgment, yet through the troubles of the time, and many going to America, the practice of it by immersion was rather rare; therefore they sent to an ancient congregation of baptists in the Netherlands, Mr. John Batte, their minister, who was baptized by immersion, upon his return, baptized Mr. Samuel Blacklock, another minister, and these two baptized the whole flock, being fifty-three; and they continued in the apostles' doctrine, in fellowship, in breaking of bread, and in prayer, though the judicious baptists, in England, thought it a needless journey respecting their going abroad to receive baptism.

At this time King James, seeing that a fierce persecution, and especially death, would not promote his interest, nor the affections of the people, because Mr. Fox had, in his Martyrology, so exposed the papists for this kind of cruelty; he therefore chose to seize upon their estates, upon which many of the dissenters, puritans, and baptists fled to America, though, let it be remarked, that the first and last martyrs, who were burnt alive in England, were baptists; and it is remarkable that the presbyterians, independents, and puritans, who fled to America from persecution, yet when they came there they unhappily began to persecute both the quakers and to oppress the baptists, Cotter Mather's History of New Eng. Lib. i. C. ii. But at length the baptists had churches settled there, so that believers' baptism is as ancient there as Christianity itself; and it is very remarkable that after the

congregationalists had practised infant baptism for some time, that it was the pleasure of the LORD to convert many of the Indians at Nantucket; then they had the bible translated in their own language, and when, as Mr. Benj. Keach says, they read the New Testament, they found no direction to baptize infants, nor any instance of any such practice; therefore they inquired of the English teachers the ground of it, but finding they could give them no example in the scriptures they rejected it. And, indeed, the baptist churches are now upon a respectable footing in America, and not a few.

But, to return to the English baptists; in James's time, in the year 1615, they printed a book, entitled, *Persecution judged and condemned*; in which, after showing their principles, and how near prelatical power came to the bloody power of the Roman Catholics, they petition his Majesty that he would not give his power, that is, to the bishops or spiritual courts, to force his faithful subjects to believe as they believed, or to the power of persecution, as it was a tender case to a tender conscience, though it was no small persecution to lie many years in filthy prisons (a practice in James's time) in hunger, cold, divided from their wives, families, and callings, so that death would have been a less persecution than this, but their sufferings continued, and in the year 1618, there came forth a book vindicating the principles of believers' baptism from the command of CHRIST, —from the practice of the apostles,—from the obedience of the New Testament saints,—from the continuation of the first primitive fathers,—from the end designed in baptism,—and that the baptizing of infants and sucklings is a ceremony of men brought into the church after the apostles' time, and was commanded by councils, popes, and emperors, and not by the word of GOD; since then, the baptists' interest has so increased and flourished in every king's reign; there has not, perhaps, been less than an hundred authors who have defended this truth; the truth being so plain, in the scrip-

tures, that the meanest ploughman has always been more than a match for great divines; which was once honestly acknowledged in familiar conversation, near a hundred years ago, by a grave independent minister, who said to the baptist teacher, Sir, I must own (being talking about baptism) that you have plain scripture proof for your practice, but as for us we must be obliged to go round to the covenant, to circumcision, and consequences for our practice.

Thus, I hope, I have given my dear *Theophilus*, perhaps an unexpected satisfaction of the rise of the baptists from John the baptist, by the command of CHRIST, through the channel of the apostles even in Britain; through the reign of every king to the present day; and, I think, it will be no difficult matter to prove, that the original rise, progress, and spread of religion, not only in Britain, but in every part of the world, had its source from the people called baptists; and they have been the chief people, though under different names, who have been the cloud of witnesses to the primitive truth, and suffered martyrdom for it in all ages of the church since the apostles' days. (See the Appendix.)

THEOPH. Dear *Philagathus*, you astonish me with the relation you have already given me, that a people whom we have so much despised and thought so little of, should be the first that embraced the truth, that suffered for it, and transmitted it to us; but that they should be the first fruits of the gospel to the world, and so little loved and so little known, this is wonderful; be astonished, Oh heavens! at this; Oh the darkness of our understanding! the power of prejudice! and the blind zeal and love that we have to the traditions of our fathers! But, wherein does this appear?—Can so many great and good men be mistaken in so important a point as a positive institution of CHRIST, both with respect to the subjects and the manner of its administration?

PHILA. What, *Theophilus*! after all, you are inclined to put the matter upon trial? Well, let it be so; only this I must insist upon, that the plain word of GOD (a rule which

cannot err) be set up as our only standard and rule, guide and directory, to determine the truth by: to the law and to the testimony, if they speak not according to these, it is because there is no light in them.

THEOPH. Dear sir, I did not bring the matter to trial for want of conviction of the truth of what you have said, as a truth, nor for want of force and energy, from Scripture, to support it as such; but, surely (as there are so many opposers of it) the baptists cannot have the original import of the word,—the command of GOD,—The example of CHRIST,—the practice of the apostles, as the ground of their faith,—and the obedience of the primitive churches, down to the present day, as the example of their continued obedience thereto.

PHILA. Why, *Theophilus*, by calling this in question, you call all in question; but since you are inclined to go through the dispute, I will venture to say they have all this on their side, and much more,—their enemies themselves being judges.

THEOPH. Wherein does this appear?

PHILA. That lies upon me to prove, which I shall attempt, first from the proper and genuine signification of the word so well agreeing with the ends and use of baptism, the shadow to the substance, sign to the thing signified.

The word we call baptism, and the Latins *baptismus*, is no other than the Greek word βαπτισμος (being so retained all along, as Gonarus observes in the Latin church) and in plain English is nothing else but to dip, plunge, or cover all over, and should have been so translated.

The truth whercof, will more fully appear from our best Greek Lexicons, and by the observation of our most eminent critics, and the scripture-use of the words.

Scapula and Stephens, two as great masters of the Greek tongue as we have (and also great defenders of infants' baptism) tell us in their lexicons, that βαπτίζω, from βαπτω, signifies *mergo, immergo, submergo, obruo*; item, *tingo, quod*

'fit immergendo, inficere, imbuere, viz. To dip, plunge, overwhelm, put under, cover over, to dye in colour, which is done by plunging.

Grotius tells us it signifies to dip over head and ears.

Pasor, an immersion, dipping, or submersion.

Vossius, that it implieth a washing the whole body.

Mincæus, in his Dictionary, that βαπτισμα α βαπτίζω, is in the Latin baptismus, in the Dutch doopsel or doopen, English, baptism or baptime, viz. to dip in water, and the same with the Hebrew word tabal, to dip.

Leigh, in his Critica Sacra, saith, its native and proper signification is to dip into water, or to plunge under water; for which he cites these scriptures, where so used, viz. *Mat. iii. 6. Acts viii. 38. And that it is taken from dyers' fat, and imports a dying, or giving a fresh colour, and not a bare washing only, Rev. xix. 13.* And for which he quotes Casaubon, Bucan, Bullinger, Zanchy, Spanhemius. He saith withal, "That some would have it signify washing, and which since Erasmus, he saith, opposed, affirming, that it was not otherwise so, than by consequence; for the proper signification was such a dipping or plunging as dyers use for dying of clothes."

Casaubon, in his annotations upon *Mat. iii.*, annexed to the New Testament, set forth by Stephens, saith, "That immersing was the proper rite in baptism, which the word itself (he saith) sufficiently declares, which as it signifies not δύνειν, a going down to the bottom without any ascending; so not επιπέλαζειν, a swimming like a cork above the water; but βαπτίζειν, a going down, and coming up again."

Beza, on *Mat. iii. 11*, saith, "The word βαπτίζαν signifies to dye by dipping or washing, and differs from the word δύναται, signifying to drown, or go down to the bottom, as a stone."

Selden, *De Jure Nat. &c. l. 2. c. 2.* saith, "That the Jews (from whom this rite is conceived to come) took the baptism wherein the whole body was not baptized, to be void.



Mr. Daniel Rogers, in his Treatise of Sacraments, part 1. c. viii. p. 177, saith, "That the minister is to dip in water, as the meetest act; the word βαπτίζω notes it; for the Greeks wanted not other words to express any other act, besides dipping, if the institution could bear it. What resemblance of the burial or resurrection of CHRIST is in sprinkling? All antiquity and Scripture, saith he, confirm that way. To dip therefore, is exceeding material to the ordinance; which was the usage of old, without exception of countries hot or cold."

Dr. Taylor, in his Rule of Consc. l. iii. c. 4. If you would attend to the proper signification of the word, Baptism signifies plunging in water, or dipping with washing."

Mr. Joseph Mede, in his Diatribe on Titus iii. 2, saith, "That there was no such thing as sprinkling or rantism used in baptism, in the apostles' days, nor many ages after them."

Chamier, Pan. Cathol. tom. iv. l. 5. c. ii. Ser. 6. "The ancient use of baptism was to dip the whole body into the element, which is the force of τὸ βάπτισμα, therefore did John, baptize in a river; which is nevertheless changed into aspersion, though uncertain when and from whence that custom was taken."

I might add many more, but shall conclude with that observable remark that Dr. Hammond gives us in his Annotations upon *John* xiii. 10. telling us 'That βαπτισμός signifies an immersion or washing the whole body, and which answereth to the Hebrew word used for dipping in the Old Testament: and therefore upon *Matt.* iii. 1. tells us, that John baptized in a river, viz. Jordan, *Mark* i. 5. In a confluence of much water, as Enon, *John* iii. 23. Because it is added there was much water, upon which account he saith, that as the Greeks called the lakes where they used to wash Κολυμβήσθαι; so the ancients called them their baptisterions; called now by the Baptists, Baptistries, which they have now in their meeting-houses, or in suitable places, containing water for the administration of the ordinance of baptism, accord-

ing to the practice of the apostles, and the primitive churches.”

I have carefully examined all the places in the Old Testament, where the word dipping or baptizing is mentioned, and find it is expressed by the Hebrew word, *Tabal*, as *Mincaus* and *Dr. Hammond* observe. The Septuagint render the word *Tabal* in the Hebrew, by *βαπτίζω*; and which all the translators, viz. the Latin, Dutch, Italian, French and English do translate, to dip; and which always signifies to dip (the word rendered washing being by another word) as the following Scriptures will inform you, *Gen. xxxvii. 31. Exod. xii. 22. Lev. iv. 6. & xvii. 14, and vi. 16, 51. Lev. ix. 9. Deut xxxiii. 24. John iii. 5. Num. xiv. 18. 2 Kings v. 14.* which are all the places I can find the word used in, in the Old Testament.

Which signification and sense of the word, is emphatically confirmed to us by the several metaphors used by the Holy Spirit in Scripture, in allusion hereto; viz. for persons to be plunged into great sufferings, they are said to be baptized therein, *Mark x. 38*, and so for persons who were endued with a great measure of the spirit, they are said to be baptized therewith, *Acts i. 5*. The children of Israel being encompassed with the cloud over their head, and the divided sea on both sides, were said to be baptized in the cloud, *1 Cor. x*. And baptized persons are said to be dead and buried, in allusion to putting men into the earth, and covering them therewith; none of which can hold good by sprinkling.

Secondly, the truth of this appears from the practice we find in Scripture, and the opinion of the learned upon it.

First, in CHRIST's baptism, we read, *Matt. iii. 5. That Jesus came from Galilee to Jordan unto John, to be baptized of him, v. 16. And when he was baptized, he went up straightway out of the water.*

The learned *Cajetan* upon the place, saith, CHRIST ascended out of the water; therefore CHRIST was baptized by John, not by sprinkling, or by pouring water upon him,

but by immersion, that is, by dipping or plunging in the water.

Musculus, on *Mat.* iii. calls Baptism dipping, and saith, "The parties baptized were dipped not sprinkled."

A second Scripture is that of *John* iii. 23. *And John was baptizing in Enon near Salem* (and the reason why he pitched upon this place is given) *because there was much water there.*

Piscator upon this passage says, "ὕδατὰ πολλὰ signifies many rivers, as ἰδῶρ in the singular number, signifies the river of Jordan; this," saith he, "is mentioned to signify the ceremony of baptism which John used in dipping or plunging the whole body of man standing in the river;" whence he saith, "CHRIST being baptized by John in Jordan, is said to ascend out of the water."

Calvin, upon these words, saith, "that from this place you may gather that John and CHRIST administered baptism by plunging the whole body into the water."

A third Scripture worthy our notice, is *Acts* viii. 36—38. *As they went on their way, they came unto a certain water; and the eunuch said, See, here is water; and they both went down into the water, both Philip and the eunuch, and he baptized him, and when they were come up out of the water: upon which passage,*

Calvin saith, "We see what fashion the ancients had to administer baptism; for they plunged the whole body into the water: the use is now," saith he, "that the minister casts a few drops of water only upon the body, or upon the head."

A fourth Scripture we shall mention is, *Rom.* vi. 4. *Buried with him in Baptism:* where the apostle elegantly alludes to the figure of baptizing in our death and resurrection with CHRIST.

Cajetan upon this passage, saith, "thus we are buried with him by baptism into death: by our burying he declares our death from the ordinance of Baptism; because he who is baptized, is put under the water, and this carries a similitude of

him that is buried, who is put under the earth. Now because none are buried but dead men, from this very thing that we are buried in baptism, we are assimilated to CHRIST'S death; buried when he was buried, namely into his death."

Keckerman, Syst. Theol. l. 3. c. viii. says, 'that immersion, not aspersion was the first institution of baptism, as it doth plainly appear from *Rom.* vi. 3.

Diodat. Annot. on *Rom.* vi. 4. Grotius on the same. Davenant, *Col.* ii. 12. do own dipping to have been the rite in CHRIST'S time.

Tilenus, in his Disputation, p. 886, 889, 890, who was a learned Protestant writer, gives a most remarkable testimony in the case. "Baptism, saith he, is the first ordinance of the New Testament instituted by CHRIST, in which with the most pat and exact analogy between the sign and the thing signified, those that are in covenant, are by the minister, baptized in water. The outward rite in baptism is threefold: 1. Immersion into the water. 2. Abiding under the water. 3. Resurrection out of the water: the form of baptism, viz. internal and essential, is no other than the analogical proportion which the signs keep with the things signified thereby: for the properties of the water in washing away the defilements of the body, does in a most suitable similitude set forth the efficacy of CHRIST'S blood in blotting out of sins; so dipping into the water, doth in the most lively similitude set forth the mortification or death of the old man; and rising out of the water, the vivification of the new. The same plunging into the water, holds forth to us that horrible gulf of divine justice, in which CHRIST for our sins' sake (which he took upon him) was for a while in a manner swallowed up or overwhelmed; his abiding under the water (how little a while soever) denotes his descent into the grave, even the very deepest of death, while lying in the sealed and guarded sepulchre, he was accounted as one dead. Rising out of the water, holds out to us a lively similitude of that conquest which this dead man, even CHRIST, got over death, which

he vanquished in his own den, (as it were) that is, in the grave. In like manner, therefore (saith he) it is meet, that we being baptized into his death, and buried with him, should rise also with him, and so go on in a new life, *Rom. vi. 3, 4. Col. ii. 12.*

Mr. Leigh in his Annotat. upon *Rom. vi. 4.* [Buried with him in Baptism unto death] “Baptism,” said he, “is an ordinance not only of thy death with CHRIST, which is the killing of sin, but also of thy burial with him, which is a perpetual mortification, or abiding under that death. He alludes to the manner in which Baptism was then administered, which was to plunge them in the water; the plunging of them into water which were baptized, was a sign of their death and burial with CHRIST.”

The Assembly’s Annotations upon the same passage says, that in this phrase the apostle seemeth to allude to the ancient manner of baptizing, which was, to dip the party baptized, and as it were to bury them under water for a while, and then to raise them up again out of it, to represent the burial of the old man, and our resurrection to newness of life.” The like saith Piscator and Diodati upon the passage.

Dr. Cave, a great searcher into antiquity, in his late book called *Primitive Christianity*, saith, p. 320, “that the party baptized was wholly immersed, or put under water; which was the common, constant, and universal custom of those times, whereby they did most notably and significantly express the great end and effects of baptism: for, as in immersing there are in a manner, three several acts, the putting the person into water, his abiding there for some time, and his rising up again; thereby representing CHRIST’s death, burial, and resurrection; and in conformity thereto, our dying unto sin, the destruction of its power, and our resurrection to a new course of life. By the person’s being put in water, is lively represented the putting off the body of

the sins of the flesh, and being washed from the filth and pollution of them. By his being under it, which is a kind of burial into water, his entering into a state of mortification; like as CHRIST remained for some time under the state or power of death; therefore it is said, as many as are baptized into CHRIST, are baptized into his death, &c. And then by his emersion or rising up out of the water, is signified his entering upon the new course of life, that like as CHRIST was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, so we should walk in newness of life."

Bishop Jewel, in his *Apology*, p. 308, brings the council of Worms, determining the manner of baptism, viz. "that the dipping into the water is the going down into the grave, and that the coming out of the water, is the resurrection, that is, representatively."

And most remarkable is the testimony that Mr. Baxter himself gives to this truth, in these words, viz. "It is commonly confessed by us to the Baptists (as our commentators declare) that in the apostles' time the baptized were dipped over head in water; and this signifieth their profession both of believing the burial and resurrection of CHRIST, and of their own present renouncing the world and flesh, or dying to sin, and living to CHRIST, or rising again to newness of life, or being buried and risen again with CHRIST, as the apostle expoundeth baptism in *Col. ii. 12.* and *Rom. vi. 4.* And though, saith he, we have thought it lawful to disuse the manner of dipping, and to use less water, yet we presume not to change the use and signification of it; so then he that signally professeth to die, and rise again in baptism with CHRIST, doth signally profess saving faith and repentance; but this do all they that are baptized according to the apostle's practice.

Daille, on the *Fathers*, l. ii. p. 148, saith, "that it was a custom heretofore in the ancient church, to plunge those they baptized over head and ears in the water; as, saith he,

Tertullian, in his third book *De Cor. Mil.* Cyprian in his seventh Ep. p. 211. Epiphanius, *Pan.* 30. p. 128, and others testify: and this, saith he, is still the practice both of the Greek and Russian church at this day; as Cassander de Bapt. p. 193; and yet, saith he, notwithstanding this custom, which is both so ancient and so universal, is now abolished by the church of Rome; and this is the reason, saith he, that the Muscovites say that the Latins are not rightly and duly baptized."

Walfridus Strabo, de Reb. Eccles. tells us, "that we must know at the first believers were baptized simply in floods and fountains."

Mr. Fox tells us in his *Acts and Monuments*, part i. p. 138. out of Fabian, c. cxix. p. 120. "That Austin and Paulinus did, in the seventh century, baptize, here in England, great multitudes in the river Trent, and the river Swol; where, note, by the way, saith Mr. Fox, it followed there was no use of fonts. The like also, as you'll hereafter find, Germanius and Lupus, the two French Evangelists, did, in the fifth century, baptize multitudes in the river near Chester."

Hieremias, *Patr. of Coustantinople*, ad Theol. Whitebergenses Resp. ii. c. 4. saith, "the ancients baptized not by sprinkling the baptized with water with their hands, but by immersion, following the Evangelist, who came up out of the water, therefore did he descend, which must needs be immersion, and not aspersion."

Zepperus *De Sacramentis*, "from the annotation and Etymology of the word, it doth appear, what was of old the custom of administering baptism, which though we have changed into rantizing or sprinkling."

Dr. Taylor, in his *Rule of Conscience*, l. iii. c. iv. p. 644, 645, says, "the ancient Church did not in her Baptism sprinkle with water with their hand, but did immerge; and therefore we find it in the Records of the Church."

And that Chrysostom said, "that the old Man is in this fi-

figure buried and drowned in the immersion under water; and when the baptized person is afterwards raised up from the water, it represents the resurrection of the new man to newness of life, as it is a figure of the death of sin and the life of grace.

And therefore concludes, “that the contrary custom, being not only against ecclesiastical law, but against the analogy and mystical signification of the ordinance, is not to be complied with.”

The church of Rome confesseth by a learned pen, the Marquis of Worcester, in his *Certam. Relig.* “that she changed dipping the party baptized over head into sprinkling upon the face.”

That, until the third century, we find not any, upon any consideration, did admit of sprinkling: The first we meet with is Cyprian, in his *Epistle to Magnus, L. iv. Ep. vii.* where he pleads “for the baptizing of the sick by sprinkling, and not by dipping or pouring, called the Clinical Baptism, *Mag Cent. iii. C. vi. P. 126.* As also for the sprinkling of new-converted prisoners in the prison-house.” And which, by degrees afterwards, they brought in use for sick children also, and then afterwards all children.

Here you see from whom infant sprinkling came, viz. from the church of Rome, when it came, and for what low end it came to answer: Oh! how is fine gold became dim, and the pure gold changed, when men lay aside the commands of GOD, and follow the traditions of men, which appear from the genuine sense of the word, nature of the ordinance, usage of the ancients, which were excellently inculcated by the learned Dr. Tillotson, in a Sermon preached at his Lectures in St. Michael’s, Cornhill, London, April 15, 1673; from *Rom. vi. 4.* “therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death; proving from thence, that dipping or plunging was the proper ceremony and rite in the ordinance; and how naturally arguments did arise from believers’ baptism,



to enforce holiness and mortification, the thing signified thereby.

THEOPH. But the word βαπτίζω, which you so much stand upon, signifies, if not to sprinkle, yet not only to dip and overwhelm, but also to wash, as *Mark* vii. 4. The washing of hands, cups, pots, vessels, beds, and tables, which, we hope, you will grant may be done without dipping or plunging in water?

PHILA. That baptism, in a sense, is washing, I no ways doubt; for you cannot dip a thing but you may be said to wash it; therefore, in allusion hereto, 'tis said, *Acts* xxii. *Arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins*: And *Tit.* iii. *the washing of regeneration*: And *Heb.* x. *bodies washed with pure water*: And in dipping of clothes they wash them: and so here, by dipping of unclean hands, pots, cups, vessels, and beds; for tables are not there, the word being κλινῆ, which as in your margin, signifies a bed, but never a table (as a learned critic observes) they are also washed.

THEOPH. But hands, cups, vessels, and beds may be washed, though not dipt.

PHILA. It is true they may (though not proved from this scripture) for though all dipping is washing, yet all washing is not dipping in a proper sense (for water sprinkled or poured upon a thing, may be so called in an improper sense) though it is a very unusual thing so to wash unclean hands, beds, or vessels: And, I presume, you will account her but a slut, and give her no thanks for her pains, that having unclean hands, vessels, beds, or clothes, to wash, doth only sprinkle or pour a little water upon them, as though that would serve the turn: And doth not our familiar experience tell us, that to dip our hands in water, rincing them, is the most effectual way to wash them. Therefore are we to take washing here (*Mark* vii. 4.) to be dipping, in a proper sense, as the word imports, and as most agreeable to known custom and use; for neither the word λέω, to wash, nor χέω, to pour, βάπτίζω, to sprinkle, are

ever taken to dip or baptize; nor the word βαπτίζω, simply taken for washing, by pouring or sprinkling, that I can find.

The divers washings, mentioned *Heb.* ix. 10. may be well explained from *Lev.* i. 9, 13, and vi. 27, 28, and xv. 5. 6. *Exod.* xxx. 19, to be such as was done by baptizing in water, not sprinkling with, nor pouring water upon.

Ainsworth upon *Lev.* xv. 5. "to baptize or wash his flesh," as is expressed v. 13, 16. meaning his whole body; and so the Greek translath, "shall wash his body." The Hebrews say, "every place where it is said in the law of bathing the flesh, and washing the clothes of the unclean, it is not meant but of baptizing the whole body in water, Maim in Makraoth, c. i. s. 2. figuring out our signification by CHRIST and his spirit, by whom we draw near to GOD, having hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and bodies washed with pure water, *Heb.* x. 22. ver. 11. If a man be baptized all over, saving the tip of his little finger, he is yet in his uncleanness: And if clay, or any such thing, cleave to the flesh of man, it is unclean still as it was, and the baptizing profiteth them nothing," c. i. ser. 2. 7, 12. and v. 12. about the washing of vessels the Jews have these rules, "that nothing must part the vessel, or any part of it, and the water, as pitch, clay, or the like, that cleaveth to the vessel; that if the vessel be turned the mouth downward, and be baptized, it is as if it were not baptized, because the water so comes not to all parts of it: Likewise, a vessel full of any liquor, except water, and baptized, is as if it were not baptized." Maim in Makraoth, c. iii. ser. 1, 12, 18.

And in 2 *Kings* v. 10, the Prophet bids *Naaman go and wash in Jordan seven times*; and accordingly, v. 14. 'tis said in obedience hereto, and in explanation of that kind of washing the Prophet intended, *he went and baptized himself seven times in Jordan*, or dipped, which is the same.

Therefore, for any to shun the proper true genuine sense, and build a practice upon an uncouth, indirect, unusual, and

at best an allegorical sense, is no other than as the Proverb is, *to leave the King's highway, and to take hedge and ditch.*

And besides, if you will follow the allusion, do you not wash all that is unclean, the whole man is all unclean, every member, and every part; therefore all and every part ought to be washed, and not the head and face only, as you expect to have all your sins washed away, and every member cleansed by faith in CHRIST's blood, pointed forth in this figure; to represent that as every member hath lived to sin, should here also die, be buried, raised, and quickened spiritually with CHRIST, in firm assurance of CHRIST's resurrection, and confident expectation of the whole man's being to be raised and glorified in the resurrection of the just. And to which purpose we have Dr. Goodwin, in his *Support of Faith*, p. 54, very excellently, viz. "That the eminent thing signified and represented in baptism, is not simply the blood of CHRIST, as it washeth us from our sins; but there is a farther representation therein of CHRIST's death, burial, and resurrection in the baptized being first buried under water, and then rising out of it; and this is not in a bare conformity to CHRIST, but is a representation of a communion with CHRIST in his death and resurrection: Therefore it is said, we are buried with him in baptism, and wherein we are risen with him, &c. And moreover, here it is that the answer of a good conscience, which is made the inward effect of this ordinance of baptism, 1 *Pet.* iii. 21. is there also attributed to CHRIST's resurrection, as the thing signified and represented in baptism, and as the cause of that answer of a good conscience, even baptism doth now also save us, as it is a figure of salvation by CHRIST.

Therefore to alter this rite from dipping to sprinkling, spoils the ordinance, and makes it quite another thing; and you may as well take a wafer-cake, to represent CHRIST's broken body, as sprinkle a little water to figure out his and our death, burial, and resurrection thereby.

Thus you see *Theophilus*, that the baptists have not only

every Greek Lexicographer of note, such as Constantine, Budæus, and those of Adrian, Junius, Plantinus, Scapula, Schrevelius, and Stockius, all which render the word baptize, being a Greek word—in its first and primary sense, by *mergo immergo*, to dip, or plunge into, and never by *perfuncto aspergo*, to pour or sprinkle,—and indeed our great English Linguist—Benjamin Martin, in his Dictionary, says, that the true etymology of the word baptism, signifies to immerse, plunge, or overwhelm—and indeed these persons were but few of them baptists, yet so clear is the truth, that they freely own it.

THEOPH. I confess that your arguments overpower me—but give me leave to ask you, do you think that the Apostles understood it in this light, and that there are witnesses to the truth of it in every century to the present time?

PHILA. You a little surprise me when you ask me if I think the Apostles so understood it—but perhaps your repeating this inquiry may be owing to the quickness of your understanding—seeing that the whole truth hinges there. Here *Theophilus* interrupted *Philagathus* for a moment, and said, sir, that is the case; then *Philagathus* replied, that it was the judgment of the Apostles, and the manner they practised it is without doubt; and that there are witnesses (*even great men in Israel*) to the truth of this in every century to the present time, is without disputation—which is affirmed by the best authors, and related by the most authentic historians.

That it was the command of GOD, (which is the sole authority of all) see *John* i. 33. *He that sent me to baptize.*

That it was the example of CHRIST, see *Matt.* iii. 16. *And Jesus when he was baptized, went up straightway out of the water,*

That it was the commission of CHRIST, see *Matt.* xxviii. 19. *Go therefore teaching all nations, baptizing them.*

That it was the practice of the Apostles, and what the New Testament Saints were found in obedience (without a murmuring word) unto, see *Acts* ii. 41.

*Acts ii. 41. Then they that gladly received his word were baptized.*

*Acts viii. 12. But when they believed Philip preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized both men and women, verse 37, 38. And Philip said, if thou believest with all thy heart, thou mayest. And he answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God. And he commanded the chariot to stand still, and they went down into the water, both Philip and the Eunuch, and he baptized him.*

*Acts xviii. 8. And Crispus the chief ruler of the synagogue believed on the Lord with all his house, and many of the Corinthians hearing, believed, and were baptized.*

*Acts xxii. 14. And Ananias said unto Paul, the God of our fathers hath chosen thee, that thou shouldest know his will, and see the just one, and shouldest hear the voice of his mouth. And now why tarriest thou? Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the LORD. Acts ix. 18. And he arose forthwith and was baptized.*

Which also is confirmed by the following testimonies.

Luther de Sacrament. Tom. 3. fol. 168. saith, "That in times past it was thus, that the ordinance of baptism was administered to none, except it were to those, that acknowledged and confessed their faith, and knew how to rehearse the same, and that it was necessary to be done, because the ordinance was constituted externally to be used, that the faith be confessed and made known to the church." See 2 Cor. viii. 5.

Bullinger in his housebook, sermon 48, saith, "That baptism hath no prescribed time by the LORD, and therefore it is left to the free choice of the faithful. Those that believed at the preaching of Peter upon the day of pentecost, as also the eunuch, whom Philip baptized, Cornelius the captain, Paul the Apostle at Damascus, Lydia the seller of purple, a woman that feared God, the keeper of the prison at Philippi,

and others, both men and women, so soon as they tasted the gifts of CHRIST, and believed his word, presently desired to be baptized.

Mr. Baxter, in his sixteenth argument against Mr. Blake, in the second disputation, p. 149. (saith most significantly) "If there can be no example given in scripture of any one, that was baptized without the profession of a saving faith, nor any precept for so doing, then must we not baptize any without it."

But the antecedent is true, therefore so is the consequent. In proof whereof he produces the several scripture examples of persons that were baptized, which (saith he) might afford us so many several arguments, but I shall mention them together, *viz.*

"First, John, as I have showed you, required the profession of true repentance, and that his baptism was for the remission of sins." *Matt.* iii. 6.

"Secondly, When CHRIST layeth down the apostolical commission, the nature and order of the apostles' work, is first to make them disciples, by teaching them the way of salvation by CHRIST, and then to baptize them in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost." *Matt.* xxvii. 19, 20.

"Thirdly, That it was saving faith that was required of the Jews, and professed by them (*Acts* ii. 38.) is plain in the text."

"Fourthly, The Samaritans believed and had great joy, and were baptized into the name of JESUS CHRIST, *Acts* viii. 12. whereby it appeareth, that it was both the understanding and will that were both changed, and that they had the profession even of a saving faith, yea, even from Simon himself." v. 37.

"Fifthly, The condition upon which the eunuch must be baptized was, if he believed with all his heart, which he professed to do, and that was the evidence Philip expected." *Acts* viii. 37.

“ Paul was baptized after his true conversion.” *Acts* ix. 18.

“ The Holy Ghost fell on the Gentiles before they were baptized.” *Acts* x. 44.

“ Sixthly, Lydia’s heart was opened before she was baptized ; and she was one the Apostles judged faithful to the LORD, and offered to them the evidence of her faith.” *Acts* xvi. 30.

“ The example also of the Gaoler is very full to the resolution of the question in hand : he first asketh, “ What shall he do to be saved ?” The Apostle answereth him, “ Believe in the LORD JESUS, and thou shalt be saved, and thy house.” So that it was a saving faith that is here mentioned. “ He rejoiced and believed with all his house, and was baptized the same hour of the night, or straightway.”

“ Crispus, the chief ruler of the synagogue, believed on the LORD, with all his house.

“ *And many of the Corinthians hearing believed, and were baptized,* *Acts* xviii. 8.

“ Philip, in *Acts* viii. 37, is determining the question, and giveth this in as the decision ; *if thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest.* And to say that this is but *de bene esse*, meaning that it includes not the negative, otherwise thou mayest not, is to make Philip to have deluded, and not decided or resolved.

“ In a word,” saith he, “ I know of no one word in scripture, that giveth us the least intimation, that ever man was baptized without the profession of a saving faith.”

Thus far Mr. Richard Baxter, a pastor of a church in Kidderminster, in Worcestershire, who was a bitter enemy to the baptists in his day ; but when the light of pure truth (I mean the scriptures) was before him, and his mind free from prejudice, see how freely and fully he acknowledges the truth, that I scarce know a better advocate for believers’ baptism, among all the baptists, than Mr. Baxter has been : Though, lamentable it is, that now there is a great congre-

gation of dissenters at the same place, yet scarce any that know their right hand from the left in this matter, so pleased are they in being priest cheated.

But, as you are so desirous, *Theophilus*, of the concurrent testimonies of the fore-fathers, we will take a concise circuit, through the ages of antiquity and every century, and see what they say; though, by the way, let it be observed, that they are wrongly called the fathers of the church; for, in this respect, there are none fathers but the Apostles, so these, at best, are but elder sons, and some of them very dark in many things, for the first-born heirs. But, as it is a matter so much boasted of, we will see what they say of it? what is said by them, as well as of them: we will begin with the ancient Magdeburgenses, whose history is well reported for its authenticity.

In the first century, they say, that in this age they find that they baptized only the adult or aged, whether they were Jews or Gentiles; where, say they, we have instances in the second, eighth, tenth, sixteenth, and nineteenth chapters of the *Acts*; but as to baptizing of infants, we read of no example. See de Infantibus Baptizatis Exempla, non legunt, Magdiburg, Cent. i. L. ii. P. 496, of the Edit. of Basil, in 7 Tomes.

Then, secondly, they point out the administrator of baptism, which, they say, we find that other ministers besides the Apostles did baptize, and in after ages it came to be fixed upon bishops, overseers, pastors, or teaching elders.

Thirdly, As to the place, they find it was as occasion offered, where rivers, fountains, and other conveniencies for baptizing were, which was as well done privately, by Philip and the eunuch, as in the great congregation, *Acts* ii. 42.

Fourthly, The time, which was, say they, at any fit time



or season, when the parties baptized did freely come and offer themselves to be baptized upon a profession of their faith and love to CHRIST.

Fifthly, The manner of baptizing was by dipping or immersing in water, in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; which was as they observe, not only agreeable to the sense of the word, which signifies immersion in water; but to the allegory of death, burial, and resurrection, which the Apostles Peter, Paul, and Ananias so properly allude to, *Acts* ii. 38.—and xxii. 16.—likewise in *Rom.* vi. 3, 4.—1 Peter iii. 21.—see *Magdeburg His. Cent. i. L. ii. Chap.* page 496, 497.

And in this first century Clemens asserts who they are that are the right subjects of Baptism, that they are such who have passed through an examination and received instruction. See Jacob Morningus in his *His. of Baptism*, page 2. out of Clement's Epistle; also *Dutch Martyrology*.

Ignatius, in his discourses upon baptism, affirms, that it ought to be accompanied with faith, love, and patience after preaching, see his letters to Polycarp, and his Letters to the Saints at Philadelphia, for which see H. Montanus page 45;—and Jacob du Bois, page 16 to 22.—and the *Dutch Martyrology*, cent. i.

Likewise those antient followers of CHRIST, the Waldenses, profess and practise believers' baptism in this century, see D. Balthazer Lidius, in his *Treatise of the church*, page 2, col. 2, out of Renarius: as also did the antient Britons who received the gospel in the reign of Tiberius, by an Evangelist sent by the Apostles; and some say, that Simon Peter was in Britain, see that antient historian our countryman Gildas, his book called *de Victoria Aurelii Ambrosii*.

Century the second, in which there seems to be no variation from the former.

Justin Martyr says, in his second Apology Ant. Pius, the

emperor, I will declare unto you how we offer up ourselves to God, after that we are received through CHRIST: those among us are instructed in the faith, are brought to the water; then they are baptized therein, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; then we bring the person, thus washed or baptized, to the brethren, where the assemblies are, that we may pray both for ourselves and the new illuminated person, that we may be found, by doctrine, and good works, worthy observers and keepers of the commandments; then bread and wine being brought to the chief brother (so they called their chief minister) he taketh it and offereth praise and thanksgiving to the Father, in the name of the Son, and the Holy Ghost. After prayer and thanksgiving, the whole assembly saith Amen. When thanksgiving is ended by the chief guide and the consent of the whole people the Deacons (as we call them) give to every one present, part of the bread and wine, over which thanks is given;—this we call the Eucharist, to which no man is admitted, but he that believeth the truth of the doctrine, and lives as CHRIST has taught.

You see, *Theophilus*, that there is a scripture beauty in all this; and how happy would it have been, if the churches had kept to this example of the primitive pattern.

Justin Martyr appears to have been converted to CHRIST about thirty years after the apostle John, when many that were witnesses of the Apostle's preaching and practice were living, when he was beheaded by Verus the emperor, see Baxter's *Saints' Rest*. c. viii. sect. 5.

Walafrid, in his *Ecclesiastical History*, says, that in this age none but understanding persons were baptized, and that upon a profession of their faith.

Third century, which in practice continued the same, though in opinion some corruption appeared.—But Mr. Baxter is pleased to give us this further account respecting baptism: that Tertullian, Origen, and Cyprian, who lived in the second and third centuries, do affirm, that in the primitive times none

were baptized but such as engaged themselves to obey him. Saints' Rest, P. i. c. viii. sect. 5.

Fourth century. We find, that in this age Jerom upon *Mat.* xxvii. 19, 20. says, the LORD commanded his Apostle that they should first instruct and teach all nations, and afterwards should baptize those that were instructed in the mysteries of the faith; for it cannot be, saith he, that the body should receive the ordinance of baptism, before the soul has received the true faith.

Athanasius, in his third sermon against the Arians, says, our Saviour hath not simply commanded to baptize, but first said teach, then baptize; because true faith proceeds from teaching, and baptism then rightly follows faith, see Morning Book, part ii. page 370.

Ephraim, bishop of Cyprus, was baptized upon a profession of his faith; and did afterwards assert for doctrine that none ought to be baptized but such, see Metaphrastes, L. i. c. 30. and Merning, page 366.

And, it is worthy observation, that about this time there were many councils and synods. There was the council of Carthage,—of Laodicea,—and of Neocæsaria, who all agree in this, that whosoever were baptized should give in their names; and then, after due examination, they should be baptized. And, what is more remarkable, that not only great men and Princes, but even those born of believing parents, were not baptized till aged and capable of declaring their Faith in the Messiah, viz. Basil, Gregory Nazianzen, Ambrose, Chrysostom, Jerom, Austin, Constantine, and Theodosius.

Basil, the great son of Basil, bishop of Nicene, was baptized in Jordan when far advanced in years.

Gregory, the son of Gregory, bishop of Nazianzen, was baptized at the age of 20, see Osiander's book, Cent. iv. L. 3. chap. xlj. lxiii. page 371, 380.

Constantine the Great, who was a Briton born, and king of England, and son of Helena, a zealous Christian, was far

advanced in age when he was baptized; in whose reign it is remarked, that most of his British troops were Christians, though in so early an age as 320.

Ambrose remained instructed in the faith till he was chosen bishop of Milan, before he was baptized, see Paulinus in *Vita Ambrosii*.

Hugo Grotius, upon *Matt. xix.* says, that Chrysostom was born of believing parents, and was educated by Melitius, a bishop; yet not baptized till the age of 21; and further adds, that many of the Greeks, in every age to this day, keep the custom of deferring the baptism of their little ones, till they make a confession of their faith.

Erasmus testifies that Jerom was born in the city of Shydon, of Christian parents, was brought up in the Christian religion, and was baptized in the 30th year of his age.

Naclerus, *Generat. An.* 391, says, that Austin, the son of the virtuous (an expression then used for gracious) Monica, being instructed in the faith, was not baptized till near the age of 30. And Vossius affirms, that Nectarius was made bishop of Constantinople before he was baptized. And *Historia Tripartita* tells us, that Theodosius the emperor, was born in Spain, and his parents were both Christians; that he was instructed in the Christian faith, who falling sick at Thessalonica was by Achalio baptized.

To the same purpose writes that learned Frenchman and great searcher into antiquity Monsieur Daille, and our countryman Dr. Field, and Dr. Taylor in his *Lib. Proph.* page 239. And particularly Dr. Barlow, who was Doctor of the chair at Oxford, a man eminent for his learning, says in a letter, "I do believe and know that there is neither precept nor example for infant baptism, nor any just evidence for it, for above 200 years after CHRIST, that Tertullian condemns it as an unwarrantable practice, and he adds, I have read what my learned friends Dr. Hammond and Mr. Baxter and others say in the defence of it; and I confess I wonder

not a little that men of such great parts should say so much to so little purpose, for I have not as yet seen any thing like an argument for it." Thus far Dr. Barlow.

THEOPH. But if this be the case, how did infant baptism come into the church?

PHILA. This may be matter of further inquiry—only I would just observe here, that about the end of the third century, a corruption prevailed among the African churches concerning the taking away of original sin, and lest any of them should die without the means of grace, they were for having them baptized, but there was much opposition to it by Tertullian and others, that it does not appear to be brought into practice till about the end of the fourth century, and was afterwards in the fifth century confirmed by Popes and councils, particularly by the Millitant council, a provincial town in Africa—who in their ignorant zeal anathematized or cursed all those who did not baptize their new-born infants, to save them from original sin.—This was occasioned by Pelagius denying original sin, and Austin a popish monk, who to confirm it, maintained baptism as necessary to cleanse and save infants from the guilt of it, which he afterwards got confirmed by many bishops, and particularly by Pope Innocent the first, see Austin's *Decreta* Epistle at large, page 822, 825, —who was the first pope that aimed at being universal bishop, and having a supremacy over all the churches, he introduced traditions, he established blasphemy, denied marriage, settled confirmation to bishops, appointed the LORD'S supper to infants, banished the emperor, expelled the Christians, and this is the innocent creature who was the first great patron, confirmer (if not the introducer) and establisher of infant baptism, to whom that corrupt council of Carthage joined, as it is confirmed to us by Wilfred Strabo, who tells us that children were now baptized according to the decree of the council of Carthage for the taking away original sin, which afore time was not practised.

Luther, that great champion for truth, says that infant

baptism was not determined till Pope Innocentius ; and Grotius, in his Annotations on *Matt.* 19, says, “ It was not enjoined till the council of Carthage.”

Which canons of Pope Innocent were confirmed by Pope Zosimus, his successor, and afterwards by Pope Boniface, and so has continued to be a part and pillar of Popery, in all ages to the present time: for what is the church of England’s baptism of infants, their sureties, their odd-fathers, and their odd-mothers, their cross in baptism, and their saying that they make the infant, by baptism, a child of GOD, a member of CHRIST, an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven, but a religious lie, taken from the church of Rome, and put in their mouths by Pope Innocent. When the priest has the daring assurance (not to say ignorance) to lie unto GOD, when he says, we yield thee hearty thanks that it has pleased thee to regenerate this infant with thy Holy Spirit. Is there then not a lie in his right hand when he says this? let his own conscience judge; or if his conscience is at a loss how to judge, let the life of the infant (if it lives) witness between GOD and his own soul, whether he did not lie to GOD when he thanked GOD heartily that it had pleased him to regenerate it with his Holy Spirit, when only the fruits of sin and the devil appear in the child’s life: and indeed Mr. John Wesley, who calls himself a son of the church of England, maintains the primitive faith of Pope Innocent, nay, he rather exceeds, for he says, “ As infants are guilty of original sin, it cannot be washed away but by baptism.” Again he says, “ it is necessary to salvation,”—nay he ascribes salvation to it, and says, “ by baptism we who were by nature the children of wrath, are made the children of GOD.” Nay but he goes further, and you must believe him, *Theophilus*, for a man that talks so much of perfection, and is so near infallibility cannot sure mistake, when he (oh! astonishing ignorance) says, “ That by the water of baptism, we are born again or regenerated.” See his *Preservative*, page 146. And he has had the assurance to say, “ that in saying this, he ascribes no

greater virtue to baptism than CHRIST himself - has done." Surely he must be a man without conscience, as well as without truth; for I never read before, except in popish books (books that I have reason to fear he is too well acquainted with) that ever CHRIST ascribed any virtue at all to baptism; though he has that daring and deceitful assurance to tell his people, that in water baptism "a principle of grace is infused which will not be wholly taken away, unless we quench the Holy Spirit of GOD by long continued wickednesses." How a man dares thus to lie for GOD, is enough to make one tremble. He says thereby a principle of grace is infused, I deny it; let him prove it:—He says that "the principle of grace infused will not be wholly taken away, unless we quench the Spirit of GOD by long continued wickedness."—It should then seem that some measure of wickedness is safe; but a long measure, or continued wickedness, is the danger.—What childish ignorance is here! an allowance of some sin, but danger of much sin, as though GOD could forbear with some iniquity, but not a deal, as though sin was more powerful to destroy us, than GOD is to save us; Oh, wretched doctrine! for, if this be true, what must become of those poor infants, who die unbaptized? What! lost for want of a little water, a few drops? O, amazing! that such ignorance still continues among the people.

But methinks, the danger lies here; if the poor infant has a principle of grace infused in baptism, as Mr. *John Wesley* says it has; and I am sure he ought to know, as he has been attempting to be a teacher in Israel so many years; then, methinks, the danger lies here at first; for if the poor dear infant has grace infused, we can hardly suppose that it has more drops of grace than there are drops of water in its baptism. Now the infant always shews, if not by crying, yet by frowning, a frowardness and rebellion against this ordinance, and the priest does it of his own will; so that here is rebellion in the child, rebellion in the priest, rebellion in the parents, and rebellion in the people; for it is all of their own

rebellious will against the will of GOD, except the poor obliged obedient infant. Quere, whether there is not more rebellion against the will of GOD, than there is grace given to the infant? If so, the poor infant, according to Mr. *Wesley's* doctrine, is in great danger of being lost at the first onset. But, why should I confine it to Mr. *Wesley's* doctrine in this point? Is it not the same ignorance in the church of England, in the church of Scotland,—and in all the Presbyterian and Independant churches in the kingdom? The church of England comes nearest of any, for if the poor infant be ill or like to die, it admits of its being only half baptized.—Now there is great ignorance and great cruelty in this:—great ignorance to think that a half can do so well as the whole, when, they say, the whole is necessary to salvation:—great cruelty to the infant, for if the whole is necessary to save it, as they ignorantly say it is, then the poor infant is but half saved, for a half cause can but have a half effect: besides, it is cruelty to the child, for if grace be given, as Mr. *Wesley* says, in baptism, then it must be cruel to withhold any part of the ordinance from the child; for consequently so much of the ordinance (if we may be allowed to call it so) that is withheld, so much grace is withheld; but this smells rank of Popery as well as cruelty.

The church of Scotland says, that the baptism of infants, as they call it, seals the covenant of grace; and that the children are put into the bond of the covenant by it.—Hence it is that we read in their works so much of their baptismal vows, and baptismal covenant; one cannot help pitying them, for surely, in this point, they are, with all their knowledge, as ignorant of the Scriptures as Hottentots, for I never read of Baptism being a seal of the covenant of grace, that is only the death of CHRIST; nor did I ever read in my bible of parents putting their children into the bond of the salvation covenant; I always thought it was an act of GOD's grace in CHRIST before the world began, and not (blessed be GOD) left to the creature to do. But oh! the stu-



pidness of them to attempt to forge such ignorance upon us as to believe in baptismal vows, and baptismal covenants, especially of the poor infant's making at eight days, or at furthest a month old, in the name of wonder whence came these? And yet how often does the zealous, traditional preacher call upon them to renew their baptismal vows, and seal at the LORD'S supper their baptismal covenant! was ever such ignorance imposed upon a people of natural understanding, to renew a vow they never made, and to seal a covenant they never heard of in the book of GOD.

And in short, the ignorance of the Presbyterians and Independants (unless they know better than what they practise) is not a hair's breadth short of this; for if the child be ill at any time before the month be expired, they soon cry out, "Fetch! O, fetch Mr. such a one, let the child be baptized, for I am afraid it will die." O! they would not have their dear little bairn die without being baptized for the whole world, lest it should miss of a safe passage to heaven. Ah! poor deluded, but pleased ignorant creatures, for what is this but believing in the doctrine of the church of Rome, that baptism or rather sprinkling of an infant is absolutely necessary to salvation; but, poor creatures, they are to be pitied, and their priest is to be blamed, who has handled the word of GOD, upon this point deceitfully to them, insomuch that they have the long path of ignorance, and the wall of prejudice to get through, before they can come at the truth; or, like the noble Bereans, search the Scriptures, whether the things spoken be so or not.

THEOPH. Surely, Sir, the child must receive some great blessing in baptism, or why do every denomination (except the Baptists) so earnestly contend for it? Nay, I remember Mr. Wesley says, in one of his Journals, that he was ten years old before he sinned away the grace which he received in baptism.

PHILA. As to the people of every denomination so earnestly contending for it, it is not to be wondered at at all, since they have (received it from the pope and have) been taught

it by their priests that it is necessary to salvation, that it is a seal of the covenant, and that they put their dear bairns thereby into the covenant; this is the priestcraft of near four thousand ministers of the church of Scotland, and the ministers of the church of England, though not such great bigots, yet equally as great cheats; for they without any nibblings of conscience, except among a few, put a barefaced religious lie in the mouth of the children, by teaching them to say, in their catechism, that in their baptism they were made a member of CHRIST, a child of GOD, and an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven. And as to Mr. Wesley saying that he was ten years old before he sinned away the grace that he received in baptism, this puts me in mind of something humorous that happened one evening: being at supper with two gentlemen, one a doctor and the other a tradesman, religion chanced to be the subject of the conversation, upon which, I remember, the tradesman told the doctor, "that if he was to change his religion he would turn Roman Catholic."—To which the doctor replied,—“You change your religion! 'tis impossible for you, Sir, to change your religion;”—upon which the tradesman was for a minute, as it were, stunned, then recovering himself, very solemnly said to the doctor,—“Sir, I suppose you think I have none to change;” “that’s the very case,” said the doctor. So may I say of Mr. Wesley’s sinning away at ten years old the grace he received in baptism; for he had not then, nor I think he has none in a true sense now; and my reasons for it, perhaps, may surprise him and the world too another time.—However, if he had any grace, as he tells us, he had in his baptism, if so, he was an exceeding wicked boy at ten years old; for he tells us, page 139, in his *Preservative*, “that this grace is in baptism not wholly taken away, but by continued wickedness.”—Ah, wicked boy! to be so wicked so young, as to sin away the grace of his baptism, as he tells you in his *Journal*, he began to fall from grace early indeed.

But this is like Mr. Wesley, and will well account to him for his doctrine of falling away from grace; for it is

easy to fall from such grace as this; but to fall from everlasting arms, from almighty power, and unchanging love, is what will try him to prove; but it is like his ignorant stuff, that he would fain impose upon us concerning the sureties for the infant in baptism, when he tells us, "that when the sponsors, who are called by the church of England (however ignorantly yet surely blasphemously) godfathers and godmothers, that these who in the most sacred and solemn manner, promise and vow three things: first, "that the child shall renounce the devil and all his works;" secondly, "that it shall constantly believe God's holy word;" thirdly, "and obediently keep his commandments." When they solemnly engage this for the child, by saying before God "I will," yet Mr. Wesley has the daring assurance to tell us, page 137, in his *Preservative*, "that they promise nothing at all, that they engage for nothing, it is another person that promises all this." And who do ye think, *Theophilus*, this person is that promises all this, can you judge?

**THEOPH.** Sir, I cannot, unless he means the priest; but that he cannot do.

**PHILA.** No, amazing ignorance! he tells you, "that whatever is then promised or undertaken, is not by them but by the child."

**THEOPH.** O astonishing! can Mr. Wesley let down himself so low to maintain a Popish tradition, as to be the subject of laughter? What can the child of a month old promise or vow? Does he think to impose such absurd stuff, that is void of reason, sense or truth, upon mankind? If he does, he will only render himself despised by persons of understanding, however he may engross the affections and impose upon the understanding of an ignorant people.

**PHILA.** But, is it not time, dear *Theophilus*, that we had done with this digression, and proceed to trace believers' baptism through every century to the present age?

**Fifth century:**—In this age believers' baptism was asserted and defended by many eminent writers.

**Chrysostom** says, that the time of grace or conversion was

the only fit time for baptism, "which (says he) was the season in which the three thousand in *Acts* ii. and others afterwards were baptized," And again he says, "the principal thing in baptism to be looked after is the spirit," see *Magd. Cent.* v. p. 363.

Faustus Regiensis, a bishop in France, taught in this age, that the will and desire of the party that comes to be baptized is necessary.

Evegrius says, "that they who have been instructed in the word of GOD, were the proper subjects of baptism," see *Merning*, page 421, 425.

Century the sixth:—In this age believers were baptized upon a profession of their faith is evident. Gregory says, "in baptism the elect receive the gift of the spirit, whereby also their understandings are enlightened 'in the Scriptures, and that by faith in the death of CHRIST by baptism their sins are forgiven." In this century the council of Agathen decreed, that the articles of faith be first preached to the persons to be baptized, before they are baptized, see *Vicecome's History of Baptism*, page 482.

Century the seventh:—In this age we find that the Bracarens council, in Spain, decreed, that no adult person but such who had been well instructed and examined should be baptized.

The council of Tolitanus express the same import; and we find that Paulinus baptized in the river Trent, in England, a great number both of men and women. See *Bede*, l. 2. chap. 16. cent. 7, page 145; and in Egypt, it is said, that the Christians departed from the faith and practice of the church of Rome, placing it upon the Apostolical foundation, that the person should first believe before he is baptized, *Vicecomes*, l. 9. chap. 3.

Century the eighth:—In this age we find that the learned *Bede* says, page 220, "That men were first to be instructed in the knowledge of the truth, then to be baptized as CHRIST has taught, because that without faith it is impossible to please GOD."

The learned *Haimé*, upon *Matt.* xxviii. 19, says, "in these

words is set down the rule how to baptize, that is, that teaching should go before baptism, for he saith, that CHRIST says, teach all nations, then baptize; for he that is to be baptized must first be instructed to believe what he in baptism shall receive."

Likewise the council of Paris, and that of Laodicea decreed, that those who are baptized ought first to be instructed in the faith, and to make a confession thereof.

Century the ninth:—In this age we find that Rabanus, in chap. 4, says, "That the catechism, which is the doctrine of faith, must go before baptism, to the intent that he that is to be baptized may first learn the mysteries of faith, and likewise observes, the LORD CHRIST anointed the eyes of him that was born blind, with clay made of spittle, before he sent him to the waters of Shiloah, to signify that he that is to be baptized, must first see or be instructed in the faith, concerning the incarnation of CHRIST, when he that is instructed doth believe, then he is to be admitted to baptism, that he might know whom he afterwards ought and in duty is bound to serve."

Albinus says, "Three things are visible in baptism, the body, the water, and the administrator; and three things invisible, the soul, faith, and the Spirit of GOD, which are all joined by the word of GOD," cent. 8, page 220.

Rabanus likewise observes, "that the adult were first to be instructed in the faith, and duly examined before they were baptized; and that as Noah and his family were saved by water and the ark; so the faithful are saved by CHRIST and baptism,"—cent. 8, page 144.

Century the tenth:—In this age we find that Smaragdo, on *Matt.* xxvi. 19, says, "Men are to be taught in the faith, then after to be baptized therein; for it is not enough that the body be baptized, but that the soul by faith first received the truth thereof," page 187.

Century eleventh:—Anselm says, "That believers are baptized into the death of CHRIST; that believing his death,

and conforming thereto, may as dying with him live also with him," cent. 11, page 169.—And again he says, "the baptism of CHRIST is the washing of water into the word of life; take away either the water or the word, baptism ceaseth." And he has another pious thought upon it, when he says, "Whoever is baptized hath heaven opened to him, and knows that GOD is there above ready to receive him, which, as by the steps of a ladder, he must from his baptism ascend to him, for Solomon says, the way of life is above to the wise," page 116.

It appears that in this age the baptism of believers was asserted and practised by the Waldenses, and the Albigenses, Twisk Chron. lib. 11, upon the year 1100, page 423. Likewise Peter Bruis, a learned author in Thoulouse, in France, and his followers, who were not a few, were zealous assertors and practisers of baptism after faith and repentance, see the Dutch Martyrology, cent. 11.

Century the twelfth:—Alburtus Magnus says, "The laver of baptism is not proper but to the illuminated and called, who can draw virtue from the death of CHRIST, and his resurrection, cent. 13, page 413.

Likewise Thomas Aquinas says, "That in baptism GOD works inwardly, as he dispenseth the ordinance outwardly, that there is not only a consecration of the soul to GOD but the body, because the whole man by baptism is dedicated to GOD, for by baptism we die to the life of sin, and begin to live a new life of grace," page 424.—"And in this century there was a great spread of those who practised believers' baptism." see Twisk Chron. l. 13, page 528, 529.

Century the thirteenth:—In which we find that Jacob Meringus says, "That he had in his hand, in the German tongue, a confession of the faith of the baptists, called Waldenses, which asserts, that in the beginning of Christianity there was no such thing as baptizing of infants, and that their forefathers practised no such thing, as Johannus Bohemius writes in his second book; and Meringus's History of Baptism, part 2, page

738.—And it is likewise observed, “that this faith and practice made a prodigious spread through Poland, Lombardy, Germany, and Holland,” see Mering upon cent. 13, page 737. And Montantus, page 86.

Century the fourteenth :—In which we find that Carlous, bishop of Meyland, did exhort the ministers under his charge, that they should first teach the faith; and that only upon a confession of faith, and a good conversation, they should administer baptism, Mering, page 740.

In this century the baptists were many, especially in Bohemia, which the confession of the Thaborites, in the year 1431, confirms, who say we do from our hearts acknowledge that the ordinance of baptism is a washing which is performed with water, which according to CHRIST’s words, doth hold out (that is in a figure) the washing of the soul from sin, according to CHRIST’s command, *Matt.* xxviii. 19, and his practice, being himself before baptized in Jordan, see Mering’s History of Baptism, page 743, 744.

Century the fifteenth :—In which Meringus tells us, page 772, “That there was more increase than ever of the doctrine of baptizing believers.”

And Twisk says, in his Chronology, page 930, “that in the year 1507, the Waldenses, who were baptists, were much spread in Hungary.”—And as a satisfaction that these Waldenses were baptists, Montantus, in his impress the second, says, “that the Waldenses in the public declarations of their faith to the French king, in the year 1521, assert in the strongest terms, the baptizing of believers, and denying that of infants.”

And Balthazer Lydias testifies, “That at this time there were several churches in Thessalonica, in Greece, supposed to continue successively from the Apostles’ time, agreeing with the faith of the Waldenses.” See Balthazer Lydias, in his third treatise of the Waldenses. And Meringus likewise observes, “that two persons were sent from the churches in Thessalonica to find some of the same faith with themselves,

and coming into Switzerland they were taken prisoners, and put into the Castle of Passau, who declared to many that they had in their care (meaning I suppose, at Thessalonica) the original of Paul's Epistles, which he sent to them." See Meringus's History of Baptism, page 739.

Century the sixteenth:—In this age we find that Jacob de Roor, a prisoner, in Bruges, in Flanders, stedfastly owned and maintained that baptism that CHRIST had commanded, after teaching and believing, "This (says he) the apostles practised, and must needs be after believing, because it is for the burying of sin, the bath or evidence of regeneration, the covenant of a Christian's life, the putting on the body of CHRIST, and planting into the true olive tree CHRIST JESUS, and for the right entrance into the spiritual ark, whereof CHRIST JESUS is the builder." See Dutch Martyrology, page 15.

Erasmus is very particular in his paraphrase upon Matt. xxviii. 19, who says, "When you have taught them the word of GOD, if they then believe and receive it, and are ready and willing to embrace the doctrine of the gospel, then let them be baptized with water, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, that they may be written among the number (I suppose he meant among the number of the brethren in the church) who trusted in CHRIST, and were, through the merits of his death, freed and washed from their sins, and received to be the children of GOD."

The great Beza, who wrote a translation and notes upon the Bible, says upon 1 Cor. vii. 14. "that to permit children to be baptized, was unheard of in the primitive church, where every one ought to be instructed in the faith before he is baptized."

And Bucer, that great man of GOD, says, "that in the congregation of GOD, confession of sin is always first before baptism; and that in the beginning of the church, no man was baptized and received into the congregation but those, who through hearing the word, wholly gave themselves over to



CHRIST, see his book entitled "The Ground Work and Cause," &c.

And Luther, that great champion for GOD, says of old, "The ordinance of baptism was administrated to none, except to those who acknowledged and confessed their faith." And of the same judgment were Grotius, Zuinglius, Bullinger, Melancthon, Chaucer, Hammond, and Field; but above all the zealous Mr. Baxter, who was, in his day, a noted enemy to the Baptists; yet, when simple truth was before him, and prejudice did not overcome him, to his own honour and to the honour of truth, he says, when treating upon Philip baptizing the eunuch, "that the constant order of the gospel is, that baptism must follow faith;" nay, he adds (which is remarkable, but is no more than the truth) "that it is no better than an impious profanation of the ordinance, if it go without faith; that is (says he) if the party seek it without faith, or if the pastor administrate it without a profession of faith." If then this be the case, how self condemned must every Pedobaptist be; and hereby you see, Theophilus, that GOD does not only out of the mouth of babes ordain strength, but out of the mouth of enemies to believers' baptism, ordain a glory to his name in the truth of his ordinance.

PHILA. *Theophilus*, as it was your desire to hear again what the great men in Israel had said upon this truth, you will pardon my freedom with presenting you afresh, with an army of the champions in Israel all slain by their own sword, acknowledging the truth, but not practising it. This weakness (not to say wickedness) but wavering from the truth in their own conscience, I would not have exposed, was it not that I find, that the ignorance and prejudice of both ministers and people, are established thereby; that they will not believe that their Goliaths are all slain, unless you show them their heads cut off with their own sword.

Casaubon, "The manner of baptizing was to plunge or dip into the water, as even the word βαπτίζειν itself plainly enough shews." On *Matt.* iii. 6.

Zanchius, "It signifies properly to plunge, dip.—So the antient church used to dip those that were baptized, so CHRIST descended into Jordan and was baptized; and so others were baptized by John," In vol. ii. on *Eph.* p. 217.

Calvin, "The very word baptizing signifies to dip; and it is certain, that the rite of dipping was observed of the ancient church." Just. lib. iv. chap. xv. sect. 19.

Luther, "Baptism is a Greek word, and may be translated a dipping, when we dip something in water, that it may be covered with water, and though it be for the most part almost altogether abolished, for neither do they dip the whole children, but only sprinkle them with a little water; they ought nevertheless to be wholly dipped and presently drawn out again, for that the etymology of the word seems to require.—I would have those that are to be baptized, to be wholly dipped into the water, as the word imports, and the mystery doth signify," tom. 1 de Baptism, fol. 71, and tom. ii. fol. 19.

Dr. Hammond, "Βαπτισμος signifies an immersion, or washing the whole body," Annot. on *John* xiii. 10.

Bishop Taylor, "If you would attend to the proper signification of the word baptism, it signifies plunging in water, or dipping with washing. Rule of Conscience, 3, c. 4.

Dr. Owen, "For the original and natural signification of it, it signifies to dip, to plunge, to dye, to wash, to cleanse— "That no honest man who understands the Greek tongue, can deny the word to signify to dip." Posthumous Works, p 581.

Chambers, "The word baptism is formed from the Greek βαπτίζω, of *Bapto*, I dip or plunge.—That, in the primitive times, this ceremony was performed by immersion, as it is to this day in the Oriental churches, according to the original signification of the word.

All the best lexicographers and critics render it as synonymous with its primitive βαπτω; and such as call it a diminutive, have not proved it so. Our learned translators thus ren-

der the word, *Luke* xvi. 24, *John* xiii. 26, *Rev.* xix. 13, *Luke* xi. 38, *Mark* vii. 4, where baptism is not intended; but in no place to pour or sprinkle. And though pouring and sprinkling do often occur in the Old Testament, the Seventy, who no doubt were masters of the Greek, if not of the Hebrew, do not once use the word to express either; but often to dip, as a distinct rite from pouring or sprinkling; and also *Job* ix. 31, to plunge. Nor have Grecian writers (as Mr. John Brown observes, in his Treatise upon baptism) used the words as expressive of pouring or sprinkling: that it is evident our LORD's commission was to dip and not to pour or sprinkle. And if we may recede the letter of the word, which expresses the mode of a positive institution, it can be no certain rule for our faith and practice; such a liberty is denied with regard to Christian doctrines, nor ought it to be granted as to Christian worship. And as we believe no set of men have a power to alter the mode of a divine ordinance, or substitute one of their own invention in its room, we choose to adhere to the letter of the word, and the primitive practice of the church; knowing it must be an high affront to stamp divine authority, in so solemn a manner, on modes of worship of our own devising.

2dly, Wherever washing is mentioned in the New Testament, as having the least allusion to baptism, it is expressed by *λῶ* and its compound *απολῶ*, *Heb.* x. 22, which signifies no less than bathing or washing the whole body; so that pouring or sprinkling is not baptism, but washing by immersion. It is strongly pleaded *βαπτίζω* signifies, to wash as well as to dip; we freely own it does washing by dipping, as a consequence thereof: and indeed had our translators been so ingenuous as to have given us the native meaning of the word in English, which is to dip, there would never have been any disputation upon this sacred ordinance of CHRIST.

Grotius, "They were more solicitous to cleanse themselves from the defilement they had contracted in the market; and

therefore, they not only washed their hands, but immersed their whole body." Annot. on *Matt.* vii. 4.

Likewise Mr. Brown rightly observes, "that the places chosen for baptism, and the particular circumstances on divine record respecting both the persons baptizing and those baptized, confirm us, that pouring or sprinkling is not baptism. We ought to be satisfied with the proper and natural signification of the letter of the word, as to the mode of an ordinance. If we act according to its real sense, we are sure to be right. Nor are we left to the sense of a single word, but the precise meaning of it you see is explained by another that signifies the bathing or dipping of the whole body. And further, for the satisfaction of sincere and unprejudiced minds, that baptism is an immersion or dipping, and not a pouring or sprinkling, the word informs us of the places where and several particular circumstances of the administration of baptism. John made choice of the river Jordan; he baptized in (*Mat.* iii. 16. *Mark* i. 5, 9, 10.) the river, and not on the banks side or shore of it. So our LORD was baptized by John in Jordan; and when he was baptized, went straightway out of the water, as both evangelists, Matthew and Mark, testify; and not from the river-side, or shore only, up the banks of the river. It cannot rationally be supposed, that John and our LORD would have gone into the river, for one to pour or sprinkle a little water on the other. The most strenuous espousers of that practice will not do so, lest they should be thought ridiculous. John also chose (*John* iii. 23.) Enon near Salem to baptize in, and the reason is assigned, because there was much water there. Whether there were many waters, a deep river, or a conflux of many rivulets, or springs of water, need not to be disputed, as the mode of pouring or sprinkling requires none of these; a little quantity would have been sufficient: but it is evident much water is mentioned, denoting thereby, it was a suitable place to immerse or dip persons in."

Witsius says, "that the immersion into the water repre-

sents to us that tremendous abyss of divine justice in which CHRIST was plunged.—An immersion of this kind, deprives us of the benefit of the light, and the other enjoyments of this world ; so it is a very fit representation of the death of CHRIST. The continuing how short soever, under the water, represents his burial.—The immersion or coming out of the water, gives us some resemblance of his resurrection.—Baptism also signifies fellowship in the death, burial, and resurrection of CHRIST.”

The principal design of baptism, is to represent the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ, and the fellowship of believers with him therein, which further confirms the mode to be immersion, and not pouring or sprinkling. Some warm advocates for sprinkling deny this, because their mode affords no resemblance of a burial or resurrection ; and rather than give up their favourite opinion, are for eclipsing the glory of this ordinance of JESUS CHRIST, by asserting, water baptism is not intended in those texts that speak of our being buried with CHRIST, (*Rom. vi. 4. Col. ii. 12.*) &c. yet these same persons will bring the Colossian text, as the only one, to prove that water baptism came in the room of circumcision. How unfair are such reasoners ! but judicious and learned pedobaptists freely own, that water baptism is intended as performed by immersion, in *Rom. vi. 4.*

Grotius saith, “ Not only these words, but the forms of baptism do intimate thus much ; i. e. a death to sin : for the total immersion of the body so far under water as to be for a while covered from sight, carries an image of that burial which is given to the dead.”

Piscator, “ It seems to respect the antient rite, when as the whole body was dipt into the water, and so as it were buried, and presently again drawn out as out of the grave.” Annot. on *Rom. vi. 4. Col. ii. 12.*

Mastricht, “ It alludes to baptism, as it was wont to be administered in the time of CHRIST and his Apostle, not by

sprinkling, but immersion, by which the baptized was as buried in water," *Theologia*, p. 917.

Dr. Hammond, "It is a thing that every Christian knows, that the immersion in baptism refers to the death of CHRIST; the putting the person baptized into the water, denotes and proclaims the death and burial of CHRIST." Annot. in *Rom.* vi. 4.

Burkitt, "The Apostle alludes, no doubt, to the ancient manner and way of baptizing persons in those hot countries, which was by immersion, or putting them under water for a time and then raising them again out of the water." *Expos. Rom.* vi. 4.

Dr. Manton, "Baptism signifieth the death and burial of CHRIST, for immersion under water is a kind of figure of death and burial—the putting the baptized person into the water, denoteth and proclaimeth the burial of CHRIST; and we, by submitting to it, are baptized with him, or profess to be dead to sin, for none but the dead are buried; so that it signifieth CHRIST'S death for sin, and our dying to sin—as a significant emblem, for the going up out of the water is a kind of a resurrection; so it signifieth CHRIST'S resurrection and ours." *Expos. Rom.* vi. 4.

It would be imposing upon your understanding as well as your patience, to proceed to the last century, when you cannot but know how many great men in Israel have, from a consciousness of the truth, embraced the believers' baptism.—Mr. Smith, Mr. Tombes, brought up at the University of Oxford, of whom Dr. Calamy says all the world must own him to be a considerable man, and an eminent scholar.—Nelson says, he was a person of incomparable parts; Mr. Wall, though an enemy to the baptists, says, "Mr. Tombes was a man of the best parts in the nation." And he adds, "perhaps in any other." He wrote 28 books, and was pastor of a small baptist church, at Bewdley in Worcestershire, where he practised baptism by immersion, and had the joy to see three eminent ministers raised up in the church, Mr. Adams, Mr. Eccles, Mr. Baylston.

There was Mr. Henry Denne, who was brought up at the university of Cambridge, he was committed to prison for preaching against infant baptism; and while in prison he wrote a judicious treatise, entitled, the foundation of children's baptism discovered and raised. He wrote six books; the last is called a contention for truth, upon which, a neighbouring clergyman puts this epitaph upon his grave, which was,

To tell his goodness, wisdom, learning unto men,  
I need say no more—but here lies Henry Denne.

Another eminent for his learning, tenderness of conscience, zeal for truth, and love to unity, peace and concord was Mr. Henry Jessey, educated at St. John's College, Cambridge, he wrote seven books.

Likewise Mr. William Dell, who was a famous preacher in his day, brought up at Cambridge, and was chaplain to the army under Sir Thomas Fairfax.—He wrote five books.

Besides, there was Mr. Hanseed, who had a liberal education, brought up at Cambridge, was a Graduate and a Presbyter of the church of England, but afterwards, for truth's sake, embraced believers' baptism, and gathered a baptist church in St. Helen's London, and was a prosperous preacher.—His journeys were many, his trials great, his faith strong, his patience remarkable, and his death triumphant. He wrote twelve books.

Mr. Francis Cornwel was likewise another eminent man for God. He was brought up at Cambridge, and was student at Immanuel's college, and master of arts. He enjoyed a living in Kent, but (what is remarkable) upon his searching the scriptures, respecting the truth and antiquity of baptism, he cries out, "O! that the learned English ministry would inform me, lest my blood, like Abel's, cry aloud for vengeance, for not satisfying a troubled conscience. How shall I admit, or believe the infant of a believer to be made a visible member of a visible church or fit to be baptized, before it be able to make confession of faith and repentance?" Upon

which he writes a book called the **Royal commission of KING JESUS**. He resigned his church living, and gathered a baptist people in Kent, and was succeeded by his son in the ministry.

Another great and worthy man was **Mr. Benjamin Cox**, a man of no mean figure in learning and birth; he was a bishop's son, a Graduate in the University, and a zealous minister for a time in the church of England; but when he became so humble as to take his religion from the scriptures, he soon became a great defender of believers' baptism, and a leading minister among the baptist churches in London.

**Mr. Daniel Dyke** was likewise another great preacher in Israel, who had his education at Cambridge, was chaplain to Oliver Cromwell, when Lord Protector of England, who was chosen and ordained co-pastor with **Mr. Kiffin** to the congregation of baptists at Devonshire-square, London, and continued a faithful labourer to his death; a man of great humility, modesty, and learning.

**Mr. Fisher**, who was well known for his knowledge in Eloquence, Rhetoric, Poetry, Greek, and Latin; he had a parochial living of 500*l.* a year in Kent, which he freely resigned for the love of truth, and joined with a baptist congregation at Ashford in Kent, where he continued in the ministry, became before thousands a zealous defender of the truth, and baptized many hundreds: he was an ornament to the truth in life and death.—He wrote a book, which is often to be seen, intituled **Baby Baptism mere Babism**, a severe irony, but through preachers' ignorance or prejudice, not more severe than true; for if people will remain so ignorant, and will not harken to the word of **GOD**, but will teach for doctrine the commandments of men, or rather the institution of the Pope, they must expect to be told of it who has required this at your hands.

We might likewise mention the pious **Mr. Francis Bramfield**, a man of birth and great learning, having an University education, he was first ordained a Deacon, then a **Presbyter** of



the church of England. He had a license from under the hands of two Kings, and the Protector of England to preach, which was obtained by friends for him. He was the first that set up separate meetings. He gathered a congregation in London, and went through much sufferings; was often carried from his meeting to prison, where he ceased not to preach in the name of JESUS, and gathered there a few people to the truth, where he died. He wrote nine books, and some of his works are very extraordinary.

We may likewise mention that great man of GOD, Vavasor Powel, being of a noble ancient family. He was brought up a scholar, and was a man (after GOD called him by his grace) of uncommon zeal in religion, and his labours and perils were more abundant than any of his brethren. He left the national church, and joined to a congregational church at Dartford, in Kent; from thence he went to his native country Wales, where he was a zealous labourer in the gospel, and settled near twenty churches there, or rather the LORD gathered them and planted them by him. He wrote nine books; many things in them are excellent.

And here we should not forget the pious Mr. Edward Stennet, who greatly suffered in his circumstances for the sake of truth and a good conscience. His residence was a safety to his person, being in a castle at Wallingford, where no warrant could enter but of a lord chief justice, which was once through malice, issued out against him, but Providence wonderfully appeared for his deliverance. He had two sons, ministers; Benjamin, who died young, and Joseph, who wrote a judicious defence of believers' baptism; his works are many, and praise him much. He was a zealous Christian, an affectionate preacher, a warm lover of the sacred name of JESUS, a favourite at court, and a faithful friend to the dissenters. His son, whose name is, at this day, affectionately engraved in the breasts of many, shone with superior lustre in all the glories of the father, as a minister, as a Christian, as a scholar, as a gentleman, and a favourite at court; as a father, as a

friend, and a patron of that which was amiable, lovely, and of good report. He had a tender heart and a relieving hand to those in distress. His qualifications as a minister were not small, but particularly affectionate; and towards his latter end, was more evangelical and deep in the gospel. His son, who succeeds him, has an affectionate heart, but too arminianized understanding, at present, ever to arise to the honours of his progenitors in the gospel. He has arrived at some heights, but nothing like those worthies before mentioned in Israel; for at present his shoe-latchets are scarce wet in the waters of the sanctuary. But why mention I this, when it is as far as most of the genteel gentlemen preachers go? For they all seem to me to worship GOD rather like strangers in Israel, than like citizens and children in Zion; for they seem to know little of that life, love, union, and fellowship with GOD, as children with a father in the temple, which GOD has pitched and not man.

There is the great Doctor Gill, whose understanding is great, and is one of the best scholars in the kingdom. He has wrote several piecces in defence of believers' baptism. He has been a zealous defender of many truths of the gospel, particularly GOD'S everlasting love to his elect, cternal union with CHRIST, free justification, the glory of CHRIST'S righteousness, efficacious grace, and believers' final perseverance; in these he has excelled many who have gone before him; but had his writings been less prolix and more spiritual, they would have been far more profitable; but the marrow of his works lies in his Exposition on the Song of Songs, and GOD'S everlasting love to his elect.—Of late he has strangely erred both in his spirit and in understanding;—in spirit as to his polemical writings, in showing rather the strength of anger than that of argument; and especially in lately cutting off a member from his church, purely to please his froward will, without ever sending a church member to him to admonish him, or admit him to come before the church or his accusers; nay, he was by letter threatened with a prosecution, if he attempted to take his place in the church.

THEOPH. Sir, I have heard with pleasure the united chain and testimonies of the truth of believers' baptism, through every age and century to the present time; but, surely, sir, there must be something particular in the Doctor's member, that could cause him and the church to use him so unlike Christians, and so contrary to the rule of CHRIST?

PHILA. The case was particular; the person, who was the Doctor's member, is Mr. Isaac Harmon, that is his name, for it is no secret. See a letter published and addressed to the Doctor as Pastor of the church. See likewise the eternal generation Creed published by Mr. Harmon himself, being a creed without credit.

The case was this: Mr. Isaac Harmon has, for more than these sixteen years, believed that the LORD JESUS CHRIST, in his DIVINE NATURE, PERSON, BEING, or EXISTENCE, ever was independent, eternal, self-existent, and enjoys essentially every divine perfection, and is as such the object of glory, and to him is ascribed every divine property, and therefore he is the GOD of glory; and every divine name being given him, such as *Jah Jehovah, Jehovah Elohim, Mighty God, everlasting Father*, therefore he must exist of and from himself; whereas the Doctor always in his preaching and in his writing, describes the LORD JESUS in his divine person, as being begotten by an eternal generation; and has this daring (pardon me if I say blasphemous) expression in his book upon the Trinity, page 176, we believe that JESUS CHRIST is begotten as GOD, and a thousand more such like expressions run through his works, which Mr. Harmon justly and very spiritedly observed, that such expressions were without truth, sense, or scripture; destructive to the essential and primordial glory of CHRIST; that they were the pillar of Arianism, and as such he could be no more the object of worship and adoration than any other creature, or an idol of gold, silver, wood, or stone; for this (though he was willing to dispute the point with the Doctor) he was, by the arbitrary power of his judge, without a jury of his peers, cut off.

**THEOPH.** What answer can the Doctor give to this?

**PHILA.** He never attempts but one, which is this, that the divine nature of CHRIST is not begotten, but his divine person.—To this he has been asked again and again, if the divine nature of CHRIST ever did, or ever could exist, or be without his divine person; if it could, his divine glory is prior to his personal glory; but to end this, is not the essential glory of CHRIST, his personal glory?—if it is said, yes, then it follows that his personal glory, and his essential or natural glory is ONE self-existing glory:—he has likewise been asked, is the personal glory of the Father natural or essential, yes! and he affirms, that the glory of CHRIST is the same with the Father; but how can this be, if the one be essential, and the other only begotten. O amazing, that this dear, this great man in Israel, has so veiled and eclipsed the glory of Him that is the glory of Heaven, the glory of Saints, the glory of the church, the glory of GOD, or as the Apostle expresseth it, “who is the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person.” Here I could almost make use of Mary’s melting expression, They have taken away my LORD and I know not where they have laid him. Can Omnipotence, or he that is the omnipresent GOD be begotten? can the Creator be begotten? can JEHOVAH *Shallom*, JEHOVAH *Jireh*, JEHOVAH *Shammah* be begotten? can he that was without beginning be begotten? can he whose dwelling ever was in eternity be begotten, whose nature is glory, and whose name is the King eternal, &c. All these questions must be answered before I dare believe it.—For, does not the divine Emanuel say, Rev. ii. 8. *I am the first, I AM THAT I AM?* And does not the Holy Ghost say, *From everlasting to everlasting thou art God:* and again, *When he could swear by no greater, he swore by himself.*—Now, can that being that is essentially the *first*; or can GOD that has every divine perfection and glory in himself, and from himself, which the Hebrew word I AM signifies, be begotten? can that being which is in its own essence from everlasting be begotten, or

HE that could swear by no greater than himself exist by generation? Be astonished, O Heavens! at this. Yet so dark is this great man in Israel, and so stubbornly confident in this soul trembling error, in denying the essential personal glory of the LORD JESUS CHRIST, that he daringly says, and is frequently in his preaching and writing attempting to prove, that the LORD JESUS has no existence as a divine person; but as he is begotten by what he calls eternal generation, that he has made it an article of faith, for every one of his members, in the presence of GOD, to declare, before he will receive them into his church communion, a thing never heard of in this world before.—And indeed in his late writings he has, upon this subject, let himself down so low, that we are obliged to him rather for the spirit of anger than argument. Is it not something below the Christian, the scholar, or the gentleman, when he calls his antagonists, ignorant scribblers, and rotten hearts; as to ignorant scribblers, the epithet is as unjust as it is low and mean; for I don't see (without any disparagement to the Doctor) but they understand the scriptures as well as himself, for is there any truth but what they understand?—But if, by ignorant, he means ignorant of the original languages, perhaps some of them know more of these than he is aware of: but is the knowledge of the original or Oriental languages necessary to understand the word of GOD, if it be truly translated? then surely, every Christian, who can read his Bible, reads the original sense of it; and it was an humble, a beautiful, and an honest acknowledgment of that lively man of GOD Mr. John Ryland, who lately said, that all his learning had never helped him to one spiritual idea of the word of GOD.—As to the rottenness of heart, let hearts be weighed in the balance of the sanctuary, and see who has the most rotten heart. He that believes contrary to truth or scripture, that CHRIST, as a divine person is begotten, or he that believes in his heart that CHRIST, in his divine person, is unbegotten, uncreated, unoriginated, self-existent, and eternal, in all the glory of his nature, and per-

fection of person.—Now let men or angels judge who has the rotten heart, for who can honour the Son as they honour the Father, while they by tradition and the imposition of men, believe, as the Doctor teaches, one divine person to be self-existent, and the other to be begotten, judge, O! *Theophilus*.

THEOPH. Sir, I stand amazed, Oh! how are the mighty in Israel fallen. Methinks I could now, was the Doctor present, say unto him with some power and pathos of soul, and not without some of the same fervour of affection, as Mary said unto her LORD, Sir, If thou hast borne him hence, tell me where thou hast laid him, and I will take him away.

PHILA. Dear *Theophilus*, is this your love, I am glad to see it so fervent to your dying LORD and GOD; the request bespeaks the affection of the heart, and not at all the impertinence of the lips, because the Doctor has already told you where he has laid him.

THEOPH. Oh! where?

PHILA. Why, in his body of divinity, where I own I have sought him sorrowing, not only for three days, but for more than three months, but I have not found him whom my soul loveth.

THEOPH. Why not found him?

PHILA. I assure you, sir, I would fain have seen the place where the LORD lay. I sought earnestly with tears to find him in the essential and full glory of his divine person. I sought him, but I found him not; though the Doctor told me much about him, and, that he was in this generation, in that generation, and the other generation; I do not mean generation of ages, but what the Doctor means, metaphysical generation, inanimate generation of vegetables, and the generation of human beings,—here I sought him, but I could not find him, neither could I see the place where the LORD lay, every thing appeared to me like Paul's voyage without sun or stars. I thought sometimes, that the disciples must

have come and stole him away while the Doctor slept, and I should have rested in this opinion had I not found the Doctor since very positive that my LORD in his divine personal glory was there: I therefore sought him again very carefully, and when I had made search and researches through all the shades of his metaphysical generation, every branch of it, said again, he is not here; then I searched through the inanimate generation, every part spake aloud, and said, HE is not here; then I entered the dark sepulchre of the human generation, to see where the LORD lay, but here I confess, so dark are the Doctor's representations, so destructive of his essential glory, as a divine person, and withal (to say the best of it) so indelicate, that made not only nature to shudder, but ready to dissolve. I wonder for my part how the Doctor dares to die with such an idea in his heart, that He who is the glory of GOD, the glory of Heaven, the glory of the Saints, has only his personal glory and existence by generation: does the Doctor think such stuff as this will pass in Israel? Nay, but if a kind Providence should spare his life, let him expect to see it razed,—razed to the foundation thereof. It was a noble and spirited saying of John Ryland, that man of GOD, when lately preaching in the Doctor's meeting-house,—speaking of the glory of CHRIST's spiritual reign, and of the knowledge of CHRIST then covering the earth, as the waters cover the sea,—then says he, spiritual knowledge will be so clear, the understanding so bright, that though now you think much of your Doctor Gill, but then we shall think nothing of your Doctor Gills, nothing of your Doctor Gills.—And upon this point, *Theophilus*, we think nothing of him already.

THEOPH. Why is the Doctor so earnest (I could almost say with the Apostle) to crucify the LORD of life and glory afresh, and put him to open shame?

PHILA. Because he thinks that the distinction of the first, second and third person in the Godhead, as we have been ignorantly taught, cannot be maintained without it, but un-

happy it is for the Doctor, nor with it; for we have not so learned CHRIST by tradition from the fathers, but from the scriptures we know and believe, not as the Doctor teaches, that a first, second, and a third person existeth, the one by nature, the other by being begotten,—and the other by procession; such an idea as this of the existence of GOD, we think is unworthy his name, his nature, and perfection, and contrary to the declaration of the truth of CHRIST, who says, I AM, I am the first; as though he had said, I am of myself, and derive neither essential nor personal glory from none,—therefore it is that we believe according to the sweet simplicity of the scriptures, that the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, the sacred three that bare record in Heaven, self-exist in every glory and perfection of the divine nature, whether essential or personal as the triune GOD, and that the personal glory of this GOD whom we adore, is only in the man CHRIST, who is called in scripture, the brightness of GOD's glory, and the express image of his person.

THEOPH. But what does the Doctor charge his adversaries with holding?

PHILA. As we believe that GOD is the GOD of glory in his nature, so we believe that CHRIST is the object of JEHOVAH's love and glory. The object of his love, as he is his delight, his elect, his beloved one; the object of his glory, as all his essential glory resides in him, and shines forth from him, called the likeness or shining of the glory of the Lord, and the brightness of his glory; therefore we believe him to be the brightness of the glory of JEHOVAH's love to the church—to angels, to men in their creation, to the Saints in their redemption, and to be the glory of his love to them in their regeneration, in every blessing, in every promise, in all their consolation, and the whole of their glorification; and we likewise believe that the Saints' or the church's glory will be so great, that it will be nothing less than that same glory that CHRIST had with the Father, before the world was—and as we see from the word of truth, that this glory is not in the future tense, nor of some



past date, such as 1700 years ago, but that it is as early as any revelation we have of JEHOVAH's love, that love could not be earlier than the object, nor without the object loved; the bosom was prepared for the object, and the object for the bosom of his love, called the Son, which is in the bosom of the Father: for as JEHOVAH's love is said to be from everlasting, *Jer.* xxxi. 3. so is the object, *Prov.* viii. 23. *Mic.* v. 2. *John* xvii. 23. And the glory being of the same date with the object and with the love to the object, as he stands in relation to GOD, he is called his first-born; and as in relation to us, the first born among many brethren, and therefore he says, *John* xvii. 5. *And now, O Father! glorify thou me with thine ownself, with the glory that I had with thee before the world was.* You see plainly that the glory here prayed for was the same that CHRIST had enjoyed and possessed in full inheritance or consummation with the Father before the world was,—which glory is the same that the Saints have a right unto and enjoy in him,—and behold in him as their glory and their all, hence he says, *The glory which thou gavest me have I given them, that they may be one, even as we are one: I in them, and thou in me; that they may be made perfect in one, and that the world may know that thou hast sent me, and hast loved them, as thou hast loved me.—Father, I will that they also whom thou hast given me, be with me where I am, that they may behold my glory which thou hast given me.*—Now we see plainly that this glory was not the glory of the Deity, which is essential to CHRIST, but is a given glory, and it was a glory given to him as man, which was enjoyed by him before the world began, *John* xvii. 5.—And because we believe this early and ancient glory of CHRIST as the object of Jehovah's delight, according to the word of truth before the world was.

The Doctor says, we believe in an eternal Creature, when we no more believe in an eternal Creature, than he believes that there was an eternal sinner.—Surely we can distinguish between the eternal essence of GOD, and the outgoing of that

divine essence in a way of love to an object, believing the object to be before the foundation of the world, which is what CHRIST affirms, *John xvii. 5*. And what the poet sweetly sings of, speaking of the song of Angels, adoring the man in GOD, in all the glory of his Sonship, before the world was, *Prov. viii. 22,—30*.

## 1.

There the dear man, my Saviour sits,  
The GOD, how bright he shines;  
And scatters infinite delights,  
On all the happy minds.

## 2.

Seraphs with elevated strains,  
Circle the throne around;  
And move and charm the starry plains,  
With an immortal sound.

## 3.

JESUS, the LORD, their harps employ,  
JESUS, my LORD, they sing;  
JESUS,—the name of both our joy,  
Sounds sweet from every string.

## 4.

Hark, how beyond the narrow bounds  
Of time and space they run;  
And speak in most majestic sounds,  
The Godhead of the Son.

## 5.

How on the Father's breast he lay,  
The darling of his soul;  
Infinite years before the day,  
Or Heaven began to roll.

Insomuch that the world was made for the glory of that object, or rather by that object for his own glory, *John* i. 1, 2.

Likewise, the Doctor says, "that we deny that his mediatorial office flows from his Sonship."—This is somehow a mistake of the Doctor's; for we as much believe that his office flows from his sonship, as we believe that pardon of sin flows from his death; for surely the office of a Sufferer, Saviour, and Redeemer, must include a nature that could suffer, satisfy, and redeem; and this nature renders him JESUS CHRIST the Son of GOD. For we believe that CHRIST being, as the Scripture says, the First-born of every creature, created purely to be the object of JEHOVAH's love and delight in his own bosom, *John* i. 18. and the object of his glory to men and angels, that in all things he might have the pre-eminence; that this object or CHRIST was taken into the most sublime intimate and consummate union with the divine nature called the bosom of the Father, in which union he became acquainted with all the designs of grace, thoughts of love, and councils of glory, therefore he could not but love the object the Father loved with the same love that GOD loves his church, called the gospel of JESUS CHRIST, the Son of GOD, see *Mark* i. 1. Therefore he says, *All mine are thine, and thine are mine, and I am glorified in them*, *John* xvii. 10. And from this union, which constitutes him the Son of GOD, flows all his grace, offices, and glory in his relations to the spouse; for as our glory lies in our union with CHRIST in his love to us, so CHRIST's glory, as a Son, lies in his union with the Father in the bosom of his love to him, which glory is nothing less than the glory of GOD in the man, consummated in the perfect union of love to us, see *John* xvii. 22, 23.

THEOPH. Sir, I hope you will pardon my freedom; but was not that expression too bold when you said, "you wondered how the Doctor dared to die with the idea in his heart of CHRIST being begotten as a divine person?"

PHILA. I did say so, nor do I recede from what I said; for you are here, *Theophilus*, to consider, that CHRIST, as a divine person, is the object of my glory, the delight of my affections, the centre of my joy, the foundation of my hope for life, for pardon, for peace, for victory, and for glory. And therefore, if he is not self-existent in all the glories of his divine person, my soul, I think, can never be saved; for can that Being (or to come close to the point) that divine Person that has its highest existence by generation save another? For, if begotten, can he be any more than an exalted creature? And does not this idea cut through (as it were with the Arian and Socinian sword) all the glories of CHRIST'S person, the merit of his blood, the conquest of his resurrection, and the power of his intercession? Let men or angels judge, though I verily believe that the Doctor has a better heart here, than understanding, for, you know, *Theophilus*, that we all know but in part; and says James, "in many things we all offend." And in this the Doctor has offended not only many of his own people, whom he is dear unto, but many thousands more in Israel. But no doubt but the Doctor is forgiven this as well as all his other crimes, for we have all sinned; and is he in any wise better than another? No, in no wise; and I know one who has received a pardon for a greater sin (if a greater can be) but believes that he is freely loved, freely forgiven, freely justified, and will be freely glorified; though thus happy, yet while he tunes his golden harp as a chief singer upon the song for ever new, he expects to wear a blush of heavenly humility before the throne for what he has done; and can the Doctor expect any thing less, when he has taken away my Lord, in his personal glory, and I know not where he has laid him?

THEOPH. Are all the rest of the Baptist ministers of the Doctor's judgment in this point?

PHILA. No, Heaven forbid they should! yet there are some few who are so weak, in the things of God, that make a kind of an oracle of the Doctor, that what he says

seems to be set up as a standard among the people, rather than thus saith the LORD.

There is Mr. Craner, who, in this point, seems to sleep in the Doctor's bosom, but in many other points he is great; and one would think, though he is so heavy a preacher, that to hear him at times he was very great upon the ancient glory of CHRIST, as the man in GOD, and with GOD, before the world was, and that all glory and grace was settled upon the church in him, as existing with the Father; but he means not so, for he only means a glory in designation, not in possession, which mars all; for in sense Paul was glorified when his forefather Benjamin was born: besides CHRIST says, *the glory that I had with thine ownself before the world began*, John xvii. 5. not to have, but had. He has wrote a good thing called a Scripture Manual, and lately a little political piece in which there is more flattery than faithfulness. Had he less of the pride of the priest, he would be far more lovely in his office.

There is Mr. Mac Gowan, a man of good parts, of an evangelical understanding, a good writer, rather a dull preacher, but his spirit is rather quick and his judgment too harsh.

There is Mr. Wallin, a man of pompous flourish, sometimes very spiritual, his understanding in the deep of the gospel but shallow. Had he less pride and more tenderness and forgiveness, he would be more respectable, but his care over his people is lovely. There are many things which he has wrote worthy of reading, but none better than that of unity among the churches.

Mr. Booth is likewise a man of popularity, and of a lively spirit, but his understanding in the ministry will not amount to any thing more, at present, than a west country Calvinist.

Likewise Mr. Hall is a man of pretty solid judgment, of a good understanding in many things, taught much by affliction, rather dull in his delivery, and upon some points it has been often wished that he was more evangelical.

There is Mr. Richards, a man of bright parts, very ingenious, pretty, but not great, in things spiritual.

Likewise there is Mr. Stevens, a man weighed in sorrows, and preserved by the brine of affliction; a great debtor to free grace, and at times speaks much of it, and in a humble spirit. His abilities are very acceptable, and has been profitable to many.

There is Mr. Hughes, a man of spirit and courage, of good understanding in most things, but too much like a wave of the sea, when he speaks of the ancient and pre-existent glories of CHRIST; and has a large latitude of love, for his church doors are many inches wider than the doors of the ancient church at Jerusalem, by which means many are slipt into Zion, who have no gospel right there.

There is the Doctor Giffard, a man of little stature, but of great zeal, spirit, and affection; offers much grace, which inclines many weak hearers to hear him; aims much at popularity, he is carried away with creature affections; his judgment, in the deep things of GOD, is but small, and often wavering; his preaching is much of a piece with the Methodists, which is often an uncertain sound, much of the grace of CHRIST, of promises, of blessings, &c.—And much of Moses, of the law, of works, of free-will, of doings, and commands. These things are so piously and so zealously mixed together, without their proper distinctions, that it all goes down for pure gospel with the people, like a nest of young birds, if you give them bread and milk it goes down; and if you give them a stone in the milk, it goes down for the sake of the milk; and this is often the case of GOD's children, that when they ask bread they give them a stone.—The Doctor is reckoned very pitiful and compassionate to the poor, but he is too partial, and much swayed by persuasion therein, for I knew him to suffer his servant, in his own presence, to turn a minister in distress away from his door, without speaking one word to him, but, doubtless, he little thought that he was then touching the apple of CHRIST's eye.

There is Mr. Mercer, a man of much piety, zeal and affection. His preaching is lively, affectionate, and successful. Was his understanding more deep in the deep things of God, and more evangelical in the elucidation of them, it would to many be more acceptable. He has been taught much by a train of afflictions, from which he appears to be a man of compassion, but he lately forgot the afflictions of Joseph.

There is Mr. Dowars, a man of good abilities, great in his understanding in the deep things of God,—lively in his ministry,—unnumbered in his particulars,—and singular in his address; but such a swell of pride runs through the man, that spoils it all, for I have known him, though he has not been without his sore trials, to meet Ephraim in distress, yet scorn to look at him, *2 Sam. xvi. 17. Is this thy kindness to thy friend?*

There is Mr. L——d, a man very affectionate and lively in his zeal; one whom God has done wonders for both in grace and providence.—He has a two-leaved door to his church, and many come thereat.

There is Mr. Clark, whom I have known these eighteen years. He was a solid youth, of a pious turn of mind, and grace has given him great improvements; but more especially of late his mind appears to be more fertile and fruitful in the field of God's everlasting love. Was he kept more from affectation, free in his spirit, and more forgiving in his heart, to those, who, through infirmity, have offended him, his ministry would be more acceptable.

There is Mr. Br——n who has a good appearance, and a good address. He says much but means little; for, after many years hearing of him, it is hard to say whether he means salvation by grace or by works, by Moses or by CHRIST, by the law or by the gospel, by CHRIST'S righteousness or by the creature's,—so linsy woolsy is the garment, and well it may, when his abilities or understanding in the gospel is so small, that some time ago he told one of his hearers, that it would take seven years to open that text which she desired him to preach from, *Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated.*

There is Mr. Potts, though not a baptist, yet a man of good ministerial abilities; but scarce a ray of them appears but when upon the ministerial throne; whom I lately heard from thence, when, I must confess, I thought that there was dearth in the pot, though it was for a Christmas dinner. He was discoursing upon those words, *It may be they will reverence him*; in which he took notice, that CHRIST was the meritorious cause of the covenant, but reverence and obedience were the conditions of it. Was not this strange, amazing strange! for a teacher in Israel thus to express himself, when he cannot but know that there can be no cause to the covenant of grace but the love of GOD; and that CHRIST is not the meritorious cause of the covenant but his person, as God-man is the covenant itself; and his fulness is the blessings and promises of the covenant, and reverence and obedience are so far from being the conditions, they are the fruit for blessings of the covenant, that the promise (in *Jer.* xxxi. 33.) may be sure to all the seed. But what astonished me more, was to hear him, in a kind of rapture, blessing GOD that all the masters of the academies and schools for the ministry, taught the young ministers to preach the offers of grace; and, what was worse, he added, it was for want of this that there was no more prosperity in the churches. Alas! alas! thought I, how dared the man thus speak? What! had he forgot the name of his great predecessor Mr. William Bently, who is dear to many in Israel? who had a more successful church in London, nay, in the kingdom, for his time, than he had? but did he preach offers of grace; nay, but did he not preach the gifts of grace, the communications of grace, and the blessings of grace? that he preached grace, free-grace, the riches and treasures of grace is well known; but then it was grace in GOD settled upon us in CHRIST, and given (not offered by any creature) but communicated to us by the Spirit of GOD.—And who had in all Israel, a more flourishing church than the great Mr. Joseph Hussey, who was champion for GOD and truth, who battered down the



Arminian offers of grace to the ground, and established the operations and communications of the grace of the gospel in the work of the ministry. Can Mr. Potts remember the names or the tombs of these great men, and not blush for what he then said to his people?

Besides, what is worst of all is, what he said, though from the pulpit, yet it is not truth, for the cause of the deadness of the saints is not for want of the preacher mocking the people, with offering that grace to them he has not to give; but for want of light, life, love, peace, and joy in their souls, flowing from a living union with CHRIST and communion with him in all his glory, graciousness, and salvation, by the sealings of the HOLY GHOST. And if the Nicodemuses, in the pulpit, are such strangers in Israel, as to teach their young pupils whom they have made ministers (who are, by the way in general more fit for gentlemen and tradesmen, than ministers) to preach offers of grace to the people, I would advise them to be kind to poor sinners and liberal hearted, and offer them at once electing grace, predestination grace, justifying grace, as well as the grace of faith and repentance. Indeed I have heard some of these hot-bred mushroom ministers, seemingly very kind, crying out upon the close of the sermon, "Here I offer you CHRIST, take him now—take him to night—don't go away without him." I wonder they are not ashamed of such stuff, to mock poor souls at such a rate, will they never see the beauty and distinction between preaching CHRIST as the author of faith, the object of faith, the foundation of hope, the way of life, the bread of life, the water of life, the living life, and the channel of all grace and glory; and the offers of that to the people they cannot give, nor the people receive, till GOD himself gives it;—but, lo! this is the Neanominian and Arminian stuff we have from almost all the Presbyterian and Independent ministers in the kingdom, and from some few of the baptists. Oh! how is their gold become dim, and their fine gold changed!

THEOPH. But are there no more baptist ministers?

PHILA. O, yes! many, very many, for there is scarce a town of any report, especially in the east, south, and west parts of England, as well as in the north, in the borders of Yorkshire, and Lancashire, but what there is a Baptist minister there, and in some towns there are several.

In Bristol there is Mr. Evans, a man of long standing in the ministry; a good scholar, and of great abilities; a lover of CHRIST, and a preacher of the truth, except in some points which he seems not to be led into; and he is particularly one of those masters in Israel, who has loaded the young Academic gentlemen (who are designed for the ministry) with such weights of traditional rust, of one sort or other, that some of them have acknowledged that they have been seven years of getting bright again; and others have been so rusty, that they have died with it not only on their backs, but on their hearts.

One thing is remarkable of Mr. Evans, he keeps a concubine, I don't mean literally nor personally, but I mean that he is joined to or administers the ordinance of the Lord's supper to two people, the one a Baptist church, and the other an Independent people; and what is this in a gospel sense but keeping a concubine? And there are a few more ministers that do the same, viz. Doctor St——t and some others; but then it is to two Baptist people, the one holding the first day Sabbath, and the other the seventh day Sabbath; but how they reconcile this to the word of GOD and their consciences, I have never yet heard.

There is Mr. Thomas, a man of a sweet temper of mind, much of a gentleman, great as a minister; whose talents are spiritual, heavenly, and successful in the ministry, a man lovely, and of good report.

There is young Mr. Evans, who is rather too stiff and affected, but is spritely, of a good genius and parts, lively in the ministry, and when more refined from his London and Bristol academical rust, may make a shining star in Israel.

There is Mr. H——s, a man of long standing in the ministry, of good understanding in the Scriptures, and a zealous preacher.

Likewise there is Mr. P——s, a man whom God has eminently appeared for in grace, in providence, and in the ministry,—he is affectionate and lively, and his abilities are not small, considering that he lives in the west.

There is likewise Mr. Ryland, a man of as much ministerial fire, zeal, and affection as any that I know of;—he is a good scholar, a zealous Christian, and a lively minister; he has his peculiar flights and oddities, but with a good design, and often answers a good end,—for I had rather hear twenty little blunders from a minister, than see (in their very methodical and orderly way) the words of life drop like ice from their frozen lips.—He has great success in the ministry, and God has done wonders for him as a God of providence, as well as a God of grace; it is true he keeps two-leaved gates to his church doors.—He is much of the gentleman, and of a very compassionate mind to poor ministers in distress, which is lovely.

There is Mr. J—n B—th, a man of sympathy, solid in his judgment, of good abilities, lively and spiritual in the ministry, and has been successful, but like many others borne down with indispositions, and many tribulations.

There is his brother J——s, whose temper is very spritely, whose fancy is very fruitful, whose ideas upon the scriptures very beautiful, but not successful, being too much mixed with dry philosophy,—he aims to be popular, but his unhappiness is, that he is already too popular; a few years in the secret chambers is the only remedy for his lively fancy, the only place to rub off his philosophical rust, and when that is gone he will come like Moses from the mount, with his countenance shining with the divine glory.

There is Mr. Pointing, who has through grace been long pointing at the truth, and aiming right has succeeded; his disposition is rather dull, and his delivery flat, but his ideas

in the gospel are truly great, especially upon public occasions, which he is remarked for.

There is Mr. Turner, a man of much improved abilities, of good understanding in the gospel, and of success in the ministry, but of too great flow of spirits, too violent in his temper, and too condemning in those who have offended him, which much hurts his usefulness;—he has had many afflictions, to teach him sympathy, but oh! how hard it is to learn to forgive one another, as GOD for CHRIST's sake has forgiven us!

There is Mr. H——l, a man of life, spirit, and soul, in the ministry, great in his ideas, rich in his experience, spiritual in the work of GOD, and successful in the ministry.

There is Mr. Ev—s,—a man of weak constitution, who has had courage to labour under many and great discouragements for many years, but after all (O who would not with patience wait) the LORD has given him many seals of his ministry, who shall be his joy and crown of rejoicing in the day of the LORD.

There is Mr. Brown, a man of good abilities, who has been long led into the deep truths of GOD, has boldly preached and defended them, and the LORD has given him not only in providence, but in grace, and in the ministry great success.

Likewise there is Mr. Bed—m, a man who more than twenty years ago came forth a champion for the LORD of Hosts, in the work of the ministry: he is a great scholar, a man of profound understanding in the Scriptures, of piercing address, of spiritual matter, and very successful in the ministry; yet this great man has his fears, his tears, his great sorrows, and his piercing cries; my heart has often bled for him, but having received mercy—he faints not.

There is Mr. Francis, a man of fine spirit, of a free conversation, of a spiritual understanding, an affectionate minister, and a lively and successful preacher.

Time would fail me to tell you of all, but there is at Seven Oaks, in Kent, a little preacher, the least of stature I ever saw,

but a great soul, and of a good understanding, and has fine ministerial abilities.

There is Mr. F——r, a man, who is much respected and revered among his people, he has a discerning judgment, a copious understanding, and a lively delivery, and the LORD has made him a fisher of men, and I think that he is one who does not drink into that dreadful idea of GOD's decreeing sin.

There is Mr. Tr——t, a man of some standing in the ministry, much zeal, remarkable for his spirituality, and good understanding in the gospel, and has been successful therein.

There is Mr. Co—e, a man of much zeal and affection, he is spiritual and lively, but does not enjoy that nearness to GOD, in worshipping of him, as some of his brethren do,—he seems to worship at the bottom of the mount, but GOD has made him successful in the work of the ministry.

But above all, as a man of GOD, as a champion for truth, as a minister in the pulpit, as a Christian in conversation, as a teacher in Israel, there is Mr. Johnson, who surely is the greatest man this day in Israel. I know of but one thing that he misseth it in, and that is, when he says, “that love cannot be before the object loved, and that the object must be coeval with the love fixed upon the object, which object, says he, is CHRIST.” In this he is surely right, for we know that the love of GOD is from everlasting, *Jer.* xxxi. 3. And that CHRIST, as the object of this love, is from everlasting, *Prov.* viii. 23, *Mic.* v. 2.—And that this love is from before the foundation of the world, *John* xvii. 23.—And that the object was before the world was, *John* xvii. 5.—Therefore the love and the object being inseparable, why does this great man in Israel place the love from everlasting, and the actual existence of the object, not till many thousand years after, this is astonishing to men of solid understanding in the things of GOD.

For is it not astonishing that Mr. Johnson says, that love could not be prior to the object, nor without the object loved;

yet he tells us, in his Divine Truth, page 28, that the object was always before the Father in his counsel (so is the ultimate glory of the saints); but CHRIST says, then was I with him; not before him.—Again he says, the glory that JESUS now possesses, and will possess, personally with the church, is no other than what he had with the Father (then he adds, by way of parenthesis, in the counsels of his bosom); but why so wise, to mar the texts: for JESUS does not say in the counsel of his bosom, as though this glory was only in some future view, for it was in personal possession; therefore he says, that I had with thee, not was to have, not in council, but with thine own self, as the text runs, *John xvii. 5. And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self, with the glory that I had with thee, before the world was*: for if love cannot be without the object, then certainly the object must as actually exist as the love, and this is the language of Scripture, wherein we find that the object, the glory given to that object, and the love fixed upon that object is of one and the same date, existence, enjoyment, and possession, *Prov. viii. 23,—30. Jer. xxxi. 3. John xvii. 5,—23.* And all the glory of grace to the elect is nothing else but the treasures of JEHOVAH's love to his beloved image, his beloved one, his CHRIST unfolded, revealed, and communicated to them; for as Adam loved Eve in her first beauty, with one undivided love, as his own image, being flesh of his flesh, therefore not twain but one; so there is the same union of nature and love between CHRIST and his church. Hence says CHRIST, that the love wherewith thou hast loved me, might be in them, being not twain but one. Now CHRIST, as the bridegroom, was the church's representative as the object of love, of glory, and of complacency; for she had the same union, and existence, as part of CHRIST, as Eve had with Adam, before she had her open existence from him; and if JEHOVAH was at rest in his love, and took up his delight of love, and CHRIST rejoiced in this love before the world was: then as surely as he now existeth, so he then existed as the object of it, and in the enjoyment of it—or we are finally at a loss how to understand his own

words; for what language can be more emphatical, or words more strong. *Prov. viii. 30. Then was I by him as one brought up with him: I was daily his delight, rejoicing always before him, and my delights were with the Sons of Men.* Likewise see *John xvii. 5.*

Thus you see, Theophilus (if I have not been so unhappy as to put your patience to pain) I have given you a concise account of the people called Baptists, taking their rise from John the Baptist, from the example of CHRIST, from the practice of the apostles, from the testimonies of the ancients through every age, through every king's reign, through every century to the present day; and the same testimonies are now continued by many Baptist teachers in Israel, whom GOD has counted faithful, and put them into the ministry, who are not ashamed to own or defend the cause, being set for defence of the gospel.

THEOPH. Dear Philagathus, your narration has been so far from being painful to my patience, as you term it, that it is delightful, like the garden of Eden, or like the avenue that leads to the flowery path, that yields more and more sweets unto the perfect day. Surely as the Baptists have such an original as the command of GOD, the example of CHRIST, the practice of the apostles, the order of the primitive churches, then what a happy people must they be!

PHILA. One would be ready to think so, *Theophilus*, for it is the best cause, and most near the primitive beauty of the gospel; but, alas! they are, through conformity, want of zeal, and understanding, in most of their churches, departed from their primitive love, and their primitive order.

From their primitive love to CHRIST, as the object of love, of life, and of joy. For if the holy One of Israel is as a fire and a flame to any one of his ministering servants, and he preaches CHRIST in his essential, personal, relative, and metaphorical glory, as the head, the chief, the life, and the all in all, leaving nothing out, but make him the ALPHA and

OMEGA, the beginning and the end, viz. the glory of GOD, the glory of the saints, the glory of love, the glory of life, the glory of faith, the glory of hope, the glory of strength, the glory of succour, the glory of conquest, the glory of victory, the saints' glorious inheritance, the glorious portion, enjoying all in him, and all from him; as their GOD, their glory, and their all; though this honour have all the saints, Oh! what has GOD wrought, yet the poor Baptists, as well as other churches, having left their first love, live now like strangers in Israel, instead of children in their Father's house; nay, so dark is their understanding, and so weak, being beset with prejudice, that they cry out against this as antinomianism, and why so, because it condemns them for their legal walk, their legal talk, and strips them of their legal frames for comfort; and this they cannot bear; for being taught to go to heaven by inward marks and signs of their love to CHRIST, and interest in him, they cannot bear to hear CHRIST, and the resurrection from the dead, as the living life, the solid hope, and continual comfort of the soul: this takes away their inward gods, and what have they more—they give it a bad name, and cry out against it, as the people of old did against Paul. But like Paul, we say, shall we sin, that grace may abound, GOD forbid! for surely, the more I see of the glory of the object that saves me, the more I shall love him, and the more I love him, surely the more I shall obey him, and adore him in all his commandments and ordinances.

They are likewise much fallen from the primitive gospel love one to another. The beauty of the gospel is to consider one another, to put on as the elect of GOD, bowels of love, to be kind one to another, to be tender hearted, to love as brethren, to consider one another, as being in the body; and, if a brother is fallen, to tell him alone to restore such a one in the spirit of meekness.—For the fruits of the spirit is LOVE; but instead of which, how often have I heard them exag-



gerate a brother's fault; and in the room of binding up the broken in heart and restoring the feet of the lame, they have ript open afresh daily the wounds of a poor broken-hearted bleeding backslider.—This I speak to their shame.

I remember a case once that was not only enough to make nature to shudder, but even nature to dissolve. It was a Christian, who being disquieted in his own mind, under the weight of troubles that lay upon him, went down from Jerusalem to Jerico, and there he fell among thieves, who stripped and wounded him, and left him as half dead. At this time there chanced to come by a Christian, noted for the licence of his tongue and the liberty of his pen, and having with him a whole quiver of the arrows of death, when he saw the poor man stripped, wounded, and half dead, instead of pouring in oil and wine into his wounds, he shot every arrow from his quiver into his bleeding heart, and there he left him, which was not all neither. This, among the heathens, would have been accounted cruelty and barbarism, but he called it zeal, and thought he did God good service. O! where is the primitive beauty of Christian affection, or the bowels of Love!

Another time a Deacon of a church, who above all persons should have compassion upon the poor, and especially one who had so many poor distracted creatures under his care, Mr. Ma——n, yet when he saw a brother in sorrow, anguish, and deep distress, when Jacob was given for a season into the hands of the robbers, and Israel to the spoilers, yet he had no more compassion than a soft adamant, nor no more tender sympathy for the affliction of Joseph, than a melting millstone. O! tell it not in Gath, publish it not in the streets of Askelon. And whatever was the cause of the affliction, whether God's Sovereignty, temptation, infirmity, or corruption, it could be no excuse to them, while they believe that dreadful idea that God fore-ordained the being, existence, afflictions, and sinful actions of the creature for his own glory; how dared they then be angry with Ephraim

who was mourning when they saw, upon their own principle, the decrees of GOD fulfilled for his own glory, I own I once thought so as well as them, but now I hate that black and dishonourable idea of GOD; for what is this but making GOD the author of every evil, by decreeing sin, by such a permissive decree, as is impossible for the creature to prevent sin, and then to punish his creatures for it, which idea I hate not only because of its cruelty, but because I am sure it is contrary to the nature, name, perfection, and love of that GOD whom I adore. Can love decree enmity? Can purity decree impurity? Can holiness decree unholiness? Do not err, my beloved brethren, can the same fountain of all mercy, grace, light, and love, send forth bitter and sweet waters? O! it is high time that this dreadful idea was finally erased out of the minds of GOD's people. Will they never see that all good is of GOD, and that all evil is of the devil, who sinned from the beginning; and that GOD's decrees are not decrees of sin, but decrees of punishing sin, and of destroying the works of sin, by the death and resurrection of CHRIST, who came to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself?

THEOPH. But are there not some Baptist churches who enjoy the primitive unity, harmony, love, and tenderness among themselves as christians?

PHILA. Though the Baptist churches are the nearest to the beauty of the primitive churches, yet, in this respect, they stand in need of much refining and purification; the old leaven of pride conforming to the world and Anti-christian churches; in superiority and tale-bearing among themselves, and an unforgiving spirit, wants much to be purged out from among them; purge ye out the old leaven; yet there are some who have held fast CHRIST's name and have not denied the faith, who are saying, walk about Zion and go round about her, tell the towers thereof, mark ye well her bulwarks that ye may tell it to the generation following, for this GOD is our GOD for ever and ever, and will be our guide unto death. And among all the Baptist churches

there are many of the members who are praying and longing for that happy time when the LORD shall revive his churches with his own power, presence, and glory; when Elders or Bishops shall be ordained in every city, with faithful Deacons—spiritual members—divine ordinances—possessing a lively zeal—bowels of love—a tender sympathy—union of heart—love to the truth—a holy watchfulness—a readiness to forgive—a humble walk—a filial fear—a ready mind to shew forth the praises of him who has called them out of darkness into his marvellous light;—and I hope these breathings are the dawning of a bright gospel day, not only among the Baptists, but among many preachers of the church of England, whom I know enjoy some bright beams of the morning star shining among them, who begin to preach and pray spiritually and evangelically, as did many of their forefathers.

**THEOPH.** But, Sir, what think you of the Sandemanian church, who so frequently represent their church and practice as perfect according to the plan of the scriptures?

**PHILA.** That there are many things among them beautiful, must in justice be acknowledged;—and that they have had the courage to throw away much of the traditional rubbish that still continues among the Presbyterian and Independant churches: They are clear in the justification of a sinner, by the righteousness and resurrection of JESUS;—and many things are beautiful in their order in the House of GOD; but as to their saying their practice is perfect according to the plan of the scriptures, or the pattern of the Jerusalem church, I wonder they don't blush at the thought, much more at the expression, when they cannot but know that it is well known that they have not so much as the spirit of the gospel—the ordinances of the gospel—nor the love of the gospel, among them; there is a wretched spirit of lightness, levity, and vanity among them, though they are nice as to their ceremonies and outward form of things—being fond of the exactness of the shadow—but as to the life, the spirit, the

power of religion, as it consisteth in full communion with **GOD**, in the bosom of his love—and the sweets of appropriation, crying, *Abba, Father*, they are in this respect the greatest strangers in Israel, and the most ignorant people I know. They have the same enmity against the full assurance of salvation by **CHRIST**, as the Pharisees ever had to the person of **CHRIST**, and speak as contemptibly of it—though they are seemingly zealous of salvation by **CHRIST** with fears and tremblings, as though there was some doubt of **CHRIST**'s willingness and power, or of their own right to be saved; they worship **GOD** at a great distance, like strangers in Israel, and therefore it is no wonder that their enmity is so great against Paul's full assurance of faith, saying, "who loved me, and gave himself for me, I know in whom I have believed,"—they are of a dreadful, condemning, censorious spirit to others—much of their religion consisteth in being zealous for *Mint, Tythe, Annis and Cummin*: I mean like the Pharisees, for the shadow of things—thanking **GOD** they are not as others are, "Come not nigh, for I am holier than thou." This I saw lately exemplified by one of their elders in his unchristian contemptible carriage to a poor backslider in Israel, even in the very street of the city; as to the ordinance of baptism they have it not.

It is true they are ready to relieve the afflicted members; in this they excel their brethren, and in this they are praiseworthy;—but yet they are equally as cruel to their poor fallen brethren, for if they offend twice, mercy is no more among them, O tell it not in Gath!

**THEOPH.** As we are now upon the subject of zealous persons for religion, pray, what think you of Mr. Wh——d's zeal.

**PHILA.** That Mr. Wh——d has been a man remarkable zealous for **GOD**, and I believe a good man, yet I think little of all his zeal and stir—because it is mixed with so much art, and with so much ignorance; mixt with so much art, (which is too natural to him) to raise the passions of the people by

his rhapsodies, seeming raptures and extasies—and the poor people are carried away with him, as though they were drinking wine of the kingdom—thinking it is all heavenly rapture in the dear man, when there is often no more fire of love in his heart than there is in a millstone, for it is what is natural to him, and he much improves it; for if he fails by attitudes of body and seeming raptures of mind—then he tell his people such a train of pretty stories, what Paul calls *Old Wives Fables*, many of them very moving to the passions—some of them very tragical; what is this but a zealous art to move upon the passions of the people, while their understanding in the gospel is exceeding dark, as is too evident by conversing with them.

It was a shrewd observation of one of his hearers (when he was in the country a preaching); one man said to the other, “Well, how did you like Mr. Wh——d’s preaching?” Well, says the other, “I believe the man could preach, if he would stay a few days first, but as it is, he goes about so much—and gets so many tales and stories to tell, that the man cannot go on.” Let him see *Titus ii. 7, 8.*

And what is it but zealous art, to be conformable as a dissenter at one end of the town—and conformable as a churchman at the other; though by the way let him remember that as a Dissenter he got his *Tottenham Court Liberty*—but if the *LORD* be *GOD* let him follow him, and if *Baal* be *GOD* then follow him, for it is a shame for a teacher in *Israel* to halt thus between two opinions.

Though I believe that there is some good thing in Mr. Wh——d to the *LORD GOD* of *Israel*, yet how often has he afflicted my soul by so ignorantly (bare with the expression, for there is nothing like plainness and honesty) I say so ignorantly, for is it not ignorance in the highest degree for him to say the people, “Here I offer you *CHRIST*, here take him, take him now, take him to-night, or else you may be damned before the morning.”—What can he mean by such ignorant stuff? Is *CHRIST* at his *Disposal*, or at the creatures

power to receive—or is the salvation of the soul limited to a night or an hour? Where are his thoughts of election and everlasting love; did Paul ever preach after this manner, does he not say, “ We preach CHRIST crucified, to the Jews a stumbling block, and to the Greeks foolishness: but unto them that are saved, CHRIST, the power of GOD, and CHRIST, the wisdom of GOD; the power of GOD in communicating and giving the blessings of his love;—and the wisdom of GOD respecting the time when, and the manner how the blessings shall be received, and not left to the creature to offer them, and mock the people with what they have not to give, nor the creature any power to receive.

Mr. Wh——d is a man of much zeal, but his understanding in the great things of GOD is but small, and much I think departed from the former stedfastness he enjoyed, when he wrote his letter to Mr. Wesley on the beauties and blessings of electing love, in which I am at a loss to say whether faithfulness or affection, truth or zeal shines most bright. I could wish that the same harmony, zeal, truth, affection, and consistency run through his sermons, but, alas! it does not, he is afraid it will preach his people away, and he has too much art to maintain his popularity—had he more humility—mor familiarity, more feeling sympathy, and readiness to relieve those who are in distress, without that priestly pride, and those worthless formalities of access, he would be more praise-worthy.

THEOPH. What think you, Sir, of Mr. W——y, who is remarkable for his humility, freedom of access, greatness of zeal, and being more abundantly in labours than them all.

PHILA. Here I would be exceeding tender, and express my thoughts with much sympathy and affection, while they are connected with plainness and sincerity, least I should make the hearts of those sad whom GOD would not have sad; for I believe that Mr. Wesley has many godly preachers under his care, and many weak gracious souls among his so-

cieties, but they are exceeding weak in the Faith, and very dark in the gospel;—these are to be pitied and prayed for, and that their knowledge of CHRIST may be encreased, their faith in him strengthened; that their love may be enflamed, that their freedom may be enjoyed, that their privileges may be believed, that their comforts may be encreased, that they may be no longer strangers in Israel. I shall use plainness of speech, not with a spirit to offend them, but with a spirit of love to them, and concern for them, for my heart's desire and prayer to GOD is, that they may be saved from their present bondage and darkness.

My thoughts of Mr. Wesley as a gentleman, and as a scholar are very respectable, and what I believe he is worthy of—that he is a man of surprizing parts, a great historian, and is as enterprizing as he is great; his natural temper is warm; and his genius taking a turn for religion, he has been like the Pharisees of old, very zealous, being in labours more abundant; compassing, like them, both sea and land to make Proselytes, and much good I believe he has done by way of order and economy among the people; that he has civilized many hundreds, if not thousands, in the kingdom, and brought them into a very orderly and regular way of living, in which respect they are become better subjects, better masters, better neighbours, and better servants:—in this respect I believe Mr. Wesley has done a great deal of good—but as to Mr. Wesley being a Christian, I dare not, *Theophilus*, attempt to deceive him or you in thinking so.

THEOPH. O Sir! What, Mr. Wesley not a Christian? What, a man of such labour, and such universal love, not a Christian? O, Sir!

PLILA. Dear *Theophilus*, let not your zeal, like the zeal of many, carry you to an extreme; for do you not know, that, that charity that is not grounded upon truth is not charity, but a delusion, and therefore mistake me not; here I do not say but that there are many well meaning weak preachers under Mr. Wesley's care, and many weak, dark and igno-

rant Christians among his societies—but as to Mr. Wesley, by all the sermons he has preached, and by all the writings he has wrote, if we compare one part with the other faithfully, I see no scripture ground to believe that he is a real Christian, or a true lover of CHRIST, and salvation alone in his name. --I don't say that Mr. Wesley may not be saved--- GOD only knows what turn of heart his grace may give him; but this I say, nay I will affirm and maintain it from the word of GOD (and let him deny it if he dares), that if the scriptures be true, it is impossible for him to be saved in the state he is in, or upon all he has done, or upon the faith he has confessed to the world.

THEOPH. O Sir! what! a man that has done so much good, and so many great things in CHRIST's name, not saved?

PHILA. Dear *Theophilus*, his doing many great things in CHRIST's name, is no real evidence at all of his being in a saved state; Lord! Lord! have we not prophesied in thy name, and in thy name done many wondrous works, and yet not in a safe state? Were not the Pharisees of old as religious as Mr. Wesley? Where they not for fastings and praying as well as him? Were they not as honest men as Mr. Wesley? Did they not pay tithe of all they possessed? Were they not as zealous as Mr. Wesley; for did they not, like him, compass sea and land to make Proselytes? And what does Paul say of them with all their zeal, but as strangers to GOD, and unacquainted with the true way of salvation? Rom. x. 3. *I bare them record that they have zeal for God, but not according to knowledge, going about to establish a righteousness of their own.* Having not submitted themselves to the righteousness of GOD, and therefore what was all their Pharisaical religion but a pious way to hell? And what is Mr. Wesley's more than theirs, of whom CHRIST says, I know you (notwithstanding all their zeal), that ye have not the love of GOD in you.

For my part, *Theophilus*, I am astonished (and am not



ashamed to declare it) how you, or any other soul, whose hopes are built purely and alone upon the person, righteousness, and blood of JESUS for salvation, can be so deceived, or rather (pardon my freedom) so unfaithful to Mr. Wesley or to his people, as to think he can possibly be saved upon his own principles; for is there any one truth, I repeat it, I say any one single truth in the word GOD, that salvation is grounded upon that he believes; I call upon him, or any of his, to answer me in this if they can. I am too well acquainted with Mr. Wesley's preaching and principles to recede from what I say; so far from receding, that I affirm Mr. Wesley is so far from believing the truth, that there is not one single truth upon which salvation depends, but he with the utmost art and enmity now opposeth; insomuch, that I question if there ever was a greater enemy to the glory of GOD, the glory of his sovereign grace, and the true comfort of poor souls ever since the world began, except it was Pelagias, Arminias, or John Goodwin, his forefather; so if a Pelagian or an Armenian, or a self-righteous Pharisee can be saved, then may Mr. John Wesley have hope, but not else; for it is written, he that believeth not shall be damned.

THEOPH. Sir, you astonish me!

PHILA. Sir, it may be I do astonish you and some others at the first View, but why it should astonish you or any other I am amazed. Let Mr. Wesley be his own judge; what would he desire more; Let his own writings prove whether what I have said is not true. I have said there is no hope that Mr. Wesley can be saved upon his own principles, and this I speak out of love to him; and my reason is this, because there is not a truth upon which salvation depends but he opposes with the greatest art and enmity: Let us therefore come close to the point, does not salvation depend upon GOD's everlasting or electing love to the object? *Eph. i. 1, 2, 3.*

THEOPH. Yes sure, for the apostle says, Chosen in him,

before the foundation of the world. Elect according to the fore-knowledge of GOD.—Nor can I see how any soul can be saved, unless it be loved with electing everlasting love, *Jer.* xxxi. 3.

PHILA. Well then if this be the case then Mr. Wesley has no just ground to expect to be saved,—for it is well known (and I will defy any to prove a like example) that there ever was a man upon the earth that hated and opposed everlasting love, and absolute election as Mr. Wesley has, calling it (to frighten poor souls from embracing it) by the blackest and most blasphemous names that he could think of,—as the doctrine of hell,—the decree of Moloch, see his blasphemous poem on GOD's everlasting love;—now can a man have any enjoyment of that love that he has such an enmity against?

THEOPH. What in life can fill his mind with such bitterness against the glory of the bible; against a doctrine so rich, so sweet, and so comfortable to the children of GOD.

PHILA. It must surely be for want of a spiritual understanding in the Scriptures, or the enmity of his corrupt nature, or his unacquaintedness with the principles of those who hold electing love, thinking, as he mistakenly says, that absolute election cannot be held without the decree of sin and reprobation—when we believe that electing love has no more connection with reprobation—than the laws of England has with the laws of France; and as to the decree of sin, that falls upon himself, we believe no such horrible doctrine.—You wonder, *Theophilus*, what can fill his mind with such enmity to GOD's electing hope, which is the ground of all our hope, and from whence springs our regeneration, redemption, and salvation.—Then I ask you, what you do think of the continuation of his enmity against this doctrine for more than thirty years, for he often speaks with the same bitterness and blasphemy against it as ever, for he calls it an act fit for a Turk, see his *Preservative*, page 225, and has taught many of his poor ignorant preachers, who are to be pitied, to do the same; does

not this bespeak him not only a stranger in Israel, but that he is in an unregenerate state, as it is written, the carnal mind is at enmity against God.

**THEOPH.** But does not Mr. Wesley own election in no sense?

**PHILA.** Yes, in a most cruel sense, (with all his love) for it is in a sense that not a single soul can be saved by it, see his Preservative, page 180,—where he tells you, “that God from the foundation of the world foreknew all men, believing or not believing; and, according to his foreknowledge, he chose or elected all obedient believers, as such to salvation, and refused or reprobated all disobedient unbelievers, as such to damnation.” Now upon the foundation of this confession of faith not one single soul can ever be saved, for you see that he makes our obedience the cause, as such, of God’s electing or chusing of us to salvation; but if there be no such cause, then consequently there can be no such effect; and therefore upon this unscriptural Arminian scheme of Mr. Wesley’s not a soul can be saved, Let us go to the law, and to the testimony. And in the first place we will suppose with many greater men in Israel than Mr. Wesley, that God chose his people in their perfection of innocency and creatureship prior to their fall in Adam.—then their obedience of Faith in **CHRIST**, could not be necessary as a cause to be seen in them, why they should be chosen; for in sense they were not sinners any more than the angels in heaven are, therefore stood in no need of a Saviour; and in this sense Mr. Wesley’s hope of salvation ceases.

2dly, Let us suppose that God chose his people in the fall, (which, by the way, is not agreeable to truth;) however upon this foundation he maintains and abides by it, that our obedience as such is the cause of our being chosen to salvation, which is contrary to truth—to scripture—and to experience.—Contrary to truth, for there is no such thing as faith in **CHRIST** and obedience to him, as we stand in relation to Adam;—for as we stand in relation to Adam as our first pa-

rent—our federal head—our root and representative of nature, he sinned; then from union of nature, we all became sinners, receiving enmity from his enmity, darkness of mind from his darkness, disobedience from his disobedience, corruption from his corruption, and all as the fruit of union to him as our first parent;—therefore in this view GOD could not foresee any thing in us but sin, considered under the fall from the first to the last view of it, as GOD himself testifies, *Gen. vi. 5. And God saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart were evil and that continually.* This is the reverse of seeing faith or obedience in them, as the cause of his chusing them. Likewise see what view GOD takes of his people as fallen, *Ezek. xvi. 1, 2, 3,* whether there appears any such thing, as foreviewed obedience in them, to move him to chuse them, judge you again, take a view of man in his actual existencē; behold, says David (one whom GOD chose) I was shapen in iniquity, if so, then not in faith and obedience. And says Paul, It is written there is none righteous, no, not one! There is none that doeth good, no, not one! And yet Mr. Wesley says that their faith and obedience is the cause of GOD's chusing them, when you see that in Adam, in their birth, and in their open being, the Scripture concludes them all under sin, *Rom. iii. 9.* And therefore to say that our Obedience is the cause of GOD's chusing us to salvation is, plain English, a lie, and no lie is of the truth.—Besides, it is contrary to the express testimony of Heaven. *Rom. ix. 11. For the children being not yet born, neither having done any good or evil, that the purpose of God according to election might stand, not of works.*—Nay, but says Mr. Wesley, it is of works, and purely as such, as obedient believers, that GOD chuses them to salvation; but says Paul, It is not of works, neither good works nor bad works, but an act of sovereign grace, without any motive in the creature, or taken from the creature, either good or bad; not of works, says Paul, least any man boast, nay, but says John Wesley, "it is of works of

obedience, as such, that is the cause,"—but whether it be right in the sight of GOD to obey men more than GOD, judge ye.—Likewise, it is contrary to the experience of all I ever knew, for I never found any one so bold,—except Mr. John Wesley, as to dare to say that GOD foresaw how obedient they would be, and therefore chose them to salvation—nor do know any that will venture their salvation upon it, except Mr. Wesley, and let himself be weighed in the balance of the sanctuary; let all his obedience be put in one scale, and his disobedience to GOD in another,—I fear he would find the wrong scale turn up,—and that he would find *Tikel*, written, *Thou art weighed, and art found wanting*. For upon his own principle if GOD chose us upon the foundation of our obedience, and refuses upon the foundation of our disobedience, then consequently he having more disobedience than obedience, then, upon his own Arminian bottom, he has no chance of being saved at all, or at least no more than the pharisees had,—for is he in any wise better than they; no, in no wise.

Likewise Mr. Wesley says, *Preservative*, page 160. "That GOD predestinates or fore-appoints all disobedient unbelievers to damnation."

O *Theophilus!* it is happy for you and I that there is, in this respect, a lie in his right hand, for if this was a truth what must have become of your soul and mine, and indeed of every soul upon the earth; for are we not by nature disobedient, enemies in our minds by wicked works, and has not GOD concluded us all in unbelief. And if GOD had, as Mr. Wesley says, fore-appointed all disobedient unbelievers to damnation, then what must become of us all,—for nothing can alter his appointments, for his counsels and appointments, says the Scripture, shall stand, and what he desireth that he doth. Then David what must have become of thee;—then Solomon what must have become of thee;—Manasseh what must have become of thee;—or Peter what would have become of thee;—or Paul what must have become of thee; for all these by nature were disobedient unbelievers, till GOD

changed their hearts; and how comes it, if this is true as Mr. Wesley says, that the Ephesians were not all damned, for they were all disobedient unbelievers, called particularly the children of disobedience, Eph. ii. 2. How was it then (if Mr. Wesley speaks truth) that they were not damned, did GOD change his mind, appoint one thing, and then suffer another thing to come to pass, that cannot be, for he is of one mind, and none can turn him: well then, to be plain, if GOD be true, Mr. Wesley must be a liar, when he says, that GOD has fore-appointed and has predestinated every disobedient unbeliever to damnation." When the apostle stares him in the face and says, *1 Thess. v. 8, God hath not appointed us unto wrath, but to obtain salvation by our Lord Jesus Christ, who were by nature, children of disobedience, worshippers of idols; among whom says the apostle, we all had our conversation in times past, in the lust of our flesh, fulfilling the desires of the flesh, and of the mind. What greater disobedience than this can there possibly be, and according to Mr. Wesley's doctrine there remained no hope for them,—and indeed every poor sinner who is now in a state of unbelief and disobedience, must, if Mr. Wesley speaks truth, be lost; for, according to his own words and ideas of predestination, "GOD has afore prepared them all to damnation." O cruel idea,—and shocking representation of the GOD of love whom we adore, yet this is the man that has run up and down the world for these thirty years crying out against the doctrine of absolute predestination as a cruel doctrine,—when of all the preachers I ever heard, and of all the writers I ever read, I never found, and I defy any one to find such another cruel and severe predestinarian as Mr. John Wesley is, John Calvin, Martin Luther, Melancthon, and Bucer were strong predestinarians, and some expressions in their writings rather harsh,—but John Wesley exceeds them all, as far as a sun exceeds a candle, or a man of war a cock-boat, for John Wesley says, (I don't change his words) "that GOD chooses or elects all obedient*

believers to salvation," making their obedience the moving cause of God's choice; for he adds, "It is a cause without which God elects none to glory." Now it happens that there never was any obedient believers, either in Adam, or in their birth, or in their life for God to choose, for in Adam they were sinners like him in their birth; or being brought forth in iniquity, in their lives, children of disobedience, *Eph. ii. 2. None righteous, no, not one.* And therefore, according to Mr. Wesley's Arminian idea of election, not one sinner could be chosen, nor one soul saved, nor he himself can have no hope upon this bottom according to the Scriptures.

THEOPH. But Sir, are there not obedient believers?

PHILA. Yes, Sir, blessed be God! a number that no man can number out of every kindred, tongue, people, and language; but sure, *Theophilus*, you cannot but see the wide difference that there is between God loving an object, and then communicating his love to the heart of the object, to engage and draw the object to obedience, then to love and choose the object for foreseen obedience when there was none? In the one God loves the object, and as the fruit of his love, gives the object the blessings of the covenant to make it obedient to him; or as the fruit of his own pleasure he loves the object, chooses it, blesses it, writes the law of his own love in the object's heart, then as the fruit and power of this love the object cannot but be obedient; whereas God cannot love or fore-appoint one single soul to glory for its fore-seen obedience, because it has none, see *2 Tim. i. 9*, till God gives it them, and surely his gifts are the fruits of his love and not the cause, *Rom. ix. 11.* Besides, this idea of Mr. Wesley pleases the pharisaical pride of the creature, that God has chosen him for being better, and more obedient than another, it destroys the glory of divine grace, it robs God of his honour, and the gospel of every truth.—Hold! where am I going? Did I say it does all this? Nay, but it does none of this, because there is no truth in what Mr. Wesley has said, and I defy him to prove it. Let God be true, who has said,

*Not for thy righteousness, or the uprightness of thine heart ;— not by works of righteousness which we have done, Titus iii. 5.— not according to our works, 2 Tim. i. 9.—not of works lest any man boast, but Mr. Wesley says it is, therefore I may venture to say in Scripture language, What shall be done unto thee, O, thou lying tongue!*

THEOPH. Sir, wherein does Mr. Wesley appear to be a greater or a more harsh Predestinarian than John Calvin?

PHILA. By far ; for Mr. Calvin only says, that God did choose and absolutely fore-appoint his elect to glory, without considering them as obedient or disobedient, but as the objects of his love, and from this love he fore-appoints means suitable to bring them to and to give them the blessings of the means to bring them to the glory ;—and the means which God has fore-appointed is CHRIST in his person and glory, as the foundation of our faith, the sanctification of the spirit in CHRIST as our meetness, and the belief of the gospel as the truth of it agreeable to the apostle's definition, *God hath chosen us to salvation through sanctification of the spirit and the belief of the truth.* Here you see the means that God has fore-appointed and given to bring his elect to glory, salvation is the end given; sanctification in the person and death of CHRIST, by the spirit of God is the blessing given to them, to give them a knowledge of this glory, and to prepare them for the enjoyment of it. Faith in the gospel is given them to believe the truth of it, and to evidence their love of it. Now in John Calvin's way of salvation by predestination or election, there is the beauty of truth, the propriety of the gospel, the prosperity of the soul, and a doctrine sweet and comfortable, as the seventeenth article of the church England says.

Whereas as John Wesley says, Preservative, p. 180, "That God predestinates or fore-appoints all disobedient unbelievers to damnation;" nay he adds, which is more shocking, and the most cruel doctrine I ever heard drop from the lips, or pen of any man ;—his words are these : "that God, from his



fore-knowledge, refused or reprobated all disobedient unbelievers as such to damnation. I then ask him solemnly, Who then shall be saved? If he say, those whom God gives faith to believe the gospel,—why, this proves that they were not as unbelievers appointed to damnation, but appointed, though they were unbelievers to become believers, and be saved by divine grace;—but, if he says, agreeably to his Pelagian principle, those shall be saved, that improve the grace that God has given them.—What disappoint God—has not Mr. Wesley told us that all unbelievers as such, are fore-appointed to damnation; so that you see that God must be (according to Mr. Wesley's opinion) mistaken, or the sinner cannot be saved. O cruel doctrine! is this his loving heart—his universal love to mankind.—Oh! poor deluded souls; what! does salvation depend upon their improving grace. When they have none to improve, can they improve what they have not got? can they reap where God has not sown, or gather where he has not strawed, and yet be damned if they do it not? O! cruel doctrine: O! what a cruel teacher art thou! Is not this the very vein of all his preaching, the very substance of all his writings? Yet he cries out against others who hold predestination, in a gospel sense, as full of comfort to a poor sinner, and prejudices his people against those who hold it;—whilst he himself holds it in such a cruel sense as to affirm, that God has reprobated all unbelievers as such to damnation. If this is the case, then where is God's universal love to every object alike, as he talks so much of; blush, Mr. Wesley, for shame: For what has God prepared CHRIST to save, his blood to pardon, his righteousness to justify, his spirit to sanctify, his power to redeem sinners, and his gospel to declare it? And yet has God fore-ordained every unbeliever, as such to be damned,—is this the gospel of CHRIST, God forbid! for is not CHRIST as much engaged to save the souls of unbelievers from their unbelief, by giving them faith, as he was to save Mary Magdalen, or the thief upon the cross?—Sure

Mr. Wesley, nor his preachers, nor his people, will ever dare again to betray their ignorance, or expose their prejudice by crying out against those who hold predestination, according to the gospel, in the comforts of it; declaring that it provides salvation for the enjoyment of the object;—that it has provided CHRIST to save the soul from wrath;—his blood to pardon it, his righteousness to justify it, his spirit to sanctify it,—and his power to keep it safe to salvation; in a word, every blessing of the covenant, every promise in the volume of the book to comfort and engage it to love, obedience, praise, and thankfulness,—having, says the apostle, predestinated us to the adoption of children to himself, (not according to our obedience) but the good pleasure of his will; to the praise of the glory of his grace (not our obedience) wherein he has made us accepted in the beloved, Eph. i. 5, 6.

THEOPH. But does not Mr. Wesley tell us in his Preservative, page 181, “That Faith in CHRIST producing obedience to him is a cause without which GOD electeth none to glory.

PHILA. Mr. Wesley has not only mentioned our obedience as the cause of our glory, but in the same page and the two next, has by a number of sophistical Syllogisms (which is an unfair way of reasoning things, too natural to him) darkening our minds with clouds of causes; while they are all effects of the love of GOD, and not the cause of it, which he mentions; besides, let him be told, that the person of CHRIST, the death of CHRIST, the gift of the spirit, the preaching of the gospel---and faith and obedience, that they are no causes of the love of GOD---but the happy fruits, gifts or effects of it, John, iii. 16. Though he has the assurance to come forth, like the Arminian, champion of the uncircumcised Philistians, and to defy the armies of the living GOD, by saying, page 183, “Our obeying CHRIST is the cause of his giving us eternal life.” Though Paul has said, It is not of works, for if it be of works then it is no more of grace. But it seems Mr. Wesley does not mind

in much what Paul says.—However let us keep to the point. “If our obeying CHRIST is the cause of his giving us eternal life,” then I ask what kind of obedience will be sufficient for eternal life; for I would fain enjoy eternal life; if it be said perfect obedience, then I have no hope, for I have not a perfect nature, and therefore cannot yield a perfect obedience; therefore his doctrine leaves me no hope of eternal life, nor Mr. Wesley either, for he was born in sin, and when he was ten years old he was a great sinner; for he tells us in his Journal he had then sinned away the grace he had received in his baptism; and it is well known, in a greater or less degree, that he has been a transgressor ever since to the present time, for we have all sinned and come short of the glory of GOD; and in many things we all offend as well as Mr. Wesley; but then we dare not venture our hope for eternal life where Mr. Wesley ventures his. Our hope is fixed for eternal life upon the gift of GOD, through the perfect obedience of the person, and perfect atonement of the blood of JESUS, as it is written, *The gift of God is eternal life through JESUS CHRIST our LORD*, Rom. vi. 23; whereas Mr. Wesley fixes his hope upon his obedience, and says (to speak in the singular number) “That his obedience is the cause why CHRIST gives him eternal life;” and what hope is this but the hope of the hypocrite, or, at best, the hope of the Pharisee, like the house that is built upon the sands? And what is this but deceiving souls, and paving, by perverting the scriptures, a devout way to hell for them? For had this been the case, that our obedience is the cause of CHRIST giving us eternal life, how did the thief upon the cross get to heaven? What! did he get the effect without the cause? O, happy thief! We see then it is possible to have eternal life without Mr. Wesley’s cause of it, but I do not know either if we take Mr. Wesley’s comment; for it is but a few years ago that he told a very public auditory, that if we thought that when CHRIST said unto the thief upon the cross, ‘This day shalt thou be with me in Paradise,’ that he was in heaven, we

were mistaken, for he was only in a state of purgation; poor man! perhaps he is there still; for if our obeying CHRIST is the cause of his giving us eternal life, how much purgation may be necessary where there was the want of this obedience who can tell? “ Ah, Sir! you had like to have put your head too far here; you had like to have fully discovered whose mother’s son you are; this would not do here, though it might have done well in the city of Rome. You know, or if you know not, I know, that many of your own people walked no more with you after this, though you had the art, not to say assurance, very lately upon the very same spot of ground, and to many of the same people, more than hint at the same purgatory, purgation doctrine.” Again, shall I remind you of what you said, methinks I hear you say, It is enough, and well it may be enough, when we turn our eye, and see what you have said in your sermon upon the scripture way of salvation, page 13 and 14, where you say, “ that repentance is necessary to our justification, which if we willingly neglect we cannot reasonably expect to be justified at all.” Ah! what a dry worthless popish doctrine is here! what! is my repentance—my fears—my sorrows necessary to save my soul—to blot out my sins—to make my peace with GOD? Ah! but what if I have no repentance, what must I do then? Let us see if we can be saved by the doctrine of the church of Rome or no? what if I have no heart to repent, nor no will to repent, what must I do then?—you must strive—what! against my will, that is hard work too? what and my justification depend upon it, that is harder still? and yet Mr. Wesley tells me, that if I willingly neglect it I cannot expect to be justified at all; but, alas! Sir, if I have no will, what must I do then? what! no hope? Ah, cruel doctrine! and well it may, for it comes from a cruel church, in-somuch, that I must go to Hell, for all the comfort it provides for me, it makes me think, Sir, of that unjust reflection you charged dear Mr. Hervey with, where you say, “ what! must I be sent to hell because I cannot reach heaven with

my hands?" Why, Sir, you see, according to your doctrine, we must. Is this not cruel? yet this is the doctrine you have taught me and many thousands more.

But from the scriptures I have been taught that God gives me grace, willingness, and repentance, not as necessary to my justification or to being received into his favour, but as the fruit of his favour and love to me; therefore upon this bottom there is a sure hope of being saved, but upon yours there is none: for you have ventured—nay, dared to add, in the same page, "that both repentance, and fruits meet for repentance are, in some sense, necessary to justification." Why, Sir, it would be just as comfortable to us that it is, in some sense, necessary for us to go up to the third heavens to see Paul there; or for you to go to the poor confined condemned malefactors in their doleful cells—and tell them that you have an universal love to them—that your bowels yearn over them, and that it is, in some sense, necessary.—You need tell them in what sense, whether in a meritorious or conditional sense—whether in an allegorical or in anagogical sense—whether in a literal or a spiritual sense—whether in a physical or metaphysical sense;—only tell them what will do, that it is, in some sense, necessary for their pardon and deliverance;—that they get off those irons that bind them, that they break those bars that secure them, that they in some sense open the door and locks that keep them in, and that they are careful that their enemies don't catch them for the future;—what thanks would you deserve for all this love to them? do you not think they would be ready to laugh at your ignorance; or, if they used prison language, use you worse for your kindness?—so contemptuous, so ignorant, in the eyes of discerning Christians, is your doctrine of repentance, and the fruits of repentance being in some sense necessary to our justification, when I already know of nothing in the scripture necessary to our justification, before God, but the perfection of CHRIST's person, obedience, and atonement, nor of justification in our own conscience, but the belief of this truth

by the gift of faith from God himself, *Rom. v. 1.*—Though Sir, you have the daring assurance to come like Goliath, and defy the armies of the living God, by telling us, page 184, “that there is as much necessity of our keeping the commandments of God, as there was of God sending his Son into the world, or of CHRIST’s dying for our sins.”—This, Sir, is a home thrust, for according to this, our obedience is as necessary to save us as CHRIST’s merits, death, sufferings, and atonement. Is not this shocking language, would the most daring popish priest in the kingdom have ventured to have thus depreciated the merits of CHRIST, by putting them upon a level with our obedience, it makes me think of what Luther says of a Popish Monk who girded himself with an hempen girdle, when he went a pilgrimage, to show how humble he was, and how much he deserved divine mercy, and for which, says Luther, “he ought rather to have been sent to Hell for his pride in putting an hempen girdle in the room of CHRIST’s merits.”—And not very impertinent to our purpose is a remark that was made by a kind of an everlasting curate, upon seeing a clergyman in an exalted sphere in life, said to his friend, ‘See, Sir, how some persons rise in life.’ To which he was answered, ‘Well, Sir, persons are rewarded according to their merits.’ ‘Oh!’ said he, ‘if that was the case, I should have been a Bishop before now.’—and what is remarkable, he is a man of very poor abilities as a preacher. But thus you see how great was the pride of his poor heart, and what proud thoughts proud worms have of their obedience, though but a worm, there is a little Pope in the pride of every man’s heart.

And what less was it, Sir, of you in a sermon not 100 miles from the north, when you told the people of your labours more abundant; of your preaching at five o’clock in the morning, and then administering (what you and the church of Rome call the sacrament, but what the scripture calls when rightly administrated the Lord’s supper) to thousands, I believe you meant hundreds, that after this you was sent for

to visit the sick, or to go to some person in distress ; this you said that flesh and blood thought hard, and would fain ease itself, and take rest, but oh ! when you thought of the reward in heaven, and of the increasing reward, that you could not but go,—Oh ! fie, is this, Sir, your motive, what labour for reward, what, call JEHOVAH to account for what you do for him, could any Popish priest have said more, what, not only obey as you say for eternal life, but for eternal reward, if this is not the Essence of Popery, I know not what it is.—I am amazed, Sir, that you should think of going to heaven ; what would you do there ; the angels will not keep you company, they know nothing of rewards in heaven ; the saints will not keep you company, for they sing the song for ever new, saying, To him that has loved us, and washed us from our sins, in his own blood, to him, be glory, now and for ever. When your song (if you are consistent in heaven) must be, “unto me who have obeyed for eternal life, and have laboured for eternal rewards.”—How awkward would this sound in heaven ! but however there is no danger of your coming there at present, you have received your reward ; for as a good old minister used to observe, “The LORD has put a new lock upon the gate of Heaven, that the old key of obedience will not unlock it.”—Besides, I would just remark to you, that it is impossible that there should be any rewards of grace or glory in heaven, or the ultimate happiness of the saints, whatever rewards of grace (not of debt) there may be in the Millinarian state, before their ultimate glory.—I have known, Sir, some persons as fervent in their love as Mr. John Wesley, and as ardent in their labours for the LORD, yet despise that base, low, and selfish principle of expecting a reward, and a greater reward for what they do ;—and though they are fervent in spirit, serving the LORD, yet what they do is out of a pure principle of love, having already received, through grace, their exceeding great reward, viz. the gift of GOD himself, which is eternal life ; and seeing that GOD is their glory, can that be increased, augmented or enlarged, therefore they say with

Jacob, it is enough. And with Paul, I am content; having nothing, yet possess all things. Though, Sir, such was your enmity to this rich doctrine of grace, that you could not help both distressing and deceiving your own people. You distressed them by telling them, "that they must all stand before GOD, to be judged according to their works." Nay, so daringly bold was you, that you defied any predestinarian to evade the force of it:—If this, Sir, be the case, I solemnly ask you once more, who then can be saved? not Mr. Wesley, who tells us, in his *Preservative*, page 215, "that he obeys in order to his final acceptance."—If so, then, Sir, your final acceptance cannot be determined till your final obedience is ended; and if GOD should be then strict to mark iniquity, how do you then think to stand? Weigh the matter, it is an affair of infinite importance, your salvation, according to your own concession, depends upon it,—if you miss here you are undone for ever, "you obey in order to your final acceptance." Is your obedience answerable to the law of GOD, his commands are exceeding broad, holy, spiritual, just, and good,—these are the characteristics of the law of GOD,—perfect righteousness, or a sinless nature, have you that, Sir? perfect holiness, or a sinless life, have you that, Sir? perfect continuation therein to death, can you boast of that, Sir? Spiritual in every thought, in every desire, in every motion, in every aim, in every design, in every end, come close to the point, Sir, don't be afraid, *Rom. x. 3*. For Moses describeth the righteousness which is of the law, the man that doth these things shall live by them. Just, as it is a display of the righteousness and holiness of GOD's nature, or the equity and justice of his command, and what he had a just right unto from his creatures, as their Maker, Creator, and Law-giver, that as he created them in Adam, perfect, sinless, and holy, undoubtedly he had a right of a perfect, sinless, and holy obedience to his law,—another character of which is good,—good in its nature, as it came from the Author and Object of all good,—good in its design, as it was given for the good of man, that by keeping it he might



possess and enjoy all that was good:—well, Sir, have you kept this law in every point? Paul says, *we have all sinned, Rom. iii. 23.* Dàre you say with the mistaken, presumptuous youñg man, all these have I kept from my youth, what lack I yet? well, Sir, I will tell you what you lack, it is what I lack, and all mankind lack as well as you,—which is a sinless nature, a sinless heart, a sinless life, and perfect obedience: for want of this the law condemns us, and stops our mouth from any plea of acceptance, by our obedience,—mind, Sir, what Paul says, don't flee from the point, *Rom. iii. 19.* *Now we know that what things soever the law saith, is said to them that are under the law, that every mouth may be stopped;* if stopped, then where is your obedience to it for your final acceptance?—if stopped, then how cruel was it of you (with all your loving heart, and universal love) to tell your people that they must stand before GOD, and be judged according to their works,—what, will the promise of GOD, the person of CHRIST, the righteousness of CHRIST, the blood of CHRIST, the resurrection of CHRIST, the intercession of CHRIST, stand for nothing at that day,—what a SOLEMN NOTHING, as it did that day with you,—sure you forget Paul's champion challenge, as indeed you generally do,—who shall lay any thing to the charge of GOD'S Elect? it is GOD that justifies; who is he that condemns, it is CHRIST that died, yea, rather that is risen again.—But if they are, as you say, to be judged according to their works, then what will become of them, for the law saith, that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world becomes guilty before GOD. If guilty, then condemned, and if condemned, where is the sinner's hope: for it follows from the lips of the inspired writer, therefore by the deeds of the law shall no flesh be justified in his sight; therefore well may your own people be distressed with such doctrine, and leave you, as many hundreds have, and it is hoped many thousands more will, for by this means you will preach them all away from you: for it is written, “*Whatsoever the law saith, it saith to them who are under the law.*”

And what that is Paul tells you. *Gal. iii. 10, As many as are of the works of the law, are under the curse*, and the reason of their being under the curse, James tells you, he that offendeth in one point is guilty of all.—If the sacred oracles then be true, then there is no hope of that soul that obeys in order to his final acceptance, or that he is to be judged according to his works.—Therefore a stranger in Israel, out of pity to the people whom you had left in distress, soon let many of them know that the text had no more to do with the judgment of the Saints, than you had to do with the laws of Persia, for it only speaks of the resurrection of the wicked, who lived under the law, died under the law, and were risen from the dead under the law. These were judged according to the things which were written in the books, every man according to his works: but as to the resurrection of the saints, whose resurrection will be a thousand years before the resurrection of the wicked, *Rev. xx. 5.* these will never rise to be brought to judgment, for there is nothing to condemn them, nor any accusation to be brought against them; neither sin, nor Satan, nor death, nor hell can do it. Who shall lay any thing to the charge of GOD's elect? not sin, for that is put away; not Satan, for he is overcome by the blood of the Lamb; not death, for it is swallowed up in victory; not hell, for CHRIST has triumphed over its power; and therefore where there is no accusation, there can be no condemnation, for who shall condemn, if there be none to accuse? who shall condemn, says the Apostle, it is CHRIST that died:—As though he said, the honour of his death, the glory of his person, the dignity of his righteousness, the merit of his blood, the victory of his resurrection, the power of his intercession, stands as the bulwark of heaven, to save, secure, and justify those for whom he died, who will come a second time without sin unto salvation, not to bring them to judgment, but to be glorified in his saints, and admired in all those who believe. And therefore you forgot that while the books of death were open to the wicked, and they were cast

into the lake of fire, which is the second death ;—that there was another book opened, which was the book of life, this was opened to the saints, which we find contained their life, their safety and security, ver. 15, but not a word of this Sir, from you : but in a Popish sense, that if they would come and believe GOD would write their names in the book of life, as though GOD waited for the creature to do something first, before he could or would do any thing for them, when the scripture tell us, It is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of GOD that showeth mercy. What, is the power of the creature to bind or bias the will of the Almighty, and rule his counsels and designs, O! Sir, the world is weary of this stuff; I wonder you are not weary of it, for I don't find, upon inquiry, that your ministry is ever blessed to the people; they have indeed your person in admiration, but as to your doctrine, many, very many of them have it, to my knowledge, in very low esteem.—I should not, Sir, have been so free and so faithful to you, had I not had a real love for you, and compassion for your people; but seeing you upon the pinnacle of religious destruction; blinded through enmity and prejudice against the pure truth, and your people in such darkness and distress, through your clouds of ignorance, that love compelled me thus to speak; and now I have drawn the sword, I expect you will come forth to battle, and then let it be like a man of war from your youth, and stand for the truth, if you have got any of your side, dispute it inch by inch, and don't give way like a French coward, by bold and daring assertions, and positive denials, and then leave the field, without any strength of argument, or scripture to prove what you have said; thus you have served dear Mr. Hervey, and several others, but I will not be so served,—you shall either defend what you have said, or with humility acknowledge with an honourable shame what you have spoken, for in scripture language, *Job. xi. 3*, should thy lies, or as it is in the margin, thy devices, make men hold their peace; and when thou mocketh,—that is at truth, shall no man make

thee ashamed,—suffer me a little and I will show thee that I have yet to speak on GOD's behalf.

THEOPH. Sir, while you have been more immediately turning your thoughts and subject to Mr. Wesley, curiosity has led me to peruse his Preservative and his Letter to Mr. Hervey, in which I find many things that astonish me; but particularly his attempt to overthrow eternal election—his enmity against imputed righteousness—his aim to prove that CHRIST died for those that perish—and his hard speeches against those that hold electing love, and final perseverance.

PHILA. What attempts does he make to overthrow eternal election, which is so clear, that one would think, he may as well attempt to eclipse the sun in the summit of the heavens, as to eclipse the glory of eternal electing love, which shines so bright in the horizon of the scriptures; but what says Mr. Wesley?

THEOPH. In page 179, he says, that the saints are not elected till they believe. Now the Apostle tells us, *Eph. i. 2. That we were chosen in CHRIST before the foundation of the world.* How are these two authors to be reconciled with each other.

PHILA. What argument does Mr. Wesley bring to prove election to commence upon the act of believing?

THEOPH. Why, he brings *Rom. iv. 17. As it is written, I have made thee a father of many nations, before him whom he believed, even God who quickened the dead, and calleth things that are not as though they were:* concluding, that things are not what they are called in scripture, or at least it may be they may be so till many thousand years after, if ever at all.

PHILA. Oh! what a treacherous way of wresting the scriptures and arguing is this! when it is plain, if Mr. Wesley understood his bible, that Abraham was both figuratively and literally the father of many nations: figuratively—as he was a figure of CHRIST; for as GOD established his covenant to be a GOD

to him, and to his seed after him, *Gen. xvii. 7.* which seed we find is distinguished in scripture from those of the flesh, called the children of the promise, which children of the promise, says the Apostle, are counted for the seed, *Rom. ix. viii.* And that the promise of grace and glory might be sure to all the seed, he tells you whose seed these are—If ye are **CHRIST'S** then are ye Abraham's seed and heirs according to the promise. In this Abraham is called the father of the faithful: and as there hath been a faithful people, or a people blessed with the faith of Abraham in all nations, in all ages and generations, in this respect he is the father of many nations, and as such he was a type of **CHRIST**, who is a father to Israel—an everlasting father by whom all the family in Heaven and earth is named—of whom it is said, men shall be blessed in him—All nations shall call him blessed; being the desire of all nations, because his redeeming love extends to every kindred, tongue, nation, and people; and as **CHRIST'S** seed and Abraham's seed are one, as it is written, in Isaac shall thy seed be called; and as Isaac was, so are we, children of the promise; and in this sense Abraham was, figuratively, the father of many nations as he was a type of **CHRIST** and his seed, which is the great end the scriptures point forth in describing Abraham as the father of the faithful; for they are not all Israel which are of Israel.

Likewise, Abraham was, literally, the father of many nations; not only the nations of the Ismalites, but the twelve tribes of Israel sprung from him,—but I am aware of the design of Mr. Wesley, for by **GOD** calling Abraham the father of many nations, before the nations existed, or the people were born, calling things that are not, as though they were, from hence he concludes, that though election is mentioned as taking place from eternity, it is only **GOD** calling things that are not, as though they were; and therefore by this sophistical art he would elude absolute and eternal election, as the fruit of **GOD'S** sovereign pleasure, and make it to become conditional, as the fruit of our faith and obedience:—

to this I answer, when GOD said to Abraham, I have made thee a father of many nations, he said no more than he had done, for when GOD created Adam, he created or made him the parent or father of all mankind, though at that time mankind did not exist,—and therefore when it is said, that GOD called things that are not as though they were; it does not mean that they were not to him, before whom all things exist, but that they were not in being to us; and the plain and true sense is GOD calling things which are not to us by the same names, by which they exist to him, as though they really existed before us, so Mr. Wesley's art (not to say argument) bears no weight with it against eternal election; neither will it ever have any authority with me, while the apostle, with language so far superior, with argument so strong, with love so triumphant, exults in the glory of its ancientness and antiquity, *Eph* i. 2. *Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who has blessed us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places, in Christ Jesus, according as he has chosen us IN HIM BEFORE THE FOUNDATION OF THE WORLD.* But says Mr. John Wesley, not till believing. It makes me think of Ahab's words to Michaiab, which I think are not, upon this occasion, very unapplicable to Mr. John Wesley, how many times shall I adjure thee that thou tell me nothing but that which is true?

PHILA. Wherein does Mr. Wesley's enmity against the imputed righteousness of CHRIST appear?

THEOPH. In many respects; in the first place Mr. Wesley says, "That the active obedience of CHRIST, his fulfilling the moral law, was never intended by GOD to be that righteousness wherewith we are justified." Nay he adds, "Therefore it cannot be imputed to any other man for his righteousness."

PHILA. This shows from his own lips what I have often said, that Mr. Wesley is no more a believer in the righteousness of JESUS, than the Scribes were in CHRIST's person; or that he has more real love to the righteousness of CHRIST, as

the full and sole matter of his justification before GOD, than the Pharisees had to the person of CHRIST as the true Messiah: for he says, "It was never intended by GOD to be that righteousness wherewith we are justified." Then I solemnly ask him what righteousness is there appointed of GOD to justify us? If not CHRIST's righteousness, then surely it must be our own; and if so, then we are undoubtedly under the works of the law, and as many as are of the works of the law, are under the curse; and if so, it is impossible for the law, which for our breaches of it curses us, to justify us. And therefore if it is as Mr. Wesley says, that GOD never intended the obedience of CHRIST to be that righteousness wherewith we are justified, than we are all undone, and not a single soul can be saved; for it is written, by the deeds of the law shall no flesh living be justified in his sight. Furthermore, I call upon Mr. Wesley before GOD, before the world, and before the bar of his own conscience, to answer for what he has said, "That GOD never intended the active obedience of CHRIST, or his fulfilling the moral law, to be that righteousness wherewith we are justified." When it is written in the volume of the book, "By the obedience of one shall many be made righteous, that grace reigns through his righteousness, GOD has made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of GOD in him." Who of GOD is made unto us, wisdom, righteousness, sanctification, and redemption.—What! does the capital name of JESUS stand for a cypher with him This is the name whereby he shall be called, THE LORD OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS. Does the word of JESUS, that spake as never man spake, bear no authority upon his soul, And their righteousness is of me, saith the LORD? if it does, then how dares he before GOD and the world to say, "A third reason against the imputation of CHRIST's righteousness is—that there is no necessity or occasion for it."—Nay, to add, "GOD doth not require of us the righteousness of CHRIST for our justification." See his Treatise on Jus. page 11, page 60. Shall a man thus

daringly lie for GOD.—O shall men hold their peace when he saps the foundation of our hope, the very stones will cry out, for upon this foundation, as Luther says, the church stands or falls,—was not this the glory, the pillar, the bulwark, and citadel of the Reformation? give up this and all is gone, your title to liberty, your title to life, your title to pardon, your title to peace, your title to Heaven, your title to all is gone; for if the foundation be destroyed, what must the righteous do. Give up this—and your bible is only a blotted blank; your faith is vain; CHRIST is dead in vain, and you are yet in your sins.

But what is most astonishing to me is, that so many great and good men have been in their disputation with Mr. Wesley treating him, not only in the character of a gentleman, and a philosopher (which I have no objection to), but as a believer; this is astonishing, how they can deceive him and the people too. Can that man be a Christian, a lover of CHRIST, and a believer in the name of JESUS for the whole of salvation, and tell the world for these thirty years, “that the obedience of CHRIST, to the moral law, was never intended by GOD to be that righteousness whereby we are justified; that it cannot be imputed, that it is not necessary, that GOD does not require of us the righteousness of CHRIST for our justification.”—Can a man have the spirit of CHRIST, and despise the glory of CHRIST? can a man really love CHRIST, and despise the obedience of the love of CHRIST? it is impossible; for if Mr. Wesley be a believer then may an heathen, an infidel be a believer. And indeed among such believers, that heathens and infidels may be, he seems to glory, O mournful thought? My soul come not thou into his secret, for he says, Preservative, page 232, “That there are hundreds, yea thousands of true believers who never once thought one way or other of CHRIST’s fulfilling all righteousness in their stead. I personally know many to this hour, who have no idea of it.” What, sir, and true believers,—I deny it,—and defy you to prove it. What, believers in



CHRIST, for life, peace, and salvation, and have no idea of his fulfilling all righteousness for them, this is a faith without an object, a hope without a bottom, a building without a foundation.—How are they to get to Heaven.—A way, I never heard of; what, without a right, without a title, without a promise, without a foundation. These hundreds and these thousands are Mr. John Wesley's disciples, they are not JESUS's disciples.—Such believers, heathens, infidels, papists, and enthusiasts may be, but they who have obtained like precious faith with us, through the righteousness of GOD our Saviour, have not so learned CHRIST.

THEOPH. But this is not all, for he proceeds to such lengths that never before were named among the most violent enemies of the Redeemer, he says in his Preservative, page 212, (though I think the title of the book should have been Putriferive) "Then for CHRIST's sake, and for the sake of immortal souls which he has purchased with his blood, do not dispute for that particular phrase, The imputed righteousness of CHRIST; it is not scriptural, it is not necessary; it has done immense HURT." And in page 226, he says, "It is always dangerous, often fatal." Is not this storming the very foundation of our hope, the life and citadel of the Christian's refuge?

PHILA. It surely is; but yet there may be a truth in all Mr. Wesley here says, unless it be in the first sentence, that is not scriptural, for this he ought never to be forgiven in this world, whatever he may in the next. To say it is not scriptural is looking *Paul* very hard in the face, and tacitly giving him the lie, who has said, *Rom. iv. 6. Even David also describeth the blessedness of the man unto whom GOD imputeth righteousness without works, ver. 11. That righteousness might be imputed to them also, ver. 22. And therefore it was imputed to him for righteousness, ver. 23, 24. Now it was not written, for his sake alone, that it was imputed to him, but for us also, to whom it shall be imputed.* Now for Mr. Wesley to say it is not scriptural, when the HOLY GHOST so

strongly testifies the truth of it,—be astonished, oh, heavens! at this.

**THEOPH.** Mr. Wesley says, it is faith that is imputed, and not the righteousness of **CHRIST**.

**PHILA.** I know Mr. Wesley is for any thing save the righteousness or obedience of **CHRIST**, as the sole cause and matter of our justification before **GOD**, he has the same enmity to it as the Pharisees ever had to **CHRIST** being the true **MESSIAH**; and so great is his enmity to this standing, impregnable hope and rock of our salvation, that he has attempted, by no less than sixty objections, to erase it from the scriptures, in his Letter to Mr. Hervey, printed in his *Preservative*.—And one objection is enough (if it were possible) to make all heaven shudder. Mr. Hervey, in his usual style, speaking of the righteousness of **CHRIST**, in its dignity and exalted glory, calls it, agreeable to the scripture, the righteousness of **GOD**, “And that it means such a righteousness as may justly challenge his acceptance.” This Mr. Wesley calls a capital mistake, and says, he cannot allow it at all. What, the righteousness of **GOD** a capital mistake, by which a sinner is accepted, justified, pardoned, and beloved; could any one upon earth, I had almost said in hell, have had the daring assurance to have said thus, except it had been Mr. Wesley, when **CHRIST** had said, *Lo! I come to do thy will, Oh! my **GOD**.—I have finished the work thou gavest me to do.—And the Father has said, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased.* However, to use his own phrase, I would follow him step by step: he says, “it is faith that is imputed for righteousness.”—I ask, what the act, instead of the object? let him consider the absurdity of it, supposing a person invited to a feast, and he believes that there is a plenteous provision made for him; now let this belief or faith of his be imputed to him, or reckoned to him instead of the feast, would it satisfy him, would not his soul be exceeding hungry, notwithstanding such an imputation?—but if the whole feast be made over to him, imputed to him, set apart for him, and reckoned his, for him

to feast and satiate his soul therewith, there would appear kindness in the giver, and life in the receiver; whereas Mr. Wesley's imputation leaves the soul as empty as it finds it. But if it be, as Mr. Wesley says, that it is the first act of faith that is imputed for righteousness; for as soon as the soul believes, he says, it is that moment justified, why not the second, and if the second, why not the third,—and so the soul, according to this, may have as many righteousnesses as it has acts of faith.

THEOPH. But, Sir, Mr. Wesley does here what is very uncommon for him to do, *viz.* he brings scripture to prove what he affirms, *Rom. iv. 6*, it should be the 5th verse, *To him that believeth on him, that justifieth the ungodly, faith is imputed for righteousness.*

PHILA. I wish Mr. Wesley would learn to be honest, and quote the scriptures word for word, as the HOLY GHOST has penned them.

It is not said barely, faith is imputed for righteousness; but it is said, his faith, &c. which I shall explain, but as this is so momentous a point, upon which our hope; life, and salvation depends, let us just take notice of the two preceding verses. For what saith the scripture, Abraham believed GOD, and it was counted to him for righteousness, that is, Immanuel, God-man in whom he believed, was in all the perfection of his nature, life, and death counted to him as the righteousness of his soul.

Now to him that worketh, is the reward not reckoned of grace, but of debt; showing plainly, that if our act of faith, which is a work, be imputed for righteousness, then the imputation is no act of grace, but a debt to us,—which is the sum total of Mr. Wesley's opinion, and design to support; but the design of the HOLY GHOST is to overthrow this, as it is written, but unto him that worketh not, but believeth on him who justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness,—whose faith, the person that believes? that is impossible, for the believer's faith has nothing to give, by way of

obedience to justify, or to bestow, by way of atonement, to satisfy.—Faith receives the blessing of justification, and therefore cannot be the blessing itself; the hand receives the gift the donor gives, but the hand is not the gift.—An insolvent debtor may believe that he has a friend that will pay the debt he owes for him, but his belief does not justify him in a law sense from the debt; but if his friend pays the debt for him, and imputes the payment to him, then he is justified; not that his belief of payment was imputed, no it is the payment itself that is reckoned his; the application is clear: besides, the faith here spoken is the faith of CHRIST, who justifies, for he as really believed for us, as he died for us. I am really astonished how many great men in Israel have seemed in their description of faith to fall short here, when it is said, *Isa. xlix. 8. In an acceptable time have I heard thee, and in a day of salvation have I succoured thee.* And the Apostle speaks the same language: He was heard, in that he feared. And the HOLY GHOST says, This poor man cried unto the LORD, and he heard him, and delivered him out of all his troubles. And the LORD JESUS CHRIST himself says to his Father, Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, neither wilt thou suffer thine holy one to see corruption. And the Father said concerning him, He shall see of the travail of his soul, and be satisfied: from hence it is evident that CHRIST was the GREAT BELIEVER, as well as the great sacrifice for the people, and this is so far from rendering faith unnecessary in us, that it is the life, source, and fountain from whence it springs; for whatever life and blessing is in CHRIST, the living head, it is communicated by the HOLY GHOST to the soul, as the sap from the root extends to every branch of the vine; and we have as surely faith from his faith, as well as every other blessing: and what is faith but a sure knowledge that GOD will do what he has promised?—and by this faith we are justified, *Isa. liii. By his knowledge shall my righteous servant justify many; that is, by his “knowledge of my delight to acquit and justify by his blood and obedience, by his knowledge of the perfec-*

tion of his obedience, and the consummate atonement of his death, he shall justify many thereby from all condemnation." Now this in Scripture is called the faith of Christ, by which we are said to be justified. And what is counted to us for righteousness, see what the Apostle says, *Gal. ii. 16.* "Knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law, but by the faith of JESUS CHRIST;" that is, by that pure life of faith which he lived for us;" a point too little thought of; hence it follows with such clearness, evidence, and life, "that we might be justified by the faith of CHRIST, and not by the works of the law:" On this account it is that justification is so frequently ascribed to faith, and salvation to faith, when it is the person of CHRIST, and the faith of CHRIST that is meant; as faith is frequently put for the object of faith, see *Gal. iii. 23*, hence says the Apostle (who well knew what the Christian life meant) "The life that I live in the flesh is by the faith of the SON of GOD." Denoting that CHRIST's life of faith and obedience was the living life of his soul; and did this lead Paul to licentiousness, and to commit all uncleanness with greediness, as Mr. Wesley basely says the doctrine of CHRIST's imputed righteousness does?—Judge, let men judge, let angels judge, let Paul's life determine, not Mr. Wesley, he must not be upon the jury, for his judgment is corrupt: But let Paul speak, who says, "we henceforth live not unto ourselves, but unto Him that died and rose again, that whether living or dying we are the LORD'S."—Thus you see that Mr. Wesley's popish doctrine of imputed faith, obedience, and holiness, in the room of the glorious righteousness of JESUS, has no being in the oracles of God.

THEOPH. But, Sir, what think you of Mr. Wesley saying, "It has done immense hurt?" Sin and Satan can do no more than immense hurt.

PHILA. True, Sir, they can do no more than immense hurt. This seems to be more cruel to the Redeemer, than Joab was to Abner, when he took him aside in the gate to speak with him quietly, and he smote him there under the

fifth rib, that he died. But undoubtedly Mr. Wesley spoke what he felt. He has said, it has done immense hurt; and without doubt he has found that it has; and can we be angry for his speaking truth, for he hath been more than thirty years in establishing self-righteousness and sinless perfection, in the room of the righteousness of JESUS. And tells his people "that they must obey, in order to their final acceptance, that they all at last must be judged by their works, and that there is no necessity for the righteousness of CHRIST; and that GOD never intended it for their justification," &c. All this and more he says in his Preservative. But lo! a champion for the Lord of Hosts comes forth, the dear, the great Mr. Hervey, who has established the perfection of CHRIST'S obedience to the law of GOD, as our only righteousness, justification and salvation: That our faith or obedience has no more part or share in our justification, than Mr. Wesley has a part or share of the stars of Heaven in his hand. But the righteousness of JESUS as the ark of the covenant, being placed before Mr. Wesley's Dagon of self-righteousness and sinless perfection, Lo! Dagon is fallen to the earth before the ark of the LORD. And though Mr. Wesley has took up Dagon and set him in his place again, yet lo! Dagon is fallen again, and there is nothing but the stump of Dagon left. Do you think then, *Theophilus*, that Mr. Wesley may not well say that the imputed righteousness of CHRIST has done immense hurt, it gives him so much trouble and pains to make Dagon and the ark stand together, and he cannot do it, though he has been trying these thirty years;—he can make Dagon stand well enough without the ark, but when the ark, I mean the righteousness of JESUS, is brought in as the foundation, cause, and condition of our salvation, then his sinless perfection, like Dagon, falls down before the ark. It takes away his gods, and what has he more? And can any one complain of his saying that it has done immense hurt? For don't you think, *Theophilus*, it was doing immense hurt when GOD destroyed the tower of Babel; that the people had laboured to build for so many years,

with such a great end, to make themselves a great name, and the top thereof to reach the Heaven. And can Mr. Wesley do less than complain of immense hurt, when lo! his building is destroyed that he has been longer erecting than Solomon's Temple was: But as he says, the imputation of CHRIST's righteousness has done immense hurt, then let me retort his own expressions, and with the same spirit and pathos, "For CHRIST's sake, and for the sake of immortal souls, which he has purchased with his blood, have nothing to do with it." *Matt. xxvii. 19. Have thou nothing to do with that just man.*

As to Mr. Wesley saying it is unnecessary, dangerous, and often fatal, though shocking and destructive to the life and comfort of the soul, yet it is no wonder to hear such expressions from his lips and from his pen. For if our dependence is upon our sinless obedience, and we are to be judged at last according to our works, then the righteousness of another must be unnecessary; for to make mention, as David did, of CHRIST's righteousness and of his only, must be dangerous indeed of destroying all hope upon Mr. Wesley's inherent righteousness, and the consequence of it must be fatal to him; like the man who built his house upon the sands, and the rains descended, and the floods came and beat upon the house, and it fell, and great was the fall thereof: Or like the guest that had not on the wedding garment, *Matt. xxii. 11. &c.* "And when the King came in to see the guests, he saw there a man not having the wedding garment,—and he said unto him, Friend, how camest thou in hither, not having a wedding garment,—and he was speechless,—then said the King unto his servants, bind him hand and foot, and take him away, and cast him into outer darkness, there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth."

THEOPH. Sir, what think you of Mr. Wesley's doctrine of CHRIST dying for all men, even for those who are in Hell?

PHILA. I think as little of it as I do of the unscriptural Socinian doctrine, that says, "CHRIST died for none at all." But as for them and the Arians it is no wonder, for they leave CHRIST out in every thing; and as to his person, his blood, his atonement, his righteousness, his resurrection, and his intercession, they only make a solemn nothing of it,—and therefore it is impossible for a single soul of them to be saved. The people are much to be pitied, and the priests are much to be blamed, for as they do not understand the Godhead of CHRIST, the glory of his person, the merit of his obedience, the atonement of his death, the conquest of his resurrection, and the efficacy of his intercession; it would be honest in them to lay aside their employment, and not deceive poor souls: How shall they preach, except they be sent? and no other foundation can any man lay than that which is laid, which is CHRIST JESUS the LORD. And though it is said, There is no other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved. And yet these gentlemen are constantly, in all their sermons, preaching a way of salvation without a SAVIOUR, and often not so much as to make mention of his name, though it is said, "In his name the Gentiles trust, their understanding is very dark of the scriptures, and of Paul's ministry, who was determined to know nothing else but JESUS CHRIST, and him crucified; the Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end. But as to Mr. Wesley, who pretends to so much zeal and knowledge, it is strange for him to say that CHRIST died for all men, and for those who are in hell, when he cannot but know that the word ALL is not to be taken in an universal sense, neither can it be, as for instance, it is said, *Matt. iii. 5. Then went to him (viz. John) Jerusalem and all Judea, and all the regions round about Jordan.* Now can we reasonably suppose that all the persons, or every individual of Jerusalem, or all the regions of Judea, or that every person round about Jordan came to John to be baptized, when it is evident it was only such who confessed their sins. Besides, speaking of CHRIST it is said,



*Mark i. 37, ALL men seek for thee; now there never was a time when every man sought for JESUS is too evident. And again it is written, Mark v. 20, And he departed, and began to publish in Decapolis how great things Jesus had done for him, and all men did marvel.* The word all signifies only to whom he had published what great things JESUS had done for him; need I mention the woman of Samaria, who said, "Come see a man that told me all things that ever I did; when it is evident CHRIST did not tell her every individual thing that she did or had done, but only the case respecting her husbands, and him whom she then had was not her husband: So that the word all is not a proof at all that CHRIST died for every man.—And when it is said, that CHRIST tasted death for every man, and that he is the Saviour of all men, it means for our comfort, that he tasted death for every one who believes, and that he is the Saviour of all men that trust in him.—But as to Mr. Wesley saying, "that CHRIST obtained a possibility of salvation for all men, and that he died for those who are now in hell."—What, the power of GOD, the wisdom of GOD, the counsels of GOD, the oath of GOD, the person of CHRIST, the blood of CHRIST, the resurrection and intercession of CHRIST, all laid out, all engaged, what to do, sure it must be for some glorious end, some great design to accomplish! Why, Mr. Wesley says, "to obtain a possibility of all men being saved,—then consequently a possibility of all men being damned; for by the same rule, that one is lost, all may be lost: But how is this consistent with the oracles of Heaven, which says, "Israel shall (not may) be saved in the LORD with an everlasting salvation, and shall never be confounded, world without end."

But if CHRIST only obtained a possibility of salvation, I ask how that possibility is to be made effectual? If it be said by my improvement,—Improvement!—of what—my enmity, my darkness, my rebellion, my wickedness, for this all I have by nature to improve.—No, it must be a religious improvement: what, must it be then by works at last? But Paul says

“it is not of works, lest any man boast.” No, it must be by CHRIST’s power, here we are agreed; but observe the connexion of this, and don’t mix the creature’s power with CHRIST; for if it be by CHRIST’s power, then it is not barely a possibility of salvation, but a real certainty of salvation; for he says, “I give unto my sheep eternal life, and they shall never perish.” Mr. Wesley. says, “they may perish,” but CHRIST says, “they never shall perish.” Now either CHRIST or Mr. Wesley must be mistaken; which it is, judge ye, for CHRIST adds, neither shall any be able to pluck them out of his hands.

As to Mr. Wesley saying that CHRIST died for those who are in hell,—what, die for their sins, and yet suffer their sins to damn them,—what, pay their debt for them, and yet send them to punishment;—what, love them so as to die for them, and yet suffer them to go to hell; what, conquer Satan, and suffer Satan to conquer them; what, had sin more power to destroy them than CHRIST had to save them? what, had CHRIST power to save them, and died in love for them, and yet did not save them? then where is his love,—this doctrine will not do, for it has neither truth, sense, nor scripture with it.—Suppose I was in a pit of deep mire, as the Psalmist says, where there was no standing, and a friend, who has power to get me out, came to me, and says, “O! I am concerned for you, I greatly love you, my heart aches for you! come out, come out:” To whom I say, why, I cannot come out, unless it be by your strength and power, then I can: Oh! but I don’t choose to do that, says he, or if he does not say the same in words he goes away and leaves me sinking there till I am lost, without exerting either his love or his power to save me;—what should I think of such a friend? should I not have a right to think that all his testified affection for me was nothing: And is not Mr. Wesley’s doctrine the same when he says, “that CHRIST died for those who are in hell?” Is not this making CHRIST insincere in his love; leaving the soul in a hopeless state, and making the death of

CHRIST, to use once more Mr. Wesley's own words, "to obtain a SOLEMN NOTHING?"

THEOPH. Sir, but Mr. Wesley in order to prove this, frequently brings in the scripture phrase, "the world, the whole world, who is a propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only but for the sins of the whole world: And as to the world of believers, a term frequently used by some writers, he says, "it has no countenance in scripture."

PHILA. Sir, I have read Mr. Wesley's thoughts on predestination and election, in which I must confess that Mr. Wesley has, by an art which is peculiar to himself, proved as clearly that CHRIST died for no man, as that he died for every man; it is very difficult to say which he best proves:—As to the word, World, Mr. Wesley must know that it is never once used in the scriptures respecting either salvation or condemnation, in an universal sense, or to mean every individual person upon the earth; as for instance, when it is spoken of salvation, GOD so loved the world, &c. No, this cannot be meant of every individual person in the world,—for if so then every individual person must, as the consequence of this love, be saved, for GOD is at rest in his love, he is of one mind and none can turn him. But did he love Esau as he loved Jacob, let the oracles of heaven speak, Jacob have I loved, Esau have I hated: did he love the sons of Belial, sons of wickedness, with the same love that he loved David and Solomon? did he love Judas with the same love that he loved Paul? again, when it is said, "Behold the Lamb of GOD that taketh away the sins of the world;" now it is evident that it does not mean the sins of every individual person in the world, for if so, then every man must surely be saved; for if their sins are taken away there can be no punishment, for where there is no sin to charge, there can be no wrath to punish. But did he take away the sin of Judas, if so, how came it upon him again? hard indeed to be saved once, and damned after! did he take away the sins of the Pharisees,

and yet ask them, *Matt. xxiii. 33, How they could escape the damnation of Hell?* There would have been no occasion for our LORD to have asked them this question, if he had taken away their sins; neither would he have called them, “a generation of vipers and serpents;” or have said, “Woe unto you, ye scribes and Pharisees,” if he had so loved them as to take their sins away from them. Thus you see, *Theophilus*, that the phrase, world, does no mean every individual person, neither when it is used of condemnation does it mean that all are condemned,—as for instance, it is said in *John v. 19, The whole world lieth in wickedness*; now the phrase world, and whole world cannot be meant of every individual person, for there never was a time since the creation but what the LORD had a people whom he had formed for his praise, these did not lie in wickedness, but in the bosom of his love. Again it is said, “all the world went a wandering after the beast;” when at the same time the LORD had his seven thousands, if not his seventy times seven thousand, who had not bowed their knee unto Baal.

THEOPH. In what sense are we then to take the word, world, in scripture? for to call them, whom CHRIST died for, the world of believers is what Mr. Wesley says, the scriptures never countenance?

PHILA. Mr. Wesley has for many years taken leave to say what he pleases, but hardly ever proves what he says, for it is evident that the word, World, is used in scripture with a direct reference and connexion with believers; for the Apostle speaking of the fall of the Jews, says, “through their fall salvation is come to the Gentiles.” And adds, “if the fall of them (that is, of the Jews) be the riches of the world:” what world could the apostle here mean but the Gentiles, and what part of these Gentiles are called the world is plainly pointed out, viz. to those to whom salvation came:—And to strengthen this the Apostle adds, “for if the casting away of them be the reconciling of the world:” now what world could this be but the believing Gentiles, to whom the word of reconcilia-

tion was sent, as you have it *Acts* xiii. 48, *And when the Gentiles heard this they were glad, and glorified the word of the Lord, and as many as were ordained unto eternal life believed.*" And it is worthy to be remarked, *Theophilus*, that the word, *World*, is used particularly by the HOLY GHOST, to distinguish the Gentiles from the Jews, for as the Jews were called a holy nation, a peculiar people; and the LORD, to distinguish them as the people of his love, calls them his chosen people; but as to the Gentiles, they are called the Heathen, or the world round about: in this sense there is a beauty and propriety in the word, *World*, even when used in reference to the death and atonement of CHRIST, who was, says John, "being a Jew, a propitiation for our sins." But when he viewed the extent of his death, that in his name the Gentiles trust, he adds, "not for ours only, but for the sins of the whole world;" and who those are, and for what end the gospel is revealed, Paul tells us, *Rom.* ix. 23, &c. *That he might make known the riches of his glory, on the vessels of mercy, whom he had afore prepared unto glory; even us whom he hath called, not of the Jews only, but also of the Gentiles.*—As he saith also, *I will call them my people, which are not my people: and her beloved which was not beloved. And it shall come to pass that in the place where it was said unto them ye are not my people: There shall they be called the children of the living God.* So that by the world is meant the children of GOD, scattered abroad throughout the world, see *John* xi. 50, 51, 52, "And in this sense, CHRIST says, he came not to condemn the world, but that the world through him might be saved:" agreeable to this CHRIST says, "Look unto me all ye ends of the earth, and be ye saved."

THEOPH. Sir, your arguments from scripture communicate light, life, and satisfaction to my mind, respecting the glorious design of Emmanuel's death; but what think you of Mr. Wesley's saying, "what becomes of all other people, they must inevitably perish for ever; the die was cast or ever they were in being: the doctrine to pass them by has con-

signed their unborn souls to Hell, and damned them from their mother's womb." And that nineteen out of twenty will be lost, let them do what they will.

PHILA. These are horrible ideas, and were they just, they would deserve a serious consideration: but whom does Mr. Wesley charge these terrible things unto? not unto us I hope, for I assure him we believe no such cruel doctrine; so far from it, that we affirm that GOD never created any man to damn him, nor ever decreed sin to be the cause of damnation, for neither sin nor condemnation ariseth from GOD, but from the creature, therefore it is dreadful in Mr. Wesley to represent us as making the Almighty a tyrant, as his unjust phrase is, when we believe him to be the essence of love, 1 *John* iii. 16. "And therefore this reproach is rolled away, and like smoke it vanisheth before the wind, and like the darkness of the bottomless pit, it is chased away by the bright rising of the star of Jacob."

As to Mr. Wesley saying in a short abstract which is lately published, of electing love, and distinguishing grace, "that if this be true then nineteen out of twenty must perish, let them do what they will:" Here he talks like a stranger in Israel, for who ever talks of GOD's electing love under such narrow limits and bounds, as one in twenty. O fie, Mr. Wesley, this was done to cast an odium and reproach on electing grace and those that hold it, in order to embitter the minds of your people against embracing of it, or believing what Paul says, "The election hath obtained it, and the rest are blinded;" for we are so far from thinking, preaching or printing such narrow ideas of electing love, that we declare that they are a number which no man can number, more in number than the sands upon the sea shore, that not one single soul shall ever perish, that is made willing to be saved in GOD's own way, by faith in the obedience, death and resurrection of JESUS; and that this extends to every kindred, people, nation, and language. "He that seeth the Son and believeth on him, hath everlasting life. Whosoever will, let him come

and take of the waters of life freely; that if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the LORD JESUS, and shalt believe in thy heart, that GOD hath raised him from the dead, **THOU SHALT BE SAVED:**" and what can a poor soul, that is desirous of its salvation, desire more: hence it appears that the reproach that Mr. Wesley has been for these thirty years charging electing love, is rolled away by the power and glory of the scriptures.

**THEOPH.** But Mr. Wesley intimates, if election be true then there can be but one in twenty saved, let them do what they will.

**PHILA.** I would only here observe, that if the fallen race are left to do what they will, not only one in twenty, but not one in twenty thousand will be saved, for every man by nature willeth his own destruction, by loving darkness rather than light, and therefore upon Mr. Wesley's foundation of salvation being left to every man upon the freedom of his will, every man must be lost, because his will is by nature reverse to GOD's will and way of salvation, ye will not come unto me that ye may have life. But if GOD makes them a willing people in the day of his power, by giving them a new nature, called in scripture a new heart, and consequently a new will; and therefore it is not mankind's doing what they will that saves them or has the least influence in their salvation, but it is GOD fulfilling his will, and the work of faith with power that saves them; not only one in twenty, as Mr. Wesley would reproachfully represent it, but to an innumerable number which no man can number, even to as many as receive CHRIST, to them he gives power to become the sons of GOD, even to as many as believe on his name.

**THEOPH.** But Mr. Wesley says, to say that CHRIST died for the elect, as elect, is absolute nonsense and confusion. Preservative, page 187.

**PHILA.** Here I am amazed, that Mr. Wesley (a person of so much knowledge) should stoop so low, as to degrade his

understanding, by calling it nonsense; if by nonsense he means, according to the etymology of the word, ungrammatical; what connexion has this with it, any more than a star has with a clod of earth? Grammar is the beauty or propriety of speech, but it is evidence that proves matters of fact, and not Mr. Wesley's denials and bold assertions.—But if by nonsense he means (according to the general acceptance of the word) a trifle, a mere trifle! something very insignificant not worth a hearing! This is alarming indeed! what! the cross of CHRIST a trifle? what! his death, his wounds, his groans, his tears, a trifle? what! his atonement, his blood, his resurrection a trifle? what, an absolute trifle, not worth a hearing?—what! the salvation of thousands of thousands, of ten thousands times ten thousands, and a number which no man can number, not worth a hearing!—This in Mr. Wesley's ears is absolute nonsense: O amazing! that because CHRIST did not die for all, even for those who are in hell, or that may for rebellion hear the solemn sound, Depart, it must be a trifling affair, that he died for the unnumbered number of every kindred, nation, and language whom the Father had given him, “Thine, says CHRIST, they were, and thou gavest them me: all that the Father has given me, I have lost none; I am the good shepherd, and know my sheep, and am known of mine: as the Father knoweth me, even so know I the Father; and I lay down my life for the sheep.” And yet all this a trifling affair, absolute nonsense! But what is more amazing, be astonished, O Heavens! at this, he adds, “and confusion:” words which bear so hard upon blasphemy, that they scarce deserve a reply. What, the death of CHRIST for the elect, as elect, confusion! O astonishing! the very centre of all the divine perfections, where wisdom, mercy, love, peace, and holiness shine with such harmony, that all Heaven adores, every angel wonders, and every Saint admires,—in him mercy and truth have met together, righteousness and peace kiss each other; it is here the soul meets with Heaven, and Hea-



ven meets with the soul; here it enjoys peace on earth; in this sanctuary, in this safe retreat, the soul loves, adores, and praises GOD for ever and ever.

THEOPH. Mr. Wesley seems to allow that the elect were sinners, but not as they are elect in CHRIST, but as they are out of CHRIST.

PHILA. Unhappy for Mr. Wesley it happens according to the counsel of Jehovah's will, that the elect never were out of CHRIST, from everlasting they were chosen in him, *Eph.* 1, 2, and to everlasting they will have a being in him; and though they were thus chosen in CHRIST, and were as such the object of the same everlasting love, wherewith CHRIST was loved, *John* xvii. 23, yet this did not prevent their being sinners, nay their being dead in trespasses and sins, as they stood in relation to Adam, as the natural sinning head, and parent of all mankind, *Eph.* ii. 2. And as such or in such a relation, they were lost, were captives, were unjust, were guilty, and therefore stood in an absolute need of the death and atonement of CHRIST, to bring them in a way of honour to the divine perfections, not to be interested in the love of GOD, but to the inheritance and enjoyment of his love, which by election and choice of them, they were interested in, *Jer.* xxxi. 3, *As it is written, because ye are Sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, ABBA FATHER.*

There is one egregious mistake of Mr. Wesley's, and it seems to be his capital mistake, which chiefly leads him into all others, which is, he says in this Preservative, Page 192, "We believe that in the moment Adam fell, he had no freedom of will left, but that GOD when of his own free grace he gave the promise of a SAVIOUR to him and to his posterity graciously restored to mankind a liberty and power to accept of proffered salvation." I verily believe this is Mr. Wesley's creed, as his name is prefixed to it, but as to what the world has made much noise about, *viz.* the Apostles' creed, and

Athanasius's creed, I believe they knew nothing at all of them, and as to Mr. Wesley's creed, it is a creed without credit with me and many thousands more, because there is no truth in it.—“ We believe, says Mr. Wesley, that the moment Adam fell he had no freedom of will left.” On the contrary we believe that from the moment Adam fell, that he had a freedom of will left, and that this freedom was to every thing which is evil, which evil bias or bent of the will is the source of all the branches of sin described in near seventy particulars in the scriptures, therefore he was the sinning head, the sinning life to all mankind, as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, and nothing but sinners by him and from him, possessing the same freedom of will to every evil, and bearing the same image and likeness that Adam did; and therefore it must be exceeding wrong of Mr. Wesley to say, “ That GOD of his own free grace, when he gave the promise of a Saviour to him and his posterity, graciously restored to mankind a liberty and power to accept of proffered salvation.” This is not truth, we believe no such thing, and solemnly call upon Mr. Wesley to prove it if he can,—so far from believing it, that we affirm, and are as ready to prove as to affirm that there is no such thing as proffered salvation at all; if there is a proffered salvation it must be proffered either by man or GOD; not by GOD, for he does not proffer salvation to the poor sensible sinner, and then leave him to struggle with the mutability or rather forwardness of his will, whether he will choose the salvation or not, but he gives, communicates, or reveals his salvation to the soul, “ I will give thee, (not proffer thee) for a light to the Gentiles, that thou mayest be my salvation to the ends of the earth: To as many as received him, to them gave he power (not proffered them power) to become the sons of GOD, who called me by his grace, (not proffered me his grace) and revealed his Son in me, not proffered his Son to me.

Now as this salvation is not proffered by GOD, upon any

condition in the creature, but given freely, and the blessing of faith to receive it as the fruit of his promise, power, and love; then I would ask Mr. Wesley or any other, who gave them any authority to proffer, as they call it, grace and salvation when they have neither the one nor the other to give? what is this but solemn mockery? besides, Mr. Wesley is exceeding wrong when he says, "that God has graciously restored to mankind a liberty and power to accept of the proffered salvation, this Mr. Wesley affirms; your proof, your proof, Sir,—for this we absolutely deny,—and ask, what power has enmity to love? what power has blindness to see, or the dumb to speak, or the deaf to hear, or the dead to walk? try the experiment, Sir, take a walk among the solemn tombs, go visit the mansions of the dead, and tell them that you proffer them salvation, if they will but open their eyes to see it, or rise up and embrace it; perhaps you are saying the figure is too strong, but it is not, for the case of poor sinners is more deplorable than the figure points them out, for they are not only as weak and incapable as the dead in the grave, to help themselves, but here let it be considered the dead have no enmity against rising, though they have no life nor power to rise, but the sinner has not only no power to receive the proffered salvation as you call it, but has an enmity against it; therefore, according, Sir, to your representation, every soul must finally be lost, for it has no power to conquer its enmity, nor no will to love the object; if not, then how is it possible that they can accept of a proffered salvation (as you call it) by that object, whereas the salvation that the gospel proclaims declares that God gives love to conquer the enmity, willingness to receive the object, and grace to make thankful and obedient for having received the blessing of salvation, according to his word, *Isa. xxxv. 5, 6, The eyes of the blind shall be opened, and the ears of the deaf shall be unstopped; then shall the lame man leap as an hart, and the tongue of the dumb sing: for in the wilderness shall waters break out, and streams in the desert.*

But the great, the capital mistake of all is Mr. Wesley saying, "that GOD gave to every man in Adam the promise of a Saviour, power and liberty to accept of salvation," when in fact GOD did no such thing, so far from giving it to every man, that he gave it to no man in Adam; grace was given in CHRIST, not in Adam; so far was GOD from waiting to see the fall of Adam before he gave grace to the people, that he settled all his grace upon them in CHRIST, before Adam had any being, see *Eph.* i. 2, 3, *2 Tim.* i. 9. But Mr. Wesley's supposition of GOD's giving to every man, power and liberty in Adam, wholly sets aside CHRIST being the head of grace, of influence, of life and power to the soul; for as Adam is the head, and being of death, darkness and corruption to all mankind, called his seed and offspring, so CHRIST is the head, life, power and glory of all grace, peace and salvation to all his seed, for as Adam by his death and disobedience brought death upon his posterity, so CHRIST by the perfection of his obedience brought life and salvation to all his posterity, and this is the beauty of the Apostle's reasoning between Adam as he is the head of nature, and CHRIST as he is the head of grace, *Rom.* v. 13, 21, and perhaps one of the best interpretations of the word ALL, "for as in Adam all died," that is Adam's all, to whom he was a head of natural life, "so in CHRIST shall all," that is, CHRIST'S ALL, to whom he is a head of grace and glory, be made alive: for the Apostle is not there speaking of the resurrection of the wicked, but only of the saints, and therefore the genuine sense appears to be this, that as sure as all mankind died by Adam's death or disobedience, so sure shall all that are CHRIST'S rise in the resurrection of the just, "CHRIST the first fruits, and they that are CHRIST'S at his coming."

THEOPH. But Mr. Wesley frequently inquires why all mankind are not saved; or at least, why they may not be saved, *Preservative*, page 192.

PHILA. The reason why is given in the oracles of Heaven, which in his most bold attempt he has never yet been

able to answer, see *John* x. 26. *John* xii. 39, 40. *Rom.* xi. 7, 8, 10.

**THEOPH.** Sir, that beautiful remark of Mr. Hervey's, occurs to my mind, "that faith in the imputed righteousness of **CHRIST**, is a fundamental principle of the gospel," if so, says Mr. Wesley, "what becomes of all those who think nothing of the imputed righteousness of **CHRIST**."

**PHILA.** Mr Wesley may see what becomes of them, *Matt.* xxii. 11. *And when the King came in to see the guests, he saw there a man which had not on the wedding garment; and he said unto him, Friend, how camest thou in hither, not having on a wedding garment? And the man was speechless: Then said the King to the servants, bind him hand and foot, and take him away, and cast him into utter darkness; there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth.*

**THEOPH.** If this be the case, says Mr. Wesley, how many who are full of faith and love must perish everlastingly!

**PHILA.** Yes, they must, and they justly deserve it, and this was the case of the Pharisees, they were full of faith in the law of Moses, *John* v. 45, and full of love to their prayers; fasting twice in the week, and giving tythe of all they possess, and seeking righteousness by the works of the law, and therefore those who are full of faith in their self-righteousness, and full of love with their own doings, to obtain eternal life, must share in the same condemnation with the Pharisees; for I affirm that it is impossible to be full of faith and love to **CHRIST**, and think nothing, nothing of his imputed righteousness.

But as Mr. Wesley desired to know "what must become of all those who think nothing about the imputed righteousness of **CHRIST**;" and having given a scripture answer to the inquiry, I now ask Mr. Wesley what will become of those who think much of imputed righteousness, who build their immortal hopes of Heaven and salvation upon it if it does immense hurt, if it is unnecessary, if it is dangerous and often

fatal, what must then become of the souls that trust therein? if this be the case, I wish, Sir, you would solemnly inform us, but let us have no middle state, no invisible shades, no paradise separate from Heaven, lest, Sir, you stay there too long, notwithstanding the virtue of the double silver cross upon the bible, or the more curious one upon the bosom, or your solemn watchnights, your fastings twice in the week, your intercessions on Fridays, your body-bands, your private bands, your select bands, your love-feasts: will this heap of popish stuff and trash do, why, Sir, are you so cruel to choke the people with the black smoke of the bottomless pit; where read you of an invisible state between heaven and hell? where read you of watch-nights, of directions to fast twice in the week, of intercession on Fridays, of body-bands, of select bands, of private bands, of leaders of classes? what is this but refined popery, and English nurseries for nunneries? **FOR THE MYSTERY OF BABYLON THE GREAT, THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS, AND ABOMINATION OF THE EARTH.** *Rev.* xviii. 20, 21, “ Rejoice over her, thou Heaven, and ye holy Apostles and Prophets, for GOD hath revenged you on her. And a mighty Angel took up a stone, and cast into the sea: thus with violence shall that great city Babylon be thrown down, and shall be found no more.” Therefore, Sir, as you love your own soul, and as you so love precious and immortal souls, come out of her, touch not the unclean thing, nor worship the beast, nor the image of Babylon any more; but as you will preach, let it be not only in CHRIST’S name, but let it be the power of CHRIST to conquer the will, the grace of CHRIST, to draw the heart, the person of CHRIST to engage the affection; the righteousness of CHRIST to justify the soul, the blood of CHRIST to pardon our sins, the faithfulness of CHRIST to keep us, and the spirit and blessings of CHRIST to engage us to love, praise and obedience, then may you expect to be great in Israel, and let us never any more hear of that popish trash, unless you are determined against

the law of the land, the law of **God**, the light of the gospel, and the light of your own conscience to establish the popish superstition of nunneries, especially for the female sex, by telling them in a letter, directed to the single women in the Methodists' Society, second edition, printed at Bristol, only four years ago, where you say, page 4, "I will speak the inmost sentiments of my heart." And what these inmost sentiments of your heart are to these single sisters, you tell us freely, for you say in the same page, "My business with you is only to guard you against those snares which Satan will assuredly lay for our feet; the first and indeed the most dangerous snare he can throw in your way is any kind or degree of intimacy with single men; indeed I would wish you to be very sparing in your conversation with any man, but more especially with those who are single; all familiarity with these ought to be avoided; even with the most devout, for the most innocent commerce with them, if it wounds not our consciences leaves a stain on our reputation, and the smoke blackens when the fire does not burn us." Can any one read this paragraph without shuddering? Are these, Sir, the inmost sentiments of your heart, I believe they are; what, the most dangerous snare the Devil can throw in a young lady's way, any kind or degree of intimacy with single men! nature starts at it; what, born with a native love to them! what, made by Heaven itself as an helpmate for man, to be a sharer of all the sweets, the bliss, the joys of life, and yet forbid an intimacy, forbid the union of love! What, has nature placed the most exalted thoughts, the most superlative affection to some particular object, as it is written, Thy desire shall be unto thy husband, and yet this desirable object must not be admitted near, O cruel doctrine! well may the Apostle call it the doctrine of devils, 1 *Tim.* iv. 1.

Here, Sir, I cannot forgive you; what did **God** make Eve for? was it not for an helpmate? what, and not come near her? a strange helpmate! Why did the **LORD** take Eve

from so near Adam's heart, and not from his feet, that he may trample upon or tyrannize over her, but from his heart? Was it not to show how near, how dear, the object of our affection should be unto us, even as our own heart, and yet not come nigh them? O cruel thought! from whence came thou?—Why did GOD make Eve of Adam's bone, but to show the man that in loving the object of his affections whom he intends to make his wife, he only loves himself, his own bone? and yet not come near her? What! no kind nor degree of intimacy between them? what, all familiarity with them (you say) must be avoided, even with the most devout? Is not this as heart-breaking as those moving, melting, feeling accents which once dropped, I will not say from whom, "O! the desire of my eyes and the joy of my heart is taken away with a stroke, and sacrificed to I. B."—Perhaps, Sir, you know from whom they came?—But why did GOD present the woman to the man?—What! to engage his affections, then to tease him, to distract him, to distress him, which must unavoidably be the case, if your doctrine be true, that there must be no intimacy with the single women, not the most innocent, O Sir! nature shakes, for surely GOD presented the woman to the man to show us that single women are presented as the rich gifts of Providence to the men, to command their affections, to unite their hearts, and engage in them all the endearing ties of love, and the delights of the mind.—Why did Adam say upon seeing the woman, This is flesh of my flesh, and bone of my bone; why surely, to show us that the women are made with the same tender passions, tender affections, love and complacency to the men, as the men are made with to the women, and yet no intimacy between them, O! Sir, what heart can forgive you? But why did Eve become Adam's wife, and they be no longer twain but one, why sure it was to show us that GOD ordained the MARRIAGE UNION between Adam and Eve, as an emblem or rather a pattern of the marriage union (where there



is a mutual love) between the man and the woman that they should not be twain, but one in heart, one in union, one in life, one in love, what, and all intimacy must be avoided! O Sir! your doctrine is more cruel than the grave; for it is happier to be buried in the grave than for the object of our affection to be buried from our sight. But, Sir, why did the LORD say, It is not meet that man should dwell alone? Surely, to show us that it is impossible for the man to be happy without a suitable object for his affections, love and complacency, or as the *Jews* express it, "MAN ALONE is but half blessed, and yet these objects must be forbid to have the least intimacy with them, O fie! Sir, what can you mean? Would you forbid the law of GOD and nature too, and all this under the notion of religion and piety. O! Sir, you seem to be more than over the threshold of the door of a certain place; I do not choose to mention where, but would only say in scripture language, "Come out of her, that ye be not partaker of her sins, that ye receive not of her plagues."

But above all, Sir, never more represent union, communion and intimacy with women, "as irreligious, and a dangerous snare, and that the most innocent commerce with them leaves a stain upon our reputation." When the HOLY GHOST by this figure represents the whole glory of CHRIST'S love to the church, *Eph. v. 25, Husbands, love your wives, even as CHRIST also loved the church, and gave himself for it.* And the Apostle expressly calls Adam a figure of him that was to come, showing that as it was not meet for man to dwell alone without an helpmate, so it was not meet that the MAN JESUS should dwell alone in the glory he had in the bosom of the Father's love, therefore the church was formed to be his bride, spouse, and companion with him in the same love and glory, and as Eve was taken from near Adam's heart, it shows how near and dear the church is to CHRIST; likewise as Eve was formed from the flesh and bone of Adam, it shows that the church is CHRIST'S body, so near as to be part

of himself, as says the Apostle, We are flesh of his flesh, and bone of his bone. And as Eve was formed from the beauty and perfection of Adam, he therefore loved her as his own image and beauty, so the church was formed in the womb of GOD's love, or in the superlucarian or overful way of grace, from CHRIST's beauty and perfection, and therefore CHRIST loves his church in his own loveliness and glory, with the same love the Father loved him in all his glory, *John xvii. 22, 23, John xv. 9.* And as Adam and Eve were no longer twain but ONE, so CHRIST and his church are not twain but ONE,—one in union, one in nature, one in love, one in spirit, one in glory,—but this is a great mystery, but I speak concerning CHRIST and the church, *Eph. v. 23—32.*

THEOPH. What think you of the doctrine of sinless perfection, which Mr. Wesley preaches to his people?

PHILA. Mr. Wesley appears to me, to want understanding in those parts of scripture that speak of perfection: but above all people Mr. John Wesley ought to be silent about perfection; because, he has none in CHRIST, nor has he a sinless perfection in himself:—and as to all his perfect people, they seem to me, to know no more of perfection, than the old woman did of the nature of a heavenly rapture, when hearing a popular field preacher at a great distance, a gentleman seeing her hands and eyes often lifted up to Heaven, said to her, Good woman, you cannot hear the preacher at such a distance; no, says she, but I can see his heavenly wig. As to Mr. Wesley's perfection, I well know, it is like mine, by far too imperfect, and far short of Paul's, who said, Not as though I had already attained or were already perfect; for he says, When I would do good, evil is present with me. Though Mr. Wesley has had more than once the assurance to say, that Paul speaks here not in his own case as converted, but the state of an unconverted person.—I have only this to say, I choose to be one of Mr. Wesley's unconverted persons; for, I think, they are much better: much better! did I say? It is a phrase too low, infinitely better than his con-

verted ones, because they delight in the law of **GOD** after the inward man, and serve him in newness of spirit, and not in the oldness of the letter, *Rom.* vii. 6—22.

**THEOPH.** What think you of Mr. Wesley's short method to convert all the Roman Catholics in the kingdom of Ireland?

**PHILA.** His universal conversion appears to me like his universal salvation, without any foundation; but the old adage is the most suitable answer to him I can just think of, Physician, heal thyself.

**THEOPH.** What think you of the sermon he preached upon those words, **THE LORD OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS?**

**PHILA.** Therein he handles the word of **GOD** deceitfully; the art of the Serpent twines through the whole; the real meaning of his heart he does not suffer to come out of his lips. He says and he unsays; he affirms and then contradicts. He had lost many hearers by what he had written to Mr. Hervey against imputed righteousness; and in this sermon, because there are many good expressions of the righteousness of **CHRIST**, he would fain have us believe, that there was no real difference between him and Mr. Hervey, and others of the same sentiment. That the difference consisted only in words, and not in any real meaning; though the one says, that the imputed righteousness of **CHRIST** is the sole **FOUNDATION, MATTER, CAUSE, LIFE and CONDITION** of our justification before **GOD**; and the other says, it is unnecessary, and unscriptural; that is, has done immense hurt; that we must obey in order for our final acceptance, and at last be judged for our works, and yet no difference in meaning, only in words. What! does Mr. Wesley think that when our **LORD** shall urge the awful sentence, Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire! and pronounce the happy joy, Come, ye blessed of my Father! does he think that there is no real difference in meaning, but only in words. Suppose he was to step down to the dark shades, and tell them so; O! this art and sophistry will not do, for the scriptures

are so plain, that he that runneth may read; yet Mr. Wesley would fain have us to believe, that Bellarmine, that great advocate for the church of Rome; and of justification by self-righteousness, attended with the works of charity, had a share in the righteousness of CHRIST? What! just such a share as to make up the deficiency of his own? Ay, this is the marrow of Mr. Wesley's heart, and too much the refined Popery and current doctrine of the day. I would take this sermon sentence by sentence and answer it, but, I remember, it is already answered with such an answer, that Mr. Wesley has never been able to answer as I have ever heard of.

But, there is one objection that I would take notice of, Mr. Wesley says, they are afraid to use the expression, the imputed righteousness of CHRIST, lest any should abuse it; should not Mr. Wesley forbid eating, lest any should abuse it, for the same reason? but he says, we have known this done a thousand times, and particularizes wherein; "A man has been reprov'd, suppose for drunkenness, O! said he, I pretend to no righteousness of my own, CHRIST is my righteousness. Another has been told, that the extortioner and unjust shall not inherit the kingdom of God, he replies with all assurance, I am unjust in myself, but I have a spotless righteousness in CHRIST." Now, this is what Mr. Wesley affirms, page 19, and says, "We have known this done a thousand times." This I deny, and call upon Mr. Wesley, before GOD and the world, to prove it; I charge him here to his face with an untruth and insincerity. Let him prove a thousand instances of drunkards saying they have no righteousness of their own, but that they have a righteousness in CHRIST; or of unjust persons, or of extortioners saying that they do not pretend to have a righteousness of their own, but they have a righteousness in CHRIST; nay, that they reply, with all assurance, I am unjust in myself, but I have a spotless righteousness in CHRIST.—Now this is a vile accusation and a dark horror drawn over the imputation of CHRIST'S

righteousness, and those that hold it, on purpose to degrade the one and expose the other; for, blessed be **GOD**! Nature has not the daring assurance to attempt to prove such a thing; and yet he tells the world he has seen a thousand instances of it; O! Heaven forgive him. Where is the drunkard, or the unjust person, or extortioner, that will dare to say so? your proofs, sir, are called for. O! what enmity has **Mr. Wesley** in his mind against imputed righteousness! but what is all this to us? we hold no such doctrine; nor countenance in the least respect any such persons, if any such profane hardened sinners can be found; indeed, I have heard some, who should know better, and to their shame be it spoke, who have charged the baptists with preaching Antinomian doctrines, which has engaged me to hear them frequently, and to search into their principles particularly; and they appear to me to be just such Antinomians as **PAUL** and **PETER**, as **JOHN** and **JAMES**; for they preach **GOD**'s everlasting love and the power of that love upon the mind, loving him because he first loved them. They preach light and life, peace and pardon, and plenteousness of redemption by the **LORD JESUS**, and the influence of his grace upon the heart; that in his light they see light; that from his **LIFE** they receive life; that from his peace they in patience possess their souls; that from the rich atonement of his blood they have peace with **GOD**, peace of conscience and joy in the **HOLY GHOST**; and from the plenteousness of redemption by the **LORD JESUS CHRIST**, they rejoice in hope of the glory of **GOD**, and are edified, and multiplied, and walk in the fear of the **LORD**, and in the comforts of the **HOLY GHOST**.— They preach the power, the life, and influence of the **HOLY GHOST**, in quickening, enlightening, reviving, sealing, and comforting the saints; in leading them to **JESUS** as their living life, their living bread, their living water, their living strength, their living rock, their living righteousness, and their living hope for ever; to him as their **ALL**, to enjoy **ALL** in him, and receive **ALL** from him; who is their **GOD**, their

glory, and their ALL ; seeing that his person, his glory, his perfection, his promises, his power, his presence, his love, his grace, his covenant, his oath, his faithfulness, and fulness are all theirs ; and as the fruit of this inheritance and possession, being in all things enriched by him, they walk in union and communion, in faith, hope, and love, in all the blessings and privileges of the gospel ; in all the statutes, order, and ordinances of the house of GOD, continuing in the Apostles' doctrine, in fellowship, in breaking of bread, and in prayer every first day of the week, as the primitive disciples did, that they may grow up into HIM in all things, which is the head, even CHRIST ; being cemented together in the bonds of love, as one body, one bread, one family, and one building ; having one faith, one Lord, one baptism ; and being baptized into one spirit they partake of all the marrow and fatness, blessing and fulness of the covenant of grace, and treasures of glory ; they sit like olive branches round their father's table, and enjoy all the blessings of his love ; not as strangers, servants and slaves, but as children possessing the inheritance, and as heirs of grace rejoicing in their portion, remembering the love of CHRIST, which is better than wine ; and being followers of GOD as dear children, and walking in love as CHRIST also has loved them and gave himself for them ; they learn to love as brethren, to love one another as CHRIST has loved them ; to be kind one to another, tender hearted, forgiving one another, as GOD, for CHRIST's sake, has forgiven them ; that if any wander they restore such an one in the spirit of meekness ; that if any are sick or in prison they visit them, or if any are afflicted, they pray for them ; and if any are in distress, they relieve them ; being ready to give and to communicate, that they that want may know no lack of any thing. Their desire is that no corrupt communication may come out of their mouth, but that which is good to the use of edifying, that it may administer grace to the hearers, that they may with one heart and with one mouth glorify GOD, even our father, and the LORD JESUS ; to him be

glory in the church throughout all ages, world without end. Amen.

Now, these are the people, *Theophilus*, whom not only Mr. Wesley, but all the legal pharisaical professors of the age among the Presbyterians (and Independents so called, but there are very few of them in the kingdom) these, like the Pharisees of old, take an unchristian, unscriptural liberty to call these people Antinomians as the Pharisees did PAUL, saying shall we continue in sin, that grace may abound? what answer did Paul give them, God forbid! and do they not with the same heart and soul express the same language, *Rom. vi. 15. What then shall we sin because we are not under the law, but under grace? God forbid! I often blush and am ashamed for the ignorance of most of the professors of the present day: they seem in general to know no more of their bibles than the church of England priest did of the seventh day sabbath, who lately accused a certain godly man, who kept the seventh-day sabbath, with profanation, because he kept not the first day of the week for his sabbath; to whom he said, Sir, it is very strange you charge me with profaning the Sabbath, when I keep that very sabbath you direct me to keep. Where do you find it, said the clergyman? Sir, said the other, wrote over your altar-piece thus: Remember the seventh day to keep it holy: for the seventh day is the sabbath of the LORD thy God. O! said the clergyman, I never thought of that before. And as ignorant are those professors who charge the baptists of being Antinomians when they hold of the law in all its highest honours, not only as the royal law, but as their rule of love, and as such the perfect law of liberty. However, they are content and count it their honour to be thus reviled, that the spirit of CHRIST and of glory may rest upon them, as it is written, *The people shall dwell alone, and shall not be reckoned among the nations, Num. xxiii. 9.**

THEOPH. Sir, your description amazes me! attracts me! yea, astonishes me! to find by fresh proofs that these are the

people whom we have so much reproached, and entertained such depreciating ideas of; to use the prophetic language of the inspired Poet, "Their light rises out of obscurity, and their darkness is as the noonday." Well may the Prophet say, Happy art thou, O, Israel! who is like unto thee? O, people, saved by the LORD! happy are the people that are in such a case!

It not only amazes me, but attracts and engages my attention! and likewise astonishes me that the power of prejudice is so prevalent, the walls of bigotry so strong, and the scales of ignorance like the bars of a castle upon weak minds.

PHILA. Dear *Theophilus*, as the greatest prejudice you can do to a friend, is to entertain too high expectations from him; as you will then be apt to measure all his excellencies according to the exalted height of your expectation, and not according to their own intrinsic merit or value.—These people do not pretend to perfection in the most perfect parts of their conduct, but to come as near as possible to the pattern given in the mount; for it sometimes fares with them as it did with the primitive churches in Paul's days; some tall cedars in Zion like David drop; some flaming professors like Solomon backslide; and zealous lovers of CHRIST like Peter grow cold and become like lost sheep for a season, but when the LORD restores their souls and turns their captivity like streams in the south; heals all their backslidings, and loves them freely; then they make known to the sons of men his mighty acts, and talk of his wonderful power, and therefore these instances, tremendous as they are, ought to keep professors silent, and their mouths in the dust; considering that they are in the body, and be not high minded, but fear, and not dare charge the doctrines of grace or imputed righteousness with Antinomianism, for it is not grace but corruption that is the cause of the saints' fall; it is not living upon CHRIST, and all life and fulness in him, but the want of living upon him; or only living by half or part upon



him, that is the cause of their fall; for, it is hard to say, where infinite wisdom, power, and faithfulness shines most bright, whether in regeneration, in restoration, or in the resurrection of the saints.—It was a mournful remarkable expression of Mr. P—ts, who made an excursion from Scotland to London about twenty years since, upon his return said to a familiar acquaintance, I have, said he, attended upon almost all the preachers in London, yet, had it not been for the free grace of baptist preachers, said he, I should have found no gospel; though no baptist himself, I suppose he meant no gospel to his mind; however this may be, without any attempt to a spirit of prophecy, it may be said that in CHRIST'S spiritual reign, when he shall destroy the man of sin with the brightness of his glory; when HE shall be as the light of the morning, as a morning without clouds when the sun ariseth, and reign before his ancients gloriously, and make Zion the joy of the whole earth. Then Ephraim shall no more vex Judah, nor Judah vex Ephraim; but they shall all see eye to eye; then there will be a revival of the primitive beauty, honour, and order of the churches according to their first original and pattern of the baptist churches of CHRIST settled by the Apostles at Jerusalem, at Corinth, at Philippi, Galatia, Ephesus, and the seven churches in Asia.

THEOPH. Sir, my obligations are renewed to you for your labour of love in opening the scriptures, in elucidating the doctrines of grace, and clearing them from those dark glosses of Mr. Wesley, and removing that art, sophistry, and Arminian smoke in which the nation has been almost smothered for these thirty years; but some I fear will think you have been too hard upon him.

PHILA. Such that think I have been too hard, must be very soft people indeed; for out of his own mouth, I do not judge him, for he not only judges but condemns himself, for he says in his sermon upon the Lord our righteousness, page 5. "That the christian church stands or falls with it; it is

certainly the ground and pillar of that faith of which alone cometh salvation, of that Catholic or universal faith which is found in all the children of GOD, which unless a man keeps whole and undefiled, without doubt he shall perish everlastingly.

Now, let men, let angels, let Mr. Wesley's own conscience judge if he has kept the righteousness of CHRIST whole! has he not been rending it these thirty years, and thereby more cruel than the soldiers who crucified the Redeemer, who said of his seamless garment, which was an emblem of the perfection of his righteousness, let us not rent it? but, has not Mr. Wesley been rending it by saying, "it is unnecessary, unscriptural, that the scriptures no where countenanced any such imputation of CHRIST's righteousness, wherein the justifier and the justified, being both righteous with the self-same righteousness. That the active obedience of CHRIST, his fulfilling the moral law, was never intended by GOD to be that righteousness where by we are justified." Again he says, "Therefore it cannot be imputed to any man for his righteousness, there is no necessity or occasion for it." And adds, "GOD does not require of us the righteousness of CHRIST for our justification." Now, I call upon Mr. Wesley himself to judge whether upon his own faith, if he has any right to go to heaven, or any of his people, who believe in the same doctrine, for he says, "if any man keep not the righteousness of CHRIST WHOLE, without doubt he shall perish everlastingly; without doubt this must be the case of those who do not, *Rom. ii. 21. Thou therefore which teachest another, teachest thou not thyself?*"

But further, lest any one may think that my thoughts are harsh upon Mr. Wesley, let them judge of the soft words which proceed from his own lips; for he says, that a man, except he keep the righteousness of CHRIST, not only whole but undefiled, without doubt he shall perish everlastingly.—Now, if GOD has no more mercy upon Mr. Wesley than he has for himself; let him be weighed in his own balance, and

see if he is not wanting; for let his own friends, the best and the most perfect of them, judge whether Mr. Wesley has kept the righteousness of CHRIST undefiled? has he not in his Preservative, and in his Letter to Mr. Hervey, charged the most black and base accusations to it? has he not said therein, page 212, that it is dangerous, often fatal, it has done immense hurt; that it has encouraged mankind to work all uncleanness with greediness?

Again he says, "that imputed righteousness leads not to repentance, but to licentiousness, this doctrine makes the Holy One of GOD the minister of sin." Now let his friends speak, let Mr. Wesley's own conscience speak, let them speak if they have a word to say or for ever be ashamed in eternal silence: for surely if the angels for sinning deserved to be cast out of heaven; if the devil for sinning deserved to be damned; if the Pharisees for their enmity, deserved from our LORD that interrogatory sentence, how can ye escape the damnation of hell? What must that man deserve that has, in enmity to the righteousness of JESUS, exceeded them all, when he says, in answer to Mr. Hervey, where Mr. Hervey says, "I read there is a righteousness which supplies all the creature needs." This Mr. Wesley calls (page 226) "Terrible, always dangerous, often fatal, and that if we allow this, viz. that CHRIST fulfilled all the conditions of the covenant for us, antinomianism comes in with a full tide," What is this but charging CHRIST's love and obedience to the law for us, to be an open floodgate of iniquity; does not this exceed the Pharisees, who said to CHRIST, thou castest out devils by Belzebub, the prince of the devils. He calls it likewise a syren song and pleasing sound to James Wheatley and James Reiley. Whatever it be to them I know not, but it is certainly a sweet song and a pleasing sound to the church of GOD, *Isa. lxi. 10. I will greatly rejoice in the Lord, my soul shall be joyful in my God, for he hath clothed me with the garments of salvation, he has covered me with the robes of righteousness.* And here I would ask Mr. Wesley, and many others, how they dare in their consciences (not only expose their ignorance) but

endeavour to frighten people against the pure doctrines of rich grace, by that frightful ghost and bugbear word. O! it is Antinomianism, when we say no more than Paul did, *Rom. v. 20. Moreover, the law entered that the offence might abound; but where sin has abounded, grace has much more abounded.* But, where is the man, the hardened sinner that dares to sin that grace may abound? I know of none such, therefore it is high time that this old frightful ghost, that haunts the churches and our consciences, was laid in the Red Sea; for we have a saying in Shropshire, that if evil spirits or ghosts are laid in the Red Sea, they never come to trouble weak minds any more. But, supposing there are some men who abuse the blessings of Providence, does this take away our interest in them? or that there are, as Jude expresses it, some ungodly men, who were for their ungodliness ordained of old to this condemnation, of turning the grace of GOD into lasciviousness. I would here very seriously ask Mr. Wesley, which is the most sure way to hell? whether to sail through the gulf of Antinomianism, in the libertine's sense, or to run foul and sink upon the sands of Arminianism? Is not the self-righteous Pharisee as sure to be lost as the most profane sinner? nay, to go further, is not the most refined moralist, or the most zealous professor, that depends upon any one act, or upon all the actions he has done, or that CHRIST has enabled him to do, as sure to perish as those who said, *In thy name have we not done many wonderful works?* *Mat. vii. 22.* For know this, it is not what we do, nor what CHRIST enables us to, that is the matter of our faith, hope, or confidence towards GOD, but purely what CHRIST has done and suffered for us; his person we trust as the single and ALONE object of faith; his righteousness without our filthy rags; his death for atonement without any works of merit; his power without our strength; his all-sufficiency without any of our own deficiency; not doing what we can (as too many of the preachers of the day preach) and CHRIST will make up the deficiency, teaching, that it is CHRIST's merits that make our obedience effectual to save us, when in fact it is no such a thing, for it

is his own arm that saves us, his own righteousness that justifies us, his own blood that pardons us, his own power that supports us, his grace that supplies us, and his love that engages us to praise, love, and obedience to his name ; therefore not unto us, not unto us, but unto his name be all the glory.

**THEOPH.** But, is it not said by our **LORD**, blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see **GOD**?

**PHILA.** Yes, it is ; and I know that many of Mr. Wesley's people are in great darkness and distress, by Mr. John Wesley and his preachers murdering this text : They explain of a purity of heart that is free from all sin in thought and deed ; and they still find sin in them, and that there is no just man upon earth that liveth and sinneth not ; therefore they are afraid they shall never see **GOD**, and well they may under these dark apprehensions. Whereas the pure heart our **LORD** speaks of, is the same that Paul calls new man, or the inward man, and what the **LORD** has promised to give, even a new heart will I give you : now, this new heart is a pure heart, a nature that cannot sin, for it is nothing less than **CHRIST** formed in us the hope of glory, therefore it may be well said, blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see **GOD** ; for this hidden man of the heart is nothing but purity and perfection, it cannot sin, it has not the nature of sin, hence, says the Apostle John, whosoever is born of **GOD** doth not commit sin, for his seed remaineth in him, and he cannot sin, because he is born of **GOD**. Here, you see, that this seed cannot sin, and the reason is given, because it is born of **GOD**. Now, what is this seed ? the principles of grace, say some ; even in this sense it cannot sin, for faith cannot sin, hope cannot sin, nor can love transgress ; but it is something more than grace, for it is nothing less than **CHRIST**, the seed of the woman, which seed cannot sin ; not unto seeds as of many, but unto thy seed, which is **CHRIST**. And in this sense whosoever is born of **GOD** sinneth not, nor cannot sin, because their new birth, their new heart, called the new man, which after **GOD** is created, is nothing less than **CHRIST** in them ; I in them,

says CHRIST, and thou in me, that they all may be perfect in one. Here I could wish that those who are distressed about sinless perfection and meekness for heaven would well consider this, that flesh and spirit, that nature and grace, the old man and the new, are distinct things in the christian, and are not to be confounded together, for grace does not renew nature, nor does the new man change the old man, nor the spirit renew the flesh.—Sin is the law of the flesh, or the law of nature as corrupt; and grace is the law of love as communicated from CHRIST. Now, both these laws dwell in the christian, as Paul says, *Rom. vii. 25.* (who appears to me at that time to be a very good christian) *With the mind I myself serve the law of God, but with the flesh the law of sin.* And says the HOLY GHOST, what will you see in the Shulamite, but as it were a company of two armies. So that whatsoever meekness for death, purity, and perfection, the christian finds, it is not in his corrupt heart being made perfect or pure, but it is in CHRIST, as revealed in him as the hope of glory; and, I hope, we shall never more hear of a perfection in the flesh, because it is said, whatsoever is born of GOD overcometh the world. Now, we know that none can overcome the world but CHRIST; I have, says he, overcome the world. And, therefore, whatsoever is born of GOD in the christian, is CHRIST; this is his life, his purity, his perfection, and his all; as Paul saith, *Col. i. 28.* *Whom we preach, warning every man, and teaching every man in all wisdom, that we may present every man perfect in CHRIST JESUS.*

THEOPH. Sir, there is one part of scripture, which one of Mr. Wesley's Preachers says, stands against the perseverance of the saints like a brazen wall.

PHILA. What part of scripture, pray you, is that?

THEOPH. It is that parable you have, *Mat. xviii. 23, 25,* where the servant whose debt was forgiven him by his LORD, was afterwards (as represented) for want of compassion to his fellow servant, cast into a prison till he had paid the debt due.

PHILA. The parable, *Theophilus*, does not take me at this time altogether unprovided, it is what has engaged my thoughts frequently; by the kingdom of heaven—we are to understand the gospel church state; by one owing CHRIST ten thousand talents, the debt of love and praise,—by his having nothing to pay, it shows our inability to pay that debt of love and praise which we owe; by the LORD having compassion upon him, and forgiving him, it shows to us CHRIST's readiness to forgive, to restore us graciously, and to love us freely; by the servant of the LORD taking hold of his fellow servant by the throat, saying, "pay me what thou owest me," it shows us how apt we are to think that we do well to be angry when a brother has offended us; by his desiring patience, and he would pay him, his readiness to be reconciled to him; by his casting him into prison, it shows how hard a brother offended is to be won over to a reconciliation, and to what unhappy heights they often carry their resentments; by the LORD calling him a wicked servant, convincing him how greatly he had broke the law of love to his brother, and what great ingratitude he had shown to his name, who had so frankly forgave him all: by CHRIST being wroth, not any change in his love, as to the nature of it, but only as to the manifestation of it, which is clearly interpreted from his own lips, *Isa. lxiv. 8. In a little wrath I hid my face from thee for a moment, but with everlasting kindness will I have mercy upon thee, saith the Lord thy Redeemer.* By his delivering him over to the tormentors till he should pay all that was due; by the tormentors we are not to understand the Devil and wicked angels, because the debt of infinite justice can never be paid by a finite creature, but the condemnation of the word of GOD, his own conscience, and the proceedings of the church till he had made an acknowledgment of his fault, and paid the debt of gratitude, which was due both to CHRIST and to his brother, which is consonant with our LORD's own words, 'So likewise shall my heavenly Father, do also unto you, if ye from the heart forgive not every one his brother their trespasses;' which

shows that the whole parable is so far from militating against the final perseverance of the saints, that it only points forth their condemnation and distress in their own minds, for ingratitude to GOD, and for want of love and forgiveness to the brethren, which is more fully explained by CHRIST, see *Mat.* vi. 14, 15.

I have been the more free upon this parable, in order to remove those dismal, distressing, I add, dishonouring ideas of GOD, that Mr. Baxter and Mr. Wesley teach, that GOD may first pardon and forgive the sinner, then, for want of some condition being performed by the sinner, he may unpardon him and send him to hell. O, cruel doctrine! from whence came thou?

In a word, to speak tenderly, and at the same time faithfully, and what, I believe, Mr. Wesley will not have the least inclination to contradict, is this, that we carry Mr. Wesley's doctrine too high and beyond what he intends, when we say that he means, that we are to do something for ourselves, and CHRIST to do the rest; or in other words, that we have partly by our prayers, tears, repentance, and almsgiving, a righteousness of our own, and that CHRIST, by his righteousness, makes up the deficiency of ours;—whereas, Mr. Wesley does not mean so much as this; he has no notion of such a patch work, for justification before GOD; he is a more deep and refined Arminian, for the sum of his principle (if his writings and preaching are to be believed) is this, "That CHRIST is the sole and only author of our salvation, not by imputing his righteousness to us, but by purchasing such favourable terms of reconciliation for us, and by restoring to us such abilities to fulfil them, by means of which we only become capable of being justified in the sight of GOD;" therefore says Mr. Wesley, "We say that those in this life, who have used well the grace that is given them, and conformed to the terms of the gospel, GOD doth justify." That is, were he to call them to the bar of judgment and try them, he would acquit them and pronounce them not guilty upon this foundation; be-



cause CHRIST, by his meritorious death and sufferings, having, as Mr. Wesley says, "purchased for them the law of repentance, as the law by which they are to be judged; and they having, through grace (as they call it) fulfilled the law, that is, become true penitents, GOD therefore, for the above merits of CHRIST, admits of their qualification, forgives them their offences, and rewards them according to their works." Here then it is plain to a demonstration, that there is no splitting, adding to, or dividing of the imputation of the righteousness of CHRIST, or copartnership with CHRIST, but CHRIST's righteousness is represented as the sole procuring cause of our salvation, and ours as the applying cause, by performing the conditions requisite; so that, according to Mr. Wesley's scheme of salvation, our justification is not made up partly of CHRIST's righteousness and partly of our own; for according to this idea, CHRIST's righteousness is not partly imputed, but not at all imputed in the gospel sense of the word, which is a righteousness to him that worketh not, a **RIGHTEOUSNESS WITHOUT WORKS**, not of works: blessed, saith the **HOLY GHOST**, is the man to whom the **LORD** imputeth righteousness without works. Whereas, Mr. Wesley is so far from this gospel idea of CHRIST's righteousness, that he says, "We obey in order to our final acceptance, and with the deep ingrained Arminians, or refined Neanomianism, suppose that CHRIST did not fulfil the terms of justification in our stead, but on the contrary having purchased them for us, and procured us sufficient powers and abilities, he left us to co-operate with these powers and so to fulfil them ourselves; in a word, to complete and secure our salvation by our own power and obedience through CHRIST's name." This is, *Theophilus*, a fair and candid state of the case. I appeal to Mr. Wesley himself whether it is misrepresented. And if this is not another gospel (or rather something in the room of the gospel) I know not what is. If this is not perverting the gospel of CHRIST, I will defy either men or angels to say

what is ; and what the HOLY GHOST says of such, let Mr. Wesley read at his leisure, *Gal.* i. 8, 9.

THEOPH. Sir, my obligations of gratitude are beyond expression, for your condescension, your labour of love, your readiness to remove those traditional darkness and obscurity upon the order and ordinances of GOD'S house, and the glorious way of salvation by JESUS CHRIST, the solid satisfaction my soul has received, with the brightness and glory with which they shine, like the light of the morning without a cloud, prevails upon me to increase my debt of obligation by a few farther inquiries.

PHILA. Dear *Theophilus*, as it is my highest honour to be a servant to the servants of JESUS, and to set forth (in my little way) his unsearchable riches, therefore, I can have no greater joy than to find, that my dear *Theophilus* has a desire to know and walk in the TRUTH.

THEOPH. Sir, the loveliness of CHRIST'S person, the beauty of the gospel, the completeness of salvation by CHRIST, the sweetness of divine mercy, the riches of grace, the harmony of love among the saints, the prelibations of glory in the ordinances of GOD'S house, engages my soul to say with the Psalmist, one thing have I desired of the LORD and that I will seek after, to dwell in the house of the LORD for ever, to behold the beauty of the LORD, and to inquire in his temple.

PHILA. Dear *Theophilus*, I am glad with exceeding joy to find your mind under the sweet influences of love ! of love to CHRIST, to his word, his ordinances, and his people. When I said his people, the phrase is indefinite and undetermined, not as to reality ; but who they are, as there are so many different persuasions and denominations who declare that they love CHRIST and embrace his ordinances.

THEOPH. The different denominations in general, take their rise from the tradition of the fathers and not from the

scriptures; therefore, I would leave them, and say to them, as our LORD did unto the Pharisees, *Matt. vii. 9. And he said unto them, full well ye reject the commandments of God, that ye may keep your own tradition.* And since they are taught with all their warmth of love, light of knowledge and zeal, to be so tenacious of the tradition of their fathers, as to lay aside the commandments of GOD, to hold the traditions of men; who can forbear a pitying eye or a sympathizing heart for them; for, it is evident that they have zeal for GOD, but not according to knowledge? it is, therefore, the good old-way that has the command of GOD for its authority to persuade us, the example of CHRIST to engage us, the testimony of the Father's love to draw us, the sealing of the Holy Spirit to comfort us, the commission of CHRIST to constrain us, the practice of the apostles to induce us, and the settlement of all the primitive churches to follow, who were all of one heart and of one soul, in the order and ordinances of GOD's house, which house, says the Apostle, we are; being built together an habitation for GOD through the spirit. With these who were first called Christians at Antioch, but now called BAPTISTS, my soul desires to join in union and communion, in the faith and fellowship of the gospel.

PHILA. Here, you are to consider the situation of the people with whom you have a desire to join; that they are a despised people, generally a poor people, though some, not many, rich among them.

THEOPH. Sir, they being despised by the world in their glory, as it is written, *1 Pet. iv. 14. If ye be a reproach for the name of CHRIST, happy are ye, for the spirit of glory and of God resteth upon you.* And as to their being poor, it is their highest joy, which has the threefold witness of the HOLY GHOST, the poor have the gospel preached to them.—GOD has chosen the poor in this world rich in faith.—I will, saith the LORD, live in the midst of thee a poor, and a despised people, and they shall trust in the name of the LORD; and, it is said, not many rich are called.

PHILA. I see, *Theophilus*, your heart seems (to use the expression) to be paved with love to the people.

THEOPH. Sir, why need this surprise you, when I consider the obligations of love that I am under to CHRIST for the redemption of my soul with his own blood, and that debt of love I owe to his name, and the ties of gratitude that I am under to show forth his praise by obedience to his command, by following his example, surely I may say to him (when I consider his rich love to my soul) with the sharpest pains of ingratitude, renewed with all the solemn ties of affection, why should I be as ONE that turns aside from the flocks of thy companions, especially when he has said, go thy way by the footsteps of the flock? and have not you, my dear *Philagathus*, been pointing forth the footsteps of the flock, whither the tribes go up, the tribes of the LORD to the testimony of Israel, in all ages, through every century, through every king's reign? and can my dear *Philagathus* think it strange, that *Theophilus* should be desirous to be a follower of those, who through faith and patience have inherited the promises?

PHILA. As this is, *Theophilus*, your earnest desire to follow the Lamb whithersoever he goes, I am all ear and attention to every inquiry you shall make. But, here let me say unto you, as the LORD said unto Ezekiel, Son of man, mark well and behold with thine eyes, and hear with thine ears all that I say unto thee concerning all the ordinances of the house of the LORD and all the laws thereof; and mark well the entering in of the house, with every going forth of the sanctuary. It is likewise written, he that believeth make'h not haste.

THEOPH. Sir, your tender caution is like the rain upon the mown grass, or the dew upon the tender herb. I, Wisdom, saith the scripture, dwell with prudence; and can there be a higher degree of wisdom, in those who are wise to salvation, than to embrace the command of GOD, and follow the example of JESUS? see *Mat.* iii. 13,—17.

PHILA. Therein I acknowledged that the wisdom of the christian shines with the brighter prudence, when the commands of CHRIST are submitted to, or embraced, out of a principle of love with a fixed eye to the glory of King JESUS. But, have you considered well what Mr. John Wesley, the church of England champion; Mr. Huddleston, the Sandemanian champion; and Mr. Eltringham, the presbyterian or independent champion, for infant-baptism say, before you embrace that of believers?

THEOPH. I confess these books which you have mentioned I have not yet read, but I have read very maturely the chief books that have ever been published upon the subject since our conversation upon the faith and order of the baptist churches; and I confess, without any prejudice, that all the arguments of more champions than you have mentioned faint in their mouths or die in their birth, not having strength to come forth. You call them champions, and so they are; but they appear to me champions for babies, or rather baby champions. But, as the eyes of my understanding are clear from prejudice to see the truth, and my affections are as ready to embrace where I find, thus saith the LORD; for as it is his truth I would diligently search for, willingly embrace, and follow after it, therefore let me hear what Mr. Wesley has to say.

PHILA. He tells you in a little abstract, page 1, "That the covenant made with Abraham and his seed, *Gen. xvii.* is the covenant of grace."

THEOPH. SIR, what has this to do with believers' baptism, I wonder? however, to give it an answer, it is true, the covenant made with Abraham to be a GOD unto him and his seed, if rightly understood, will appear to be a bright figure of the covenant that GOD made with the elect in CHRIST, for it is said, a GOD unto thee and to thy seed; but now the question is, who are the seed here meant? surely, none but the inconsiderate will say, that all his natural seed, or all those who proceeded from Abraham, are here meant; for if so, then all the nations of the Ismaelites, which were many, and al

the nations that sprung from his wife Keturah, and all the nations of the Idumeans, who were called the Heathens round about, must have an interest in the covenant of grace, which I think, none will dare to affirm; because the Apostle says, the children of the flesh, these are not the children of GOD: therefore, by Abraham's seed, it is plain, who are the seed meant; for the scripture saith, in Isaac shall thy seed be called, which the apostle explains clearly and satisfactorily, *Gal. iv. 28. Now we, brethren, as Isaac was, are the children of the promise*; and says Paul, the children of the promise are counted for the seed. Here let *Philagathus* observe minutely, that Isaac was the son of the free woman by promise, in which respect Sarah, says the apostle, was a figure of Jerusalem, which is above, which is free, which is the mother of us all. And as Isaac was a son of the promise, or the seed, or child of the covenant of grace, so are we, says the apostle; for in this respect Isaac was a figure (not of CHRIST, as most represent him) but of the church and the seed of the church, which are the children of the promise, who are by GOD counted for the seed; therefore GOD is said to be the GOD of Isaac, the same that he is said to be the GOD of Jacob, or the GOD of Israel, that is, his church, for, it is written, in Isaac shall thy seed be called; and who these seed are is plain, that they are CHRIST's seed which is his church, called the seed of Jacob, the seed of Israel, the seed of Abraham, a seed that shall serve him, his seed, as Paul explains it, *Gal. iii. 29. If ye be CHRIST's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise*; so that Abraham's seed, and CHRIST's seed are one body or one family, called the children of the promise.

I have been the more free, *Philagathus*, upon this answer, because I never heard a presbyterian or an independent in my life, that was clear upon the covenant of grace, when they got their Abramatical covenant into question; here they are all to a man of them, muddy, dark, and obscure. Sometimes they seem to mean Abraham and all his natural seed; another time only his spiritual seed (a term I confess, I do not understand, for I never knew that Abraham ever begot

any spiritual children): then again we have it, it is CHRIST'S seed, but when they come to explain who CHRIST'S seed are, O! say they (either ignorantly, or to please the religious pride of their people) it is believers and their seed, when, in fact, it is no such thing; for, saith the apostle, *Gal. iii. 16, Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made; he saith not unto seeds.* I wish the independents (who aim in many things to be clear in the covenant of grace) would mind this, he saith not unto seeds; therefore, not to believers, and their seeds, or children, who are a multiplicity of seeds, not of many, says the Apostle, but of ONE. What! only ONE? No! only to one, and to thy seed which is CHRIST—Which, shows plainly, it is not to believers and their seed, but to CHRIST and his seed, that the promises were made; not in the line of a natural pedigree, but in the line of electing love, and hereby the promise becomes sure to all the seed, because it is written, in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed. And, who can this seed be but the MESSIAH, the promised seed of the woman, of whom it is said, all nations shall call him blessed? therefore, Sir, if Mr. Wesley brought this argument to prove, that all Abraham's natural seed were interested in the covenant of grace, or for a succession of infant privileges in the covenant, it is of no force, nor has it any truth in it, for it is written, the children of the flesh, these are not the children of GOD; but the children of the promise are counted for the seed: and who these are is plain, by what is said before, that they are the seed of CHRIST according to ancient promise, *Isa. liii. 10. He shall see his seed, he shall prolong his days, and the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in his hands.* Therefore, if infant baptism be attempted to be proved from infant privilege, it must stand upon the tradition of their forefathers, because it is not found in the oracles of truth.

PHILA. But, Sir, Mr. Wesley describes who Abraham's seed are; that they are such that imitate the faith of

Abraham : and that spiritual promises and blessings belong to them ?

THEOPH. Imitate faith ! it makes me think of my calling at the foundery about sixteen years ago, and there the people were in great devotion ; but whether they were worshipping Mr. John Wesley or the Supreme Being, it appeared then difficult to me to determine ; but, I well remember Mr. Wesley read several pages out of a book which he called a preparation for faith. I hope the eyes of the people were only earnestly fixed upon him to know his meaning ; I confess mine were ; but I was at last finally at a loss to know it. I wanted to know how it was that the blind prepared themselves to see, that the deaf prepared themselves to hear, that the dumb prepared themselves to speak, the lame to walk, and the enmity of the natural mind to love. And, I own, I am almost at the same loss to know, what it is to imitate faith. I confess I have not so learned CHRIST, neither do the scriptures leave us with such dark phrases, but says, *Gal. iii. 9. So then they that be of faith, are blessed with faithful Abraham.* If by Abraham's seed Mr. Wesley means such who are blessed with the faith of faithful Abraham ; that to these belong privileges, blessings, and promises, here we say that God allows to such those blessings, privileges, and promises, that those blessings whom Mr. Wesley allows have no glory, by reason of the glory which excelleth. Mr. Wesley only allows them a little grace ; if they improve that well, a little more, called by him the first blessing ; if they improve that little more to perfection, and keep that perfection perfect, then Mr. Wesley's charity allows them to go to glory. But the blessings and privileges which we say that God allows them by lot or by inheritance, is the privilege of ever ordinance of his house, as the gift of his love, with grace upon grace, promise upon promise, blessing upon blessing, grace to draw them, life to quicken them, love to attract them, righteousness to justify them, atonement to pardon them, faithful-



ness to keep them, and glory to crown them, that in all things GOD may be glorified.

PHILA. But, Mr. Wesley says, page 4, "That the children of the Jews were visible members of the Jewish church under the covenant of Abraham, and as such they were acknowledged and received into it by circumcision," and for proof, *Gen. xvii. 9.—14.*

THEOPH. Supposing what Mr. Wesley here says to be all true, what force or strength has this for infant baptism? But here, I think the baptists themselves do not do justice to the truth nor to their own cause, for they seem to allow that the children of the Jews were made members of the Jewish church by circumcision; this I absolutely deny, and affirm that circumcision was so far from making the children of the Jews church members, that it gave them no right at all to any church ordinance. It was never intended for any such thing.

PHILA. But, what did it give them a right unto? for if this be given up, I own, the main pillar and support commonly brought for infant baptism must drop.

THEOPH. Sir, However warm you are for the support of this, the scriptures are plain that the right that circumcision gave the circumcised, was only a right to the land of promise with all its blessings, *Gen. xvii. 8. And I will give unto thee, and to thy seed after thee, the land wherein thou wert a stranger, all the land of Canaan for an everlasting possession, and I will be their God.* Here it is plain, as the sun at noon day, what circumcision gave the seed of Abraham a right to, or rather what circumcision gave all the circumcised a right unto; for it was not confined to the seed of Abraham only, but extended with the same promise and privilege to strangers who were bought, *Gen. xvii. 12. He that is born in thine house, or he that is bought with money of any stranger which is not of thy seed.* So then it appears the external privilege of circumcision, it was only to distinguish them from other nations round about; and to show, that they were the peculiar people

according to GOD's promise to Abraham, and that they as such had a right to the land of Canaan with all its blessings as their possession; and therefore for any one to say that circumcision gave any one a right to the covenant of grace, or made them members of the visible church, is saying what no one can prove, though it is confidently said that they were received into the Jewish church by circumcision, and for proof *Gen. xvii. 9.—14. And God said unto Abraham thou shalt keep my covenant, therefore thou and thy seed after thee in their generation*; here is not a word upon circumcision, much less of infants being members of the Jewish church by it.—In verse 14 it is said, *And the uncircumcised man-child whos: flesh of his foreskin is not circumcised, that soul shall be cut off from his people: He hath broken my covenant.*

Now the plain and natural sense of these words, such a one has no right to the land of promise made by covenant to Abraham. For this reason it is plain he does not belong to Abraham, his seed, or a stranger bought with money, because such were commanded to be circumcised; but by his refusing to submit thereto, he deprives himself of claiming any inheritance in the land of promise, called the breaking of GOD's covenant, because the LORD gave the land of Canaan by covenant only to those who were or should be circumcised.—This appears to me, Philagathus, to be the plain meaning of the words, therefore it is foreign to bring this text, or any other, to prove that infants, either of believers or unbelievers, had any right of church membership by circumcision. I know, sir, how fond the Presbyterians, Independents, and the church of Scotland, and some of the church of England, have been in asserting it, and how weak some of the Baptists have been in almost owning it. But, I absolutely deny that it can be proved from one single text of scripture, though infant sprinkling (called by the unthinking christian infant baptism) has been long built upon this unscriptural foundation, namely, that as infants were church members under the law and received by circumcision, they have a right under the gospel

to be received by baptism, when, in fact, they never had a right under the law by circumcision, to any ordinance of the temple, or church membership, neither have they any right under the gospel.

PULLA. Amazing ! sir, if you can now prove what you say, I must give up the main pillar and corner stone of infant baptism.

THEOPH. Sir, I have said that circumcision according to the word of GOD, gave no infant at all any right to church membership, or any right to any ordinance in the temple service under the law ; for first it gave them no right to the passover, if we consider how and in what manner the passover was to be eat, *Gen. xii. 11. Thus shall ye eat it, with your loins girded, your shoes on your feet, your staff in your hand, and ye shall eat it in haste.*—Now, let me ask what loins the infant of eight days has to be girded ? What shoes does it at that age wear on its feet ?—What staff does it carry in its hand ? And what understanding has it then of doing any thing in haste ?—Let the thinking mind consider of this. Besides, it is plain that it was not infants, but such children as could inquire into the meaning and design of the pas-over that were to partake of it, *Exod. xiii. 14. And it shall be when thy son asketh thee in time to come, saying what is this, that thou shalt say unto him, by strength of hand the Lord brought us out of Egypt from the House of Bondage, &c.* therefore, it is amazing to me, how teachers in Israel can remain so ignorant as to affirm, that circumcision gave infants a right to the passover, when it is so far from it, that we find that thousands of them partook of the passover for many years before they were circumcised at all ; for the passover was kept or celebrated constantly every fourteenth day of the first month in the evening, *Lev. xxiii. 5.* For, let it be observed, that through all the years and journeys of the children of Israel it is evident that none of the children of the children of Israel were circumcised in the wilderness ; whereas all those who were circumcised in Egypt, died in the wilder-

ness, save Caleb and Joshua ; yet these uncircumcised Israelites eat the passover, which shows to a demonstration, that circumcision gave them no right to the passover or any temple ordinance, neither did their being uncircumcised deprive them of them, *Jos. v. 5, Now all the people that came out were circumcised, but all the people that were born in the wilderness, by the way, as they came forth out of Egypt, them they had not circumcised* ; and yet they partook of the passover, and of all services of the sanctuary, and were members of the visible church without it, the same as women were.

PHILA. Sir, your reasoning is plain, scriptural, and clear. I confess I never thought of this before, but believed it was as my forefathers told me, that infants were made church members by circumcision under the law, which appears to me to receive its rise and confirmation from that text you have, *Exod. xii. 44. But every man-servant that is bought with money, when thou hast circumcised him, then shall he eat thereof.*

THEOPH. But, sir, what will this text do with the case of infants ; it is said every man servant that is bought with money (not infants) when circumcised shall eat thereof, even those who have knowledge and understanding, these shall enjoy the passover ? In like manner the gospel runs, *he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved.*

PHILA. But, is not circumcision called the *seal of the righteousness of faith. Rom. iv. 11.*

THEOPH. Yes, sir ; but to whom was it a seal of the righteousness of faith, was it not to Abraham, who was strong in faith, and likewise of that righteousness of faith which he had, says the Apostle, being yet uncircumcised ? and therefore Abraham's being circumcised, or obeying the command of GOD, was a seal to his own breast, or evidence to the world, of that faith in CHRIST'S righteousness which he had before ; so in this sense obedience to the command of GOD in all the ordinances of the gospel, is a seal or evidence to the world of their true faith in the righteousness of JESUS ;

but can an infant give this seal or evidence who has no faith nor knowledge of righteousness, I ask how the women had their right to church membership ?

PHILA. Sir, what did give the people a right to the blessings of the covenant under the law ?

THEOPH. Sir, the same that gives us a right to the blessings of grace under the gospel, which is nothing done by us nor wrought in us, but is the same that gives us a right to the rain from heaven, which is GOD's promise and his communication of the blessing promised ; for his promise is that he will give us the former and the latter rain. This promise gives us a right of expectation, and the communication of the rain gives us a right of enjoyment ; so the Lord promising to Abraham to be a God unto him and to his seed, gave his seed a right of expectation, but it was GOD, communicating those blessings which he promised to Abraham that gave a right of possession, and in the same free unconditional way do we enjoy all the blessings of the covenant of grace ; for first, GOD gives us a right of expectation to eternal life by promise, and a right of enjoyment, or full possession, by communicating himself to us : the gift of GOD is eternal life.

PHILA. Sir, what think you then could be the great end and design of circumcision under the law ?

THEOPH. Sir, the spiritual design of circumcision under the law, however little understood by most, was far more great and glorious than to make infants church members ; or, as some say, to initiate them into the covenant of grace ; for it was not appointed for either of these ends but an end more glorious, which was to be a lively figure or representation of regeneration or the new birth, called in scripture the circumcision of the heart, as it is written *Deut. xxx. 6. And the Lord thy God will circumcise thine heart, and the heart of thy seed, to love the Lord thy God with all thine heart and with all thy soul, that thou mayst live.* Rom. ii. 29. *Circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter, whose praise is not of men, but of God.* From hence it is evident,

that the great end of circumcision was to point forth, by way of adumbration, that change of heart, soul, and spirit which the power of divine grace creates in the mind towards GOD in regeneration. But, there is still a further, a more glorious design (which appears to be almost totally forgot by every author) in circumcision, which is, that as circumcision was a cutting of the foreskin of the flesh, *Exod. iv. 25.* called likewise the foreskin of the heart, denoting those who are in a state of rebellion against GOD, said to be in *Acts vii. 51.* uncircumcised in heart; and saith the Apostle, *Col. ii. 13.* *And you being dead in your sins in the uncircumcision of your flesh.* But as circumcision was literally a cutting of the foreskin of the flesh, and spiritually the LORD circumcising the heart to love him;

Now, these figures shine in their full glory in the person of CHRIST, *Col. ii. 11.* *In whom also ye are circumcised, with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh, by the circumcision of CHRIST.* Here you see, that all sins are removed, put off, or cast away by the circumcision of CHRIST; therefore, circumcision under the law, has its full accomplishment in the circumcision of JESUS, and there it ceaseth for ever. Then, surely, if circumcision points to the putting off the sins of the flesh, by the circumcision of CHRIST, it must be far more glorious than to make infants visible church members in their sins. And as circumcision under the law, gave the circumcised a right to the land of Canaan, with all the blessings and privileges thereof, which has its full accomplishment in the person of CHRIST, in whom all the blessings and the promises of the heavenly Canaan are treasured up, in whom we have the possession and inheritance of them as our rest, or the keeping of a sabbath; for we which have believed do enter into rest. Thus, you see, the great design of circumcision under the law, which if compared with the glory of making infants church members; this infant glory, supposing there were some truth contained

therein, it loses all its glory by reason of the glory that excelleth.

PHILA. Sir, I acknowledge that I never saw the beauty of circumcision in such a light before.—It certainly holds forth a blessing to the church, beyond what is commonly observed. Yet, is it not, *Theophilus*, frequently affirmed that infant baptism came in the room of circumcision?

THEOPH. What is affirmed by men, that is not plainly proved from the scriptures, has no authority with me; and that that has no command, nor any example in the word of GOD, how is it possible for any but the ignorant, or the inconsiderate to believe it to be a divine ordinance? Sir, was it not the plain command of GOD, that gave the infants a right to circumcision? If so, then how dare any one attempt to prove infants' right to baptism without a divine command? Query, would it not, think you, *Philagathus*, have been a bold presumption in Abraham, without a divine command from GOD, to have circumcised himself, his children, and his seed, and said to them that it was the seal of the covenant which GOD had made with him?—And is it in any wise a less presumption in those who administer baptism, as they call it, to infants, as a divine ordinance without a divine command? Besides, to say that baptism came in room of circumcision is exceeding weak and absurd. Can one shadow come in the room of another? But to allow this, it would prove much more than the Pedobaptist would wish to have proved, namely, that all children born of believing or unbelieving parents, have a right to baptism, as all male children, whether slaves redeemed, strangers bought with money, or those born in the house, had a right to circumcision. Besides, if baptism came in the room of circumcision, then John ought not to have baptized any that were circumcised, for this makes baptism not come in the room of circumcision, but an addition to it. Moreover, if baptism came in the room of circumcision, then it ought only to be administrated to the same subjects, namely, to infants; if so, why is it call-

ed the Baptism of repentance? *Matt. iii. 6. And they were baptized of him in Jordan confessing their sins.*—Further, if baptism came in the room of circumcision, what occasion could there be for CHRIST to be circumcised, when circumcision, according to this argument, must have ceased in John's commission? Besides, it is impossible that baptism could come in the room of circumcision:—First, because baptism is administrated to different subjects, such as could not be under the ordinance of circumcision, and therefore how could it come in the room of it? *Acts viii. 12. But when they believed Philip preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized both men and women.*—Secondly, If baptism came in the room of circumcision, why did Paul circumcise Timothy so many years after he was baptized?—Thirdly, It is remarkable, *Acts xv. 1, 2, And certain men which came down from Judea, taught the brethren, and said, Except ye be circumcised after the manner of Moses, ye cannot be saved. When therefore Paul and Barnabas had no small dissention and disputation with them.* Now, if baptism had come in the room of circumcision, the dis-sention would have been over, and the disputation at an end; for would not the Apostles have said, Brethren, there is no occasion for circumcision, for baptism is now come in its room; and they having been baptized, why then should they be circumcised? But so far was the Apostle Paul and Barnabas from thinking that baptism came in the room of circumcision, that they appointed, with certain others, to go up to Jerusalem about the question, *ver. 6, And the Apostles and Elders came together, to consider of this matter.* Now, what need of such a consultation upon this matter, if one came in the room of the other? and why the Apostles so silent of it if this was the case? Besides the Judaizing Christians never thought so, for they taught the contrary, namely, that the Gentiles, who believed and were baptized, should be circumcised, *Acts xvi. 5.* In a word, the main argument of the Pedobaptist quite fails them; for, they



say, that circumcision was appointed to believers and their seed, when, in fact, it is no such thing; for was there not Lot, Heber, Salah, Shem, and Melchisedeck, with their families, and the command did not extend to them, therefore not to all believers and their seed, but only to Abraham, his family, and servants, and strangers bought with money, whether believers in the GOD of Abraham, or not.—Besides' it was confined to the children of believers of Abraham's seed, for did not Joshua circumcise the children of those who entered not in, says the Apostle because of unbelief; so that every argument faints for want of strength, that is urged in favour of infant baptism from circumcision, though I remember, a certain gentleman said, that he could prove it from *Gal. iii. 14. That the blessing of Abraham might come upon the Gentiles through Jesus Christ, that we might receive the promise of the spirit through faith.*

PHILA. Sir, this is the very promise that is brought by Mr. Wesley for the confirmation of baptizing of infants coming in the room of circumcision.

THEOPH. Amazing! surely, their cause must be very foreign from the scriptures, whose arguments are so foreign from truth!—That the blessing of Abraham might come upon the Gentiles, what blessing could this be, the blessing of baptism? No, it could not be that, because Abraham was never baptized.—Was it the blessing of circumcision? If so, the Gentiles became by the gospel blessed with a very painful bloody blessing to the flesh, and with a yoke upon their necks which they are not able to bear.—Then, surely, the blessing here spoken of must be the same blessing of faith that Abraham had in the MESSIAH, who saw his day and was glad.—Which blessing was not in circumcision but in uncircumcision, and therefore the blessing of Abraham that came upon the Gentiles, was not the blessing of baptism, but the blessing of faith in CHRIST, and this not to infants but to believers, as it follows that we might receive the promise of the spirit through faith.

PHILA. But, Mr. Wesley says, The children of Christians were never cut from this privilege?

THEOPH. Sir, it would be strange for those branches to be cut off from a tree that were never on it.

He likewise observes "That baptism is now (like circumcision of old) the sign of GOD's covenant;" but this is false, for baptism is no sign nor seal of the covenant of grace at all.

He likewise says, "That baptism is come in the room of circumcision, seems plain from *Col. ii. 12*".—See, *Philagathus*, whether it seems plain from this text or not, *Col. ii. 12*. *Buried with him in baptism; wherein also you are risen in him through the faith of the operation of God.* This text might as well have been brought to have proved, that in six days the LORD made the heavens and the earth.

PHILA. I think so too; but it is observed, that baptism and circumcision signify the same thing, that is, the taking away of sin; the one by cutting off, the other by washing away.

THEOPH. This I deny; but for humour sake, if baptism signifies to remove sin by washing away, how little sin must a few drops wash away in baptism? A little sin, a little water a little infant, alas!

It is likewise observed with great wrath, that the gospel which is a dispensation of great grace, does not lessen but increase the privileges of the church.—This I allow, as the ministration of the gospel excels in glory; but, sure none but the weak and inconsiderate will say that it is a privilege to the church, to have infants members. To whom can it be a privilege, not to the bishop or pastor, for he would not know what to do with them? Or to the elders or deacons, for they would not know what to do with them? And what privilege it could be to them, I confess, I am at as great a loss as the poor infants to know, unless there were some good motherly woman in the church to give them some milk, then it might be a privilege to them? But what pri-

vilege would it be to the church, suppose there were no other but these infant members in it, so much pleaded for, I ask ?

PHILA. But it is confidently affirmed, that children should be admitted into the visible church by the christian door, that is baptism, as well as circumcision gave them a right to the passover.

THEOPH. Sir, things are sooner affirmed than proved, and old errors, by long tradition, become matter of great confidence ; but I deny that baptism, even true baptism, such as the Apostles practised, gave any one a right of entrance into the church, and that circumcision gave no one a right to the passover, neither did the LORD'S Supper come in the room of the passover but CHRIST himself, so these affirmations fail for want of proof, though it is confidently said, that infants are to be admitted in particular to baptism, the present seal of the covenant. To this I shall only say, as confidently (and amazed, that it must be told to them so often) that infants ought not to be admitted to baptism, as the seal of the covenant to them ; for this is only to deceive the poor infants, because baptism is no seal at all of the covenant : It is only a religious lie in the mouths of the priests, to please the parents, who, in this respect, are by long tradition become almost as weak and as easy imposed upon as their little infants.

PHILA. But it is said, page 6, that GOD thought fit to change the old sign of circumcision for baptism ; and that he has in the gospel warned us of the change, in *Acts xv. 24.—xxii. 21,—25.*

THEOPH. This is a bold and daring affirmation : we must see, if his proofs prove it, if not, we shall soon see that bold words are often but weak arguments. *Acts xv. 24. Forasmuch as we have heard that certain which went from us have troubled you with words, subverting your souls, saying, ye must be circumcised and keep the law, to whom we gave no such commandment.* These words, indeed, prove that circumcision is abo-

lished, but do they prove that baptism came in the room of it, when there is not the least hint nor word about it. *Acts xxii. 21*, is still far more remote, *And he said unto me, Depart, for I will send thee far hence to the Gentiles.* So Paul being sent to the Gentiles, is now become a proof that the baptism of infants came in the room of circumcising of children. O wonderful proof!—I wonder that all the baptists in the kingdom are not convinced by it,—who can stand against it? For was there ever such a potent proof brought before.—I think I must not proceed any further into the author's arguments, lest I am not only convinced but stunned by them.

But it is likewise said, that GOD chose to make an alteration with regard to the persons to whom the seal of the covenant should be applied, and to ordain that females as well as males should be baptized, *Acts viii. 12. And they were baptized both men and women*—and this is brought as a proof for female infants to be baptized——O astonishing! what, because women were baptized, that female infants have a right to it. I wonder that these infant pleaders, or pleaders for infants, are not ashamed of their weak infantine arguments;—besides, if circumcision was the only seal of the covenant of grace under the law, to the circumcised, what became of all the poor females? let charity inquire; and moreover, if baptism be their dear seal of the covenant, that they are so fond of, I would inquire how all their dear infants break this seal;—not one keep it. Sure it is a strange seal, a strange covenant—or they have strange froward little infants.

PHILA. But Mr. Wesley says, “It is then incumbent upon those who oppose infant baptism, if they would make their point good, positively to prove this from texts, namely that CHRIST has cast infants out of the covenant; but no such texts can be produced, therefore it appears they continue in the covenant, and have a right to the seal of it, which is baptism.”

THEOPH. As to baptism it is no seal at all (unless a seal of

the believer's faith in CHRIST) much less a seal of the covenant of grace. As to the infants of the best parents in the world, they have no right to it from scripture; and if they had a right, it is no seal of the covenant to them: But, as they have none, it is only an ignorant religious imposition upon them.—And as to the baptist denying baptism to infants, does this imply, as they would fain make mankind believe, that CHRIST has cast them out of the covenant. O astonishing ignorance! for if the denying or withholding of baptism from infants be the casting of them out of the covenant, then it follows, baptizing them must be putting them in: And as this is the understanding of Mr. Wesley, let me beg of him before he dies to go over once more to America, and baptize all the Indian infants he can meet with; for he may surely save more souls in one month, by this means, than I am sure he has saved these thirty years in praying, fasting, and preaching.—Will he never understand; how long must it be told him, that the seed that is in the covenant is CHRIST's seed, called his seed, a seed that shall serve him that shall be counted to the LORD for a generation, born not of believers in particular, but born some of godly, and some of ungodly parents. This makes no odds to the election of grace at all, nor to the seed of the church: These can never be cast off, or be put out of the covenant, for they are bound up in the bundle of life with the LORD their GOD, and when this seed or children are brought forth in Zion, or born from above, born of the Spirit; then the baptists do not deny baptism to these, but receive them as the seed of Abraham, and baptize them in the name of the FATHER, of the SON, and of the HOLY GHOST; and what can mankind desire more.

“It is urged with a kind of vehemency, that the texts which speak of faith as the term of baptism, do not at all imply that infants are not to be baptized.”—Strange, then the texts which speak of faith in CHRIST, as necessary to salvation, do not at all imply that it is necessary to salvation.

What shameful arguing is this! For it is plain, as the sun at noon day, that faith in CHRIST is as necessary to baptism as it is to salvation; believe in the LORD JESUS CHRIST, and thou shalt be saved; and does not the same divine record say, —He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved.—If thou believest with all thine heart, said Philip to the eunuch, thou mayest, i. e. be baptized.

PHILA. I am convinced, that your observation here is very just; but Mr. Wesley tells us, page 7, that heathens were admitted to circumcision upon the account of their faith in the GOD of Israel; and upon this he makes a long harangue by changing the word teach to proselyte, baptizing into the word circumcising, and supposing that the commission had been to circumcise instead of baptizing, whether any one would question the right of infants to it.

THEOPH. Sir, I have read the harangue, and the remarks made, and must own I have not met with a greater piece of art and sophistry, though the reasoning at the first view seems fair; yet call upon examination, it will appear to be very false and falacious; and first, he says, that the heathens were admitted to circumcision upon their faith, in the GOD of Israel. This I deny, and call upon him to prove it, even in Abraham's family, who was the father of the faithful—or in all the men of his house, born in the house; or those who were bought with money, who were circumcised with him. It was GOD's command, not their faith, that gave them a right; and let him but give us GOD's command for baptizing of infants, and we will no longer dispute their right.

But granting him, for argument sake, as it seems to be his master-piece and his boast, that the commission under the gospel had been to, Go teach all nations, circumcising them in the name of the FATHER, of the SON, and of the HOLY GHOST. I firmly believe, that the Apostles would not have extended their commission beyond their commission, in circumcising those they could not teach, nor proselyte by any persuasion: Would not this have been breaking their com-

mission, and imposing upon poor infants; for, according to this subtle supposition, they had no authority to circumcise any but those whom they had first taught; and therefore this long fine spun argument drops to the ground—or rather proves, that, as Abraham had no right to circumcise any, but by a divine command, so the Apostles had no right, nor has any other any right to baptize any but by a divine command.

PULLA. Sir, I am pleased with your observation, I think it is clear and just, though Mr. Wesley is pleased to say, he thinks that this way of arguing takes away the force of all the objection that men think they find in the scriptures against the baptism of infants, when, to me, there does not appear the force of an argument in it: but what is amazing to me is, Mr. Wesley says, “that as infants may be saved without faith, so they may be baptized without their own faith;” and then, with a kind of triumph usual to himself, he says, “thus all the objections against infant baptism are at once cut off.”

THEOPH. Amazing, Sir; sure this argument must be like Goliath’s sword in the hands of David, that cuts of all objections at once: Surely this man must be more mighty than any of David’s worthies, but let not him that putteth on the harness boast like him that putteth it off.

To this I would observe, that an infant of a day old can no more be saved without actual faith in CHRIST, than a person of eighty years old can; for actual faith is nothing more than a desire of being saved by the MESSIAH; and undoubtedly infants are as capable of this, by the sweet influences of grace upon their tender minds, as they are of desiring the breast. Was not this the case of Jeremiah who was sanctified from the womb, and of John the Baptist, who leaped in his mother’s womb for joy at the name of JESUS; and which way can infants be saved but by this inward desire, formed in them by grace, to JESUS as a Saviour? For to allow that infants may be saved without actual faith, because of their

inability ; then we may, for the same reason, allow a sinner of forty years old to be saved without actual faith in CHRIST, for the inability of the latter is greater than the former. In the infant there is, it is true, original sin, or the corruption of nature, to oppose the influence of grace ; but in the other, there is the enmity of an hardened mind in the way of sin for grace to conquer. But, to please this warrior of Israel, we will grant him the victory, and give him the field ; for, as he says, as infants may be saved without actual faith, so they may be baptized without their own faith. I grant it, they may be baptized without their own faith : They may be baptized upon the faith of Abraham, of Isaac, of Jacob, of Moses, and the Prophets, of David or Solomon, of Paul or Peter, or any of the Apostles, or if Mr. Wesley pleases, upon his own faith, if he has any, I have no objection. Thus this mighty warrior has gained the field at last, and has as he says, you see, cut off, at one stroke, all the objections against infant baptism. I think the infants, if they are able, ought to erect a monument to the honour of their mighty champion in Westminster Abbey : But had he said, they might be baptized without faith, I still would have disputed the point, but his saying they may be baptized without their own faith, it implies they may be baptized upon the faith of another : And, indeed, I think, they may, upon any one's faith whom he may choose, yet, by the way, can they believe or be saved by another's faith ? But, upon a second thought, let him not take any of the faith of the fore-mentioned Saints ; as I remember they never had any to spare ; but there is a certain church, too well known, that has many Saints with much faith to spare ; and they cannot well deny little infants some, one would think, especially as the little infants have as great right to their faith as they have to baptism, for as infant baptism first came from that church, the least, I think, the Saints of that church can do to establish it, is to leave a legacy of faith to every infant ; then Mr. Wesley and the rest of the infant pleaders would have some argument for infant baptism,



because every infant, by virtue of such a kind legacy, would have a faith of their own.

As to Mr. Wesley's referring to the fathers for the proof of infant baptism, it is vastly impertinent to the point: For supposing Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Clemens, Origen, or others, had positively embraced it and practised it, what is this to us? We are not disputing what the fathers say or what they did, but what the oracles of truth say, and what Paul and the rest of the Apostles practised. For if the man of sin appeared to work in Paul's time, no wonder but it might in the fathers' time, mistakenly so called, for in many things they appear, as to understanding of the gospel, to be rather infants than fathers; however, what Mr. Wesley has quoted from the fore-mentioned authors or fathers, is much of it spurious, a deal of it ridiculous, and some of it direct falsehood. One instance is enough, he says, page 13, that Origen says, "That the church received an order from the Apostles, to give baptism even unto infants." What church received it? The church at Corinth? The church at Galatia? The church at Ephesus? Or any of the seven churches in Asia? I am afraid that here is a lie fathered upon Father Origen. Mr. Wesley places him about 60 years after the Apostles, whereas Origen did not flourish till about the year 230. Besides, the passage referred to, is not to be found in the original of Origen's works, but appears to be an interpolation of that perfidious translator Ruffinus. That the learned Huetius, who has given us a good edition of Origen's commentary of the scriptures in Greek, who was conversant with his writings, often complains of the perfidy and impudence of Ruffinus. He says of him, "That whatsoever he undertook to translate he interpolated, that he so distressed and corrupted the writings of Origen by additions, that one is at a loss to find Origen in Origen." Moreover, it is plain, that Origen, in his own original thoughts, was for believers' baptism. "It is to be observed," says Origen, "that the four evangelists saying that John confessed he came to baptize in water only,

Matthew adds unto repentance, teaching that he has the profit of baptism who is baptized of his own will and choice.”—Now, let any one judge whether Father Origen was for the baptism of infants or believers; for if the profit of baptism (to keep to Origen’s phrase) be tied to a person baptized of his own will and choice, then baptism must be unprofitable and insignificant to infants, because they are not baptized of their own will and choice; or as Mr. Wesley innocently observes, “But, by their crying and noise while the sacrament is administrating, they disturb the holy mysteries;” nay, but I add, rather the mysterious men disturb the poor children. The word holy mysteries and sacrament I do not like. They have a bad smell with them.—However, to do our forefathers honour, I will defy Mr. Wesley, or any other writer, to give one plain proof from the original writings of the fathers of the two first centuries, or near the end of the third century, that any one infant was baptized in any of the churches under their care.—See this clearly defended by Dr. Gill, in his *Infant Baptism an Innovation*, to which I refer Mr. Wesley, or any other reader, for satisfaction.—As to Mr. W—— referring to Mr. Baxter’s letter to Mr. Tombs, as a proof of infant baptism, it is astonishing; for those who have read what Mr. Baxter says in vindication of believers’ baptism must own, that he has some of the most nervous arguments to prove it of almost any other writer, though he had not faith nor courage to follow it.—As to his letter to Mr. Tombs it is exceeding weak, and the premises he goes upon are not true, and therefore not worth paper pains.—As to his inconsistencies and self contradictions upon baptism, are they not like his other inconsistencies in almost all he wrote, which could not be accounted for by himself?—What is further said respecting the mode of baptism, has been already cleared, proved, and enlarged upon; only, I would just observe, that as Mr. Wesley has thought proper to subjoin what Dr. Watts says concerning the signification of the word, namely, “That the Greek word baptize,” he says, “signifies to wash

any thing properly by water coming over it." If so, then the dispute is finally decided, the baptists are in the right, and the Pedobaptists are in the wrong.—This is all the baptists contend for respecting the mode, in which respect the baptizer and the baptized go, like Philip and the Eunuch, both down into the water; and the baptized is covered, or immersed, in water, in the name of the FATHER, and of the SON, and of the HOLY GHOST; this done, they, like JESUS, their glorious King and pattern, come straightway up out of the water, and rejoice that they are counted worthy to follow the Lamb whithersoever he goes, who hath said, Thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness.

Now, *Philagathus*, I hope you will allow that one of your champions is slain.

PHILA. In this respect, *Theophilus*, I cannot express my concern more feelingly and pathetically than in David's words, How are the mighty slain; and the weapons of war perished!

But, there is Mr. Elthringham who makes his boast above measure that he has silenced all the baptists; nay, he has entitled his book a full confutation of all the baptist books that ever have been written against infant baptism, though I must own, that he was one of the most unfair writers, unjust reasoner, and most quarrelsome disputant I ever met with. That he neither writes like a gentleman, a minister, a Christian, nor a scholar; his spirit, as an author, is so unbecoming the gospel, that it renders his works contemptible. Yet, I think, there are some things worthy of consideration when he says, "The whole and every part of the righteousness which JESUS CHRIST fulfilled, was nothing more nor less than the righteousness of Moses and the prophets," and therefore adds, "That the man JESUS was in all things perfectly obedient to this law, and consequently the law or ordinance of John's baptism was contained in the law of Moses which JESUS fulfilled; if so," then he says, "it is no new revelation of GOD'S will, and that therefore those who were the

subjects under the law are the same under the gospel, because it is written thou shalt not add." Here, he says, "The baptists' mouths are all stopt and are become speechless."

**THEOPH.** Speechless! Sir; speechless! for what? because they have said that John's baptism was not commanded in the law of Moses; and that it was a new revelation of the will of God, and that CHRIST yielded obedience to it to fulfil the righteousness of God's will, or counsel, as the head and pattern of his church?—that therefore he would infer from this, that the baptists make CHRIST the minister of sin by adding to the law, by doing that which is not commanded in the law of Moses—how unjust is this!—is it written in the law of Moses how many miracles he was to perform? perhaps by doing any he has (according to Mr. Elthringham's unjust way of reasoning) added and committed sin. How weak and impertinent a way of arguing is this! however, I affirm that John's baptism is no where literally commanded in the law of Moses, whatever it may be typically, but was a new revelation of God's will or a new dispensation to be administered to new subjects, which will appear by a train of arguments, many of which were received from no great stranger to Mr. Elthringham and his spirit.

Mr. Elthringham observes, "that righteousness when man is the subject, is neither more nor less than obedience to the law, &c." I grant, 'tis true; but then this law is either moral and so binding on all mankind, or ceremonial, and as such obligatory only on the seed of Abraham. By the former of these it is impossible for any of the sons of man to be righteous, by the latter the seed of Abraham are only ceremonially so; the first law speaks nothing of cleansing or acquitting any man either from the pollution or the punishment threatened; the second cleansed only to the purifying of the flesh. But, as it is not possible for the seed of Abraham to pay a punctual regard unto the ceremonial law unless the precepts of it are plainly expressed, neither is it possible for them to observe the law in a right manner, if the end and design of its

precepts are not made known. Therefore, if baptism is contained in the law of Moses as a rite which the Israelites were bound to observe, it must be so expressed that they might understand both the nature and end of it in a ceremonial sense, which is the case in all the ceremonial institutions; but if it is not so contained, our author loses the force of all his reasoning; for if he says it is contained in some prophecy either of Moses or the prophets, this is entirely against him, because whatever is declared in a prophetic manner, as a thing which shall take place afterwards, and must evidently belong to another dispensation than the ceremonial law. But, if he says it is contained in the law under some type, though his reasoning in this view, is just, yet it will fail to prove the point he aims at, by proving too much, or more than he designed. For though it is true that the whole and every part of the righteousness which CHRIST JESUS by his obedience fulfilled, was nothing more nor nothing less than the righteousness of the law of Moses and the prophets, yet, if his obedience is contained in either of the two last-mentioned, viz. in either type or prophecy, it is easy to see where the point turns; for if the MAN CHRIST JESUS in his baptism yielded obedience to the ceremonial law, it must be for some of the ends therein specified, for which the washings under the law were appointed; but as there is not the least shadow of resemblance between these ceremonial washings and the baptism of CHRIST, who is holy, harmless, and undefiled (except in the washing of Aaron and his sons, *Lev. viii. 6,—13*, at their investiture into the priest's office) it is evident that CHRIST was not baptized to fulfil righteousness in obedience to that law in a literal sense; for though I grant that the washing of Aaron and his sons was a type of CHRIST'S being baptized at his public investiture into his priestly office, yet as the subjects are not the same as literally expressed in the law, there is a manifest difference between John's baptism and the ceremonial washings under the law; for if John baptized only with a view to fulfil the ceremonial law in a literal sense,

he must have baptized none but such as were ceremonially unclean, or such as were separated to holy use. The first of these were persons, or things, that were defiled in a ceremonial sense; the second were priests and levites with the vessels appointed to a holy use. The first of these could not be the subjects of John's baptism, because they had express commands in the law to offer sacrifice, &c. Nor could the second be the subjects, &c. as literally expressed in the law, for then would he have baptized none but priests, levites, &c. But, it is evident that our Lord sprang of the tribe of Judah, of which tribe Moses spoke nothing concerning priesthood. But, to allow our author all the force his arguments will admit of, viz. that CHRIST in his baptism fulfilled righteousness by yielding obedience to the law of Moses, in his being the antitype of Aaron the high priest and his successors in that office, does it therefore follow, as a natural consequence, that children have a right unto it? No; for it is allowed that *Lev. viii. 6,—13*, is the only place, or that subject there mentioned, is the only one which appears to typify that action of CHRIST; then it follows, that not infants but adults are the only subjects of baptism; for Aaron and his sons, if typically viewed, point at CHRIST and real believers, see *Heb. ix. 11.—24. 1 Pet. ii. 5.—9*. Nor will the levites and their children answer his purpose any better, *Num. iii. 15.* and *viii. 6.* &c. Compare this with *James i. 18*, *Rev. xiv. 4.* and you will see the intent of this passage: but, for the sake of argument, observe, that if the levites and their seed are to be viewed literally, we have nothing to do with them being under another dispensation. If typically, as they are the peculiar brethren of the high priest, they more properly point out ministers of the gospel, as they are related by office or at least believers in CHRIST; nor do the 32,000 Medianitish damsels answer his purpose any better, for their uncleanness was only of such a nature as made it unlawful for the men to cohabit with them; for even the gold, silver, brass, iron, tin, and lead, were purified by fire ere they durst bring them into the

camp. This is a fine argument for baptizing bells, &c. rather than children, and if it proves any thing it will be, that we ought to oblige every slave taken with the sword to be baptized whether they will or not.

I shall give you, *Philagathus*, a short specimen of arguments used to prove, that the ordinance of John's baptism is not literally contained in the law of Moses, but is purely a New Testament appointment:—first, because all the washings and every other rite of that law were literally expressed; as also the occasion, time, and manner in which they were to be observed; but it is not expressed that John, or any other were to baptize people upon confessing their sins under the law, &c.—Therefore, secondly, John's mission being immediately from GOD and not from the law, *John* i. 6,—33. *Mal.* iii. 1. proves that his baptism was not literally expressed in the law, for had he received it from the law, all the priests from Aaron must have had the same.—Thirdly, the end for which he was sent, viz. to manifest CHRIST, but he could no more manifest CHRIST than all his predecessors had done, if his baptism was literally expressed in the law.—Fourthly, his title, The Baptist, which must have been unjustly given him if his baptism had been contained in the law, &c. for all the priests from Aaron, if this was the case, were baptists without any distinction.—Fifthly, The Pharisees' question, why baptizest thou then? &c. Would not have been proposed if his baptism was literally expressed in the law: for, surely, they knew that John was of the seed of Aaron, and could easily show his authority from the law if his baptism had been there expressed, *Luke* i. 5. *1 Chron.* xxiv. 10,—19. *Neh.* xii. 4,—17.—Sixthly, The persons he baptized, &c. were the people of Judea and Jerusalem; but, where is it literally expressed in the law of Moses, that people were to go to be baptized upon confession of sin? can Mr. Eltringham tell? no, he says, “We never read of one man dipping another,” but do we ever read in the law of Moses, of any being washed or sprinkled upon any other consideration, than ceremonial un-

cleanness, or separating of them to holy use; but were all they whom John baptized thus unclean? or were they priests and levites? or were they such as were out of communion with the Jewish church, and must be initiated by baptism? no: surely, they were such of the Jews as had heard of John's birth, life, and doctrine; which they believing, repented and gave evidence thereof confessing their sins.—Seventhly, Our LORD's testimony of John, *Luke* vii. 26,—28. a *Prophet*, A prophet's work is either to reveal the mind of GOD or expound it. In both these senses the people that believed him were bound to receive his doctrine, the discrediting of which was the sin of the Pharisees and lawyers who rejected the council of GOD against themselves, Verse 30. *Acts* xix. 4. xx. 21,—27. for John declared, *He that sent me to baptize, said unto me, upon whom, &c. And I saw and bare record that this is the Son of God.* Therefore, I conclude, his baptism was not literally expressed in the Law, for Moses could only say, *Deut.* xviii. 15,—18. *A Prophet shall the Lord raise up, &c.* but John says, This is he (of whom I said) preaching the gospel and the sum of the Apostles' Ministry, to prove that JESUS is the CHRIST.—Eighthly, Our LORD's question, the baptism of John whence was it? &c. shows that it was not literally contained in the law, which if it had, the Pharisees would have found another answer than we cannot tell, nor would they have treated it with such contempt had it been a rite of the law.

Thus *Philagathus*, I think, every argument M. Eltringham has urged is answered, by making a distinction between what is literally expressed and what is typically set forth in the law; for it is certainly true, that every particular action of CHRIST was prefigured under the law and prophets: but, it is as true, that all these had another end for which they were enjoined literally considered; instance the passover has the reasons assigned for the observation of it, *Exod.* xii. which typified the same thing to come that the LORD's supper shows as already come to pass, yet are the institutions



quite different literally considered; the one a commemoration of a temporal, the other of a spiritual deliverance.

Thus we may answer his first and third proposition by observing that John the administrator, and CHRIST and the Jews as subjects, did each fulfil righteously their obedience to that which was typified in the law; and his second and fourth may be answered in one, viz. the Pharisees find in not believing John's testimony concerning CHRIST, of whom all the law and the prophets did prophecy, until John who preached the kingdom of GOD or the gospel unto them, which they rejecting, did not repent or bring forth fruits meet for repentance and rejected baptism in consequence thereof; therefore as they rejected that which was the spirit of the law and sinned thereby, our LORD sinned not in complying with it, when he said, thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness; for as CHRIST's baptism was a representation of his death, burial, and resurrection, *Rom. vi. 3, 4.* so it shows he was obedient unto death, buried all our sins in his grave, then he rose from the dead. Now, in his obedience, death, and resurrection, all righteousness was fulfilled: here is a righteous life—an atoning death—and a triumphant resurrection, which includes all righteousness in CHRIST for us, all righteousness imputed to us.

Thus, I hope, your second champion is at the feet of your first.—How are the mighty fallen!

THEOPH. This, Sir, shows plain that amongst all those ordinances and institutions of CHRIST, that the man of sin hath so miserably mangled, metamorphosed and changed, none hath been more abused than that of baptism; which as to matter and form, subject and circumstance, hath suffered such apparent alteration and subversion, that nothing but the very name of the thing remains among many professors at this day.

Which the better to demonstrate, you have the pattern of the primitive institution, in CHRIST's commission, the apostles' precepts and practice, and the spiritual ends thereof,

plainly laid down from the scriptures, and confirmed by the learned; the change itself of believers' into infants' baptism, traced out and detected, with all the ridiculous superstitions and fooleries, made essential to it, as many are forward to impose upon us: than which, nothing did ever more tend to ruin the true church, and reproach the wisdom and authority of CHRIST their head; so nothing could rationally more establish and confirm the false, or more apparently promote the sovereignty and dignity of Antichrist, which is so plain, that he that runs may read.

For if the very act of sprinkling or pouring a little water on the child's head or face must give grace, regenerate, take away sin, save the soul, add to the church, and give right to all the ordinances; as the Pope hath been pleased, sitting in the temple of GOD, as GOD to ordain and decree, and that with Anathemas too, against every one that shall not so receive it; thus hath it become the corner and foundation-stone of the antichristian church and state.

For as they who take (as far as they can judge) living stones, (called the spiritual seed, saints by calling, or believers) to build CHRIST a house or church, orderly joining them together in the LORD by baptizing, do yield obedience to CHRIST's command, conform to the primitive pattern of the New Testament churches, ascribe honour and glory to the LORD CHRIST the institutor: so they who take the carnal seed, viz. ignorant and unconverted ones, to make up the national or any particular church, joining them together by sprinkling, do thereby yield obedience to the Pope's Canons, conform to the Antichristian pattern, and reflect honour and dignity to their sovereign Lord the Pope, the contriver and imposer thereof; and is not this very observable, that Pope Innocentius the first (that Abaddon and Apollyon) that had so many marks of Antichrist here given him, was the first confirmer and imposer hereof.

But that which is most to be lamented is, that the protestant reformers, who detected and cast away so many Anti-

christian abominations, should yet hold fast such a principal foundation stone of their building; though it is granted, that the rejecting many of its superstitions, is upon good grounds: that when the rottenness of the Popish grounds aforesaid did appear for infants' sprinkling, it had certainly fallen to the ground, had it not been for some new contrivances to support it, though therein they have not been so happy as to agree amongst themselves in their conclusions about it.

For some are for baptizing all children, whose parents are never so wicked; others, only the children of professors; whilst others are for the baptizing the children of such professors only, whose parents are inchurched, viz. belonging to some particular congregation. Some are for baptizing children upon their own particular faith (which with much confidence it is affirmed they have. Others deny that with great vehemency, affirming, that they ought only to be baptized upon an imputative faith, viz. upon the faith of some others; though herein, as you'll find, they vastly differ; saying, it must be by the imputative faith of the church; others of the gossips; others of the parent or proparent in covenant upon the account of federal right.

So that some are for baptizing upon an ecclesiastical faith, some an imputative, some a seminal, some an habitual, some a dogmatical, and some without any faith at all, which is the case of all baptizers.

And it is no wonder, that such contradictions should proceed from such contrary principles; for if from one baptism, *Ephes. iv.* CHRIST would draw and engage us to unity, let it not be thought strange, that from a baptism so different from CHRIST'S, such differences and divisions should flow.

For as one ingeniously observes, that as it happens to travellers, when they are out of the way, one conjectures he should go this way, another that, and sometimes at hot disputes and contentions about it, and in the contest many by-ways are attempted. Yet still the further they go, the more they are out of the way, till they can come to the true road again:

So it hath been with the baptizers of infants, they are fallen into many new devices to maintain it, which hath occasioned many hot contests, breaches, and divisions among themselves, whose principal arguments and pretences for the practice, we have examined and answered.

PHILA. But, Sir, before we conclude the subject, as I would fain go through it, have you seen what Mr. Huddleston has said in his letters upon infant baptism, of which the Sandimanians and some Independents make such boast of.

THEOPH. Sir, I have seen it, and must confess that there is through the whole such a remoteness from the point, such a darkness of understanding, and such an obscurity of reasoning, that I have been much at a loss to find out Mr. Huddleston's meaning; however, I am ready to attend to any observation you may remark in favour of infant baptism, for I am not so far a baptist but that I am ready to submit to any conviction that ariseth from the oracles of truth.

PHILA. Have you observed his description of the kingdom, who the subjects are, and that baptism is the sign of it, *Luke xxiv. 49.*

THEOPH. Yes, Sir, I have observed closely his typical kingdom, his prophetic kingdom, and his abramatical kingdom, and his observation of believers, and their children, being the subjects of it, *Acts ii. 39.* And here I confess he seems to me to be one that would fain find out a way to escape from the truth, but he knows not how: His mind appears plain to be much harassed to find peace in his present practice; and no wonder, when intellectuals fight against conscience, and conscience fights against the truth. He has a long tedious dark introduction about the word Kingdom; but the sum of all is, to attempt to prove that children have a right to it, and that baptism is a sign of it, and to prove their right, *Acts ii. 39.* is brought, and to prove that baptism is a sign of it, *Luke xxiv. 49.* But why this long preamble, and tedious introduction, to prove what no one de-

nies, that children belong to CHRIST'S kingdom. May we not soon expect a folio volume to prove the sun rises in the east and sets in the west. But the question is, -what sort of children are they? For I think that all the world, save Adam and Eve, have been children; and consequently from among these children the kingdom is composed, whether it be the providential kingdom, redemption kingdom, or salvation kingdom, but it is salvation kingdom that Mr. Huddleston is contending for. Now the Apostle tells us plainly, *Rom. ix. 8. They which are the children of the flesh, these are not the children of God*; therefore then there must be some peculiar characteristic which the scripture gives to denominate them the children of the kingdom; and what this character is (I am amazed to find people so dark and ignorant of) when he that runneth may read, that these children of the kingdom *are the children of God by faith in Jesus Christ, Gal. iii. 26.* Such who have a knowledge of the foundation, laws, nature, and blessings of the kingdom, *Rom. viii. 16. The spirit beareth witness with our spirit that we are the children of God; and, if children, then heirs of God, and joint heirs with Christ.* Now, according to this idea of the Apostles, there are some—some, did I say; pardon the expression, I mean there is infinite happiness and enjoyment in being a child of the kingdom; but according to Mr. Huddleston's idea, which is very different from the Apostles, there can be no enjoyment of happiness among the children of the kingdom; for he supposes them to be infants that have a right to the kingdom, and all because they are the children of believers, as though believers had a peculiar holiness in them to beget children fit for CHRIST'S kingdom: But the Apostle cuts off all this vain hope of parental holiness or self-righteous dependence; *Neither, says he, because they are the seed of Abraham are they all children, Rom. ix. 7.* And says John, think not to say, that ye have Abraham to your father. But Mr. Huddleston says, it is to believers and their children that the kingdom belongs; if so, what must become of the children

of unbelievers, let tender CHARITY inquire. But this is so far from being true, that I am bold to tell Mr. Huddleston, and as ready to prove as to say, that there never was any kingdom of either nature, grace, or glory, either in Heaven or earth, that was made with or confined to believers and their children; so far from it, that even the covenant of circumcision was not confined to believers and their children, for there were many eminent believers in the GOD of Israel, who had not themselves, neither had their children any share at all in the kingdom of circumcision, or promise made to Abraham, which is so much boasted of; and therefore how is it possible, with any propriety or truth to think that the kingdom of CHRIST or Heaven is confined to believers and their children as such; for if so, then every child of Adam must be saved, even in the old or antideluvian world, because Adam was undoubtedly a believer in the MESSIAH, being a figure of him that was to come, and so according to this way of arguing that the kingdom of CHRIST, belonging to believers and their children, then Adam's children must have a right to it, and his children's children throughout every generation, not one could miss of Heaven according to this idea. This is the best idea in the world to establish universal redemption, for it puts CHRIST, his seed, and his heirs out of the question from having any right by election or adoption, and gives the right to believers, and from them to their children, and from them to their children's children to all generations. Oh! how wild a way of arguing is this! Perhaps it proves much more than Mr. Huddleston would wish; especially, as this supposed favour is renewed in the deluvian or the new world by Noah, who was undoubtedly a believer, being a preacher of righteousness; and if the kingdom of CHRIST, or salvation, is confined to believers and their children, as such, then all Noah's children had a right to it, and consequently their children and their children's children to the last generation; thus all the world is saved at last. O, pleasing thought! to Mr. John Wesley; or delightful dream!

to Mr. John Huddleston, who has, after much search and labour, found out a new intricate way to forsake the truth of the oracles of God. But, as this proves too much, I would just observe, that the proofs brought to establish, that infants have a right to baptism, supposing they belong to the kingdom, prove too little, *Acts ii. 2,—9. The promise is to you and to your children.*

Now, what does this promise prove? Neither that infants have a right to the kingdom of JESUS, or that they have a right to baptism: But, as Mr. Sandiaman observes (an author I am amazed Mr. Huddleston forgot, and more so that he should contradict) that it is a promise of the gift of the HOLY GHOST, which indeed seems to be the genuine sense of the words: However, it is plain, that the promise has no reference to infants nor to baptism, but plainly seems to be the promise of salvation to their children to comfort their distressed minds under the fearful apprehension of the curse they had imprecated upon them, saying, his blood be upon us and upon our children, which makes the promise to be far more glorious and precious than barely a promise of baptism to them. Moreover, had the promise been of baptism to their infants, then it must have been thus expressed, Then they that gladly received the word were baptized, and their children, but is there a word of baptizing their children? Are they not distinguished who were baptized by receiving the word gladly? Besides, it is plain, that the promise is the same to the fathers as to the children, to you and to your children, says the text. Now, to say it was only the promise of baptism to the fathers, it would have been but small comfort to them under the thoughts of crucifying JESUS; and, therefore, I am bold to say, the promise does not at all refer to baptism but to something more glorious; but supposing it should mean baptism, how pitifully ignorant must that person be that brings it as a proof of infant baptism, or their right to the kingdom of JESUS, because it says, to you and to your children. Does children suppose infants here? If

scripture language is to determine let the reader judge? Is it not said, Let the children of Zion be joyful in their King! are these infants? Again, Return ye backsliding children, are these infants? If children, then heirs with GOD, are these infants? Once more, Be ye followers of GOD as dear children, but can these be infants? For infants to be infants is natural, but for men of understanding to become such infants in their reasoning and their understanding of the scripture is amazing, especially when Mr. Huddleston brings *Luke xxiv. 49*, to prove that baptism is a sign that infants belong to CHRIST's kingdom, *Behold! I send the promise of my Father upon you, but tarry ye at Jerusalem until ye be endowed with power from on high.* A strange proof for baptism, a stranger still that it belonged to infants; for it would amaze all Heaven to know what sort of infants were to tarry at Jerusalem till they were endowed with power from on high.

Mr. Huddleston observes, page 8, "That baptism belongs to the kingdom, church, or body, of CHRIST, or to the members on earth wherever they appear, and on their very first appearance of their membership, as a sign of their entrance into it."—This is verily a truth—a truth that was engraved upon Mr. Huddleston's mind many years ago.—I am glad to find that he has not yet forgot it.—But, if baptism belongs to the members of CHRIST upon their very first appearance of faith and love to his name, how dares Mr. Huddleston baptize, as he calls it, those who have not the least appearance of membership to CHRIST? Is not this, verily a profanation of the ordinance, a reflection upon the wisdom of GOD, and a despising the command of CHRIST, to do that in GOD's name without GOD's word or command? What is this but offering strange fire, burning incense, to their own drag, laying aside the commandment of GOD, and teaching for doctrine the commandments of men? For can an infant of eight days give the least appearance of being a member of JESUS? Then, sure, it must be as Mr. Huddleston says, page 9, "That it is to be administered to persons



appearing to be members of the congregation of Saints, separately on the very first appearance of that membership, before they can be added to any such congregation of Christians."—This is a noble and judicious confession of the truth, but not much to be wondered at as it comes from Mr. Huddleston, who once confessed a good confession before many witnesses, and out of the abundance of the heart, the mouth will speak; and, like the rest of the writers for infant baptism, he gives up the point, and proves that it belongs to none but to those persons who appear to be the members of CHRIST, and upon their first appearance:—This is all that is contended for; this is all that GOD commands, his word directs unto, and the Apostles were found in the practice of. And it is remarkable, *Philagathus*, that all the writers for infant baptism not only by the weakness of their arguments give up their cause, but always, before they have done, establish the truth of adult baptism as it shines in the scriptures. It makes me think of a certain person, who was exceeding angry with her neighbour for joining in communion with the baptist church, and expressed (as many weak ignorant people do) much resentment; her husband said to her, "Hold your tongue, hold your tongue, Nanny, they have more to say for their practice than thee can'st ken;" and two independent members were lately disputing the point; the one was very angry with the baptist, the other calmly said, They have the truth upon their side, but we have only tradition.

PHILA. But, Sir, Mr. Huddleston's particular aim is to prove, that the infants of believers belong to the kingdom of CHRIST, and consequently that baptism belongs to them; and to prove it he brings those words of our LORD, Suffer little children and forbid them not to come unto me, for of such is the kingdom of Heaven.

THEOPH. Sir, I see this is the main point, the chief pillar, and corner stone of all his argument; and to please Mr. Huddleston, for once let us put on CHARITY beyond the

bounds of truth and revelation; and suppose that all the infants of believing parents belong to the kingdom of JESUS, what will all this main pillar do for him? Why nothing at all, for supposing it was true, it is impossible for them to belong to the kingdom of CHRIST in any other sense, but in the bosom of electing love, and how that it is a secret that belongs to the LORD, and not for us to know; but supposing it to be so, it proves nothing at all for Mr. Huddleston, for it is not election but vocation that gives a right to baptism, not a right to faith but the enjoyment of faith, for baptism is part of the inheritance and possession, and therefore can belong to none but to those who appear to us to be heirs of it by faith in CHRIST JESUS. Moreover, it lies upon Mr. Huddleston to prove, first, that these little children were the children of believing parents, or else his argument falls to the ground; and if this can be proved (which will be difficult for him) his argument is still of no force for what he brings it for, namely to prove that infants have a right to baptism, unless he can prove that they were brought to be baptized by CHRIST; if so, it would be exceedingly strange that his disciples should forbid them. I often blush with shame for the ignorance of teachers in Israel, when they have brought this text to prove infants to have a right to baptism, when it proves a much greater thing, which is clearly explained by our LORD himself in the following words, *Mark x. 15. Verily I say unto you, whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, he shall not enter therein;* which is again further explained by *Mat. xviii. 2, 3. And Jesus called a little child unto him, and set him in the midst of them, and said, Verily I say unto you, except ye be converted and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of Heaven: And whosoever shall offend one of these little ones which believe in me, &c.* which plainly proves, to any unprejudiced mind, that little children being brought to CHRIST, his blessing of them, and suffering them to come to him, points forth emblematically the whole of regeneration and salva-

tion, and therefore it must be very ignorant and impertinent to bring it as a proof for what it has no relation to or connexion with, of which Mr. Huddleston's scripture quotation so much abounds with : And it is a very remarkable confession of Mr. Huddleston, page 11, where he says, "That he doubts not but infant baptism, by this time, had been nearly expelled from most of the protestant churches, had it not been for the almost unconquerable strength of custom and tradition." I believe so too, and so must every sober and considerate mind, when they consider that there is no command for it in the word of GOD.—But, O, blessed be tradition !

Mr. Huddleston, in page 13, asketh the following question, "Does CHRIST not leave an express injunction on his disciples to the end of the world, to acknowledge the infants of those who believe he is able to bless them members of his body?"—The answer is, No, there is no such injunction !

Mr. Huddleston says, "That our denying infants to have the same appearance of being of the kingdom that we have ourselves is a dangerous mistake ;"—amazing ! was ever such profound ignorance ever before published ; or is it possible that an infant of eight days old, can have the same appearance of belonging to the kingdom of CHRIST, as those who can say, Whom having not seen we love, though now we see him not, yet believing we rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory ?

Mr. Huddleston, page 15 and 16, has unhappily raised, or expressed such objections against infant baptism, which neither he nor any one in the world is able to answer ; but, he says, the intent of it is to show, that the same spirit is in the baptist as was in the disciples of CHRIST which was condemned by him.—This spirit never was condemned in the disciples ; for, could they be condemned for what they never thought nor did ?

Mr. Huddleston is very daring to appropriate an untruth

to Him who is truth itself, in saying, page 20, “ That CHRIST declared children, with their parents, to belong to his kingdom:”—This is not true:—Your proofs, Sir; your proofs, Sir:—And, “ That the Apostles opened this kingdom for the reception of subjects from circumcision:”—This is equally false with the last, for baptism (as has been before proved) did not come in the room of circumcision, neither did circumcision ever make any infants church members.

Though Mr. Huddleston is pleased to say, “ That if Peter was now giving this promise to the called, as a reason for their being baptized, it would be equally a reason for baptizing their infants with them:—Was ever any reasoning so weak and so feeble; that because they received the word gladly their infants had a right to the same blessings as they had? One cannot help blushing for their ignorance, for the promise had no more to do with the infants of those Jews then, or of believers now, than I have to do with the infants of Indians; it is not to infants at all, neither concerning baptism at all; and, one would be ready to think, that those who brought it, either for one or the other, appear to make manifest, that either their minds are full of prejudice, or that they have never read with much consideration their bibles.

Mr. Huddleston complains, “ that to explain the promise, in the same sense, to the children, as to those who are afar off, is to leave those Jews who were concerned in killing our LORD no more comfort than unbelievers, or their latest posterity concerning their children:—This is certainly true, for had not the Gentiles, who were the people afar off, the same right to salvation when Paul said to them, To you is the word of this salvation sent, as the children of the Jews had? surely they had; for why it must be thought that the promise is confined to the children of believing parents, singularly from those of unbelieving, I am finally at a loss, unless it be for some peculiar holiness in them which unbe-

lievers have not; if so, let us cease to say salvation is by grace, if we attempt to make it flow in a parental line and not in the line of electing love. But, if the promise must be confined to the infants of believers, I should be glad to know when the promise belongs to them; whether before they are born, considered in the loins of their parents, or as soon as they are born, or at eight days old; when they are, as some ignorant people say, baptized, or at a month old, or when? And, after it is proved, it will prove nothing for what it is by Mr. Huddleston and others intended, viz. their right to baptism, it has nothing to do with it, for though eternal love gives us a right to Heaven, it is faith in the righteous life and death of CHRIST that gives us a right to salvation and to every promise and divine ordinance, and not our parents' believing for us, unless our parents are to be saved for us.

Mr. Huddleston's observation of the house of Cornelius being saved by the faith of Cornelius is exceeding weak and ridiculous. Can the faith of the father save the child? Or, can the child receive any spiritual blessing from the father's faith? There is a certain church that speaks much of the works of Supererogation but not so large as this; however, it is still more impertinent to bring as a proof for baptizing of infants, because it is said he feared GOD with all his house. Can infants discover that they fear GOD? It is said that the HOLY GHOST fell upon all them that heard the word, can these be infants? for it is written, They heard them speak with tongues and magnified GOD, were these infants? Well may the Apostle say, Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized? &c.

His referring to the jailor and his house to prove infants therein, or infant baptism therefrom, is so notorious that it needs no explanation, unless it be to minds darkened with prejudice against the clearest truth, see *Acts xvi. 32.* *And they, viz. PAUL and SILAS, spoke unto him and unto all that were in his house;* can any man in his senses suppose Paul

and Silas spoke to infants? Again it is said, The jailor believed in GOD with all his house, not for his house, Paul was no papist; nor for his house, as Mr. Huddleston says, but WITH his house, showing that they were not infants, but such as could join with him in rejoicing in GOD, and therefore, according to Paul's commission, Go teach all nations, baptizing them; it is no wonder that he and all his were straightway baptized.

Mr. Huddleston says, page 25, "That the practice of the Apostles in baptizing, corresponded with their preaching; for as they preached the gospel to men, and to their children, and their houses, so they baptized them and their houses."—This is not true, for this is to make the Apostle baptize all to whom he preached. To those, indeed, the word of salvation was sent, but as to the baptizing of them another interrogation was made: If thou believest with all thine heart: He that believeth and is baptized, &c. Then they that gladly received the word were baptized. Many of the Corinthians hearing and believing were baptized. This shows a particular distinction from Paul's preaching, because that was all promiscuously. Moreover, if this was true, Paul must have baptized whole synagogues and that often, *Acts xix. 8. And he went into the synagogue, and spoke boldly for the space of three months, disputing and persuading the things concerning the kingdom of God*; so this argument that Mr. Huddleston is so fond of, fails him, and the case of Lydia's household, which he quotes, is a weak reed. Indeed it is like a man that is drowning who catches at the weakest twig; for can it be reasonably supposed that Lydia, who acted in the capacity of a merchant, came quite from Thyatira to the city of Phillippi to sell purple, should bring a train of children with her if she had any; but by the way, it does not appear that she had any husband, much less children; and if she had, what would this prove for infant baptism?

PHILA. Why, Sir, is it not said that all her household were baptized?

THEOPH. Yes, Sir; but does it follow, that because all her household were baptized that they were all infants? what, a household of infants! surely some of her household must be grown up to a state of knowledge; but more likely they were all her household servants that assisted her in her business of selling of purple, as servants are frequently called the household, *2 Sam. xv. 16.* *And the king went forth and all his household after him,* that is, *all his servants.* And as Lydia's household are said to be brethren, verse 40, I make no doubt but that Lydia's household was such another household as the household of Aristobulus, of Narcissus, of Cæsar, of Onesiphorus, whom Paul salutes in the faith mentioned, *Rom. xvi. 10. 11.—Phil. iv. 22.—2 Tim. iv. 19.*—Called, *Gal. vi. 10, The household of faith.* But, what has all this to do to prove infant baptism? for supposing, *Philagathus,* that Lydia's household was composed of one infant; there could not well be above (unless she happened to have twins, then there may be two) and the rest of grown up children, and the rest of servants (I think this is allowing all the length of argument any one can ask) that these made up her household; what will this prove? why, the final overthrow of what all the Pedobaptists, of every name and denomination, have been pleading for so long, namely, that the promise of baptism is only to believers and their children, as their house or household; whereas according to the case of Lydia's household, it is no more to the children than it is to the servants, supposing there were any infants there; therefore, let it be remembered, that all infant right to baptism, so much pleaded for from the words, *seed, thy seed, your children, thy house, and household* fall to the ground, for the word *seed, children, house, and household* denotes most frequently, in scripture, grown persons, called the seed of Jacob—the house of Israel—the children of the fathers—the household of faith, &c. so then it remains nothing but a deception to the infants, a fallacy imposed upon the parents, therefore it is no wonder for Mr Huddleston, as a Sandemanian priest, to have the singular assurance to say,

page 27, "though it cannot be absolutely affirmed that none were baptized belonging to Lydia and the Jailor, except little children," when it never was absolutely affirmed before: it is now absolutely affirmed that there were no little children at all baptized either in Lydia's household, or in the Jailor's house, and I defy Mr. Huddleston to prove there were. But this is not all, for having the pen of a ready writer, he has the confidence to say, "that when salvation comes to a person, having children incapable of understanding it, the gospel places them in the same state of salvation with himself, and gives them the same title to baptism as it gives him." This is astonishing to every sensible mind; that because salvation as a free gift comes to a parent, that it thereby comes to his children: does the parent possess peace, pardon, and righteousness for his child? is not that wronging the poor child, for at this rate we shall have parents go to heaven for their children? or does the child possess it by virtue of his father's inheritance, then he has only a virtual right, and not an actual one? if so, when does the child's right take place? at the father's death. I think it cannot well before; for before death, I think the father can have no right to spare: but then, what if the child should die first? alas! for the poor child; but if it be to all the children, alas! for the whole family, if the parent dies first.

Thus, *Philagathus*, you see how miserable Mr. Huddleston's idea is, of saying that because salvation comes by faith in the righteous life and death of Jesus to a parent, that his infants have the same right to it as he has, when it is his faith that gives him a right to salvation; but can his faith or his being baptized upon his faith, give his infant a right to it; let any sober mind think upon this; for really *Philagathus*, if it be true, as Mr. Huddleston says, that salvation coming to a parent gives his children, or places his children in the same state of salvation with himself, this cannot but give me great concern, for you must know, sir, that I was not a parent when salvation came to me, but since I am



become a parent; consequently, according to Mr. Huddleston, then my children can have no right to salvation, it coming to me before I had any children? however, I would be glad to know, of some ingenious mind, but more glad to see it proved from scripture, if they have a right to salvation by salvation coming to me; for if they have a right, it is high time to let them know it, for poor things they appear to my grief (except one) to be great strangers in Israel. But if it should be so, and they have a right, and are placed in the same salvation as myself, then the right the gospel gives, is not to believing parents and their children, but to believers, and there it stays for a time, to see if they have any children; if they have, then it breaks unto them. O! this is charming doctrine to old grandmothers; well may they hug the dear babe when it comes. But supposing the believer never has any children (as is often the case) what becomes of that right that he had in reserve in case he should have had any, is it transferred at his death, or any little time before his death, or when he could spare it to any believing parents for their children? or is it transferred to those believing parents who have many children, who may want it to help out? care, undoubtedly, is taken of it, it must not be lost, for if it be lost what will become of the dear infants? what indeed if they had not a better right than this? O! I wonder, that the priests are not ashamed to impose upon people at this rate; or rather that professors of the gospel are so ignorant of the truth of the gospel, the way of salvation, and the beauty of the ordinance of baptism, as to suffer themselves and their children to be thus imposed upon.

It puts me in mind of two singular cases, which lately happened near to Newcastle upon Tyne: A midwife having delivered a woman of a weak child, and being likely to die, the pious old women who were there, begged hard of the midwife to baptize it, as they call it; the midwife being conscious that GOD had not directed her nor any person in life so

to do, refused it with spirit.—One of the women starts up,—What, object against making a christian soul! what will become of the poor creature? it will be lost. Give me some water. Water was brought, and a few drops were bestowed upon the child in the name of the Father, &c. There, says the women, all is well now; the child died.—Then the midwife said to the baptizer, “what if the child should want a name in the next world, what name must it have?” “O! says she, I was in such a hurry to save the soul, I did not think of that.” O the astonishing ignorance of the people!

Another case was, the same midwife being sent for, the case was dangerous; Dr. Sm-th was sent for in a great hurry,—the woman was delivered,—the child appeared to be dying soon,—the father hearing, said,—O! I will have it baptized, says the doctor to the midwife, “You must do it”—said she, “I will not.”—Says the doctor to the father, “Sir, is it a matter of conscience with you?” “Yes, sir:” “Then,” said he, “bring me a little water,—then he named it with the solemn ceremony;—it died;—the priest Mr. St—s, was sent for to the funeral; it being very wet weather, he was loath to go; but being obliged, he went; but next time he met Dr. Sm-th, he said, “Doctor, doctor, don’t you never baptize no more bairns,” said the doctor, “Sir, the man could not rest in his conscience till I did it.” “No,” said the priest, “nor he could not rest till he brought me through the rain, wet to the skin, to bury it, and after all gave me but two shillings.” Alas, for the people!

PHILA. But, sir, Mr. Huddleston, after speaking of Paul baptizing the household of Stephanus, asks this important question, “Can it be said in the view of these baptized houses, and with any reverence for the sacred history, that we have no example for infant baptism?”

THEOPH. No, Sir, not one; and with the utmost reverence to the sacred history do we speak it: if there is any example, where is it? here all the pedobaptists in the kingdom are put to the same loss as the Pharisees were put to by our

LORD, when he said unto them, the baptism of John, whence is it, from Heaven or of men? they said, We cannot tell. But as Mr. Huddleston seems to determine the whole point upon saying, "we cannot deny scripture example for baptizing infants, till we first deny that there were infants in those baptized houses unto which salvation came." As the point terminates here, I do deny that there were infants in those baptized houses to whom salvation came; and I know none that will be so daring to expose their ignorance as to attempt to prove it; though Mr. Huddleston is pleased to amuse his weak readers by saying, "On our seeing a person, having a household of little children, on his believing, baptized and his house, with what sobriety can we say this is without scripture example?" but, sir, where do we see or hear of a household of little children being baptized? what imposing stuff is this! sure Mr. Huddleston has got a new kind of a bible: it may be in his by some addition, or interpolation, or interlineation, but it is not in the baptists' bible, nor is it in the original I am sure. It makes me think of the warm public disputation that there was some years ago at Portsmouth, between the independents and the baptists. The independent advanced a point he could not prove. Scripture failing him, he said, "there are six leaves of the original lost." "Undoubtedly," said the baptist, "Sir, it may be in them." So Mr. Huddleston's household of baptized infants may be in them. As he understands the Greek he may have seen it there. But as it is not to be found in our common translation, the baptists may with sobriety speak the words of truth and soberness, and say that there is not one example in the book of GOD for infant baptism, neither were there infants in those baptized houses to whom salvation came; and if there were infants in the house, what proof would this be for infant baptism, I wonder, unless it could be proved that they were baptized? as to Mr. Huddleston's bringing the household of Stephanus and the house of Joshua, is giving up the point; for as to the household of Stephanus, whom Paul baptized, it is said

to be the first fruits of Achaia, and that they addicted themselves to the ministry of the saints: could these be infants?

PHILA. But, Sir, Mr. Huddleston says, that this objection is weak, because the baptists do not consider what time there might be between his baptizing the household of Stephanus and his writing this epistle, therefore baptized infants may be called the first fruits of Achaia.

THEOPH. What! infants the first fruits, rather buds and branches, than fruits? but let us see what kind of persons those are who are described as the first fruits to God and the Lamb: these, it is said, follow the Lamb whithersoever he goes: were these infants? however, it is said, they addicted themselves to the ministry of the saints. If they were infants when Paul baptized them, when did Paul write his epistle to the church of Corinth, was it five or six years after? Mr. Huddleston knows that it was not so long, as the distracted case of the church required it long before; and supposing it was so long before Paul wrote, with what propriety could it be said, that such addicted themselves to the ministry of the saints: these little far-fetched arts will not do with the thinking mind for solid proofs: it revives my memory of what, I am ready to think, Mr. Huddleston is no stranger to: It is a case relating to a few people in the Island of Providence, in New England, who were, if I remember right, originally baptists, but drinking into Mr. Sandeman's dry sentiments of the gospel, they were still embarrassed respecting believers' baptism, and wanting to find out in the bible, if it were possible, the baptism of infants, without which they could not join Mr. Sandeman's people: these wise people by reading the scriptures, lo! they found out infant baptism from *2 Kings v. 27. The leprosy of Naaman shall cleave unto thee, and unto thy seed for ever, and he went out from his presence as white as snow.* This great discovery was sent over to the church of the Sandemans, in the Bull and Mouth Street, London; and so far were they in ho-

nesty from reproving them for their enthusiasm and ignorance, that they approved of them as brethren, and I believe it is recorded among their church annals; and why should it not? for the words will as soon prove infant baptism as any words in the whole scriptures. Amazing! that such a solemn cause should at last be obliged to be supported by such a broken reed; for surely, if the words prove any thing, they prove a curse of leprosy rather than the blessing of baptism, to Gahazi and his seed for ever. But, O! what wonderful discoveries some wise men can make to bring in infant baptism, which only discovers the weakness of their cause, though this cause is thought by Mr. Huddleston to be mightily supported from these words, else were your children unclean, but now are they holy. I confess it is amazing to me, that so often as these words have been acknowledged by Mr. Hammond, and so many pedobaptists, to have no reference to baptism at all, that they are still so weak as to urge it as a proof of infant baptism; it is like their pleading, suffer little children, &c. and, indeed, they suffer bad enough both from the parent and the nurse, in being disturbed from their sleep, and from the priest in being wakened by the chills of the cold drops; but above all by having a lie told it almost as soon as it is born, by saying, as the church of England does, "We thank thee, Heavenly Father, in that thou hast regenerated this child in baptism:" or, as in this respect, her sister dissenting churches say, "In baptism they are ingrafted into JESUS CHRIST," when it is all a solemn lie; and what would parents, the nurse, the priest, or the people desire little children to suffer more, is not this suffering enough for an infant of eight days, to have a lie said of it so soon? methinks they should in pity wait a little longer till the infant is able to answer for itself, before they thus impose upon it, for it is nothing less, for they are not regenerated in baptism, neither are they ingrafted into CHRIST in baptism; therefore to say they are, is speaking a solemn lie to GOD for them. O! that ministers

would lay this to heart, and not make poor infants cry, and men of understanding blush for shame for them, since in cases of conscience, there is a necessity of falling either into the hands of man or into the hands of GOD, of these two whether is the BEST: I leave every particular considerate person to judge; only, I will just add, it is a fearful thing to trifle with GOD, with truth, and our conscience. However, not to fly from the face of the argument, let us see what support it will afford these poor suffering infants,—else were your children unclean, but now are they holy.—Let the holiness here spoken of witness whether it be a covenant holiness, a ceremonial holiness, a parental holiness, or a matrimonial holiness? what, does it all prove an infants right to baptism? surely, there are none so weak that will dare to attempt so much as to speak it, much less to attempt to prove it. As to covenant holiness, if there is any such thing (which, I am sure, in a strict sense there is not) it only distinguished the nation of the Jews, to whom belonged the covenant and the promises, from the heathen nations round about. As to ceremonial holiness, it gave them only a right to the ceremonial law. As to parental holiness, children (poor things!) they have none but what they had in their ancient father Adam, and poor old man, he lost it all before he had any children of his own; and how little infants can claim any, or any one claim any for them now, I cannot tell. As to matrimonial holiness, it only denotes the lawfulness or honour of the marriage relation; and therefore it is pitifully weak to bring any of these holinesses to prove infant baptism.

PHILA. But is it not said that children are holy? sure believers' children must be more holy than unbelievers' children?

THEOPH. What! Sir, will you not give up the argument? a little twig or straw is better than no hold. You say, surely the children of believers are more holy than the children of unbelievers, because it is here said, now are they holy.—Here,

Sir, I beg leave to say your remark is very unhappy for you ; for these holy children happen to be the children that were born of unholy and unbelieving parents, namely, children they had before they believed in CHRIST, even the children they had then, not the children they might have ; therefore the holiness could not be from their parents' believing, because they were born before they believed : for certain it is, that if holiness belongs to the children of believers more than others, what must be the state of those children which they have before they believe? what, some of them holy, and some of them unholy. O! who can help or forbear to drop a single sigh for the poor infants who are born before their parents believe. Poor things, they came too soon to be holy, yet one would hope not too soon to be happy ; but methinks it is a pity the parents were married so soon, or that their little infants were born so quick ; however, sir, it is undoubtedly happy for me I need not sigh about it ; for I was, according to this, happy born, being born of believing parents ; and I think if any one had a right to be holy from the womb, I more, for my father and grandfather, my mother and grandmother were believers, and I don't know but my progenitors may be believers as far as Noah, or for what I know up as high as Adam ; but some how or other I was marr'd in the birth, but how it was I don't know, I was so young ; but I verily think I was conceived in sin, and brought forth in iniquity, as David was ; for this reason, because I found for seventeen years such an enmity to that which is good, and such an innate love to that which was evil, that if I was holy, I was a holy devil, having every seed of sin in me, like David, *Psal.* li. 5. Therefore I beg leave to conclude from the records of truth and experience, that parental holiness is a mere fancy, which has been for some hundred years drest up like a London doll, by the scribes in Israel to please children, and now is new drest up by Mr. Glass, and Mr. Huddleston, to please the Glassites and Sandemanian brethren, while they (not to their honour) forget what Paul says,

*Rom. iii. 10. It is written, there is none righteous, no not one.*

PHILA. Sir, I confess the pleasure of your humour and the force of your reasoning, and own that you have cast a light upon the text I never before saw. But for my satisfaction, what may be your serious and genuine thoughts upon the text?

THEOPH. Sir, I should not have indulged my little flow of fancy had not Mr. Huddleston appeared (to please the women and children) so fond of this fancy of his own; as to the text, it needs no critical comment, it is plain, that he that runneth, may read, that the Corinthians had wrote to Paul, ver. 1, to know of him whether it was right and lawful for a believing wife to abide in the marriage relation with an unbelieving husband, or for a believing husband to abide with an unbelieving wife, because that unlawful wives with their children were put away under the law, *Ezra x. 3.* The answer that Paul gives is plain and clear, ver. 10, *Let not the wife depart from the husband,* ver. 11, *And let not the husband put away his wife,* denoting plainly that if their believing in the MESSIAH gave those authority that believed to put away the unbelieving husband or wife, then the riches of grace would dissolve the ties of nature, which nothing could be more absurd, and thereby render their marriage invalid, and consequently their children in the eye of the law, illegitimate, for if their marriage to the unbeliever became dissolved by the faith in CHRIST, their children would be acknowledged thereby to be unlawful, called by the Apostle, unclean; but as their marriage was true and lawful, their children were clean or holy, that is, not begotten in a state of unlawfulness, but to use an ecclesiastical expression, in the holy state of matrimony; for the same children, which the Apostle calls unclean, he calls holy in the same sense that he says that the unbelieving wife is sanctified or made holy to the believing husband, which is explained as of all other enjoyments to the believer, *1 Tim. iv. 5. For it is sanctified by the word of*



*God and prayer*, therefore this holiness can in no sense have any reference to, much less be a proof for, infant baptism.

PHILA. Sir, your thoughts are very obliging; I think they appear to be the leading scope and genuine meaning of the Apostle. But why is it that many of the presbyterians, and some stiff independents will say that children have a right to baptism, if but one of the parents are believers?

THEOPH. They may as well say from one being a believer as both: but this practice appears so full of fancy, I had almost said so ridiculous, that it needs no comment upon it; for if one believing parent renders the child sufficiently holy to be baptized, then sure if they are both believers, the child must be unnecessarily holy; but if there be but one believer, is here not danger of a great mistake? as it will be hard to say whether the child belong most to the believer, or to the unbeliever, unless nurse or the priest understand physiognomy, and can look in the child's face and thereby tell. Oh! what shocking shifts do the priests (not the scriptures) put the parents to about their dear children, it makes me think of that little priestcraft of the church of England, that in case of danger, they will half baptize the child, as they call it; for if in baptism it is as they say, regenerated, what must it be when it is but half baptized; half a cause can have but half effect. Oh! what darkness and ignorance still remains upon the reformed churches! I should now proceed to take bone from bone, and sinew from sinew, even all the life of Mr. Huddleston's supposed arguments, in his remarks upon the following letters, but they appear to me to contain nothing new from his first, and that they are only a very dark and intricate recapitulation of his first letter. Besides, the objections he quotes from his antagonist appear to me to remain in their full force against him, but especially those quoted from Mr. James Rutherford, page 15, and those quoted by himself, page 87, these still appear like a brazen wall against

all that he has said, and like a man with a drawn sword in his hand looking him full in the face, let him look which way he will: thus, *Philagathus*, may I not indulge the vanity to inquire, is not your last warrior in Israel fallen down, slain upon the mountains of Gilboa?

PHILA. I am, I must own, constrained by the force of truth once more to indulge king David's pathetic complaint how are the mighty fallen, and the weapons of war perished! But yet there are a few inquiries in my mind, if they may not be painful to *Theophilus*?

THEOPH. Whatever you have to say, say on.

PHILA. Have there not been as good men, and as great men for infant baptism, as ever there were of the baptist persuasion?

THEOPH. No, sir, I deny that; where will you find such great men, or such good men as PAUL, PETER, JOHN, JAMES, and the rest of the Apostles, who were all baptists: or if this fails, where will you find any man like the God-man, even JESUS the DIVINE BAPTIST, who spake as never man spake; where will you find any command like GOD'S command, *John* i. 33, any example like CHRIST'S example, *Mat.* iii. 15, 16, any practice like the Apostles' practice, *Acts* ii. 41, 42, *Acts* viii. 12, 36, 37, 38, *Acts* x. 47, 48, *Acts* xvi. 15,—33, any churches like those planted by the Apostles in Jerusalem, in Galatia, in Ephesus, in Philippi, and Thessalonica.

PHILA. But some are very inquisitive, and are ready to say, what are become of all the good men who have opposed infant baptism?

THEOPH. Why, sir, gone to heaven; what would they have become of them? *Zach.* i. 5. *Your fathers, where are they, and the Prophets, do they live for ever?*

PHILA. If they could be saved without it, why do you so earnestly plead for it?

THEOPH. Not because it is a saving ordinance, but because it is not.—I think that Abraham might have been

saved without offering up his son Isaac, but GOD said unto him, Take now thy son, thine only son Isaac, whom thou lovest, and get thee unto the land of Moriah, and offer him there for a burnt-offering; and to show his love to the LORD, and his filial obedience to his command. "Abraham," it is said, "took the wood of the burnt-offering, and laid it upon Isaac, his son; and took the fire in his hand, and a knife, and they went both of them together." Now Abraham's obedience was absolutely necessary, not to save him, but to please GOD and to fulfil his will and commandment; in this sense the baptists plead; and have an undoubted right to plead that baptism is absolutely necessary, not to save them, that is only the blood of CHRIST, but to please GOD and keep his commandment, it being his command, *John* i. 33; his will, *Mat.* iii. 17; his counsel, *Luke* vii. 30; and CHRIST's commission, *Mat.* xxviii. 19.—Paul might have been saved without his being baptized or his preaching the gospel; but what did ANNANIAS say unto him, *Acts* xxii. 14, 15, 16, *The God of our fathers has chosen thee, that thou shouldest know his will, and see that JUST ONE, and hear the voice of his mouth.—For thou shalt be his witness unto all men, of what thou hast seen and heard.—And now why tarriest thou? Arise, and be baptized, wash away thy sins, calling upon the name of the Lord.—*And it is said, *Acts* ix. 18. *And he arose and was baptized:* But, did Paul do this to save his soul? No, far from it, but out of love to the LORD, and in obedience to his will, and to testify to the brethren his true faith in the MESSIAH: Therefore he did not, like many of our delicate professors of the day, confer with flesh and blood, but straightway he preached CHRIST in the synagogue. And as a believer in CHRIST, may undoubtedly be saved without his being baptized, so he may be saved without partaking of the ordinance of the LORD'S SUPPER in breaking of bread. But where is that ungrateful believer that is loved beyond degree, and saved by blood, that is not willing to meet the King at the table, to commemorate the bleeding heart and hands, the bleeding

side and feet of a dying LORD, who has said, Do this in remembrance of me.—Take, eat, this is my body that is broken for you.—This is the cup of the New Testament in my blood, which is shed for the remission of sins, drink ye all of it.—And, therefore, my dear *Philagathus*, let me tell you, that the same love that constrains the believer to partake of one ordinance, engages it to embrace the other; for as faith is absolutely necessary to discern the LORD's body in the one, so faith is as absolutely necessary to behold CHRIST's death, burial, and resurrection in the other; though baptism is not necessary to salvation, nor infant baptism, falsely so called, yet believers' baptism is certainly necessary to our comfort and joy of faith, and what GOD has joined let no man put asunder: He hath said, He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved.

PHILA. Sir, is it not strange and amazing, that so many good men should be such strangers in Israel? I hear that there are near three thousand ministers in Scotland, besides what are in England, who are almost totally ignorant of their divine commission of baptism, and what GOD has commanded them to observe.

THEOPH. Not at all so strange and unaccountable as some make of it, though to their shame be it spoke; for as there never was a time but what there were baptist churches ever since the baptist churches were settled in the Apostles' days; so under the law there never was a time from the dedication of the tabernacle by Moses, to the destruction of the temple by Nebuchadnezzar, but what the seed of Abraham had their feasts, their passover, and their temple services; yet there was one part of what GOD had commanded them entirely forgot, it should seem, for more than a thousand years: And if the Jews, who were so tenacious of their rites and ceremonies, were so forgetful of what GOD had commanded Moses, no wonder then that so many in Israel have been so unmindful of what GOD the LORD had said unto them.—It is remarkable that GOD commanded Moses that the children of Israel

should dwell in booths in the feast of the seventh month, called the feasts of tabernacles, see *Lev. xxiii. 34,—43*. Now, this command, *Philagathus*, had been neglected or over-looked for more than a thousand years, even from the days of Joshua to the return of the children of Israel from their Babylonian captivity, see *Neh. viii. 14,—18*. *And they found it written in the law which the Lord had commanded Moses, that the children of Israel should dwell in booths, in the feast of the seventh month. And all the congregation of them that came again out of captivity, made booths and sat under the booths; for since the days of Joshua the son of Nun, unto that day, had not the children of Israel DONE SO, and there was very great gladness.* Here let it be remarked that the children of Israel were not so wise as many of the professors of the present day; they did not say why Hezekiah was a good king, and did great good; and why Josiah was a good king, and revived the glory of the temple. David was a good man and a great king, and prepared much for the building of the temple; and Solomon was a wise king, and he built the temple, and dedicated it to the LORD, and they took no notice of this. It is but a ceremony, and why should we?—No; but when they found that it was written in the law which the LORD had commanded by Moses, it was sufficient authority for them to obey though their forefathers had not obeyed it; but our tender delicate professors of the present day cannot get over these stumbling stones, they cannot think of disturbing the peace of their forefathers by attempting to be more wise than they, or their own peace by going out of their old path; but whether it is right, in the sight of God, to obey man more than God, judge ye?

PHILA. Sir, I am glad of this remark; there is a scripture beauty and life in it, by which it proves that we have a divine authority to leave the practice of our fathers when they have, either by negligence or tradition, forsaken the commandments of God. But why is baptism called the counsel of God? *Luke vii. 10*.

**THEOPH.** To show us that it is **GOD'S** unchangeable will; that obedience thereto is the fulfilment of his will: That it is the revelation of his own mind, the very same as salvation by **CHRIST**, who doth all things according to the counsel of his own will, which appears in its being commanded by him, *John* i. 31, in **CHRIST** embracing it, *Suffer it to be so now, for thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness*, *Mat.* iii. 15.—In the commission of **CHRIST** to his Apostles, *Mat.* xxviii. 9.—In the practice of the Apostles, *Acts* ii. xli.—And in the settlement of all the Churches, *Acts* ii. 41, 42, &c.

**PHILA.** Who may they be who are said to reject the counsel of **GOD**, against themselves, not being baptized?

**THEOPH.** Those who believe and rest satisfied that their being sprinkled in their infancy is baptism, which is all a cheat and priestcraft, these reject the counsel of **GOD** with a witness, being pleased with a popish tradition more than **GOD'S** divine ordinance, which is not necessary to prove, for they prove it in their own breast, by believing more what men say than what **GOD** in his word declares, rejecting the counsel of **GOD** for the tradition of the fathers.—Likewise those parents who take or desire their infants to be baptized, these persons pay no regard at all to the word of **GOD** in this matter. Where has he directed them to be so cruel to their little infant, not only to disturb it, but religiously to cheat it, by putting a solemn lie into the mouth of the priest, saying, “We thank thee, Heavenly Father, that it hath pleased thee to regenerate this child in baptism,” when, in fact, there is no such thing: And, there are others, who will not go quite so far, but say, That the child is by baptism ingrafted into **CHRIST**.” Is not this pleasing the parent, and cheating the child with a religious lie, merely out of complaisance to the custom of the times.—Moreover, they may be said to reject the counsel of **GOD** against themselves who are convinced of believers' baptism as a truth, but look upon it as a trifle, a mere indifferent thing: Stop, reader, pause a little;

what! the counsel of GOD a trifle, a mere indifferent thing? What! the will of GOD a trifle with thee? His command an indifferent thing to thee? Perhaps thou art ready to say, "Why, he has loved me, and washed me from my sins!" Ay; then, surely, the more important is thy debt of love and obedience to his name, had he bid thee do some great thing, wouldst thou not have done it, when he only says, if ye love me, keep my commandments? But, it must be owned, that it is certainly, *Philagathus*, too much the case, as a gentleman lately observed, some cannot believe it, and some will not; that is, some are so ignorant they cannot, others are so obstinate they will not; but I hope better things of you, reader, though I thus speak.

Likewise, they may be said to reject the counsel of GOD against themselves, who are convinced of the truth of it, yet do not obey it, because there is such difficulty in the way; or because they have not such promise upon their mind, or because they have not that strength of desire they could wish; they see it to be a duty, the Christian's duty, but not their duty. What is this but rejecting the counsel of GOD against themselves, not being baptized, is not the path of duty or rather privilege clear, the command of GOD full, the example of CHRIST glorious, and does not the blessing of the HOLY GHOST attend it? To wait when GOD has commanded, and we are convinced on the account of any fear of distress or difficulty, or for any immediate revelation from GOD; is it to tempt CHRIST as the Israelites tempted him in the wilderness, and to do evil that good may come thereby, (however humble the mind may seem to be) attempt to be an Antinomian indeed, by knowing the will of GOD and not doing it, is not the word nigh thee?

PHILA. O, *Theophilus*! this is too close upon me, for such a one, in omission, sure I am: Long have I been convinced, often have I pleaded for it as a truth; and though I have brought the warriors in Israel against you, I was afraid I should fall at last among the slain; but shall I again trans-

gress! What may I apprehend by the Publicans justifying GOD by being baptized? *Luke vii. 29.*

THEOPH. They justified, that is, they commended, or approved of the will of GOD, in appointing such an ordinance; they testified their love to it by embracing it as a revelation of his wisdom; and thus believers justify GOD, that is, own his love and approve of the ordinance as it leads them, by faith, to the MESSIAH, the glory of his love, the greatness of his sufferings, the atonement of his death, the conquest of his grave, the triumphs of his resurrection, their union with him, and enjoyment of him, *Rom. vi. 3, 4.*

PHILA. Why is baptism said to save us? *1 Pet. iii. 21.*

THEOPH. Sir, the Apostle Peter says, The like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now save us, that is, as the salvation of Noah's family, in the ark, from the deluge, was a figure of the salvation of the church in CHRIST, as every creature moved freely to go into the ark, they found supply, security, and GOD shut them in; so it was a figure of the soul moving freely to CHRIST, finding a supply of all grace in him, security from all wrath by him, and the seal of everlasting love by GOD's shutting them in. Now, baptism may be said to save us, not really or meritoriously, that is the honour of the blood of CHRIST, but remotely or figuratively as baptism, when administered according to the word of GOD, is a figure of the whole of our salvation.—Is the love and favour of GOD necessary to our salvation, baptized in the name of the FATHER?—Is the person of CHRIST necessary to our salvation, baptized in the name of the SON?—Is the power of the HOLY GHOST necessary to our salvation, baptized in the name of the HOLY GHOST?—All of which is a lively figure of the love of the THREE that bare record in Heaven.—Is the death of CHRIST necessary, baptized into his death?—Is his grave necessary, buried with him by baptism?—Is his resurrection necessary, risen again with him by the faith of the operation of GOD; and JESUS when he was baptized came straightway out of the water?—



Are his sufferings necessary, I have, says he, a baptism to be baptized with? &c.—Is his love necessary? Herein is displayed, love that waters cannot quench, nor floods drown!

PHILA. But, is it not said, that it is not a putting away the filth of the flesh?

THEOPH. Yes, surely; that is the peculiar honour of the blood and resurrection of JESUS; then, *Philagathus*, how ignorant are they who baptize infants to take away original sin, or believe that it does in any wise do them any good respecting their salvation! for it was never intended for any infant, much less to put away the filth of the flesh, or to give the least hope of happiness by it; but it is declared plainly to be the answer of a good conscience towards GOD; a good conscience is a purified one by the blood of CHRIST, a tender conscience of sin, an affectionate conscience, or a consciousness of love to CHRIST, and an obedient conscience to his commands.

PHILA. What may I apprehend by giving an answer of a good conscience towards GOD?

THEOPH. Sir, it is undoubtedly the duty and privilege of the believer, to give a reason of the hope that is in him with meekness and fear; but the answer here of a good conscience towards GOD, is an answer of obedience to CHRIST, of love to his name, of faith in his blood, righteousness, death, and resurrection, for the whole of salvation.

PHILA. How is this answer to be given towards GOD by the resurrection of JESUS CHRIST?

THEOPH. By beholding in baptism the resurrection of JESUS, answering for all our sins, for all our sufferings, for all our debts, for all our payment and discharge, and thereby our full victory to GOD for us, as our Surety, Saviour, Sufferer, and Conqueror; whose resurrection for us GOD receives as a final answer to all that sin, Satan, death, and hell can bring against us; so that whatever bills are filed by the law of GOD, or entered in the courts of our own conscience, the

resurrection of CHRIST answers to GOD for them all; so that we are acquitted, justified, and discharged by his resurrection, because he died for our sins and rose again for our justification.

PHILA. Sir, if baptism be the answer of a good conscience, then, as Mr. Baxter justly observes, it can belong to none but to those who have, through grace, a good conscience. Then, surely, it must be great ignorance and imposition, either in parents or in ministers, to administer it to infants who have not a good conscience, being conceived in sin and brought forth in iniquity; neither can they give an answer of what they have; I blush and am ashamed for the ignorance of the people and the imposition of the priests, for it is hard to say which is the greatest. I am astonished, *Theophilus*, at it; what do you think can be the cause of such long-continued ignorance of this truth among the ministers of the gospel?

THEOPH. Sir, I think it is impossible to be entirely owing to ignorance, for they all own, when in a cool spirit, that the baptists are right; that there is no express command nor example in the word of GOD for their practice of infant baptism, but only the strength of custom and tradition; inso-much that both Papist and Protestant agree in this, that infant baptism is not to be proved from scripture but from tradition, only with this difference, the Papists maintain that the tradition of their church is of equal authority with the scriptures, and therefore their proof stands good. No doubt but it may be proved from tradition, but they are so sensible that it can no otherwise be proved, that a Papist told his neighbour, one morning, that he was going to see a miracle. He asked what miracle? He said, infant baptism proved from scripture. Whereas the Protestants say, they ascribe too much to tradition, and think that infant baptism may be better proved from long custom and consequences; that Father Austin himself says, that infant baptism is not to be believed but from tradition; and the great convocation at Ox-

ford, which I think was in Wickliff's time, say, "That without the judgment and practice of the church, they should be at a loss, when called upon, for proofs in the point of infant baptism." Which there is no doubt of, as the scripture affords them none, so that it cannot be ignorance in many of them.

PHILA. What can then be the cause ?

THEOPH. If the reader can bear Paul's language to speak the truth to every man's conscience in the sight of God, I think it is much owing to PRIDE and INTEREST, and not so much for want of knowledge, or if it is owing to their ignorance they are the more to be pitied : But an independent minister, who was disputing the point with one of his Elders, who was about to join the baptists, their disputation came to this decision : The Elder said unto the Pastor, " Sir, if I, out of love to you, should stay with you, and should in my own conscience be wrong, will you engage to answer for me at the last day." To which the minister said very pathetically, " No." Then said the Elder to him, " Sir, how can you preach and practise what you are afraid to answer for at the last day ?" To which he said, " I have preached it and practised it these forty years, and to leave it now what will the world say of me ?"—Poor man ! he was much to be pitied, for he was surely in a dismal dilemma ; and, indeed, I am thinking, that if the baptist churches were as populous and as prosperous as other denominations, and could spare their hundreds a year, there would not be such a scarcity of converts among the canonical order.—But let this suffice—I would only remark, that if baptism be the answer of a good conscience, how self condemned in their own conscience must those persons be, who are convinced of it as a truth, yet do not give to God, nor to the church, neither before men nor angels, their answer of a good conscience by their faith and hope in the resurrection of JESUS CHRIST ! for how they can enjoy the peace of a good conscience, and struggle with the conviction of it, I cannot see.

PHILA. Sir, the struggles of my conscience are almost over with me. There is a passage that my mind struggles in doubt about, and I believe many persons have been in the same case; it is in *Acts* xix. 2, 3, 4, 5, where it seems that those who had been baptized into John's baptism, were afterwards baptized in the name of the LORD JESUS?

THEOPH. The Apostle is so far from supposing, that the baptism of John is distinct from CHRIST's baptism, that he confirms John's baptism to be the same as CHRIST's. Paul, when he saw these disciples, who appear to be ministers of the gospel, *ver.* 9, without the ministerial, or rather the extraordinary gifts of the HOLY GHOST, asked them if they had received the HOLY GHOST since they believed, and they said they had not so much as heard that there was any HOLY GHOST, though they enjoyed the blessings of the HOLY GHOST, as to salvation by CHRIST, without which they could not have been disciples, therefore it must be understood of the extraordinary gifts of the HOLY GHOST poured out upon the day of pentecost, to work miracles, to speak with tongues and prophesy. Then Paul asked them unto what baptism, or with what baptism, were they then baptized unto, and they said unto John's baptism; then Paul explained the nature, intent, and design of John's baptism; that it was to reveal CHRIST and every blessing of salvation in his name, which is plain from the words: Then said Paul, John verily baptized with the baptism of repentance, saying unto the people, that they should believe on him which should come after him, that is on JESUS CHRIST; denoting that CHRIST JESUS was in John's baptism, the centre of their faith in all he had suffered for them, and promised to them; and when they heard this they were satisfied, or instructed into the blessing of John's baptism, *viz.* that they were baptized in the faith of the LORD JESUS; then Paul confirmed it by laying his hands upon them, and the HOLY GHOST sealed it, for it is said, the HOLY GHOST came upon them, and they spoke with tongues and prophesied.

PHILA. Sir, I am satisfied; this is a difficulty that I am glad to see so clearly removed. I think there is but one objection more in my mind: What Scripture example have we for women receiving the LORD's Supper?

THEOPH. Sir, this is an objection that has been frequently urged, though I confess it does not appear to me to be of any force or power; for, upon this weak way of reasoning, they may as well say that there were no women under the law that had a right to the passover: for, if as some people say, that circumcision gave the circumcised infants a right to the passover and made them church members; consequently then no female could be a church member nor have any right to the passover; but who will dare to say this when it is said, that Zecharias and Elizabeth his wife walked in all the ordinances of GOD blameless? But the matter appears to me more clear in the New Testament, *Acts viii. 12. When they believed, they were baptized both men and women.* Now, who they were that were admitted to baptism, or were baptized, is plain, *Acts ii. 41. Then they that gladly received the word were baptized.*—Of whom was the church composed and organized, was it not of those baptized believers? *42. Then they continued stedfastly in the Apostles' doctrine, in fellowship, in breaking of bread, and in prayers.* Now, if the church consisted of baptized believers in CHRIST, then consequently it must consist of women as well as men, because women were baptized as well as men; and as women are called disciples, saints, members of churches, *Acts ix. 36, Tabitha, a certain disciple, Phœbe, a servant or deaconess, and member of the church,* these were to be received in the LORD, as becometh the Saints, *Rom. xvi. 1. Priscilla was Paul's helper, ver. 3, to whom the gentile churches gave thanks, who had a church in her own house, and was surely a member of it, and a partaker of the ordinance of the LORD's Supper.* Besides, if we consider Paul's direction to the church at Corinth, whom he styles sanctified in CHRIST JESUS, called to be Saints. These were some of them virgins unmarried,

some were widows, some were wives with children; now if they were not church members, and as such partakers of the ordinance, what had Paul to do with them, why are they called sisters if they have not a portion with the brethren? or, if they were not church members, why do Paul and Peter give such exhortations to them in *Eph. v.*—*Col. iii.*—*1 Peter iii.*—for what have they to do with them that are without?—besides, I do not remember that under the law there is any particular direction to show the right of women, under the name of women, to the passover or temple privileges, yet they enjoyed every privilege by virtue of their knowledge in the ordinances of the temple; and so do women, under the gospel, by virtue of their faith in CHRIST, as saith Paul, *1 Cor. xi. 28.* *Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat;* and it is well known, that the Greek word signifies either a man or a woman, being a word of common gender, the same as in *1 Tim. ii. 4, 5,* *There is one Mediator between God and man;* and surely between GOD and women, or what must become of them? the word MAN denoting both, as the woman is not without the man in the LORD, neither is the male nor female, either by way of distinction or separation, from the ordinance, but ye are, saith the Apostle, all one in CHRIST. *Gen. v.* *And called their name Adam.*

PHILA. Sir, I am highly pleased and satisfied, but there are some to whom a difficulty appears, how the Apostles could baptize three thousand in one day? *Acts ii. 41.*

THEOPH. Sir, this difficulty scarcely appears, for it does not appear that they were baptized in one day; that they who received the word gladly were baptized is evident, and added in one day appears, but that they were baptized in one day is not so evident; and, if they were, I see no great difficulty therein, as there was a hundred and twenty disciples and twelve Apostles to baptize, whose baptism, I am sure, may be much easier done by them, than what Abraham is said to do in one day, which was a circumcision of near four hundred persons, *Gen. xvii. 26, 27,*—compared with

*Gen. xiv. 14.*—and thus I think this objection vanishes as a vapour.

**PHILA.** It has been objected that certainly the children were baptized to Moses, by sprinkling or drops of water from the cloud?

**THEOPH.** Such weak objections plainly bespeak the weakness of the cause they would defend, for this remark is very unhappy, that they were baptized by sprinkling with drops of water from the cloud, because the cloud which was an emblem of the presence of CHRIST was with them, was a cloud of glory and not of water, besides they are said to go through on dry ground; and as the water was a wall on their right hand and as a wall on their left, they were baptized or overwhelmed in water, as a figure of their salvation in the baptism of CHRIST'S sufferings, for as the rock was a figure of CHRIST, so was their passing through the Red Sea, a figure of his death, which by baptism is represented, so the objection dies.

**PHILA.** It has been said by the Baptists, that as John baptized with water, that CHRIST might be made manifest to Israel, therefore they came and were baptized by him in Jordan, confesing their sins; and as Peter required, or rather the HOLY GHOST gave the blessing of receiving the word gladly, and Philip required a believing with all the heart, and Paul hearing and believing, therefore they think that no infant has any right to baptism, not only for want of the commandment of GOD, but for want of this gospel capacity in them which the Apostles required.

**THEOPH.** Sir, they have a just right to think so, for it is plain that John thought so, that Peter thought so, that Philip thought so, and Paul thought so; and why should it be thought strange in them? for, sure I am, if the Apostles were to rise from the dead, if they were called to consult of this matter, they would say to the church of England, to the church of Scotland, the Presbyterians, and Indepen-

dents, of all nations, who has required these things at your hands ?

PHILA. But, surely, Sir, you have considered the force of the objection which is thus expressed: It is acknowledged that infants cannot make a confession of sin, and consequently they cannot tell lies like adult persons ?

THEOPH. All I shall say to this is, is it not pity think you, *Philagathus*, that the objector had not continued an infant purely on this account ; for surely, it might have prevented him from—but I will not say from what.—Was it not a pity that Peter's hearers had not continued infants, for perhaps they told lies when they said to Peter and to the rest of the Apostles, men and brethren, what shall we do ?—Is it not a pity but what the eunuch had remained an infant, for perhaps he told lies when he said, See, here is water, what doth hinder me that I may not be baptized?—But who can object against any one pleading for infants, seeing such an happiness attends the case of infants, namely, the prevention of so much sin?—is it not a pity but we had all remained infants, to have answered so great an end ?

PHILA. Sir, I have lately met with an account of the baptists that really astonishes me; it is a new History of the Reformation, dedicated to ————; in which I must own, I think the author has expressed himself very unbecoming the christian, the scholar, the minister, or the historian, where herepresents the baptists in every civil and religious character, as bad, base, and profligate! O what bitterness and envy drops from his lips through the whole, such as is not fit to be named! especially when he says, “I have now given a brief account of the rise and fall of this dangerous sect in Germany: Thus ended the king and kingdom of the Anabaptists.”

THEOPH. Sir, it was a just observation of yours, that these remarks of the author were unworthy the christian, the scholar, the minister, or the historian, for as a christian he ought



to have buried and not revived faults ; as a scholar he ought to have dealt gently, especially with those whom many of them, in point of scholarship, as much deserve it as any other denomination in the kingdom ; as a minister he ought to have forgiven ; but above all as an historian he ought to have wrote truth, which he has not. He says he has given a brief account of the rise and fall of this dangerous sect, when in fact he has not, for the rise of them was not Nicholas Stork and Thomas Muncer, as he says, but John the Baptist : and they are the most ancient people professing godliness that have existed since CHRIST, through every age, century, reign, and revolution ; and have been (though under various names) spread from the Apostles preaching throughout all the world, but especially through Asia and Europe, and in many parts of America, insomuch that all parts of Germany, since the Apostles' days, have been full of baptists ; therefore to say, as this author, and some more before him have, that they took their rise from John of Leyden, about Luther's time, bespeaks great ignorance both of history and scripture ; for according to this author, he says, that in the reputed Munster affair, that John Matthias sent missionaries to the low countries, in Germany, for all the Anabaptists to join him at Munster, which shows that the first rise could not be then, or how could they be a body whose assistance was so earnestly desired ? besides it bespeaks great ignorance to call them Anabaptists, because I will defy any author to prove, that there ever were such a people upon the earth ; an old track of words and phrases can be no warrant for the fresh publication of ignorance.— Besides, your author says, this dangerous sect: this sentence would have suited well the lips or the pen of a Papist, but they come very ill from the pen of a Protestant ; for what are they a dangerous sect for ?—for doing as GOD has commanded them ? as CHRIST has left them an example ?—and as the Apostles practised ?—this must be a dangerous people ! how can they be otherwise ? but the danger of all is, these men that turn the world upside down, are come here also ;—thus

“ended,” says your author, “the king and the kingdom of the Anabaptists.”—A wonderful destruction! a king destroyed that never existed! a people perish, that had never any being! for if the author means spiritually, there is no truth in what he says; for CHRIST as King in Zion, and the baptists as his church, or kingdom, are more at this day that has been known for many years, therefore when the author wrote against the baptists in this bitterness of spirit, let him ask his own conscience if he did not intend to draw from the supposed (for I much question the truth of the Munster affair, as it comes originally from their enemies, the Papists,) namely, a dark odium upon the name of the baptists through the nation, and all through that glass of prejudice that he has drunk against them; because they have demanded of him the command of GOD, or an example in his word for his present practice. However, I leave him to struggle with the conflicts of his own conscience for what he has said in his second number; and may GOD forgive him, and I hope that the baptists, as the elect of GOD, will put on bowels of mercy and forgive him likewise.—It makes me think of Mr. John G——, though raised to the eminence of a silver-smith, whose mind being imbittered with prejudice against one, whom he should rather as a christian if he be one) have pitied, spoke to his friend, upon seeing a certain author’s book in his hand, very reproachfully of the pedigree of the author, forgetting, at the same time that the author’s pedigree was far more respectable than that of a quill boy; but, alas! what a full possession of a pharasaical spirit remains in many of our silver-slippered christians at this day; is not this the carpenter’s son, said the Pharisees of old?

PHILA. It should seem to me, whatever their state may be, as to eternity (which GOD only knows) that they are surely such that enjoy little of the spirit of CHRIST, the blessings of CHRIST, or the presence of CHRIST, with whom remains such a bitterness of spirit; for it is a sure maxim in things spiritual, that a mind filled by Satan with prejudice,

is surely punished with barrenness; for though they think like the perverse froward prophet (as Dr. Gill used to call him) they do well to be angry; hence it is too evident that many, besides some particular ready writers, are like the disciples, when in an infantine state in the kingdom of JESUS, know not what manner of spirits they are of, but, GOD be thanked! we have no such custom, neither have the churches of GOD. O! how beautifully may the language of our sympathizing forgiving JESUS be here adopted, Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do!

But, as it is evident that the city of Salem is the church of CHRIST,—that her walks are salvation,—that her gates are praise,—that her laws are love,—that her inhabitants are kings,—that her statutes and ordinances are glorious,—that it is a city of the GREAT KING fitly compacted together,—a holy habitation,—a building of GOD, whither the tribes go up, the tribes of the LORD to the testimony of Israel,—that her gates are open,—the highway of salvation is plain,—her provision is free,—her enjoyment is life,—her blessings are peace,—her happiness is glory,—and that her inhabitants walk in the light of this glory. O sweet engagement!—O divine attraction!—Methinks, *Theophilus*, I could almost invite you in the prophetic language of the Prophet in Israel, *Isa. ii. 3. Come, ye, and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, to the house of the God of Israel, and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths, &c.*

THEOPH. “I am as thou art;—my horses are as thy horses, and my chariots are thy chariots;—for whither thou goest I will go, and where thou lodgest I will lodge;—thy people shall be my people, and thy GOD shall be my GOD;—where thou diest will I die, and there will I be buried—the LORD do so to me, and more also, if aught but death shall part thee and me.—And as thy heart is as my heart, with whom I have had sweet council, let us go from strength to strength till we appear before GOD in Zion, for the LORD GOD is a sun and shield;—he will give grace and glory, and no good

thing will be withhold from them that walk uprightly, and faithful in He that has promised."

And as it is plain that all the promises of GOD belong to the church of CHRIST, which is the ground and pillar of truth, and that this church was, accordingly to the gospel dispensation, to have its beginning from CHRIST, and to continue ever visible till the end of the world. Now, no other church but the baptist church has had its beginning from CHRIST's time, and therefore no other church can have that gospel right to the promises, because of their disobedience to its precepts. And as it is plain that the baptists came from, or that they are called baptists from John the Baptist, and christians from CHRIST, and as we are sure, without a doubt, that the baptism of John was from Heaven; that it was the counsel of GOD, *Luke* vii. 30.—The command of GOD, *John* i. 33.—The example of CHRIST, *Mat.* iii. 16.—The practice of the Apostles, *Acts* viii. 36,—39,—what need we any further witness, both as to the manner of its administration and the subjects of it, seeing we have such a cloud of witnesses; that they have likewise continued ever since the Apostles' days, through every age, century, and revolution to the present day: Happy art thou, O Israel! who is like unto thee, O people! saved by the Lord? and therefore, *Philagathus*, may we congratulate the union of our hearts, and the triumphs of our faith and affection to the church of GOD, in the prophet's language? we will go with you, for we have heard that GOD is with you.—See, here is water, what doth hinder?—Why tarriest thou? arise, and be baptized, &c.—Seeing what blessings,—what promises,—what sweet enjoyment are before us,—in the observation of CHRIST's baptism, which is (as Mr. James Rutherford spiritually and pathetically expresseth it) "a declaration of a fixed faith in CHRIST JESUS, and an entire devotion of the subject to the service of the TRIUNE GOD. In this solemn ordinance, we assert CHRIST to be our Prophet, that has taught us the things concerning the kingdom of GOD—our Priest, who hath made an atone-

ment for us—and our King, who is to rule, govern, and defend us; otherwise our submission is only a blind obedience; for the Father and his ways are only known to such as have a revelation of both from the Son.—If JESUS is not our priest, our performance would neither be a reasonable service, nor the offering of a spiritual sacrifice, acceptable to GOD by CHRIST JESUS; for he is the altar that sanctifies the gift—And if he is not our King, why are we subject to his laws? in this holy institution, we profess to claim GOD for our Father, husband, and friend. Our Father—who hath made ample provision, and now prepared us for, and granted free admittance to, the children's bread. Our Husband—in whom we possess all things, and are now brought home to enter upon the enjoyment. Our Friend—with whom we take sweet counsel, and in fellowship with whom we have great delight. In baptism we declare that we are washed with the washing of regeneration, and enlivened by the renewing of the HOLY GHOST; for they must be clean, who come into the sanctuary of GOD; and alive, before they can walk in his commandments blameless. Moreover, in this ordinance we profess to believe with all our hearts, that the LORD is our portion, his people our people, and his ways our ways; therefore, with all our souls, we devote ourselves wholly to GOD, for this weighty reason—we are not our own, but bought with a price; also with a firm resolution—to observe whatsoever he hath commanded; and with this important prayer—that he would enable us to spend the residue of our days to his honour and glory.

A further end and use of the ordinance is, the baptism of the HOLY GHOST; or the emanation of the sweet enjoyment of those rich blessings, which are held forth to us in baptism, as in a lively figure, or bright perspective glass.

For if our minds be exercised, and faith employed, during the administration of this significant solemnity, we cannot but be impressed with the remembrance of the bitter baptism of our SAVIOUR's salutary sufferings, when he

was immersed in sin, overwhelmed in wrath, and plunged in the depth of agonies for us. Thus while we are indulged with soul-reviving views of our Father's love, and heart affecting prospects of our SAVIOUR's sufferings, we cannot but long and pray for the HOLY GHOST to lead us into green pastures, and beside the still waters; so that we may drink deeper into the love of JESUS, and behold his beauty through the windows, while he shows his glory through the lattice. This being granted, in baptism we view the death of our Surety making atonement for our sins—his grave, in which all our guilt is buried—and his resurrection, whereby we enjoy justification of life. In this figurative fountain, we behold the streams of grace, proceeding out of the throne of GOD and the Lamb, and flowing into our souls, in virtue of the death, burial, and resurrection of JESUS; and are led by faith to see a death to sin in our intellectual powers, the old man buried, and the new man in CHRIST rising to holiness of life—We have a prospect of the baptism of sufferings, to which we are called as pilgrims of JESUS: nor does this grieve or disturb our spirits, while we behold the eternal GOD our refuge, and his everlasting arms our support. If we have not yet received, we are encouraged to wait for that sealing evidence of the HOLY GHOST, which every saint is to look for, and expect after believing—the entire bathing of our bodies in water, represents the bathing of our souls in the blood of the Lamb—In going down into the water, we have a lively sense of our implantation into CHRIST, and of sinking deeper into the love of GOD, which flows from the fulness of the FATHER, SON, and HOLY GHOST.—In passing through the element, we have a sweet symbol of our translation out of the kingdom of darkness, into the kingdom of GOD's dear Son.—In coming up out of the water, we have the joyful prospect of a complete deliverance from all sin and sorrow; together with a triumphant resurrection from the grave of corruption, and an abundant entrance into the kingdom of bliss and glory. Finally, whatever is necessary to qualify a sinner

for communion with GOD in his house below, is represented in baptism ; as whatever is necessary to qualify a Saint for communion with GOD, in his house above, is represented in the LORD'S SUPPER. They are outward and visible signs of the true and real substance, and cannot possibly be of the least advantage to any soul, further than faith is concerned, and the understanding employed to behold the glory signified. Thus while we rejoice in the blessing, and feed thereon ourselves, we profess to others our confidence in, and devotedness to, the great THREE-ONE, whose name is JEHOVAH."

---

## A POEM

*Upon the Practice of the ancient Christians, according to Truth and Direction of the Word of God and the Gospel Churches in the Apostles' Days.*

*Search these Scripture.*

1

NEVER does truth more shine,	<i>Psalm xix. 4.</i>
With beams of heavenly light,	<i>Psalm cxix. 130.</i>
Than when the scriptures join,	<i>Psalm xix. 8.</i>
To prove it true and right :	<i>Isa. viii. 20.</i>
Than when each text doth each explain,	<i>1 Cor. ii. 13.</i>
And all unite to speak the same.	<i>Isa. viii. 20.</i>

2

Here then a glory seems,	<i>Mat. iii. 13.</i>
In statutes so divine,	<i>Psalm xix. 18.</i>

Thus JESUS' baptism beams,	<i>Mat. iii. 13.</i>
And rays of glory shine :	<i>Mat. iii. 16.</i>
To seal the truth of what we say,	<i>Mat. iii. 17.</i>
That this is GOD's appointed way.	<i>Mat. iii. 15.</i>

## 3

A train of saints array'd,	<i>Acts ii. 4.</i>
And Martyrs they were glad,	<i>Acts ii. 47.</i>
What JESUS to them said,	<i>Mat. xxviii. 19.</i>
When risen from the dead :	<i>Mat. xxviii. 20.</i>
Investing them with might and power,	<i>Acts ii. 4.</i>
From JESUS' resurrection hour.	<i>Luke xxiv. 49.</i>

## 4

Thus Peter he obey'd,	<i>Acts ii. 36.</i>
What JESUS said—as wise,	<i>Acts ii. 37.</i>
Unto his converts said,	<i>Acts ii. 38.</i>
“ Repent and be baptiz'd :”	<i>Acts ii. 41.</i>
Thus Philip did to th' Eunuch say,	<i>Acts viii. 36.</i>
“ If thou believ'st in CHRIST thou may.”	<i>Acts viii. 37.</i>

## 5

To Paul a Saint did say,	<i>Acts xxii. 13.</i>
When open'd were his eyes,	<i>Acts ix. 18.</i>
“ No longer now delay,	<i>Acts xxii. 16.</i>
Arise, and be baptiz'd :”	<i>Acts ix. 18.</i>
Then Paul did preach a Saviour CHRIST,	<i>Acts ix. 20.</i>
And then baptiz'd whom GOD had blest.	<i>Acts xviii. 8.</i>

## 6

He preach'd the words of grace,	<i>Acts xviii. 7.</i>
Whole households did believe,	<i>Acts xviii. 8.</i>
They were baptiz'd to CHRIST,	<i>Acts xviii. 8.</i>
Whose gospel they receiv'd :	<i>Acts xviii. 9.</i>
Thus baptists were of ancient date,	<i>Acts ii. 41.</i>
As sacred history does relate.	<i>Mark vi. 24. Luke vii. 20.</i>



## 7

We see 'tis no new thing,	<i>Mat.</i> iii. 6.
To teach and then baptize,	<i>Mat.</i> xxviii. 19.
John did the work begin,	<i>John</i> i. 28. <i>John</i> iii. 23.
STILL some his place supplies :	<i>Acts</i> viii. 38.
This makes us cheerfully obey,	<i>Acts</i> ii. 41.
And go as JESUS led the way.	<i>Mat.</i> iii. 13.

## 8

For ne'er would this truth shine,	<i>Mat.</i> xxi. 15.
With such a glorious light,	<i>Mat.</i> iii. 16.
Did not the scriptures join,	<i>Mat.</i> xxviii. 19.
To prove it true and right :	<i>Mat.</i> xxviii. 20.
Now, since the scriptures thus agree,	<i>Mat.</i> xvi. 16.
In JESUS' name baptiz'd are we.	<i>Mat.</i> xxviii. 19. <i>Acts</i> xix. 5. <i>Acts</i> xxii. 16.

## 9

The scriptures plainly saith,	<i>Acts</i> xvi. 31.
The jailor CHRIST receiv'd ;	<i>Acts</i> xvi. 34.
Corinthians—they thro' faith,	<i>Acts</i> xviii. 8.
With Crispus' house believ'd :	<i>Acts</i> xviii. 8.
They were baptiz'd, as saith his word,	<i>1 Cor.</i> i. 14.
To show their love to CHRIST the LORD.	<i>Acts</i> xviii. 8.

## 10

The saints of Lydia's flock,	<i>Acts.</i> xvi. 14.
By faith where pray'r was made,	<i>Acts</i> xvi. 23.
Found CHRIST the living rock,	<i>Acts.</i> xvi. 14.
Their love and praise they paid :	<i>Acts</i> xvi. 15.
With heav'nly zeal with holy flame,	<i>Acts</i> xvi. 14.
And were baptiz'd in JESUS' name.	<i>Acts</i> xvi. 15.

## 11

Cornelius fear'd the LORD,	<i>Acts</i> x. 2.
His house did GOD obey,	<i>Acts</i> x. 4.

Thus JESUS' baptism beams,	<i>Mat. iii. 13.</i>
And rays of glory shine :	<i>Mat. iii. 16.</i>
To seal the truth of what we say,	<i>Mat. iii. 17.</i>
That this is GOD'S appointed way.	<i>Mat. iii. 15.</i>

## 3

A train of saints array'd,	<i>Acts ii. 4.</i>
And Martyrs they were glad,	<i>Acts ii. 47.</i>
What JESUS to them said,	<i>Mat. xxviii. 19.</i>
When risen from the dead :	<i>Mat. xxviii. 20.</i>
Investing them with might and power,	<i>Acts ii. 4.</i>
From JESUS' resurrection hour.	<i>Luke xxiv. 49.</i>

## 4

Thus Peter he obey'd,	<i>Acts ii. 56.</i>
What JESUS said—as wise,	<i>Acts ii. 37.</i>
Unto his converts said,	<i>Acts ii. 38.</i>
“ Repent and be baptiz'd :”	<i>Acts ii. 41.</i>
Thus Philip did to th' Eunuch say,	<i>Acts viii. 36.</i>
“ If thou believ'st in CHRIST thou may.”	<i>Acts viii. 37.</i>

## 5

To Paul a Saint did say,	<i>Acts xxii. 13.</i>
When open'd were his eyes,	<i>Acts ix. 18.</i>
“ No longer now delay,	<i>Acts xxii. 16.</i>
Arise, and be baptiz'd :”	<i>Acts ix. 18.</i>
Then Paul did preach a Saviour CHRIST,	<i>Acts ix. 20.</i>
And then baptiz'd whom GOD had blest.	<i>Acts xviii. 8.</i>

## 6

He preach'd the words of grace,	<i>Acts xviii. 7.</i>
Whole households did believe,	<i>Acts xviii. 8.</i>
They were baptiz'd to CHRIST,	<i>Acts xviii. 8.</i>
Whose gospel they receiv'd :	<i>Acts xviii. 9.</i>
Thus baptists were of ancient date,	<i>Acts ii. 41.</i>
As sacred history does relate.	<i>Mark vi. 24. Luke vii. 20.</i>

## 7

We see 'tis no new thing,  
 To teach and then baptize,  
 John did the work begin,  
 STILL some his place supplies :  
 This makes us cheerfully obey,  
 And go as JESUS led the way.

*Mat.* iii. 6.  
*Mat.* xxviii. 19.  
*John* i. 28. *John* iii. 29.  
*Acts* viii. 38.  
*Acts* ii. 41.  
*Mat.* iii. 13.

## 8

For ne'er would this truth shine,  
 With such a glorious light,  
 Did not the scriptures join,  
 To prove it true and right :  
 Now, since the scriptures thus agree,  
 In JESUS' name baptiz'd are we.

*Mat.* xxi. 15.  
*Mat.* iii. 16.  
*Mat.* xxviii. 19.  
*Mat.* xxviii. 20.  
*Mat.* xvi. 16.  
*Mat.* xxviii. 19. *Acts*  
 xix. 5. *Acts* xxii. 16.

## 9

The scriptures plainly saith,  
 The jailor CHRIST receiv'd ;  
 Corinthians—they thro' faith,  
 With Crispus' house believ'd :  
 They were baptiz'd, as saith his word,  
 To show their love to CHRIST the LORD.

*Acts* xvi. 31.  
*Acts* xvi. 34.  
*Acts* xviii. 8.  
*Acts* xviii. 8.  
 1 *Cor.* i. 14.  
*Acts* xviii. 8.

## 10

The saints of Lydia's flock,  
 By faith where pray'r was made,  
 Found CHRIST the living rock,  
 Their love and praise they paid :  
 With heav'nly zeal with holy flame,  
 And were baptiz'd in JESUS' name.

*Acts.* xvi. 14.  
*Acts* xvi. 23.  
*Acts.* xvi. 14.  
*Acts* xvi. 15.  
*Acts* xvi. 14.  
*Acts* xvi. 15.

## 11

Cornelius fear'd the LORD,  
 His house did GOD obey,

*Acts* x. 2.  
*Acts* x. 4.

## 3

For nothing less the church could save,  
 And nothing more the church can have,  
     In earth or heaven above,  
 Than what JEHOVAH hath reveal'd,  
 His oath confirm'd, his blood hath seal'd,  
     The DEITY of love.

## 4

LOVE ! O ! unchanging, infinite !  
 Eternal bliss and sweet delight,  
     JEHOVAH he is LOVE !  
 Here dwells the church safe and secure,  
 She dwells in GOD for evermore,  
     Her dwelling can't remove.

## 5

Satan and sin, and death and hell,  
 With all their art, and malice fail,  
     Her final ruin to gain,  
 Their utmost skill and power is try'd,  
 But baffled is their force and pride,  
     And spoiled is their train.

## 6

When Satan's suffer'd to prevail,  
 And brings her to the gates of hell,  
     The ruins of the fall,  
 Where she in sin and bondage lies,  
 In dread amongst her enemies,  
 In misery and thrall.

## 7

Yet there she's safe, she is not left  
 Of GOD, or of his love bereft,

He loves her praying breath,  
 And promises to *bruise the head*  
 Of these her enemies, and tread  
 And triumph in their death.

## 8

See here that glorious mystery,  
 Which was hid in the Deity,  
 The sacred **THREE IN ONE**;  
 The counsels of eternal peace,  
 The better covenant of grace,  
 Is hereby made known.

## 9

Made known in Him, in whom 'twas made,  
 Before the world's foundation laid,  
 The man of God's right hand,  
 In union with the Deity,  
 Like union with **CHRIST** has she,  
 In which she'll ever stand.

## 10

Amazing depth of love divine!  
 Mysterious doth this union shine,  
 Eternal union this,  
 Wherefore this Mediator bears  
 Those glorious names and characters,  
**IMMANUEL, PRINCE of PEACE.**

## 11

**JESUS, CHRIST, a SAVIOUR, LORD,**  
 The Surety, the Eternal Word,  
 The Prophet, Priest, and King,  
 The Lamb of God a sacrifice,  
 And for atonement, lo! he dies,  
 His bride the church doth sing.

## 12

Nor does he bear these names in vain,  
 But all the characters sustains,  
     Revealed in his word ;  
 In which he doth himself make known,  
 Unto his church the chosen one,  
     Beloved of her LORD.

## 13

'Tis here with joy and wonder she  
 These everlasting springs doth see,  
     Springs of eternal love,  
 From whence salvation freely flows,  
 Through him the ONE JEHOVAH chose,  
     To bring her safe above.

## 14

O my soul with joy behold,  
 The church is deck'd in gems of gold,  
     And clothed with the sun ;  
 Wearing a crown upon her head,  
 Of stars compos'd and beautified,  
     Beneath her feet the moon.

## 15

And all this height of happiness,  
 Permanent everlasting bliss,  
     Aloud I hear her cry,  
 My husband ALL on me bestows,  
 From everlasting love it flows,  
     To all ETERNITY.

THE END.

A HANDSOME AND COMPLETE EDITION OF

ALLEN'S SPIRITUAL MAGAZINE,

Carefully corrected from the Original Edition, to be completed in  
Twenty-seven Numbers, forming three handsome Volumes in  
Octavo, embellished with Elegant Engravings.

---

*Just Published, No. 1 to 14, Price One Shilling each,*

OF THE

SPIRITUAL MAGAZINE;

OR,

THE CHRISTIAN'S GRAND TREASURE;

WHEREIN THE PECULIAR DOCTRINES OF THE GOSPEL ARE UN-  
FOLDED, AND THE TYPES AND SHADOWS OF THE OLD TESTA-  
MENT UNVEILED AND SPIRITUALLY EXPLAINED,

IN FAMILIAR DIALOGUES

BETWEEN FRIENDLY AND TRUTH.

BY THE REV. JOHN ALLEN,

AUTHOR OF THE SPIRITUAL EXPOSITION OF THE BIBLE, &c. &c.

WITH

A RECOMMENDATORY PREFACE,

BY THE LATE REV. WILLIAM ROMAINE, A. M.

N. B.—In consequence of the numerous applications for sets  
of this work, the proprietors intend having it ready for  
Publication by the 1st day of December, 1809, when it  
may be had complete, in three Volumes; or one or more  
Numbers at a time, as suits the convenience of the Pur-  
chaser.

---

LONDON:

PUBLISHED BY A. KIDWELL, 24, BERWICK STREET, SOHO, AND  
S. LEE, 70, FETTER LANE;

AND SOLD BY

SHERWOOD, NEELY, & JONES, AND BUTTON, PATERNOSTER ROW;  
JONES, NEWGATE STREET;

AND BY ALL BOOKSELLERS IN THE UNITED KINGDOM.

## *The following is the late Rev. Mr. Romaine's Recommendation of the Spiritual Magazine.*

Having enjoyed the pleasure of perusing this Magazine in Manuscript, I beg leave to give it a brief recommendation.

1. To those parents who are so anxious to amass together a treasure of shadows for their children; and leave them so poor for death and eternity, that they are ready to say at a dying hour, "What shall I give in exchange for my soul?" therefore as you love your children, and regard the tenderest parts of yourselves, put into their hands this Christian's Grand Treasure, that they may be, through divine blessing, rich towards God.

2. Those masters who have the command of servants, whose labours increase their wealth and opulency in life, I invite them to pay a tender regard to their servants' eternal welfare, by encouraging them to leave in their hands \* one penny a week to buy a Spiritual Treasure for their immortal souls, that they who are poor in this world may be rich in faith, and heirs of the kingdom.

3. To such that are too wise for heaven and happiness, and despise all joys of a heavenly nature, wisdom once more invites you, with all the secrets of divine love, with all the pleasing hopes of heaven, with all the joys of glory, to seek the Lord while he may be found. In this Spiritual Magazine you will find the treasures of life, joy and peace divinely opened, to make you wise unto salvation by faith in Jesus Christ.

4. To the Christian that longs to grow in grace, and breathes after an increase in spiritual knowledge, this Magazine is intended through the blessing of Heaven, as a divine treasure for your spiritual mind, as there is herein contained such an harmony of divine truths, that will prove a constant feast for your spiritual appetite, rays of knowledge for your understanding, springs of life and love for your refreshment, rivers of joy for your delight, and an ocean of happiness for your portion.

W. ROMAINE.

\* This Magazine was originally published once in six weeks, at Sixpence a Number.

---

*The decided advantage this edition possesses above every preceding one will no doubt be duly appreciated by a discerning Public, as it is printed with a large Type, on a superfine Paper, and may be easily read by aged persons; it will likewise be embellished with Engravings executed by eminent artists.*

---

### MODE OF PUBLICATION.

1. This Work will be printed with a new Type, on a Superfine wove Demy Paper.

2. With each Volume will be given an elegant Frontispiece, and an engraved Title Page, with an emblematical Vignette.









