


NYPL RESEARCH LIBRARIES



3 3433 07954806 5



Wesley

11/11/11



THE WORKS

OF THE

REVEREND JOHN WESLEY, A. M.

SOMETIME FELLOW OF LINCOLN COLLEGE, OXFORD.

FIRST AMERICAN COMPLETE AND STANDARD EDITION,

FROM THE LATEST LONDON EDITION,

WITH THE LAST CORRECTIONS OF THE AUTHOR :

COMPREHENDING ALSO

NUMEROUS TRANSLATIONS, NOTES, AND AN ORIGINAL PREFACE, &c.

BY JOHN EMORY.

IN SEVEN VOLUMES.

VOLUME V.

NEW-YORK,

PUBLISHED BY J. EMORY AND E. WAUGH,
FOR THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH, AT THE CONFERENCE
OFFICE, 14 CROSBY-STREET.

J. Colloid, Printer

1831.

281213

11

"Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1831, by J. Emory and B. Waugh, in the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the Southern District of New-York."

★MRS. H. A. CLARKSON

20, 1860

CONTENTS OF VOL. V.

An Earnest Appeal to Men of Reason and Religion	Page 5
A Farther Appeal to Men of Reason and Religion , PART I.....	34
PART II.....	97
PART III.....	142
A Plain Account of the People called Methodists	176
The Nature, Design, and General Rules of the United Societies in London, Bristol, Kingswood, &c.	190
Rules of the Band Societies	192
Minutes of some late Conversations between the Rev. Mr. Wesleys, and others, in 1741	194
Minutes of Several Conversations between the Rev. Mr. Wesley and others, from the year 1741, to 1789	211
The Character of a Methodist	240
A Short History of Methodism	246
Advice to the People called Methodists	249
The Principles of a Methodist	254
An Answer to the Rev. Mr. Church's Remarks on the Rev. Mr. John Wesley's last Journal: in a Letter to that gentleman	265
The Principles of a Methodist farther explained: occasioned by the Rev. Mr. Church's Second Letter to Mr. Wesley: in a Second Letter to that gentleman	292
A Letter to the Bishop of London: occasioned by his Lordship's late Charge to his Clergy	339
A Letter to a Clergyman	349
A Letter to the Rev. Dr. Free	352
A Second Letter to the Rev. Dr. Free	355
A Letter to the Author of "The Craftsman," concerning real Christianity, disparaged under the name of Methodism	360
An Answer to a Letter published in the Bath Journal	362
A Letter to the Author of "The Enthusiasm of Methodists and Papists Compared"	364
A Second Letter to Ditto	373
A Second Letter to the Lord Bishop of Exeter	405
A Letter to the Rev. Mr. Baily, of Cork	407
A Letter to the Rev. Mr. Potter	423
A Letter to the Rev. Mr. Downes	428
A Letter to the Rev. Dr. Home	438
A Letter to the Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Gloucester	443
A Short Address to the Inhabitants of Ireland	480
A Letter to the Rev. Mr. Fleury	484
The Doctrine of Original Sin, according to Scripture, Reason, and Experience	492
Preface	492
PART FIRST.—The Past and Present State of Mankind	493
PART SECOND.—The Scriptural Method of Accounting for this, Defended	523
PART THIRD.—An Answer to Dr. Taylor's Supplement:—	
SECTION I. Of Imputed Guilt	576
SECTION II. Of the Nature and Design of our Afflictions and Mortality	578
SECTION III. The Argument taken from the Calamities and Sinfulness of Mankind considered	580
SECTION IV. Some Consequences of the Doctrine of Original Sin	585
SECTION V. A General Argument taken from what God has declared concerning Mankind, at the Restoration of the World after the Deluge	586
SECTION VI. The notion of Adam's being a Federal Head, or Representative of Mankind, considered	588
SECTION VII. Of the Formation of our Nature in the Womb	590
SECTION VIII. Of Original Righteousness	593
PART FOURTH.—Extracts from Dr. Watts and Mr. Hebden	603
ESSAY FIRST.—Do the present Miseries of Man alone prove his Apostasy from God?	620

ESSAY SECOND. —A Plain Explication of the Doctrine of Imputed Sin and Imputed Righteousness	Page 626
PART FIFTH. —The Doctrine of Original Sin.....	629
PART SIXTH. —The Doctrine of Original Sin, Explained and Vindicated.....	639
PART SEVENTH. —The Doctrine of Original Sin, extracted from Mr. Boston's Fourfold State of Man.....	651
A Letter to the Rev. John Taylor, D. D.	669
An Extract of a Letter to the Rev. Mr. Law	669
Thoughts upon Jacob Behmen	699
A Specimen of the Divinity and Philosophy of the highly illuminated Jacob Behmen	703
A Letter to the Rev. Doctor Conyers Middleton: occasioned by his late "Free Inquiry"	705
A Letter to a Roman Catholic.....	761
A Roman Catechism, faithfully drawn out of the allowed writings of the Church of Rome: with a Reply thereto	766
SECTION I. Of the Church, and Rule of Faith.....	767
SECTION II. Of Repentance and Obedience.....	772
SECTION III. Of Divine Worship	777
SECTION IV. Of the Sacraments.....	784
Of Baptism	785
The Exorcism of the Salt.....	786
Of Confirmation	786
Of the Eucharist	787
Of Penance	791
The Sacrament of Extreme Unction.....	793
Of the Sacrament of Orders.....	794
Of the Sacrament of Marriage	794
A Short Method of Converting all the Roman Catholics in the kingdom of Ireland: humbly proposed to the Bishops and Clergy of that kingdom	795
The Advantage of the Members of the Church of England over those of the Church of Rome	798
Popery Calmly Considered	803
SECTION I. Of the Church, and the Rule of Faith	803
SECTION II. Of Repentance and Obedience.....	805
SECTION III. Of Divine Worship	807
SECTION IV. Of the Sacraments	809
A Letter to the Printer of "The Public Advertiser:" occasioned by the late Act passed in favour of Popery. To which is added, A Defence of it, in Two Letters to the Editors of "The Freeman's Journal," Dublin	816
LETTER I. —First Letter to the Editors of "The Freeman's Journal," Dublin...	819
LETTER II. —Second Letter to Ditto	821
A Disavowal of persecuting Papists.....	826
The Origin of Image Worship among Christians	827

EARNEST APPEAL

TO

MEN OF REASON AND RELIGION.

Doth our law judge any man, before it hear him, and know what he doeth?

JOHN vii, 51.

1. **ALTHOUGH** it is with us a “very small thing to be judged of you or of man’s judgment,” seeing we know God will “make our innocency as clear as the light, and our just dealing as the noon-day;” yet are we ready to give any that are willing to hear a plain account, both of our principles and actions; as having “renounced the hidden things of shame,” and desiring nothing more, “than by manifestation of the truth to commend ourselves to every man’s conscience in the sight of God.”

2. We see (and who does not?) the numberless follies and miseries of our fellow creatures. We see, on every side, either men of no religion at all, or men of a lifeless, formal religion. We are grieved at the sight; and should greatly rejoice, if by any means we might convince some that there is a better religion to be attained,—a religion worthy of God that gave it. And this we conceive to be no other than love; the love of God and of all mankind; the loving God with all our heart, and soul, and strength, as having first loved *us*, as the fountain of all the good we have received, and of all we ever hope to enjoy; and the loving every soul which God hath made, every man on earth, as our own soul.

3. This love we believe to be the medicine of life, the never-failing remedy for all the evils of a disordered world, for all the miseries and vices of men. Wherever this is, there are virtue and happiness going hand in hand. There is humbleness of mind, gentleness, long suffering, the whole image of God; and at the same time a peace that passeth all understanding, and joy unspeakable and full of glory.

Eternal sunshine of the spotless mind;
 Each prayer accepted, and each wish resign’d;
 Desires composed, affections ever even,
 Tears that delight, and sighs that waft to heaven.

4. This religion we long to see established in the world, a religion of love, and joy, and peace, having its seat in the inmost soul, but ever showing itself by its fruits, continually springing forth, not only in all innocency, (for love worketh no ill to his neighbour,) but likewise in every kind of beneficence, spreading virtue and happiness all around it.

5. This religion have we been following after for many years, as many know, if they would testify: but all this time, seeking wisdom, we found it not; we were spending our strength in vain. And being now under

full conviction of this, we declare it to all mankind ; for we desire not that others should wander out of the way as we have done before them ; but rather that they may profit by our loss, that they may go (though we did not, having then no man to guide us) the straight way to the religion of love, even by faith.

6. Now, faith (supposing the Scripture to be of God) is *πραγματων ελεγχος* & *βλεπομενων*, “the demonstrative evidence of things unseen,” the supernatural evidence of things invisible, not perceivable by eyes of flesh, or by any of our natural senses or faculties. Faith is that divine evidence whereby the spiritual man discerneth God, and the things of God. It is with regard to the spiritual world, what sense is with regard to the natural. It is the spiritual sensation of every soul that is born of God.

7. Perhaps you have not considered it in this view. I will, then, explain it a little further.

Faith, according to the scriptural account, is the eye of the new-born soul. Hereby every true believer in God “seeth him who is invisible.” Hereby (in a more particular manner, since life and immortality have been brought to light by the Gospel,) he “seeth the light of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ ;” and “beholdeth what manner of love it is which the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we,” who are born of the Spirit, “should be called the sons of God.”

It is the ear of the soul, whereby a sinner “hears the voice of the Son of God, and lives ;” even that voice which alone wakes the dead, “Son, thy sins are forgiven thee.”

It is (if I may be allowed the expression) the palate of the soul ; for hereby a believer “tastes the good word, and the powers of the world to come ;” and “hereby he both tastes and sees that God is gracious,” yea, “and merciful to him a sinner.”

It is the feeling of the soul, whereby a believer perceives, through the “power of the Highest overshadowing him,” both the existence and the presence of Him in whom “he lives, moves, and has his being ;” and indeed the whole invisible world, the entire system of things eternal. And hereby, in particular, he feels “the love of God shed abroad in his heart.”

8. By this faith we are saved from all uneasiness of mind, from the anguish of a wounded spirit, from discontent, from fear and sorrow of heart, and from that inexpressible listlessness and weariness, both of the world and of ourselves, which we had so helplessly laboured under for many years ; especially when we were out of the hurry of the world, and sunk into calm reflection. In this we find that love of God, and of all mankind, which we had elsewhere sought in vain. This we know and feel, and therefore cannot but declare, saves every one that partakes of it, both from sin and misery, from every unhappy and every unwholy temper.

Soft peace she brings, wherever she arrives ;
She builds our quiet, as she forms our lives ;
Lays the rough paths of peevish nature even,
And opens in each breast a little heaven.

9. If you ask, “Why then have not all men this faith ? all, at least, who conceive it to be so happy a thing ! Why do they not believe immediately ?”

We answer, (on the Scripture hypothesis,) "It is the gift of God." No man is able to work it in himself. It is a work of omnipotence. It requires no less power thus to quicken a dead soul, than to raise a body that lies in the grave. It is a new creation; and none can create a soul anew, but He who at first created the heavens and the earth.

10. May not your own experience teach you this? Can you give yourself this faith? Is it now in your power to see, or hear, or taste, or feel God? Have you already, or can you raise in yourself, any perception of God, or of an invisible world? I suppose you do not deny that there is an invisible world; you will not charge it in poor old Hesiod to Christian prejudice of education, when he says, in those well-known words,

"Millions of spiritual creatures walk the earth
Unseen, whether we wake, or if we sleep."

Now, is there any power in your soul whereby you discern either these, or Him that created them? Or, can all your wisdom and strength open an intercourse between yourself and the world of spirits? Is it in your power to burst the veil that is on your heart, and let in the light of eternity? You know it is not. You not only do not, but cannot, by your own strength, thus believe. The more you labour so to do, the more you will be convinced "it is the gift of God."

11. It is the free gift of God, which he bestows, not on those who are worthy of his favour, not on such as are previously holy, and so fit to be crowned with all the blessings of his goodness; but on the ungodly and unholy; on those who till that hour were fit only for everlasting destruction; those in whom was no good thing, and whose only plea was, "God be merciful to me, a sinner!" No merit, no goodness in man precedes the forgiving love of God. His pardoning mercy supposes nothing in us but a sense of mere sin and misery; and to all who see, and feel, and own their wants, and their utter inability to remove them, God freely gives faith, for the sake of Him in whom he is always "well pleased."

12. This is a short, rude sketch of the doctrine we teach. These are our fundamental principles; and we spend our lives in confirming others herein, and in a behaviour suitable to them.

Now, if you are a reasonable man, although you do not believe the Christian system to be of God, lay your hand upon your breast, and calmly consider what it is that you can here condemn? What evil have we done to *you*, that you should join the common cry against us? Why should *you* say, "Away with such fellows from the earth; it is not fit that they should live?"

13. It is true, your judgment does not fall in with ours. We believe the Scripture to be of God. This you do not believe. And how do you defend yourselves against them who urge you with the guilt of unbelief? Do you not say, "Every man *must* judge according to the light he has," and that "if he be true to this, he ought not to be condemned?" Keep then to this, and turn the tables. *Must* not *we* also judge according to the light we have? You can in no wise condemn us without involving yourselves in the same condemnation. According to the light *we* have, we cannot but believe the Scripture is of God; and while we believe this, we dare not turn aside from it, to the right hand or to the left.

14. Let us consider this point a little further. You yourself believe

there is a God. You have the witness of this in your own breast. Perhaps sometimes you tremble before him. You believe there is such a thing as right and wrong; that there is a difference between moral good and evil. Of consequence you must allow, there is such a thing as conscience: I mean, that every person, capable of reflection, is conscious to himself when he looks back on any thing he has done, whether it be good or evil. You must likewise allow, that every man is to be guided by his own conscience, not another's. Thus far, doubtless, you may go, without any danger of being a volunteer in faith.

15. Now then, be consistent with yourself. If there be a God, who, being just and good, (attributes inseparable from the very idea of God,) is "a rewarder of them that diligently seek him," ought we not to do whatever we believe will be acceptable to so good a Master? Observe: If we believe, if we are fully persuaded of this in our mind, ought we not thus to seek him, and that with all diligence? Else, how should we expect any reward at his hands?

16. Again: Ought we not to do what we believe is morally good, and to abstain from what we judge is evil? By good I mean, conducive to the good of mankind, tending to advance peace and good will among men, promotive of the happiness of our fellow creatures; and by evil, what is contrary thereto. Then surely you cannot condemn our endeavouring, after our power, to make mankind happy; (I now speak only with regard to the present world;) our striving, as we can, to lessen their sorrows, and to teach them, in whatsoever state they are, therewith to be content.

17. Yet again: Are we to be guided by our own conscience, or by that of other men? You surely will not say that any man's conscience can preclude mine. You, at least, will not plead for robbing us of what you so strongly claim for yourselves: I mean the right of private judgment, which is indeed unalienable from reasonable creatures. You well know, that, unless we faithfully follow the dictates of our own mind, we cannot have a conscience void of offence toward God and toward man.

18. Upon your own principles, therefore, you must allow us to be, at least, innocent. Do you find any difficulty in this? You speak much of prepossession and prejudice; beware you are not entangled therein yourselves! Are you not prejudiced against us, because we believe and strenuously defend that system of doctrines which you oppose? Are you not enemies to us, because you take it for granted we are so to you? Nay, God forbid! I once saw one, who, from a plentiful fortune, was reduced to the lowest extremity. He was lying on a sick bed, in violent pain, without even convenient food, or one friend to comfort him: so that when his merciful landlord, to complete all, sent one to take his bed from under him, I was not surprised at his attempt to put an end to so miserable a life. Now, when I saw that poor man weltering in his blood, could I be angry at him? Surely, no. No more can I at you. I can no more hate, than I can envy, you. I can only lift up my heart to God for you, (as I did then for him,) and, with silent tears, beseech the Father of mercies, that he would look on you in your blood, and say unto you, "Live."

19. "Sir," said that unhappy man, at my first interview with him, "I scorn to deceive you or any man. You must not tell me of your Bible;

for I do not believe one word of it. I know there is a God; and believe he is all in all, the *Anima mundi*, (the soul of the world,) the

Totam

Mens agitans molem, et magno se corpore miscens.

(The all-informing soul,

Which spreads through the vast mass, and moves the whole.)

But further than this I believe not: all is dark; my thought is lost. But I hear," added he, "you preach to a great number of people every night and morning. Pray, what would you do with them? Whither would you lead them? What religion do you preach? What is it good for?" I replied, "I do preach to as many as desire to hear, every night and morning. You ask, what I would do with them: I would make them virtuous and happy, easy in themselves, and useful to others. Whither would I lead them? To heaven; to God the Judge, the lover of all, and to Jesus the Mediator of the new covenant. What religion do I preach? The religion of love; the law of kindness brought to light by the Gospel. What is this good for? To make all who receive it enjoy God and themselves: to make them like God; lovers of all; contented in their lives; and crying out at their death, in calm assurance, 'O grave, where is thy victory! Thanks be unto God, who giveth me the victory, through my Lord Jesus Christ.'"

20. Will you object to such a religion as this, that it is not reasonable? Is it not reasonable then to love God? Hath he not given you life, and breath, and all things? Does he not continue his love to you, filling your heart with food and gladness? What have you which you have not received of him? And does not love demand a return of love? Whether, therefore, you do love God or no, you cannot but own it is reasonable so to do; nay, seeing he is the Parent of all good, to love him with all your heart.

21. Is it not reasonable also to love our neighbour, every man whom God hath made? Are we not brethren, the children of one Father? Ought we not, then, to love one another? And should we only love them that love us? Is that acting like our Father which is in heaven? He causeth his sun to shine on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust. And can there be a more equitable rule than this: "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself?" You will plead for the reasonableness of this; as also for that golden rule, (the only adequate measure of brotherly love, in all our words and actions,) "Whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, even so do unto them?"

22. Is it not reasonable then, that, as we have opportunity, we should do good unto all men; not only friends but enemies; not only to the deserving, but likewise to the evil and unthankful? Is it not right that all our life should be one continued labour of love? If a day passes without doing good, may one not well say, with Titus, *Amici, diem perdidit!* (My friends, I have lost a day!) And is it enough, to feed the hungry, to clothe the naked, to visit those who are sick or in prison? Should we have no pity for those

Who sigh beneath guilt's horrid stain,

The worst confinement, and the heaviest chain?

Should we shut up our compassion toward those who are of all men

most miserable, because they are miserable by their own fault? If we have found a medicine to heal even that sickness, should we not, as we have freely received it, freely give? Should we not pluck them as brands out of the fire? the fire of lust, anger, malice, revenge? Your inmost soul answers, "It should be done; it is reasonable in the highest degree." Well, this is the sum of our preaching, and of our lives, our enemies themselves being the judges. If therefore you allow, that it is reasonable to love God, to love mankind, and to do good to all men, you cannot but allow that religion which we preach and live to be agreeable to the highest reason.

23. Perhaps, all this you can bear. It is tolerable enough; and if we spoke only of being saved by love, you should have no great objection: but you do not comprehend what we say of being saved by faith. I know you do not. You do not in any degree comprehend what we mean by that expression: have patience then, and I will tell you yet again. By those words, "We are saved by faith," we mean, that the moment a man receives that faith which is above described, he is saved from doubt and fear, and sorrow of heart, by a peace that passes all understanding; from the heaviness of a wounded spirit, by joy unspeakable; and from his sins, of whatsoever kind they were, from his vicious desires, as well as words and actions, by the love of God, and of all mankind, then shed abroad in his heart.

24. We grant, nothing is more unreasonable, than to imagine that such mighty effects as these can be wrought by that poor, empty, insignificant thing, which the world calls faith, and you among them. But supposing there be such a faith on the earth as that which the Apostle speaks of, such an intercourse between God and the soul, what is too hard for such a faith? You yourselves may conceive that "all things are possible to him that" thus "believeth;" to him that thus "walks with God," that is now a citizen of heaven, an inhabitant of eternity. If therefore you will contend with us, you must change the ground of your attack. You must flatly deny there is any faith upon earth: but perhaps this you might think too large a step. You cannot do this without a secret condemnation in your own breast. O that you would at length cry to God for that heavenly gift! whereby alone this truly reasonable religion, this beneficent love of God and man, can be planted in your heart.

25. If you say, "But those that profess this faith are the most unreasonable of all men;" I ask, Who are those that profess this faith? Perhaps you do not personally know such a man in the world. Who are they that so much as profess to have this "evidence of things not seen?" that profess to "see Him that is invisible," to hear the voice of God, and to have his Spirit ever "witnessing with their spirits, that they are the children of God?" I fear you will find few that even profess this faith, among the large numbers of those who are called believers.

26. "However, there are enough that profess themselves Christians." Yea, too many, God knoweth; too many that confute their vain professions, by the whole tenor of their lives. I will allow all you can say on this head, and perhaps more than all. It is now some years since I was engaged in a conversation with a strong reasoner, who at first urged the wickedness of the American Indians, as a bar to our hope of

converting them to Christianity. But when I mentioned their temperance, justice, and veracity, (according to the accounts I had then received,) it was asked, "Why, if those Heathens are such men as these, what will they gain by being made Christians? What would they gain by being such Christians as we see every where round about us?" I could not deny they would lose, not gain, by such a Christianity as this. Upon which she added, "Why, what else do you mean by Christianity?" My plain answer was, "What do you apprehend to be more valuable than good sense, good nature, and good manners? All these are contained, and that in the highest degree, in what I mean by Christianity. Good sense (so called) is but a poor, dim shadow of what Christians call faith. Good nature is only a faint, distant resemblance of Christian charity. And good manners, if of the most finished kind that nature, assisted by art, can attain to, is but a dead picture of that holiness of conversation which is the image of God visibly expressed. All these, put together by the art of God, I call Christianity." "Sir, if this be Christianity," said my opponent, in amaze, "I never saw a Christian in my life."

27. Perhaps it is the same case with *you*. If so, I am grieved for you, and can only wish, till you do see a living proof of this, that you would not say you see a Christian. For this is scriptural Christianity, and this alone. Whenever, therefore, you see an unreasonable man, you see one who perhaps calls himself by that name, but is no more a Christian than he is an angel. So far as he departs from true, genuine reason, so far he departs from Christianity. Do not say, "This is only asserted, not proved." It is undeniably proved by the original charter of Christianity. We appeal to this, to the written word. If any man's temper, or words, or actions, are contradictory to right reason, it is evident, to a demonstration, they are contradictory to this. Produce any possible or conceivable instance, and you will find the fact is so. The lives, therefore, of those who are *called* Christians, is no just objection to Christianity.

28. We join with you then in desiring a religion founded on reason, and every way agreeable thereto. But one question still remains to be asked, What do you mean by *reason*? I suppose you mean the eternal reason, or the nature of things; the nature of God, and the nature of man, with the relations necessarily subsisting between them. Why, this is the very religion *we* preach; a religion evidently founded on, and every way agreeable to, eternal reason, to the essential nature of things. Its foundation stands on the nature of God and the nature of man, together with their mutual relations. And it is every way suitable thereto; to the nature of God; for it begins in knowing him: and where, but in the true knowledge of God, can you conceive true religion to begin? It goes on in loving him and all mankind; for you cannot but imitate whom you love: it ends in serving him; in doing his will; in obeying him whom we know and love.

29. It is every way suited to the nature of man; for it begins in a man's knowing himself; knowing himself to be what he really is,—foolish, vicious, miserable. It goes on to point out the remedy for this, to make him truly wise, virtuous, and happy; as every thinking mind (perhaps from some implicit remembrance of what it originally was)

longs to be. It finishes all, by restoring the due relations between God and man ; by uniting for ever the tender Father, and the grateful, obedient son ; the great Lord of all, and the faithful servant ; doing not his own will, but the will of him that sent him.

30. But perhaps by reason you mean the faculty of reasoning, of inferring one thing from another. There are many, it is confessed, (particularly those who are styled Mystic divines,) that utterly decry the use of reason, thus understood, in religion ; nay, that condemn all reasoning concerning the things of God, as utterly destructive of true religion.

But we can in no wise agree with this. We find no authority for it in holy writ. So far from it, that we find there both our Lord and his Apostles continually reasoning with their opposers. Neither do we know, in all the productions of ancient and modern times, such a chain of reasoning or argumentation, so close, so solid, so regularly connected, as the Epistle to the Hebrews. And the strongest reasoner whom we have ever observed (excepting only Jesus of Nazareth) was that Paul of Tarsus ; the same who has left that plain direction for all Christians : "In malice," or wickedness, "be ye children ; but in understanding," or reason, "be ye men."

31. We therefore not only allow, but earnestly exhort, all who seek after true religion, to use all the reason which God hath given them, in searching out the things of God. But your reasoning justly, not only on this, but on any subject whatsoever, pre-supposes true judgments already formed, whereon to ground your argumentation. Else, you know, you will stumble at every step ; because *ex falso non sequitur verum*, "it is impossible, if your premises are false, to infer from them true conclusions."

32. You know, likewise, that before it is possible for you to form a true judgment of them, it is absolutely necessary that you have a clear apprehension of the things of God, and that your ideas thereof be all fixed, distinct, and determinate. And seeing our ideas are not innate, but must all originally come from our senses, it is certainly necessary that you have senses capable of discerning objects of this kind : not those only which are called natural senses, which in this respect profit nothing, as being altogether incapable of discerning objects of a spiritual kind ; but spiritual senses, exercised to discern spiritual good and evil. It is necessary that you have *the hearing ear*, and *the seeing eye*, emphatically so called ; that you have a new class of senses opened in your soul, not depending on organs of flesh and blood, to be "the evidence of things not seen," as your bodily senses are of visible things ; to be the avenues to the invisible world, to discern spiritual objects, and to furnish you with ideas of what the outward "eye hath not seen, neither the ear heard."

33. And till you have these internal senses, till the eyes of your understanding are opened, you can have no apprehension of divine things, no idea of them at all. Nor, consequently, till then, can you either judge truly, or reason justly, concerning them ; seeing your reason has no ground whereon to stand, no materials to work upon.

34. To use the trite instance : as you cannot reason concerning colours, if you have no natural sight, because all the ideas received by

your other senses are of a different kind ; so that neither your hearing, nor any other sense, can supply your want of sight, or furnish your reason in this respect with matter to work upon : so you cannot reason concerning spiritual things, if you have no spiritual sight ; because all your ideas received by your outward senses are of a different kind ; yea, far more different from those received by faith or internal sensation, than the idea of colour from that of sound. These are only different species of one genus, namely, sensible ideas, received by external sensation ; whereas the ideas of faith differ *toto genere* [entirely] from those of external sensation. So that it is not conceivable, that external sensation should supply the want of internal senses ; or furnish your reason in this respect with matter to work upon.

35. What then will your reason do here ? How will it pass from things natural to spiritual ; from the things that are seen to those that are not seen ; from the visible to the invisible world ? What a gulf is here ! By what art will reason get over the immense chasm ? This cannot be, till the Almighty come in to your succour, and give you that faith you have hitherto despised. Then upborne, as it were, on eagles' wings, you shall soar away into the regions of eternity ; and your enlightened reason shall explore even "the deep things of God ;" God himself "revealing them to you by his Spirit."

36. I expected to have received much light on this head, from a treatise lately published, and earnestly recommended to me ; I mean, "Christianity not founded on Argument." But on a careful perusal of that piece, notwithstanding my prejudice in its favour, I could not but perceive, that the great design uniformly pursued throughout the work was, to render the whole of the Christian institution both odious and contemptible. In order to this, the author gleans up, with great care and diligence, the most plausible of those many objections that have been raised against it by late writers, and proposes them with the utmost strength of which he was capable. To do this with the more effect, he personates a Christian : he makes a show of defending an avowed doctrine of Christianity, namely, the supernatural influence of the Spirit of God ; and often, for several sentences together, (indeed, in the beginning of almost every paragraph,) speaks so like a Christian, that not a few have received him according to his wish. Meanwhile, with all possible art and show of reason, and in the most laboured language, he pursues his point throughout, which is to prove, that "Christianity is contrary to reason ;" or, that "no man acting according to the principles of reason, can possibly be a Christian."

37. It is a wonderful proof of the power that smooth words may have even on serious minds, that so many have mistook such a writer as this for a friend of Christianity ; since almost every page of his tract is filled with gross falsehood and broad blasphemy ; and these supported by such exploded fallacies, and common place sophistry, that a person of two or three years' standing in the university might give them a sufficient answer, and make the author appear as irrational and contemptible as he labours to make Christ and his Apostles.

38. I have hitherto spoken to those chiefly, who do not receive the Christian system as of God. I would add a few words to another sort of men ;—though not so much with regard to our principles or practice

as with regard to their own: to you who do receive it, who believe the Scripture, but yet do not take upon you the character of religious men. I am therefore obliged to address myself to you likewise under the character of men of reason.

39. I would only ask, Are you such indeed? Do you answer the character under which you appear? If so, you are consistent with yourselves; your principles and practice agree together.

Let us try whether this is so or not. Do you not take the name of God in vain? Do you remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy? Do you not speak evil of the ruler of your people? Are you not a drunkard, or a glutton, faring as sumptuously as you can every day; making a god of your belly? Do you not avenge yourself? Are you not a whore-monger or adulterer? Answer plainly to your own heart, before God the judge of all.

Why then do you say you believe the Scripture? If the Scripture is true, you are lost. You are in the broad way that leadeth to destruction. Your damnation slumbereth not. You are heaping up to yourself wrath against the day of wrath, and revelation of the righteous judgment of God. Doubtless, if the Scripture is true, and you remain thus, it had been good for you if you had never been born.

40. How is it that you call yourselves men of reason? Is reason inconsistent with itself? You are the furthest of all men under the sun from any pretence to that character. A common swearer, a Sabbath breaker, a whoremonger, a drunkard, who says he believes the Scripture is of God, is a monster upon earth, the greatest contradiction to his own, as well as to the reason of all mankind. In the name of God, (that worthy name whereby you are called, and which you daily cause to be blasphemed,) turn either to the right hand or to the left. Either profess you are an Infidel, or be a Christian. Halt no longer thus between two opinions. Either cast off the Bible, or your sins. And, in the mean time, if you have any spark of your boasted reason left, do not "count us your enemies," (as I fear you have done hitherto, and as thousands do wherever we have declared, "They who do such things shall not inherit eternal life,") "because we tell you the truth;" seeing these are not our words, but the words of Him that sent us; yea, though, in doing this, we use "great plainness of speech," as becomes the ministry we have received. "For we are not as many who corrupt" (camponize, soften, and thereby adulterate) "the word of God. But as of sincerity, but as of God, in the sight of God speak we in Christ."

41. But, it may be, you are none of these. You abstain from all such things. You have an unspotted reputation. You are a man of honour, or a woman of virtue. You scorn to do an unhandsome thing, and are of an unblamable life and conversation. You are harmless (if I understand you right) and useless from morning to night. You do no hurt,—and no good to any one, no more than a straw floating upon the water. Your life glides smoothly on from year to year; and from one season to another, having no occasion to work,

You waste away in gentle inactivity the day.

42. I will not now shock the easiness of your temper by talking about a future state; but suffer me to ask you a question about present things: Are you now happy?

I have seen a large company of reasonable creatures, called Indians, sitting in a row on the side of a river, looking sometimes at one another, sometimes at the sky, and sometimes at the bubbles on the water. And so they sat, (unless in the time of war,) for a great part of the year, from morning to night.

These were, doubtless, much at ease. But can you think they were happy? And how little happier are you than they?

43. You eat, and drink, and sleep, and dress, and dance, and sit down to play. You are carried abroad. You are at the masquerade, the theatre, the opera house, the park, the levee, the drawing room. What do you do there? Why, sometimes you talk; sometimes you look at one another. And what are you to do to-morrow, the next day, the next week, the next year? You are to eat, and drink, and sleep, and dance, and dress, and play again. And you are to be carried abroad again, that you may again look at one another! And is this all? Alas, how little more happiness have you in this, than the Indians in looking at the sky or water!

Ah, poor, dull round! I do not wonder that Colonel M—— (or any man of reflection) should prefer death itself, even in the midst of his years, to such a life as this; and should frankly declare that he chose to go out of the world, because he found nothing in it worth living for.

44. Yet it is certain there is business to be done: and many we find in all places (not to speak of the vulgar, the drudges of the earth,) who are continually employed therein. Are you of that number? Are you engaged in trade, or some other reputable employment? I suppose, profitable too; for you would not spend your time and labour and thought for nothing. You are then making your fortune; you are getting money. True; but money is not your ultimate end. The treasuring up gold and silver, for its own sake, all men own, is as foolish and absurd, as grossly unreasonable, as the treasuring up spiders, or the wings of butterflies. You consider this but as a means to some further end. And what is that? Why, the enjoying yourself, the being at ease, the taking your pleasure, the living like a gentleman; that is, plainly, either the whole or some part of the happiness above described.

Supposing then your end to be actually attained; suppose you have your wish before you drop into eternity: go and sit down with Thlecanowhee and his companions on the river side.—After you have toiled for fifty years, you are just as happy as they.

45. Are you, can you, or any reasonable man, be satisfied with this? You are not. It is not possible you should. But what else can you do? You would have something better to employ your time; but you know not where to find it upon earth.

And, indeed, it is obvious that the earth, as it is now constituted, even with the help of all European arts, does not afford sufficient employment to take up half the waking hours of half its inhabitants.

What then can you do? How can you employ the time that lies so heavy upon your hands? This very thing which you seek declare we unto you. The thing you want is the religion we preach. That alone leaves no time upon our hands. It fills up all the blank spaces of life. It exactly takes up all the time we have to spare, be it more or less; so that "he that hath much, hath nothing over; and he that has little, has no lack."

46. Once more : Can you, or any man of reason, think you was made for the life you now lead? You cannot possibly think so ; at least, not till you tread the Bible under foot. The oracles of God bear thee witness in every page, (and thine own heart agreeth thereto,) that thou wast made in the image of God, an incorruptible picture of the God of glory. And what art thou even in thy present state? An everlasting spirit, going to God. For what end then did he create thee, but to dwell with him, above this perishable world, to know him, to love him, to do his will, to enjoy him for ever and ever? O look more deeply into thyself! and into that Scripture, which thou professest to receive as the word of God, as "right concerning all things." There thou wilt find a nobler, happier state described, than it ever yet entered into thy heart to conceive. But God hath now revealed it to all those who "rejoice evermore, and pray without ceasing, and in every thing give thanks," and do his "will on earth as it is done in heaven." For this thou wast made. Hereunto also thou art called. O be not disobedient to the heavenly calling! At least be not angry with those who would fain bring thee to be a living witness of that religion, "whose ways are" indeed "ways of pleasantness, and all her paths peace."

47. Do you say in your heart?—"I know all this already. I am not barely a man of reason. I am a religious man; for I not only avoid evil and do good, but use all the means of grace. I am constantly at church, and at the sacrament too. I say my prayers every day. I read many good books. I fast—every thirtieth of January, and Good-Friday." Do you indeed? Do you do all this? This you may do, you may go thus far, and yet have no religion at all; no such religion as avails before God: nay, much further than this; than you have ever gone yet, or so much as thought of going. For you may "give all your goods to feed the poor," yea, "your body to be burned," and yet very possibly, if St. Paul be a judge, "have no charity," no true religion.

48. This religion, which alone is of value before God, is the very thing you want. You want (and in wanting this, you want all) the religion of love. You do not love your neighbour as yourself, no more than you love God with all your heart. Ask your own heart now if it be not so. It is plain you do not love God. If you did, you would be happy in him. But you know you are not happy. Your formal religion no more makes you happy, than your neighbour's gay religion does him. O how much have you suffered for want of plain dealing! Can you now bear to hear the naked truth? You have "the form of godliness, but not the power." You are a mere whited wall. Before the Lord your God, I ask you, Are you not? Too sure; for your "inward parts are very wickedness." You love "the creature more than the Creator." You are "a lover of pleasure more than a lover of God." *A lover of God!* You do not love God at all, no more than you love a stone. You love the world; therefore the love of the Father is not in you.

49. You are on the brink of the pit, ready to be plunged into everlasting perdition. Indeed you have a zeal for God; but not according to knowledge. O how terribly have you been deceived! posting to hell, and fancying it was heaven. See, at length, that outward religion, without inward, is nothing; is far worse than nothing, being, indeed, no other than a solemn mockery of God. And inward religion you have

not. You have not the faith "that worketh by love." Your faith (so called) is no living, saving principle. It is not the apostle's faith, "the substance," or subsistence, "of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen." So far from it, that this faith is the very thing which you call enthusiasm. You are not content with being without it, unless you blaspheme it too. You even revile that "life which is hid with Christ in God;" all seeing, tasting, hearing, feeling God. These things are foolishness unto you. No marvel; "for they are spiritually discerned."

50. O no longer shut your eyes against the light! Know, you have a name that you live, but are dead. Your soul is utterly dead in sin; dead in pride, in vanity, in self-will, in sensuality, in love of the world. You are utterly dead to God. There is no intercourse between your soul and God. "You have neither seen him," (by faith, as our Lord witnessed against them of old time,) "nor heard his voice at any time." You have no spiritual "senses exercised to discern spiritual good and evil." You are angry at Infidels, and are all the while as mere an Infidel before God as they. You have "eyes that see not, and ears that hear not." You have a callous, unfeeling heart.

51. Bear with me a little longer: my soul is distressed for you. "The god of this world hath blinded your eyes," and you are "seeking death in the error of your life." Because you do not commit gross sin, because you give alms, and go to the church and sacrament, you imagine that you are serving God: yet, in very deed, you are serving the devil; for you are doing still your own will, not the will of God your Saviour. You are pleasing yourself in all you do. Pride, vanity, and self-will (the genuine fruits of an earthly, sensual, devilish heart) pollute all your words and actions. You are in darkness, in the shadow of death. O that God would say to you in thunder, "Awake, thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light!"

52. But, blessed be God, he hath not yet left himself without witness:

All are not lost! there be, who faith prefer,
Though few, and piety to God!

who know the power of faith, and are no strangers to that inward, vital religion, "the mind that was in Christ; righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost." Of you who "have tasted the good word of God, and the powers of the world to come," I would be glad to learn if we have "erred from the faith," or walked contrary to "the truth as it is in Jesus." "Let the righteous smite me friendly, and reprove me;" if haply that which is amiss may be done away, and what is wanting supplied, till we all come to the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ.

53. Perhaps the first thing that now occurs to your mind relates to the doctrine which we teach. You have heard that we say, "Men may live without sin." And have you not heard that the Scripture says the same;—we mean, without committing sin? Does not St. Paul say plainly, that those who believe "do not continue in sin," that they cannot "live any longer therein?" Rom. vi. 1, 2. Does not St. Peter say, "He that hath suffered in the flesh, hath ceased from sin; that he no longer should live to the desires of men, but to the will of God?" 1 Peter iv, 1, 2. And does not St. John say expressly, "He that committeth sin is of the devil? For this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that

he might destroy the works of the devil. 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," 1 John iii, 8, &c. And again: "We know that whatsoever is born of God sinneth not," v, 18.

54. You see then it is not we that say this, but the Lord. These are not our words, but his. And who is he that replieth against God? Who is able to make God a liar? Surely he will be justified in his saying, and clear when he is judged! Can you deny it? Have you not often felt a secret check when you was contradicting this great truth? And how often have you wished for what you was taught to deny? Nay, can you help wishing for it this moment? Do you not now earnestly desire to cease from sin? to commit it no more? Does not your soul pant after this glorious liberty of the sons of God? And what strong reason have you to expect it! Have you not had a foretaste of it already? Do you not remember the time when God first lifted up the light of his countenance upon you? Can it ever be forgotten? the day when the candle of the Lord first shone upon your head?

Butter and honey did you eat;

And, lifted up on high,

You saw the clouds beneath your feet,

And rode upon the sky.

Far, far above all earthly things

Triumphantly you rode;

You soar'd to heaven on eagles' wings,

And found, and talk'd with God.

You then had power not to commit sin. You found the Apostle's words strictly true, "He that is begotten of God keepeth himself, and that wicked one toucheth him not." But those whom you took to be experienced Christians telling you, this was only the time of your espousals, this could not last always, you must come down from the mount, and the like, shook your faith. You looked at men more than God, and so became weak, and like another man. Whereas, had you then had any to guide you according to the truth of God, had you then heard the doctrine which now you blame, you had never fallen from your steadfastness; but had found, that, in this sense also, "the gifts and calling of God are without repentance."

55. Have you not another objection nearly allied to this, namely, that we preach perfection? True; but what perfection? The term you cannot object to; because it is scriptural. All the difficulty is, to fix the meaning of it according to the word of God. And this we have done again and again, declaring to all the world, that Christian perfection does not imply an exemption from ignorance, or mistake, or infirmities, or temptations; but that it does imply the being so crucified with Christ, as to be able to testify, "I live not, but Christ liveth in me," Gal. ii, 20, and hath "purified my heart by faith," Acts xv, 9. It does imply "the casting down every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ." It does imply "the being holy, as he that hath called us is holy, in all manner of conversation," 2 Cor. x, 5; 1 Peter i, 15; and, in a word, "the loving the Lord our God with all our heart, and serving him with all our strength."

56. Now, is it possible for any who believe the Scripture to deny one tittle of this? You cannot. You dare not. You would not for the world. You know it is the pure word of God. And this is the whole of what we preach; this is the height and depth of what we (with St.

Paul) call perfection, —a state of soul devoutly to be wished by all who have tasted of the love of God. O pray for it without ceasing! It is the one thing you want. Come with boldness to the throne of grace, and be assured that when you ask this of God, you shall have the petition you ask of him. We know indeed that to man, to the natural man, this is impossible. But we know also, that as no word is impossible with God, so “all things are possible to him that believeth.”

57. For “we are saved by faith.” But have you not heard this urged as another objection against us, that we preach salvation by faith alone? And does not St. Paul do the same thing? “By grace,” saith he, “ye are saved through faith.” Can any words be more express? And elsewhere, “Believe in the Lord Jesus, and thou shalt be saved,” Acts xvi, 31.

What we mean by this (if it has not been sufficiently explained already) is, that we are saved from our sins, only by a confidence in the love of God. As soon as we “behold what manner of love it is which the Father hath bestowed upon us, we love him,” (as the Apostle observes,) “because he first loved us.” And then is that commandment written in our heart, “That he who loveth God love his brother also;” from which love of God and man, meekness, humbleness of mind, and all holy tempers, spring. Now, these are the very essence of salvation, of Christian salvation, salvation from sin; and from these outward salvation flows, that is, holiness of life and conversation. Well, and are not these things so? If you know in whom you have believed, you need no further witnesses.

58. But perhaps you doubt whether that faith whereby we are thus saved implies such a trust and confidence in God as we describe. You cannot think faith implies assurance; an assurance of the love of God to our souls of his being now reconciled to us, and having forgiven all our sins. And this we freely confess, that, if number of voices is to decide the question, we must give it up at once: for you have on your side, not only some who desire to be Christians indeed; but all nominal Christians in every place; and the Romish church, one and all. Nay, these last are so vehement in your defence, that, in the famed Council of Trent, they have decreed, “If any man hold (*fiduciam*) trust, confidence, or assurance of pardon, to be essential to faith, let him be accursed.”

59. Thus does that council anathematize the Church of England; for she is convicted hereof by her own confession. The very words in the Homily on Salvation are, “Even the devils believe that Christ was born of a virgin; that he wrought all kind of miracles, declaring himself very God; that for our sakes he suffered a most painful death, to redeem us from death everlasting. These articles of our faith the devils believe; and so they believe all that is written in the Old and New Testament. And yet, for all this faith they be but devils. They remain still in their damnable estate, lacking the very true, Christian faith.

“The right and true Christian faith is, not only to believe the Holy Scriptures, and the articles of our faith, are true; but also to have a sure trust and confidence, to be saved from everlasting damnation through Christ.” Or, (as it is expressed a little after,) “a sure trust and confidence which a man hath in God, that by the merits of Christ his sins are forgiven, and he reconciled to the favour of God.”

60. Indeed, the bishop of Rome saith, "If any man hold this, let him be Anathema Maranatha." But it is to be hoped, Papal anathemas do not move *you*. You are a member of the Church of England. Are you? Then the controversy is at an end. Then hear the Church: "Faith is a sure trust which a man hath in God, that his sins are forgiven." Or, if you are not, whether you hear our Church or no, at least hear the Scriptures. Hear believing Job, declaring his faith, "I know that my Redeemer liveth." Hear Thomas (when having seen he believed) crying out, "My Lord and my God!" Hear St. Paul clearly describing the nature of his faith, "The life I now live, I live by faith in the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me." Hear (to mention no more) all the believers who were with Paul when he wrote to the Colossians, bearing witness, "We give thanks unto the Father, who hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the kingdom of his dear Son; in whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins," Ch. i, 12, 13, 14.

61. But what need have we of distant witnesses? You have a witness in your own breast. For am I not speaking to one that loves God? How came you then to love him at first? Was it not because you knew that he loved you? Did you, could you, love God at all, till you tasted and saw that he was gracious; that he was merciful to you a sinner? What avails then controversy, or strife of words? Out of thy own mouth! You own you had no love to God till you was sensible of his love to you. And whatever expressions any sinner who loves God uses, to denote God's love to him, you will always upon examination find, that they directly or indirectly imply forgiveness. Pardoning love is still at the root of all. He who was offended is now reconciled. The new song which God puts in every mouth is always to that effect: "O Lord, I will praise thee; though thou wast angry with me, thine anger is turned away. Behold, God is my salvation. I will trust, and not be afraid: for the Lord Jehovah is my strength and my song; he is also become my salvation," Isaiah xii, 1, 2.

62. A confidence then in a pardoning God is essential to saving faith. The forgiveness of sins is one of the first of those unseen things whereof faith is the evidence. And if you are sensible of this, will you quarrel with us concerning an indifferent circumstance of it? Will you think it an important objection, that we assert that this faith is usually given in a moment? First, let me entreat you to read over that authentic account of God's dealings with men, the Acts of the Apostles. In this treatise you will find how he wrought from the beginning on those who received remission of sins by faith. And can you find one of these (except perhaps St. Paul) who did not receive it in a moment? But abundance you find of those who did, besides Cornelius and the three thousand: Acts ii, 41. And to this also agrees the experience of those who now receive the heavenly gift. Three or four exceptions only have I found in the course of several years;—perhaps you yourself may be added to that number, and one or two more whom you have known. But all the rest of those who from time to time among us have believed in the Lord Jesus were in a moment brought from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God.

63. And why should it seem a thing incredible to you, who have known

the power of God unto salvation, (whether he hath wrought thus in your soul or no; "for there are diversities of operations, but the same Spirit,") that "the dead should hear the voice of the Son of God," and in that moment live? Thus he useth to act, to show that when he willeth, to do is present with him. "Let there be light," said God; "and there was light. He spoke the word, and it was done. Thus the heavens and the earth were created, and all the hosts of them." And this manner of acting in the present case highly suits both his power and love. There is therefore no hinderance on God's part; since "as his majesty is, so is his mercy." And whatever hinderance there is on the part of man, when God speaketh, it is not. Only ask then, O sinner, "and it shall be given thee," even the faith that brings salvation: and that without any merit or good work of thine; for "it is not of works, lest any man should boast." No; it is of grace, of grace alone. For "unto him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted to him for righteousness."

64. "But by talking thus you encourage sinners." I do encourage them—to repent; and do not you? Do not you know how many heap sin upon sin, purely for want of such encouragement; because they think they can never be forgiven, there is no place for repentance left? Does not your heart also bleed for them? What would you think too dear to part with? What would you not do, what would you not suffer, to bring one such sinner to repentance? Could not your love "endure all things" for them? Yes,—if you believed it would do them good; if you had any hope that they would be better. Why do you not believe it would do them good? Why have you not a hope that they will be better? Plainly, because you do not love them enough; because you have not that charity which not only endureth, but at the same time believeth and hopeth all things.

65. But that you may see the whole strength of this objection, I will show you, without any disguise or reserve, how I encourage the chief of sinners. My usual language to them runs thus:—

O ye that deny the Lord that bought you, yet hear the word of the Lord! You seek rest, but find none. Even in laughter your heart is in heaviness. How long spend ye your labour for that which is not bread, and your strength for that which satisfieth not? You know your soul is not satisfied. It is still an aching void. Sometimes you find, in spite of your principles, a sense of guilt, an awakened conscience. That grisly phantom, religion, (so you describe her,) will now and then haunt you still. Righteousness looking down from heaven is indeed to us no unpleasing sight. But how does it appear to you?

Horribili super aspectu mortalibus instans?

[With a horrible aspect, brooding over mortals?]

How often are you in fear of the very things you deny? How often in racking suspense? What, if there be an hereafter, a judgment to come, an unhappy eternity? Do you not start at the thought? Can you be content to be always thus? Shall it be said of you also?—

"Here lies a dicer, long in doubt
If death could kill the soul, or not:
Here ends his doubtfulness; at last
Convinced: But, O, the die is cast!"

Or, are you already convinced there is no hereafter? What a poor state then are you in now? taking a few more dull turns upon earth, and then dropping into nothing! What kind of spirit must you be of, if you can sustain yourself under the thought! under the expectation of being in a few moments swept away by the stream of time, and then for ever

swallow'd up, and lost

In the wide womb of uncreated night!

But neither indeed are you certain of this; nor of any thing else. It may be so; it may not. A vast scene is behind: but clouds and darkness rest upon it. All is doubt and uncertainty. You are continually tossed to and fro, and have no firm ground for the sole of your foot. O let not the poor wisdom of man any longer exalt itself against the wisdom of God! You have fled from him long enough; at length, suffer your eyes to be opened by Him that made them. You want rest to your soul. Ask it of Him who giveth to all men liberally, and upbraideth not! You are now a mere riddle to yourself, and your condition full of darkness and perplexity. You are one among many restless inhabitants of a miserable, disordered world, "walking in a vain shadow, and disquieting yourself in vain." But the light of God will speedily disperse the anxiety of your vain conjectures. By adding heaven to earth, and eternity to time, it will open such a glorious view of things as will lead you, even in the present world, to a peace which passeth all understanding.

66. O ye gross, vile, scandalous sinners, hear ye the word of the Lord. "Turn ye, turn ye from your evil ways; so iniquity shall not be your ruin. As I live, saith the Lord, I have no pleasure in the death of a sinner, but rather that he should turn and live." O make haste; delay not the time! "Come, and let us reason together: though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be white as snow; though they be red as crimson, they shall be as wool. Who is this that cometh from Edom, with dyed garments, red in his apparel?" It is he on whom the Lord "hath laid the iniquities of us all!" Behold, behold the Lamb of God, that taketh away thy sins! See the only-begotten Son of the Father, "full of grace and truth!" He loveth thee. He gave himself for thee. Now his bowels of compassion yearn over thee! O believe in the Lord Jesus, and thou shalt be saved! "Go in peace, sin no more!"

67. Now, cannot you join in all this? Is it not the very language of your heart? O when will you take knowledge, that our whole concern, our constant labour, is, to bring all the world to the religion which you feel, to solid, inward, vital religion! What power is it then that keeps us asunder? "Is thine heart right, as my heart is with thy heart? If it be, give me thy hand. Come with me, and see," and rejoice in, "my zeal for the Lord." No difference between us (if thou art a child of God) can be so considerable as our agreement is. If we differ in smaller things, we agree in that which is greatest of all. How is it possible then that you should be induced to think or speak evil of us? How could it ever come into your mind to oppose us, or weaken our hands? How long shall we complain of the wounds which we receive in the house of our friends? Surely the children of this world are still "wiser in their generation than the children of light." Satan is not divided

against himself: why are they who are on the Lord's side? How is it that wisdom is not justified of her own children?

68. Is it because you have heard that we only make religion a cloak for covetousness; and because you have heard abundance of particulars alleged in support of that general charge? It is probable you may also have heard how much we have gained by preaching already; and, to crown all, that we are only Papists in disguise, who are undermining and destroying the Church.

69. You have heard this. Well; and can you believe it? Have you then never heard the fifth chapter of St. Matthew? I would to God you could believe it. What is written there? How readest thou? "Blessed are ye, when men shall revile you, and persecute you, and say all manner of evil against you falsely, for my name's sake. Rejoice and be exceeding glad: for great is your reward in heaven: for so persecuted they the Prophets that were before you;" namely, by "reviling them, and saying all manner of evil of them falsely." Do not you know that this, as well as all other scriptures, must needs be fulfilled? If so, take knowledge that this day also it is fulfilled in your ears. For our Lord's sake, and for the sake of his Gospel which we preach, "men do revile us, and persecute us, and" (blessed be God, who giveth us to rejoice therein) "say all manner of evil of us falsely." And how can it be otherwise? "The disciple is not above his Master. It is enough for the disciple, that he be as his Master, and the servant as his Lord. If they have called the Master of the house Beelzebub, how much more shall they call them of his household?"

70. This only we confess, that we preach inward salvation, now attainable by faith. And for preaching this (for no other crime was then so much as pretended) we were forbid to preach any more in those churches, where, till then, we were gladly received. This is a notorious fact. Being thus hindered from preaching in the places we should first have chosen, we now declare the "grace of God which bringeth salvation, in all places of his dominion;" as well knowing, that God dwelleth not only in temples made with hands. This is the real, and it is the only real, ground of complaint against us. And this we avow before all mankind, we do preach this salvation by faith. And not being suffered to preach it in the usual places, we declare it wherever a door is opened, either on a mountain, or a plain, or by a river side, (for all which we conceive we have sufficient precedent,) or in prison, or, as it were, in the house of Justus, or the school of one Tyrannus. Nor dare we refrain. "A dispensation of the Gospel is committed to me; and wo is me, if I preach not the Gospel."

71. Here we allow the fact, but deny the guilt. But in every other point alleged, we deny the fact, and call upon the world to prove it, if they can. More especially, we call upon those who for many years saw our manner of life at Oxford. These well know that "after the straitest sect of our religion we lived Pharisees;" and that the grand objection to us for all those years was, the being righteous overmuch; the reading, fasting, praying, denying ourselves,—the going to church, and to the Lord's table,—the relieving the poor, visiting those that were sick and in prison, instructing the ignorant, and labouring to reclaim the wicked,—more than was necessary for salvation. These were our open, flagrant

crimes, from the year 1729 to the year 1737; touching which our Lord shall judge in that day.

72. But, waiving the things that are past, which of you now convinceth us of sin? Which of you (I here more especially appeal to my brethren, the clergy) can personally convict us of any ungodliness or unholiness of conversation? Ye know in your own hearts, (all that are candid men, all that are not utterly blinded with prejudice,) that we “labour to have a conscience void of offence both toward God and toward man.” Brethren, I would to God that in this ye were even as we. But indeed (with grief I speak it) ye are not. There are among yourselves ungodly and unholy men; openly, undeniably such; drunkards, gluttons, returners of evil for evil, liars, swearers, profaners of the day of the Lord. Proof hereof is not wanting, if ye require it. Where then is your zeal against these? A clergyman, so drunk he can scarce stand or speak, may, in the presence of a thousand people, (at Epworth, in Lincolnshire,) set upon another clergyman of the same Church, both with abusive words and open violence. And what follows? Why, the one is still allowed to dispense the sacred signs of the body and blood of Christ: but the other is not allowed to receive them,—because he is a field preacher.

73. O ye pillars and fathers of the Church, are these things well pleasing to Him who hath made you overseers over that flock which he hath purchased with his own blood? O that ye would suffer me to boast myself a little! Is there not a cause? Have ye not compelled me? Which of your clergy are more unspotted in their lives, which more unwearied in their labours, than those whose “names ye cast out as evil,” whom ye count “as the filth and off-scouring of the world?” Which of them is more zealous to spend and be spent, for the lost sheep of the house of Israel? Or who among them is more ready to be offered up for their flock “upon the sacrifice and service of their faith?”

74. Will ye say, (as the historian of Catiline,) *Si sic pro patriâ!* [If thus for your country!] “If this were done in defence of the Church, and not in order to undermine and destroy it!” That is the very proposition I undertake to prove,—that we are now defending the Church, even the Church of England, in opposition to all those who either secretly undermine or more openly attempt to destroy it.

75. That we are Papists, (we who are daily and hourly preaching that very doctrine which is so solemnly anathematized by the whole Church of Rome,) is such a charge that I dare not waste my time in industriously confuting it. Let any man of common sense only look on the title pages of the sermons we have lately preached at Oxford, and he will need nothing more to show him the weight of this senseless, shameless accusation;—unless he can suppose the governors both of Christ Church and Lincoln College, nay, and all the university, to be Papists too.

76. You yourself can easily acquit us of this; but not of the other part of the charge. You still think we are secretly undermining, if not openly destroying, the Church. What do you mean by the Church? A visible Church (as our article defines it) is a company of faithful or believing people;—*cætus credentium*. This is the essence of a church; and the properties thereof are, (as they are described in the words that follow,) “among whom the pure word of God is preached, and the sacraments duly administered.” Now then, (according to this authentic

account,) what is the Church of England? What is it indeed, but the faithful people, the true believers in England? It is true, if these are scattered abroad, they come under another consideration: but when they are visibly joined, by assembling together to hear the pure word of God preached, and to eat of one bread, and drink of one cup, they are then properly the visible Church of England.

77. It were well if this were a little more considered by those who so vehemently cry out, "The Church! the Church!" (as those of old, "The temple of the Lord! the temple of the Lord!") not knowing what they speak, nor whereof they affirm. A provincial or national Church, according to our article, is the true believers of that province or nation. If these are dispersed up and down, they are only a part of the invisible Church of Christ. But if they are visibly joined by assembling together to hear his word and partake of his supper, they are then a visible Church, such as the Church of England, France, or any other.

78. This being premised, I ask, How do we undermine or destroy the Church,—the provincial, visible Church of England? The article mentions three things as essential to a visible Church. First: Living faith; without which, indeed, there can be no Church at all, neither visible nor invisible. Secondly: Preaching, and consequently hearing, the pure word of God, else that faith would languish and die. And, Thirdly, a due administration of the sacraments,—the ordinary means whereby God increaseth faith. Now come close to the question: In which of these points do we undermine or destroy the Church?

Do we shut the door of faith? Do we lessen the number of believing people in England? Only remember what faith is, according to our Homilies, viz. "A sure trust and confidence in God, that through the merits of Christ my sins are forgiven, and I reconciled to the favour of God." And we appeal to all mankind, Do we destroy this faith, which is the life and soul of the Church? Is there, in fact, less of this faith in England, than there was before we went forth? I think this is an assertion which the father of lies himself will scarce dare to utter or maintain.

With regard then to this First point, it is undeniable we neither undermine nor destroy the Church. The Second thing is the preaching and hearing the pure word of God. And do we hinder this? Do we hinder any minister from preaching the pure word of God? If any preach not at all, or not the pure word of God, is the hinderance in us, or in themselves? or do we lessen the number of those that hear the pure word of God? Are then the hearers thereof (whether read or preached) fewer than they were in times past? Are the usual places of public worship less frequented by means of our preaching? Wheresoever our lot has been cast for any time, are the churches emptier than they were before? Surely, none that has any regard left either for truth or modesty will say that in this point we are enemies to, or destroyers of, the Church.

The Third thing requisite (if not to the being, at least) to the well-being of a Church, is the due administration of the sacraments, particularly that of the Lord's Supper. And are we, in this respect, underminers or destroyers of the Church? Do we, either by our example or advice, draw men away from the Lord's table? Where we have laboured most, are there the fewest communicants? How does the fact stand in London,

Bristol, Newcastle? O that you would no longer shut your eyes against the broad light which encompasses you on every side!

79. I believe you are sensible, by this time, not only how weak this objection is, but likewise how easy it would be terribly to retort every branch of it upon most of those that make it; whether we speak of true living faith, of preaching the pure word of God, or of the due administration of the sacraments, both of baptism and the Lord's Supper. But I spare you. It sufficeth that our God knoweth, and will make manifest in that day, whether it be by reason of us or you that "men abhor the offering of the Lord."

80. Others object that we do not observe the laws of the Church, and thereby undermine it. What laws? the rubrics or canons? In every parish where I have been curate yet, I have observed the rubrics with a scrupulous exactness, not for wrath, but for conscience' sake. And this, so far as belongs to an unbeneficed minister, or to a private member of the Church, I do now. I will just mention a few of them, and leave you to consider which of us has observed, or does observe, them most.

1. Days of fasting or abstinence to be observed: The forty days of Lent: The Ember days at the four seasons: The three Rogation days: All Fridays in the year, except Christmas-day.

(2.) "So many as intend to be partakers of the holy communion shall signify their names to the curate, at least some time the day before:

"And if any of these be an open and notorious evil liver,—the curate shall advertise him, that in any wise he presume not to come to the Lord's table, until he hath openly declared himself to have truly repented.

(3.) "Then (after the Nicene creed) the curate shall declare unto the people what holidays or *fasting-days* are in the week following to be observed.

(4.) "The minister shall first receive the communion in both kinds himself, and *then proceed to deliver the same to the bishops, priests, and deacons, in like manner*, if any be present, and *after that*, to the people.

(5.) "In cathedral and collegiate churches, and colleges, where there are many priests and deacons, they shall *all receive the communion with the priest every Sunday at the least*.

(6.) "The children to be baptized must be ready at the font *immediately after the last lesson*.

(7.) "The curates of every parish shall warn the people, that without great necessity they procure not their children to be baptized *at home in their houses*.

(8.) "The curate of every parish shall diligently *upon Sundays and holidays, after the Second lesson at evening prayer, openly in the church*, instruct and examine so many children as he shall think convenient, in some part of the catechism.

(9.) "Whensoever the bishop shall give notice for children to be brought unto him for their confirmation, the curate of every parish shall either bring or *send in writing, with his hand subscribed thereunto, the names of all such persons* within his parish, as he shall think fit to be presented to the bishop."

81. Now, the question is not whether these rubrics ought to be

observed, (you take this for granted in making the objection,) but whether in fact they have been observed by you, or me, most. Many can witness I have observed them punctually, yea, sometimes at the hazard of my life; and as many, I fear, that you have not observed them at all, and that several of them you never pretended to observe. And is it you that are accusing me for not observing the rubrics of the Church? What grimace is this! "O tell it not in Gath! Publish it not in the streets of Askelon!"

82. With regard to the canons, I would, in the first place, desire you to consider two or three plain questions:—First. Have you ever read them over? Secondly. How can these be called the canons of the Church of England, seeing they were never legally established by the Church, never regularly confirmed in any full convocation? Thirdly. By what right am I required to observe such canons as were never legally established? And then I will join issue with you on one question more, viz. Whether you or I have observed them most. To instance only in a few:

"Canon 29.—No person shall be admitted godfather or godmother to any child, before the said person hath received the holy communion.

"Can. 59.—Every parson, vicar, or curate, upon every Sunday and holiday, before evening prayer, shall, for half an hour, or more, examine and instruct the youth and ignorant persons of his parish.

"Can. 64.—Every parson, vicar, or curate, shall declare to the people every Sunday, whether there be any holidays or *fasting-days* the week following.

"Can. 68.—No minister shall *refuse* or *delay* to christen any child that is brought to the church to him upon Sundays or holidays to be christened, or to bury any corpse that is brought to the church or church yard."

(N. B. Inability to pay fees does not alter the case.)

"Can. 75.—No ecclesiastical persons shall spend their time idly, by day or by night, playing at *dice*, *cards*, or *tables*."

Now, let the clergyman who has observed only these five canons for one year last past, and who has read over all the canons in his congregation; (as the king's ratification straitly enjoins him to do once every year;) let him, I say, cast the first stone at us, for not observing the canons (so called) of the Church of England.

83. "However, we cannot be," it is said, "friends to the Church, because we do not obey the governors of it, and submit ourselves (as at our ordination we promised to do) to all their godly admonitions and injunctions.)* I answer, In every individual point of an indifferent nature, we do and will, by the grace of God, obey the governors of the Church. But the testifying the Gospel of the grace of God is not a point of an indifferent nature. "The ministry which we have received of the Lord Jesus," we are at all hazards to fulfil. It is the burden of the Lord which is laid upon us here; and we are "to obey God rather than man." Nor yet do we in any ways violate the promise which each of

* The author of a tract just published at Newcastle, entitled, "The Notions of the Methodists fully disproved, in a Letter to the Rev. Mr. John Wesley," much insists upon this objection. I have read, and believe it quite needless to take any further notice of, this performance; the writer being so utterly unacquainted with the merits of the cause; and showing himself so perfectly a stranger, both to my life, preaching, and writing, and to the word of God, and to the Articles and Homilies of the Church of England.

us made, when it was said unto him, "Take thou authority to preach the word of God, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." We then promised to *submit* (mark the words) *to the godly admonitions and injunctions of our ordinary*. But we did not, could not, promise to obey such injunctions as we know are contrary to the word of God.

84. "But why then," say some, "do you leave the Church?" *Leave the Church!* What can you mean? Do we leave so much as the Church walls? Your own eyes tell you we do not. Do we leave the ordinances of the Church? You daily see and know the contrary. Do we leave the fundamental doctrine of the Church, namely, salvation by faith? It is our constant theme, in public, in private, in writing, in conversation. Do we leave the practice of the Church, the standard whereof are the ten commandments? which are so essentially in-wrought in her constitution, (as little as you may apprehend it,) that whosoever breaks one of the least of these is no member of the Church of England. I believe you do not care to put the cause on this issue. Neither do you mean this by leaving the Church. In truth, I cannot conceive what you mean. I doubt you cannot conceive yourself. You have retailed a sentence from somebody else, which you no more understand than he. And no marvel; for it is a true observation,

Nonsense is never to be understood.

85. Nearly related to this is that other objection, that we divide the Church. Remember, the Church is the faithful people, or true believers. Now, how do we divide these? "Why, by our societies." Very good. Now the ease is plain. "We divide them," you say, "by uniting them together." Truly, a very uncommon way of dividing. "Oh, but we divide those who are thus united with each other, from the rest of the Church!" By no means. Many of them were before joined to all their brethren of the Church of England (and many were not, until they knew us) by "assembling themselves together," to hear the word of God, and to eat of one bread, and drink of one cup. And do they now forsake that assembling themselves together? You cannot, you dare not, say it. You know they are more diligent therein than ever; it being one of the fixed rules of our societies, that every member attend the ordinances of God; that is, do not divide from the Church. And if any member of the Church does thus divide from or leave it, he hath no more place among us.

86. I have considered this objection the more at large, because it is of most weight with sincere minds. And to all these, if they have fairly and impartially weighed the answer as well as the objection, I believe it clearly appears, that we are neither undermining nor destroying, neither dividing nor leaving, the Church. So far from it, that we have great heaviness on her account, yea, continual sorrow in our hearts. And our prayer to God is, that he would repair the breaches of Sion, and build the walls of Jerusalem; that this our desolate Church may flourish again, and be the praise of the whole earth.

87. But perhaps you have heard that we in truth regard no Church at all; that gain is the true spring of all our actions; that I, in particular, am well paid for my work, having thirteen hundred pounds a year (as a

reverend author accurately computes it) at the Foundery alone, over and above what I receive from Bristol, Kingswood, Newcastle, and other places; and that whoever survives me will see I have made good use of my time; for I shall not die a beggar.

88. I freely own this is one of the best-devised objections which has ever yet been made; because it not only puts us upon proving a negative, (which is seldom an easy task,) but also one of such a kind as scarce admits of any demonstrative proof at all. But for such proof as the nature of the thing allows, I appeal to my manner of life which hath been from the beginning. Ye who have seen it (and not with a friendly eye) for these twelve or fourteen years last past, or for any part of that time, have ye ever seen any thing like the love of gain therein? Did I not continually remember the words of the Lord Jesus, "It is more blessed to give than to receive?" Ye of Oxford, do ye not know these things are so? What gain did I seek among you? Of whom did I take any thing? From whom did I covet silver, or gold, or apparel? To whom did I deny any thing which I had, even to the hour that I departed from you? Ye of Epworth and Wroote, among whom I ministered for nearly the space of three years, what gain did I seek among you? Or of whom did I take or covet any thing? Ye of Savannah and Frederica, among whom God afterward proved me, and showed me what was in my heart, what gain did I seek among you? Of whom did I take any thing? Or whose food or apparel did I covet, (for silver or gold had ye none, no more than I myself for many months,) even when I was in hunger and nakedness? Ye yourselves, and the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, know that I lie not.

89. "But," it is said, "things are fairly altered now. Now I cannot complain of wanting any thing; having the yearly income of a bishop of London, over and above what I gain at other places." At what other places, my friend? Inform yourself a little better, and you will find that both at Newcastle, Bristol, and Kingswood, and all other places, where any collection is made, the money collected is both received and expended by the stewards of those several societies, and never comes into my hands at all,—neither first nor last. And you, or any who desire it, shall read over the accounts kept by any of those stewards, and see with your own eyes, that by all these societies I gain just as much as you do.

90. The case in London stands thus:—In November, 1739, two gentlemen, then unknown to me, (Mr. Ball and Mr. Watkins,) came and desired me, once and again, to preach in a place called the Foundery, near Moorfields. With much reluctance I at length complied. I was soon after pressed to take that place into my own hands. Those who were most earnest therein lent me the purchase money, which was one hundred and fifteen pounds. Mr. Watkins and Mr. Ball then delivered me the names of several subscribers, who offered to pay, some four, or six, some ten shillings a year toward the repayment of the purchase money, and the putting the buildings into repair. This amounted one year to near two hundred pounds, the second to about one hundred and forty pounds, and so the last.

91. The united society began a little after, whose weekly contribution for the poor is received and expended by the stewards, and comes not

into my hands at all. But there is also a quarterly subscription of many of the society, which is nearly equalled to that above mentioned.

92. The uses to which these subscriptions have been hitherto applied, are, first, the payment of that one hundred and fifteen pounds: secondly, the repairing (I might almost say, rebuilding) that vast, uncouth heap of ruins, the Foundery: thirdly, the building galleries both for men and women: fourthly, the enlarging the society room to near thrice its first bigness. All taxes and occasional expenses are likewise defrayed out of this fund. And it has been hitherto so far from yielding any overplus, that it has never sufficed for these purposes. So far from it, that I am still in debt, on these accounts, near three hundred pounds. So much have I hitherto gained by preaching the Gospel! besides a debt of one hundred and fifty pounds, still remaining on account of the school built at Bristol; and another of above two hundred pounds, on account of that now building at Newcastle. I desire any reasonable man would now sit down and lay these things together, and let him see, whether, allowing me a grain of common sense, if not of common honesty, he can possibly conceive, that a view of *gain* would induce me to act in this manner.

93. You can never reconcile it with any degree of common sense, that a man who wants nothing, who has already all the necessaries, all the conveniences, nay, and many of the superfluities, of life, and these not only independent on any one, but less liable to contingencies than even a gentleman's freehold estate; that such a one should calmly and deliberately throw up his ease, most of his friends, his reputation, and that way of life which of all others is most agreeable both to his natural temper, and education; that he should toil day and night, spend all his time and strength, knowingly destroy a firm constitution, and hasten into weakness, pain, diseases, death,—to gain a debt of six or seven hundred pounds!

94. But suppose the balance on the other side, let me ask you one plain question, For what gain (setting conscience aside) will *you* be obliged to act thus? to live exactly as I do? For what price will you preach (and that with all your might, not in an easy, indolent, fashionable way) eighteen or nineteen times every week; and this throughout the year? What shall I give you to travel seven or eight hundred miles, in all weathers, every two or three months? For what salary will you abstain from all other diversions, than the doing good, and the praising God? I am mistaken if you would not prefer strangling to such a life, even with thousands of gold and silver.

95. And what is the comfort you have found out for me in these circumstances? Why, that I shall not die a beggar. So now I am supposed to be heaping up riches, that I may leave them behind me. *Leave them behind me!* For whom? my wife and children? Who are they? They are yet unborn. Unless thou meanest the children of faith whom God hath given me. But my heavenly Father feedeth them. Indeed, if I lay up riches at all, it must be to leave behind me; seeing my fellowship is a provision for life. But I cannot understand this. What comfort would it be to my soul, now launched into eternity, that I had left behind me gold as the dust, and silver as the sand of the sea? Will it follow me over the great gulf! or can I go back to it? Thou

that liftest up thy eyes in hell, what do thy riches profit thee now? Will all thou once hadst under the sun gain thee a drop of water to cool thy tongue? O the comfort of riches left behind to one who is tormented in that flame! You put me in mind of those celebrated lines, (which I once exceeding admired,) addressed by way of consolation to the soul of a poor self-murderer:—

Yet shall thy grave with rising flowers be dress'd,
 And the green turf lie light upon thy breast!
 Here shall the year its earliest beauties show:
 Here the first roses of the spring shall blow:
 While angels with their silver wings o'ershade
 The place now sacred by thy relics made.

96. I will now simply tell you my sense of these matters, whether you will hear, or whether you will forbear. Food and raiment I have; such food as I choose to eat, and such raiment as I choose to put on. I have a place where to lay my head. I have what is needful for life and godliness. And I apprehend this is all the world can afford. The kings of the earth can give me no more. For as to gold and silver, I count it dung and dross; I trample it under my feet. I (yet not I, but the grace of God that is in me) esteem it just as the mire in the streets. I desire it not; I seek it not; I only fear lest any of it should cleave to me, and I should not be able to shake it off before my spirit returns to God. It must indeed pass through my hands; but I will take care (God being my helper) that the mammon of unrighteousness shall only pass through; it shall not rest there. None of the accursed thing shall be found in my tents when the Lord calleth me hence. And hear ye this, all you who have discovered the treasures which I am to leave behind me: If I leave behind me ten pounds, (above my debts, and my books, or what may happen to be due on account of them,) you and all mankind bear witness against me, that I lived and died a thief and a robber.

97. Before I conclude, I cannot but entreat you who know God to review the whole matter from the foundation. Call to mind what the state of religion was in our nation a few years since. In whom did you find the holy tempers that were in Christ? bowels of mercies, lowliness, meekness, gentleness, contempt of the world, patience, temperance, long-suffering? a burning love to God, rejoicing evermore, and in every thing giving thanks; and a tender love to all mankind, covering, believing, hoping, enduring all things? Perhaps you did not know one such man in the world. But how many that had all unholy tempers? What vanity and pride, what stubbornness and self-will, what anger, fretfulness, discontent, what suspicion and resentment, what inordinate affections, what irregular passions, what foolish and hurtful desires, might you find in those who were called the *best* of men, in those who made the strictest profession of religion? And how few did you know who went so far as the profession of religion, who had even the "form of godliness!" Did you not frequently bewail, wherever your lot was cast, the general want of even outward religion? How few were seen at the public worship of God! how much fewer at the Lord's table! And was even this little flock zealous of good works, careful, as they had time, to do good to all men? On the other hand, did you not with grief observe outward irreligion in every place? Where could you be for one week without being an eye or an ear witness of cursing, swearing, or profaneness, of Sabbath

breaking or drunkenness, of quarrelling or brawling, of revenge or obscenity? Were these things done in a corner? Did not gross iniquity of all kinds overspread our land as a flood? yea, and daily increase, in spite of all the opposition which the children of God did or could make against it?

98. If you had been then told that the jealous God would soon arise and maintain his own cause; that he would pour down his Spirit from on high, and renew the face of the earth; that he would shed abroad his love in the hearts of the outcasts of men, producing all holy and heavenly tempers, expelling anger, and pride, and evil desire, and all unholy and earthly tempers; causing outward religion, the work of faith, the patience of hope, the labour of love, to flourish and abound; and, wherever it spread, abolishing outward irreligion, destroying all the works of the devil: if you had been told that this living knowledge of the Lord would in a short space of time overspread our land; yea, and daily increase, in spite of all the opposition which the devil and his children did or could make against it; would you not have vehemently desired to see that day, that you might bless God and rejoice therein?

99. Behold, the day of the Lord is come! He is again visiting and redeeming his people. Having eyes, see ye not! Having ears, do ye not hear, neither understand with your hearts? At this hour the Lord is rolling away our reproach. Already his standard is set up. His Spirit is poured forth on the outcasts of men, and his love shed abroad in their hearts. Love of all mankind, meekness, gentleness, humbleness of mind, holy and heavenly affections, do take place of hate, anger, pride, revenge, and vile or vain affections. Hence, wherever the power of the Lord spreads, springs outward religion in all its forms. The houses of God are filled; the table of the Lord is thronged on every side. And those who thus show their love of God, show they love their neighbour also, by being careful to maintain good works, by doing all manner of good, as they have time, to all men. They are likewise careful to abstain from all evil. Cursing, Sabbath breaking, drunkenness, with all other (however fashionable) works of the devil, are not once named among them. All this is plain, demonstrable fact. For this also is not done in a corner. Now, do you acknowledge the day of your visitation? Do you bless God and rejoice therein?

100. What hinders? Is it this,—that men say all manner of evil of those whom God is pleased to use as instruments in his work? O ye fools, did ye suppose the devil was dead? or that he would not fight for his kingdom? And what weapons shall he fight with, if not with lies? Is he not a liar, and the father of it? Suffer ye then thus far. Let the devil and his children say all manner of evil of us. And let them go on deceiving each other, and being deceived. But ye need not be deceived also; or if you are, if you will believe all they say, be it so,—that we are weak, silly, wicked men; without sense, without learning, without even a desire or design of doing good; yet I insist upon the fact: Christ is preached, and sinners are converted to God. This none but a madman can deny. We are ready to prove it by a cloud of witnesses. Neither, therefore, can the inference be denied, that God is now visiting his people. O that all men may know, in this their day, the things that make for their peace!

101. Upon the whole, to men of the world I would still recommend the known advice of Gamaliel: "Refrain from these men, and let them alone: for if this work be of men, it will come to nought: but if it be of God, ye cannot overthrow it; lest haply ye be found even to fight against God." But unto you whom God hath chosen out of the world, I say, Ye are our brethren, and of our father's house; it behoveth you, in whatsoever manner ye are able, "to strengthen our hands in God." And this ye are all able to do; to wish us good luck in the name of the Lord, and to pray continually that none of "these things may move us," and that "we may not count our lives dear unto ourselves, so that we may finish our course with joy, and the ministry which we have received of the Lord Jesus!"—*Written in the year 1744.*

PRIMITIVE CHRISTIANITY.

HAPPY the souls who first believed,
To Jesus and each other cleaved,
Join'd by the unction from above,
In mystic fellowship of love!

Meek, simple followers of the Lamb,
They lived and spake and thought the
same;

Brake the commemorative bread,
And drank the Spirit of their Head.

On God they cast their every care:
Wrestling with God in mighty prayer,
They claim'd the grace, through Jesus
given;

By prayer they shut and open'd heaven.

To Jesus they perform'd their vows:
A little church in every house,
They joyfully conspired to raise
Their ceaseless sacrifice of praise.

Propriety was there unknown,
None call'd what he possess'd his own;
Where all the common blessings share,
No selfish happiness was there.

With grace abundantly endued,
A pure, believing multitude!
They all were of one heart and soul,
And only love inspired the whole.

O what an age of golden days!
O what a choice, peculiar race!
Wash'd in the Lamb's all cleansing blood,
Anointed kings and priests to God.

Where shall I wander now to find
The successors they left behind?
The faithful, whom I seek in vain,
Are 'minish'd from the sons of men.

Ye different sects, who all declare,
"Lo, here is Christ!" or, "Christ is
there!"

Your stronger proofs divinely give,
And show me where the Christians live.

Your claim, alas! ye cannot prove,
Ye want the genuine mark of love:
Thou only, Lord, thine own canst show;
For sure thou hast a Church below.

The gates of hell cannot prevail,
The Church on earth can never fail:
Ah! join me to thy secret ones!
Ah! gather all thy living stones!

Scatter'd o'er all the earth they lie,
Till thou collect them with thine eye,
Draw by the music of thy name,
And charm into a beauteous frame.

For this the pleading Spirit groans,
And cries in all thy banish'd ones:
Greatest of gifts, thy love, impart,
And make us of one mind and heart!

Join every soul that looks to thee,
In bonds of perfect charity:
Now, Lord, the glorious fulness give,
And all in all for ever live!

PART II.

JESUS, from whom all blessings flow,
Great Builder of thy Church below,
If now thy Spirit moves my breast,
Hear, and fulfil thy own request!

The few that truly call thee Lord,
And wait thy sanctifying word,
And thee their utmost Saviour own,
Unite, and perfect them in one.

Gather them in on every side,
And in thy tabernacle hide;
Give them a resting place to find,
A covert from the storm and wind.

O find them out some calm recess,
Some unfrequented wilderness!
Thou, Lord, the secret place prepare,
And hide and feed "the woman" there.

Thither collect thy little flock,
Under the shadow of their Rock:
The holy seed, the royal race,
The standing monuments of thy grace.

O let them all thy mind express,
Stand forth thy chosen witnesses!
Thy power unto salvation show,
And perfect holiness below:

The fulness of thy grace receive,
And simply to thy glory live;
Strongly reflect the light divine,
And in a land of darkness shine.

In them let all mankind behold
How Christians lived in days of old:
Mighty their envious foes to move,
A proverb of reproach—and love.

O make them of one soul and heart,
The all-conforming mind impart;
Spirit of peace and unity,
The sinless mind that was in thee.

Call them into thy wondrous light,
Worthy to walk with thee in white;
Make up thy jewels, Lord, and show
The glorious, spotless Church below.

From every sinful wrinkle free,
Redeem'd from all iniquity;
The fellowship of saints make known;
And O, my God, might I be one!

O might my lot be cast with these,
The least of Jesus' witnesses!
O that my Lord would count me meet
To wash his dear disciples' feet!

This only thing I do require,
Thou know'st 'tis all my heart's desire,
Freely what I receive to give,
The servant of thy Church to live:

After my lowly Lord to go,
And wait upon the saints below,
Enjoy the grace to angels given,
And serve the royal heirs of heaven.

Lord, if I now thy drawings feel,
And ask according to thy will,
Confirm the prayer, the seal impart,
And speak the answer to my heart!

Tell me, or thou shalt never go,
"Thy prayer is heard, it shall be so:"—
The word hath pass'd thy lips,—and I
Shall with thy people live and die.

A FARTHER APPEAL

TO

MEN OF REASON AND RELIGION.

Let the righteous smite me friendly, and reprove me, *PSALM cxli, 5.*

PART I.

IN a former treatise I declared, in the plainest manner I could, both my principles and practice; and answered some of the most important, as well as the most common, objections to each. But I have not yet delivered my own soul. I believe it is still incumbent upon me to answer other objections, particularly such as have been urged by those who are esteemed religious or reasonable men.

These partly relate to the *doctrines* I teach, partly to my *manner* of teaching them, and partly to the *effects* which are supposed to follow from teaching these doctrines in this manner.

I. 1. I will briefly mention what those doctrines are, before I consider the objections against them. Now, all I teach respects either the nature and condition of justification, the nature and condition of salvation, the nature of justifying and saving faith, or the Author of faith and salvation.

2. First: The nature of justification. It sometimes means our acquittal at the last day: *Matt. xii, 37.* But this is altogether out of the present question; that justification whereof our Articles and Homilies speak,

meaning present forgiveness, pardon of sins, and, consequently, acceptance with God; who therein "declares his righteousness" (or mercy, by or) "for the remission of the sins that are past;" saying, "I will be merciful to thy unrighteousness, and thine iniquities I will remember no more," Rom. iii, 25; Heb. viii, 12.

I believe the condition of this is faith: Rom. iv, 5, &c: I mean, not only, that without faith we cannot be justified; but also, that as soon as any one has true faith, in that moment he is justified.

Good works follow this faith, but cannot go before it: Luke vi, 43: much less can sanctification, which implies a continued course of good works, springing from holiness of heart. But it is allowed, that entire sanctification goes before our justification at the last day: Heb. xii, 14.

It is allowed, also, that repentance, and "fruits meet for repentance," go before faith: Mark i, 15; Matthew iii, 8. Repentance absolutely must go before faith; fruits meet for it, if there be opportunity. By repentance, I mean conviction of sin, producing real desires and sincere resolutions of amendment; and by "fruits meet for repentance," forgiving our brother; Matt. vi, 14, 15; ceasing from evil, doing good; Luke iii, 4, 9, &c; using the ordinances of God, and in general obeying him according to the measure of grace which we have received: Matt. vii, 7; xxv, 29. But these I cannot as yet term good works; because they do not spring from faith and the love of God.

3. By salvation I mean, not barely, according to the vulgar notion, deliverance from hell, or going to heaven; but a present deliverance from sin, a restoration of the soul to its primitive health, its original purity; a recovery of the divine nature; the renewal of our souls after the image of God, in righteousness and true holiness, in justice, mercy, and truth. This implies all holy and heavenly tempers, and, by consequence, all holiness of conversation.

Now, if by salvation we mean a present salvation from sin, we cannot say, holiness is the condition of it; for it is the thing itself. Salvation, in this sense, and holiness, are synonymous terms. We must therefore say, "We are saved by faith." Faith is the sole condition of this salvation. For without faith we cannot be thus saved. But whosoever believeth is saved already.

Without faith we cannot be thus saved; for we cannot rightly serve God unless we love him. And we cannot love him unless we know him; neither can we know God unless by faith. Therefore, salvation by faith is only, in other words, the love of God by the knowledge of God; or the recovery of the image of God, by a true, spiritual acquaintance with him.

4. Faith, in general, is a divine, supernatural *ελεγχος* (evidence, or conviction) of things not seen, not discoverable by our bodily senses, as being either past, future, or spiritual. Justifying faith implies, not only a divine *ελεγχος*, that God "was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself," but a sure trust and confidence that Christ died for my sins, that he loved me and gave himself for me. And the moment a penitent sinner believes this, God pardons and absolves him.

And as soon as his pardon or justification is witnessed to him by the Holy Ghost, he is saved. He loves God and all mankind. He has "the mind that was in Christ," and power to "walk as he also walked."

From that time (unless he make shipwreck of the faith) salvation gradually increases in his soul. For "so is the kingdom of God, as if a man should cast seed into the ground; and it springeth up, first the blade, then the ear, after that the full corn in the ear."

5. The first sowing of this seed I cannot conceive to be other than instantaneous; whether I consider experience, or the word of God, or the very nature of the thing;—however, I contend not for a circumstance, but the substance: if you can attain it another way, do. Only see that you do attain it; for if you fall short, you perish everlastingly.

This beginning of that vast, inward change, is usually termed, the new birth. Baptism is the outward sign of this inward grace, which is supposed by our Church to be given with and through that sign to all infants, and to those of riper years, if they repent and believe the Gospel. But how extremely idle are the common disputes on this head! I tell a sinner, "You must be born again." "No," say you: "he was born again in baptism. Therefore he cannot be born again now." Alas, what trifling is this! What, if he was *then* a child of God? He is *now* manifestly a child of the devil; for the works of his father he doeth. Therefore do not play upon words. He must go through an entire change of heart. In one not yet baptized, you yourself would call that change, the new birth. In him, call it what you will; but remember, meantime, that if either he or you die without it, your baptism will be so far from profiting you, that it will greatly increase your damnation.

6. The author of faith and salvation is God alone. It is he that works in us both to will and to do. He is the sole Giver of every good gift, and the sole Author of every good work. There is no more of power than of merit in man; but as all merit is in the Son of God, in what he has done and suffered for us, so all power is in the Spirit of God. And therefore every man, in order to believe unto salvation, must receive the Holy Ghost. This is essentially necessary to every Christian, not in order to his working miracles, but in order to faith, peace, joy, and love,—the ordinary fruits of the Spirit.

Although no man on earth can explain the particular manner wherein the Spirit of God works on the soul, yet whosoever has these fruits, cannot but know and *feel* that God has wrought them in his heart.

Sometimes he acts more particularly on the understanding, opening or enlightening it, (as the Scripture speaks,) and revealing, unveiling, discovering to us "the deep things of God."

Sometimes he acts on the wills and affections of men; withdrawing them from evil, inclining them to good, inspiring (breathing, as it were) good thoughts into them: so it has frequently been expressed, by an easy, natural metaphor, strictly analogous to רוח, πνευμα, *spiritus*, [spirit or breath,] and the words used in most modern tongues also, to denote the third person in the ever blessed Trinity. But however it be expressed, it is certain all true faith, and the whole work of salvation, every good thought, word, and work, is altogether by the operation of the Spirit of God.

II. 1. I come now to consider the principal objections which have lately been made against these doctrines.

I know nothing material which has been objected as to the nature of justification; but many persons seem to be very confused in their

thoughts concerning it, and speak as if they had never heard of any justification antecedent to that of the last day. To clear up this, there needs only a closer inspection of our Articles and Homilies; wherein justification is always taken for the present remission of our sins.

But many are the objections which have been warmly urged against the condition of justification, faith alone; particularly in two treatises, the former entitled, "The Notions of the Methodists *fully* disproved;" the second, "The Notions of the Methodists *farther* disproved:" in both of which it is vehemently affirmed, (1.) That this is not a scriptural doctrine; (2.) That it is not the doctrine of the Church of England.

It will not be needful to name the former of these any more; seeing there is neither one text produced therein to prove this doctrine unscriptural, nor one sentence from the Articles or Homilies to prove it contrary to the doctrine of the Church. But so much of the latter as relates to the merits of the *cause*, I will endeavour to consider calmly. As to what is *personal*, I leave it as it is. "God be merciful to me a sinner!"

2. To prove this doctrine unscriptural,—That faith alone is the condition of justification,—you allege, that "sanctification, according to Scripture, must go before it:" to evince which, you quote the following texts, which I leave as I find them: "Go, disciple all nations,—teaching them to observe all things, whatsoever I have commanded you," Matt. xxviii, 19, 20. "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved," Mark xvi, 16. "Preach repentance and remission of sins," Luke xxiv, 47. "Repent and be baptized every one of you, for the remission of sins," Acts ii, 38. "Repent and be converted that your sins may be blotted out," iii, 19. "By one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified," Heb. x, 14. You add, "St. Paul taught 'repentance toward God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ,' Acts xx, 21; and calls 'repentance from dead works, and faith toward God,' first principles," Heb. vi, 1.

You subjoin: "But 'ye are washed,' says he, 'but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified.' By 'washed,' is meant their baptism; and by their baptism is meant, first, their sanctification, and then their justification." This is a flat begging the question; you take for granted the very point which you ought to prove. "St. Peter also," you say, "affirms that 'baptism doth save us,' or justify us." Again you beg the question; you take for granted what I utterly deny, viz. that *save* and *justify* are here synonymous terms. Till this is proved, you can draw no inference at all; for you have no foundation whereon to build.

I conceive these and all the scriptures which can be quoted to prove sanctification antecedent to justification, (if they do not relate to our final justification,) prove only, (what I have never denied,) that repentance, or conviction of sin, and fruits meet for repentance, precede that faith whereby we are justified: but by no means, that the love of God, or any branch of true holiness, must or can precede faith.

3. It is objected, Secondly, that justification by faith alone is not the doctrine of the Church of England.

"You believe," says the writer above mentioned, "that no good work can be previous to justification, nor, consequently, a condition of it. But, God be praised, our Church has no where delivered such *abominable* doctrine." (page 14.)

“The clergy contend for inward holiness, as previous to the first justification;—this is the doctrine they universally inculcate, and which you cannot oppose without contradicting the doctrine of our Church.” (Page 26.)

“All your strongest persuasives to the love of God will not blanch over the deformity of that doctrine, that men may be justified by faith alone;—unless you publicly recant this *horrid* doctrine, your faith is vain.” (Page 27.)

“If you will vouchsafe to purge out this *venomous* part of your principles, in which the *wide, essential, fundamental, irreconcilable difference*, as you very justly term it, mainly consists, then there will be found, so far, no disagreement between you and the clergy of the Church of England.” (*Ibid.*)

4. In order to be clearly and fully satisfied what the doctrine of the Church of England is, (as it stands opposite to the doctrine of the Antinomians, on the one hand, and to that of justification by works, on the other,) I will simply set down what occurs on this head, either in her Liturgy, Articles, or Homilies:—

“Spare thou them, O God, which *confess their faults*: Restore thou them that are *penitent*, according to thy promises declared unto mankind in Christ Jesus our Lord.”

“He pardoneth and absolveth all them that *truly repent*, and *unfeignedly believe* his holy Gospel.”

“Almighty God, who dost forgive the sins of them that are *penitent*, create and make in us new and contrite hearts; that we, *worthily lamenting our sins*, and *acknowledging our wretchedness*, may obtain of thee perfect remission and forgiveness, through Jesus Christ our Lord.” (*Collect for Ash-Wednesday.*)

“Almighty God—hath promised forgiveness of sins to all them that with *heartly repentance and true faith* turn unto him.” (*Communion Office.*)

“Our Lord Jesus Christ hath left power to absolve all sinners who *truly repent and believe* in him.” (*Visitation of the Sick.*)

“Give him *unfeigned repentance and steadfast faith*, that his sins may be blotted out.” (*Ibid.*)

“He is a merciful receiver of all true *penitent* sinners, and is ready to pardon us, if we come unto him with *faithful repentance.*” (*Communion Office.*)

Infants, indeed, our Church supposes to be justified in baptism, although they cannot then either believe or repent. But she expressly requires both repentance and faith in those who come to be baptized when they are of riper years.

As earnestly, therefore, as our Church inculcates justification by faith alone, she nevertheless supposes repentance to be previous to faith, and fruits meet for repentance; yea, and universal holiness to be previous to final justification, as evidently appears from the following words:—

“Let us beseech him—that the rest of our life may be pure and holy, so that at the last we may come to his eternal joy.” (*Absolution.*)

“May we seriously apply our hearts to that holy and heavenly wisdom here, which may in the end bring us to life everlasting.” (*Visitation of the Sick.*)

“Raise us from the death of sin unto the life of righteousness,—that at the last day we may be found acceptable in thy sight.” (*Burial Office.*)

“If we from henceforth walk in his ways,—seeking always his glory, Christ will set us on his right hand.” (*Communion Office.*)

5. We come next to the Articles of our Church : the former part of the ninth runs thus :—

OF ORIGINAL OR BIRTH-SIN.

“Original sin—is the fault and corruption of the nature of every man,—whereby man is very far gone from original righteousness, and is of his own nature inclined to evil, so that the flesh lusteth always contrary to the spirit ; and therefore in every person born into this world, it deserveth God’s wrath and damnation.”

ARTICLE X.—OF FREE-WILL.

“The condition of man after the fall of Adam is such, that he cannot turn and prepare himself by his own natural strength and good works to faith and calling upon God. Wherefore we have no power to do good works, pleasant and acceptable to God, without the grace of God by Christ preventing us, that we may have a good will, and working with us when we have that good will.”

ARTICLE XI.—OF THE JUSTIFICATION OF MAN.

“We are accounted righteous before God, only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ by faith, and not for our own works or deservings. Wherefore that we are justified by faith only, is a most wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort, as most largely is expressed in the Homily of Justification.”

I believe this Article relates to the *meritorious cause* of justification, rather than to the *condition* of it. On this, therefore, I do not build any thing concerning it, but on those that follow.

ARTICLE XII.—OF GOOD WORKS.

“Albeit, that good works, which are the fruits of faith and follow after justification, cannot put away our sins ; yet are they pleasing and acceptable to God in Christ, and do spring out necessarily of a true and lively faith : insomuch that by them a lively faith may be as evidently known as a tree may be known by the fruit.”

We are taught here, (1.) That good works in general follow after justification. (2.) That they spring out of a true and lively faith, that faith whereby we are justified. (3.) That true, justifying faith may be as evidently known by them as a tree discerned by the fruit.

Does it not follow, that the supposing any good work to go before justification is full as absurd as the supposing an apple, or any other fruit, to grow before the tree ?

But let us hear the Church, speaking yet more plainly :—

ARTICLE XIII.—OF WORKS DONE BEFORE JUSTIFICATION.

“Works done before the grace of Christ, and the inspiration of his Spirit,” (that is, before justification, as the title expresses it,) “are not pleasant to God, forasmuch as they spring not of faith in Jesus Christ. Yea, rather, for that they are not done as God hath willed and commanded them to be done, we doubt not they have the nature of sin.”

Now, if all works done before justification have the nature of sin, (both because they spring not of faith in Christ, and because they are not done as God hath willed and commanded them to be done,) what becomes of sanctification previous to justification ? It is utterly excluded ; seeing whatever is previous to justification is not good or holy, but evil and sinful.

Although, therefore, our Church does frequently assert that we ought to repent, and bring forth fruits meet for repentance, if ever we would

attain to that faith whereby alone we are justified; yet she never asserts (and here the hinge of the question turns) that these are good works, so long as they are previous to justification. Nay, she expressly asserts the direct contrary, viz. that they have all the nature of sin. So that this "horrid, scandalous, wicked, abominable, venomous, blasphemous doctrine," is nevertheless the doctrine of the Church of England.

6. It remains to consider what occurs in the Homilies, first with regard to the meritorious cause of our justification, agreeable to the eleventh; and then with regard to the condition of it, agreeable to the twelfth and thirteenth Articles:—

"These things must go together in our justification;—upon God's part his great mercy and grace; upon Christ's part, the satisfaction of God's justice; and upon our part, true and lively faith in the merits of Jesus Christ." (*Homily on Salvation*, part i.)

"So that the grace of God doth not shut out the justice (or righteousness) of God in our justification; but only shutteth out the righteousness of man,—as to deserving our justification.

"And therefore St. Paul declareth nothing on the behalf of man, concerning his justification, but only a true faith.

"And yet that faith doth not shut out repentance, hope, love, to be joined with faith (that is, afterward; see below) in every man that is justified: neither doth faith shut out the righteousness of our good works, necessarily to be done afterward. But it excludeth them so that we may not do them to this intent,—to be made just (or, to be justified) by doing them.

"That we are justified by faith alone, is spoken to take away clearly all merit of our works, and wholly to ascribe the merit and deserving of our justification unto Christ only." (*Ibid.* part ii.)

"The true meaning of this saying, 'We be justified by faith only,' is this, 'We be justified by the merits of Christ only, and not of our own works.'" (*Ibid.* part iii.)

7. Thus far touching the meritorious cause of our justification; referred to in the eleventh Article. The twelfth and thirteenth are a summary of what now follows, with regard to the condition of it:—

"Of justifying, true faith, three things are specially to be noted: First, that it bringeth forth good works: Secondly, that without it can no good works be done: Thirdly, what good works it doth bring forth." (*Sermon on Faith*, part i.)

"Without faith can no good work be done, accepted and pleasant unto God. For 'as a branch cannot bear fruit of itself,' saith our Saviour Christ, 'except it abide in the vine, so cannot you, except you abide in me.' Faith giveth life to the soul; and they be as much dead to God that lack faith, as they be to the world whose bodies lack souls. Without faith all that is done of us is but dead before God. Even as a picture is but a dead representation of the thing itself, so be the works of all unfaithful, (unbelieving) persons before God. They be but shadows of lively and good things, and not good things indeed. For true faith doth give life to the works, and without faith no work is good before God." (*Ibid.* part iii.)

"We must set no good works before faith, nor think that before faith a man may do any good works. For such works are as the course of a horse that runneth out of the way, which taketh great labour, but to no purpose." (*Ibid.*)

"Without faith we have no virtues, but only the shadows of them. All the life of them that lack the true faith is sin." (*Ibid.*)

"As men first have life, and after be nourished, so must our faith go

before, and after be nourished with, good works. And life may be without nourishment, but nourishment cannot be without life." (*Homily on Works annexed to Faith, part i.*)

"I can show a man that by faith without works lived and came to heaven. But without faith never man had life. The thief on the cross only believed, and the most merciful God justified him. Truth it is, if he had lived and not regarded faith and the works thereof, he should have lost his salvation again. But this I say, faith by itself saved him. But works by themselves never justified any man.

"Good works go not before in him which shall afterward be justified. But good works do follow after when a man is first justified." (*Homily on Fasting, part i.*)

8. From the whole tenor then of her Liturgy, Articles, and Homilies, the doctrine of the Church of England appears to be this:—

(1.) That no good work, properly so called, can go before justification.

(2.) That no degree of true sanctification can be previous to it.

(3.) That as the meritorious cause of justification is the life and death of Christ, so the condition of it is faith, faith alone. And,

(4.) That both inward and outward holiness are consequent on this faith, and are the ordinary, stated condition of final justification.

9. And what more can *you* desire, who have hitherto opposed justification by faith alone, merely upon a principle of conscience; because you was zealous for holiness and good works? Do I not effectually secure these from contempt at the same time that I defend the doctrines of the Church? I not only allow, but vehemently contend, that none shall ever enter into glory who is not holy on earth, as well in heart, as "in all manner of conversation." I cry aloud, "Let all that have believed, be careful to maintain good works;" and, "Let every one that nameth the name of Christ, depart from all iniquity." I exhort even those who are conscious they do not believe: "Cease to do evil, learn to do well: the kingdom of heaven is at hand;" therefore, "repent, and bring forth fruits meet for repentance." Are not these directions the very same in substance which you yourself would give to persons so circumstanced? What means then this endless strife of words? Or what doth your arguing prove?

10. Many of those who are perhaps as zealous of good works as you, think I have allowed you too much. Nay, my brethren, but how can we help allowing it, if we allow the Scriptures to be from God? For is it not written, and do not you yourselves believe, "Without holiness no man shall see the Lord?" And how then, without fighting about words, can we deny that holiness is a condition of final acceptance? And as to the first acceptance or pardon, does not all experience, as well as Scripture, prove that no man ever yet truly believed the Gospel who did not first repent? that none was ever yet truly "convinced of righteousness," who was not first "convinced of sin?" Repentance, therefore, in this sense, we cannot deny to be necessarily previous to faith. Is it not equally undeniable, that the running back into known, wilful sin, (suppose it were drunkenness or uncleanness,) stifles that repentance or conviction? And can that repentance come to any good issue in his soul, who resolves not to forgive his brother; or who obstinately refrains from what God convinces him is right, whether it be prayer or hearing his word? Would you scruple yourself to tell one of these, "Why, if

you *will* thus drink away all conviction, how should you ever truly know your want of Christ; or, consequently, believe in him? If you will not forgive your brother his trespasses, neither will your heavenly Father forgive you your trespasses. If you will not ask, how can you expect to receive? If you will not hear, how can 'faith come by hearing?' It is plain you 'grieve the Spirit of God;' you will not have him to reign over you. Take care that he does not utterly depart from you. For 'unto him that hath shall be given; but from him that hath not,' that is, uses it not, 'shall be taken away, even that which he hath.'" Would you scruple, on a proper occasion, to say this? You could not scruple it if you believe the Bible. But in saying this, you allow all which I have said, viz. that previous to justifying faith, there must be repentance, and, if opportunity permit, "fruits meet for repentance."

11. And yet I allow you this, that although both repentance and the fruits thereof are in some sense necessary before justification, yet neither the one nor the other is necessary in the same sense, or in the same degree, with faith. Not in the same degree; for in whatever moment a man believes (in the Christian sense of the word) he is justified, his sins are blotted out, "his faith is counted to him for righteousness." But it is not so at whatever moment he repents, or brings forth any or all the fruits of repentance. Faith alone, therefore, justifies; which repentance alone does not, much less any outward work. And, consequently, none of these are necessary to justification, in the same degree with faith.

Nor in the same sense. For none of these has so direct, immediate a relation to justification as faith. This is proximately necessary thereto; repentance, remotely, as it is necessary to the increase or continuance of faith. And even in this sense these are only necessary on supposition,—if there be time and opportunity for them; for in many instances there is not; but God cuts short his work, and faith prevents the fruits of repentance. So that the general proposition is not overthrown, but clearly established by these concessions; and we conclude still, both on the authority of Scripture and the Church, that faith alone is the proximate condition of justification.

III. 1. I was once inclined to believe that none would openly object against what I had any where said of the nature of salvation. How greatly then was I surprised some months ago, when I was shown a kind of circular letter, which one of those whom "the Holy Ghost hath made overseers" of his Church, (the (then) Archbishop of York,) I was informed, had sent to all the clergy of his diocess!

Part of it ran (nearly, if not exactly) thus:—

"There is great indiscretion in preaching up a sort of religion, as the true and only Christianity, which, in their own account of it, consists in an enthusiastic ardour, to be understood or attained by very few, and not to be practised without breaking in upon the common duties of life."

O, my lord, what manner of words are these! Supposing candour and love out of the question, are they the words of truth? I dare stake my life upon it, there is not one true clause in all this paragraph.

The propositions contained therein are these:—

- (1.) That the religion I preach consists in enthusiastic ardour.
- (2.) That it can be attained by very few.

(3.) That it can be understood by very few.

(4.) That it cannot be practised without breaking in upon the common duties of life.

(5.) And that all this may be proved by my own account of it.

I earnestly entreat your grace to review my own account of it, as it stands in any of my former writings; or to consider the short account which is given in this; and if you can thence make good any one of those propositions, I do hereby promise, before God and the world, that I will never preach more.

At present I do not well understand what your grace means by "an enthusiastic ardour." Surely you do not mean the love of God! No, not though a poor, pardoned sinner should carry it so far as to love the Lord his God with all his heart, and with all his soul, and with all his strength! But this alone is the ardour which I preach up as the foundation of the true and only Christianity. I pray God so to fill your whole heart therewith, that you may praise him for ever and ever.

But why should your grace believe that the love of God can be attained by very few; or, that it can be understood by very few? All who attain it understand it well. And did not He who is loving to every man, design that every man should attain true love? "O that all would know, in this their day, the things that make for their peace!"

And cannot the love both of God and our neighbour be practised, without breaking in upon the common duties of life? Nay, can any of the common duties of life be rightly practised without them? I apprehend not. I apprehend I am then laying the true, the only foundation for all those duties, when I preach, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and thy neighbour as thyself."

2. With this letter was sent (I believe to every clergyman in the diocess) the pamphlet, entitled, "Observations on the Conduct and Behaviour of a certain Sect, usually distinguished by the name of *Methodists*." It has been generally supposed to be wrote by a person who is every way my superior. Perhaps one reason why he did not inscribe his name was, that his greatness might not make me afraid; and that I might have liberty to stand as it were on even ground, while I answer for myself.

In considering, therefore, such parts of these "Observations" as fall in my way, I will take that method which I believe the author desires, using no ceremony at all; but speaking as to an equal, that it may the more easily be discerned where the truth lies.

The first query relating to doctrine is this:—

"Whether notions in religion may not be heightened to such extremes, as to lead some into a disregard of religion itself, through despair of attaining such exalted heights: and whether others who have imbibed those notions may not be led by them into a disregard and disesteem of the common duties and offices of life; to such a degree, at least, as is inconsistent with that attention to them, and that diligence in them, which Providence has made necessary to the well being of private families and public societies, and which Christianity does not only require in all stations, and in all conditions, but declares at the same time, that the performance even of the lowest offices in life, as unto God, (whose providence has placed people in their several stations,) is truly a serving of Christ, and will not fail of its reward in the next world."

You have interwoven so many particulars in this general question, that I must divide and answer them one by one.

Query 1. Whether notions in religion may not be heightened to such extremes, as to lead some into a disregard of religion itself.

Answer. They may. But that I have so heightened them, it lies upon you to prove.

Q. 2. Whether others may not be led into a disregard of religion, through despair of attaining such exalted heights.

A. What heights? the loving God with all our heart? I believe this is the most exalted height in man or angel. But I have not heard that any have been led into a disregard of religion through despair of attaining this.

Q. 3. Whether others who have imbibed these notions may not be led by them into a disregard and disesteem of the common duties and offices of life.

A. My notions are, True religion is the loving God with all our heart, and our neighbour as ourselves; and in that love abstaining from all evil, and doing all possible good to all men. Now, it is not possible, in the nature of things, that any should be led by these notions into either a disregard or disesteem of the common duties and offices of life.

Q. 4. But may they not be led by them into such a degree, at least, of disregard for the common duties of life as is inconsistent with that attention to them, and diligence in them, which Providence has made necessary?

A. No; quite the reverse. They lead men to discharge all those duties with the strictest diligence and closest attention.

Q. 5. Does not Christianity require this attention and diligence in all stations and in all conditions?

A. Yes.

Q. 6. Does it not declare that the performance even of the lowest offices of life, as unto God, is truly "a serving of Christ;" and will not fail of its reward in the next world?

A. It does. But whom are you confuting? Not me; for this is the doctrine I preach continually.

3. Query the Second:—"Whether the enemy of Christianity may not find his account in carrying Christianity, which was designed for a rule to all stations and all conditions, to such heights as make it practicable by a very few, in comparison, or rather by none."

I answer, (1.) The height to which we carry Christianity (as was but now observed) is this: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and thy neighbour as thyself." (2.) The enemy of Christianity cannot find his account in our carrying it to this height. (3.) You will not say, on reflection, that Christianity, even in this height, is practicable by very few, or rather by none: you yourself will confess this is a rule (as God designed it should [he]) for all stations and all conditions.

Query the Third:—"Whether, in particular, the carrying the doctrine of justification by faith alone to such a height as not to allow that a sincere and careful observance of moral duties is so much as a condition of our acceptance with God, and of our being justified in his sight: whether this, I say, does not naturally lead people to a disregard of those duties, and a low esteem of them; or, rather, to think them no part of the Christian religion."

I trust justification by faith alone has been so explained above, as to secure not only a high esteem but also a careful and sincere observance of all moral duties.

4. Query the Fourth :—"Whether a due and regular attendance on the public offices of religion, paid by good men in a serious and composed way, does not answer the true ends of devotion, and is not a better evidence of the co-operation of the Holy Spirit, than those sudden agonies, roarings, screamings, tremblings, droppings down, ravings, and madnesses, into which their hearers have been cast."

I must answer this query likewise part by part.

Query 1. Whether a due and regular attendance on the public offices of religion, paid in a serious and composed way, by good (that is, well meaning) men, does not answer the true ends of devotion.

Answer. I suppose, by devotion, you mean public worship; by the true ends of it, the love of God and man; and by a due and regular attendance on the public offices of religion, paid in a serious and composed way, the going as often as we have opportunity to our parish church, and to the sacrament there administered. If so, the question is, whether this attendance on those offices does not produce the love of God and man. I answer, Sometimes it does; and sometimes it does not. I myself thus attended them for many years; and yet am conscious to myself that during that whole time I had no more of the love of God than a stone. And I know many hundreds, perhaps thousands, of serious persons, who are ready to testify the same thing.

Q. 2. But is not this a better evidence of the co-operation of the Holy Spirit, than those sudden agonies?

A. All these persons, as well as I, can testify also that this is no evidence at all of the co-operation of the Holy Spirit. For some years I attended these public offices, because I would not be punished for non-attendance. And many of these attended them, because their parents did before them, or because they would not lose their character: many more, because they confounded the means with the end, and fancied this *opus operatum* [mere performance] would bring them to heaven. How many thousands are now under this strong delusion! Beware, you bring not their blood on your own head!

Q. 3. However, does not this attendance better answer those ends, than those roarings, screamings? &c.

A. I suppose you mean, better than an attendance on that preaching, which has often been accompanied with these.

I answer, (1.) There is no manner of need to set the one in opposition to the other; seeing we continually exhort all who attend on our preaching to attend the offices of the Church. And they do pay a more regular attendance there than ever they did before. (2.) Their attending the Church did not, in fact, answer those ends at all till they attended this preaching also. (3.) It is the preaching of remission of sins through Jesus Christ, which alone answers the true ends of devotion. And this will always be accompanied with the co-operation of the Holy Spirit; though not always with sudden agonies, roarings, screamings, tremblings, or droppings down. Indeed, if God is pleased at any time to permit any of these, I cannot hinder it. Neither can this hinder the work of his Spirit in the soul; which may be carried on either with or without them.

But, (4.) I cannot apprehend it to be any reasonable proof, that "this is not the work of God," that a convinced sinner should "fall into an extreme agony, both of body and soul;" (*Journal* iii, p. 26;) that another should "roar for the disquietness of her heart;" (p. 40;) that others should scream or "cry with a loud and bitter cry, 'What must we do to be saved?'" (p. 50;) that others should "exceedingly tremble and quake;" (p. 58;) and others, in a deep sense of the majesty of God, "should fall prostrate upon the ground." (p. 59.)

Indeed, by picking out one single word from a sentence, and then putting together what you had gleaned in sixty or seventy pages, you have drawn a terrible group for them who look no further than those two lines in the "Observations." But the bare addition of half a line to each word, just as it stands in the place from which you quoted it, reconciles all both to Scripture and reason; and the spectre form vanishes away.

You have taken into your account ravings and madneses too. As instances of the former, you refer to the case of John Haydon, (p. 44,) and of Thomas Maxfield, (p. 50.) I wish you would calmly consider his reasoning on that head, who is not prejudiced in my favour: "What influence sudden and sharp awakenings may have upon the body, I pretend not to explain. But I make no question, Satan, so far as he gets power, may exert himself on such occasions, partly to hinder the good work in the persons who are thus touched with the sharp arrows of conviction, and partly to disparage the work of God, as if it tended to lead people to distraction."

For instances of madness you refer to pages 88, 90, 91, 92, 93. The words in page 88 are these:—

"I could not but be under some concern, with regard to one or two persons, who were tormented in an unaccountable manner, and seemed to be indeed lunatic as well as 'sore vexed.' Soon after I was sent for to one of these, who was so strangely 'torn of the devil,' that I almost wondered her relations did not say, Much religion 'hath made thee mad.' We prayed God to bruise Satan under her feet. Immediately 'we had the petition we asked of him.' She cried out vehemently, 'He is gone! he is gone!' and was filled with the Spirit of 'love, and of a sound mind.' I have seen her many times since strong in the Lord. When I asked, abruptly, 'What do you desire now?' she answered, 'Heaven.' I asked, 'What is in your heart?' She replied, 'God.' I asked, 'But how is your heart when any thing provokes you?' She said, 'By the grace of God, I am not provoked at any thing. All the things of this world pass by me as shadows.'" Are these the words of one that is beside herself? Let any man of reason judge!

Your next instance (p. 90) stands thus:—

"About noon I came to Usk, where I preached to a small company of poor people, on, 'The Son of Man is come to save that which is lost.' One grey-headed man wept and trembled exceedingly; and another who was there, (I have since heard,) as well as two or three who were at the Devauden, are gone quite distracted; that is, (my express words, that immediately follow, specify what it was which some accounted distraction,) 'they mourn and refuse to be comforted, until they have redemption through his blood.'" "

If you think the case mentioned, pages 92, 93, to be another instance of madness, I contend not. It was because I did not understand that

uncommon case that I prefaced it with this reflection: "The fact I nakedly relate, and leave every man to his own judgment upon it." Only be pleased to observe, that this madness, if such it was, is no more chargeable upon me than upon you. For the subject of it had no relation to, or commerce with, me; nor had I ever seen her before that hour.

5. Query the Fifth:—"Whether those exalted strains in religion, and an imagination of being already in a state of perfection, are not apt to lead men to spiritual pride, and to a contempt of their fellow Christians; while they consider them as only going on in what they call the low and imperfect way, (that is, as growing in grace and goodness only by degrees,) even though it appear by the lives of those who are considered by them as in that low and imperfect way, that they are persons who are gradually working out their salvation by their own honest endeavours, and through the ordinary assistances of God's grace; with an humble reliance upon the merits of Christ for the pardon of their sins, and the acceptance of their sincere though imperfect services."

I must divide this query too; but first permit me to ask, What do you mean by "those exalted strains in religion?" I have said again and again, I know of no more exalted strain than, "I will love thee, O Lord my God:" especially according to the propriety of David's expression, ארתוך יהוה: *Ex intimis visceribus diligam te, Domine.* (I will love thee, [O Lord,] from my inmost bowels.) This premised, let us go on step by step.

Query 1. Whether the preaching of "loving God from our inmost bowels;" is not apt to lead men to spiritual pride, and to a contempt of their fellow Christians.

Answer. No: but, so far as it takes place, it will humble them to the dust.

Q. 2. Whether an imagination of being already in a state of perfection is not apt to lead men into spiritual pride.

A. (1.) If it be a false imagination, it is spiritual pride. (2.) But true Christian perfection is no other than humble love.

Q. 3. Do not men, who imagine they have attained this, despise others, as only going on in what they account the low and imperfect way, that is, as growing in grace and goodness by degrees?

A. (1.) Men who only imagine they have attained this may probably despise those that are going in any way. (2.) But the growing in grace and goodness by degrees is no mark of a low and imperfect way. Those who are fathers in Christ grow in grace by degrees, as well as the new-born babes.

Q. 4. Do they not despise those who are working out their salvation with an humble reliance upon the merits of Christ for the pardon of their sins, and the acceptance of their sincere though imperfect services?

A. (1.) They who really love God despise no man. But, (2.) They grieve to hear many talk of thus relying on Christ, who, though perhaps they are grave, honest, moral men, yet by their own words appear not to love God at all; whose souls cleave to the dust; who love the world; who have no part of the mind that was in Christ.

6. Query the Sixth:—"Whether the same exalted strains and notions do not tend to weaken the natural and civil relations among men, by leading the inferiors, into whose heads those notions are infused, to a disesteem of their superiors; while they consider them as in a much lower

dispensation than themselves ; though those superiors are otherwise sober and good men, and regular attendants on the ordinances of religion.”

I have mentioned before what those exalted notions are: these do not tend to weaken either the natural or civil relations among men ; or to lead inferiors to a disesteem of their superiors, even where those superiors are neither good nor sober men.

Query the Seventh :—“ Whether a gradual improvement in grace and goodness is not a better foundation of comfort, and of an assurance of a Gospel new-birth, than that which is founded on the doctrine of a sudden and instantaneous change ; which, if there be any such thing, is not easily distinguished from fancy and imagination ; the workings whereof we may well suppose to be more strong and powerful, while the person considers himself in the state of one who is admitted as a candidate for such a change, and is taught in due time to expect it.”

Let us go one step at a time.

Query 1. Whether a gradual improvement in grace and goodness is not a good foundation of comfort.

Answer. Doubtless it is, if by grace and goodness be meant the knowledge and love of God through Christ.

Q. 2. Whether it be not a good foundation of an assurance of a Gospel new-birth.

A. If we daily grow in this knowledge and love, it is a good proof that we are born of the Spirit. But this does in nowise supersede the previous witness of God's Spirit with ours, that we are the children of God. And this is properly the foundation of the assurance of faith.

Q. 3. Whether this improvement is not a better foundation of comfort, and of an assurance of a Gospel new-birth, than that which is founded on the doctrine of a sudden and instantaneous change.

A. A better foundation than that. *That!* What? To what substantive does this refer? According to the rules of grammar, (for all the substantives are in the genitive case, and, consequently, to be considered as only parts of that which governs them,) you must mean a better foundation than that foundation which is founded on this doctrine. As soon as I understand the question, I will endeavour to answer it.

Q. 4. Can that sudden and instantaneous change be easily distinguished from fancy and imagination?

A. Just as easily as light from darkness ; seeing it brings with it a peace that passeth all understanding, a joy unspeakable, full of glory, the love of God and all mankind filling the heart, and power over all sin.

Q. 5. May we not well suppose the workings of imagination to be more strong and powerful in one who is taught to expect such a change?

A. Perhaps we may ; but still the tree is known by its fruits. And such fruits as those above-mentioned, imagination was never yet strong enough to produce, nor any power, save that of the Almighty.

7. There is only one clause in the Eighth Query which falls under our present inquiry.

“ They make it their principal employ, wherever they go, to instil into people a few favourite tenets of their own ; and this with such diligence and zeal as if the whole of Christianity depended upon them, and all efforts toward the true Christian life, without a belief of those tenets, were vain and ineffectual.”

I plead guilty to this charge. I do make it my principal, nay, my whole employ, and that wherever I go, to instil into the people a few favourite tenets;—only, be it observed, they are not my own, but His that sent me. And it is undoubtedly true that this I do, (though deeply conscious of my want both of zeal and diligence,) as if the whole of Christianity depended upon them, and all efforts without them were void and vain.

I frequently sum them all up in one: “In Christ Jesus” (that is, according to his Gospel) “neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision, but faith which worketh by love.” But many times I instil them one by one, under these or the like expressions: “Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy mind, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength: thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself;” as thy own soul; as Christ loved us. “God is love; and he that dwelleth in love, dwelleth in God, and God in him. Love worketh no ill to his neighbour; therefore love is the fulfilling of the law. While we have time, let us do good unto all men; especially unto them that are of the household of faith. Whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, even so do unto them.”

These are my favourite tenets, and have been for many years. O that I could instil them into every soul throughout the land! Ought they not to be instilled with such diligence and zeal, as if the whole of Christianity depended upon them? For who can deny that all efforts toward a Christian life, without more than a bare belief, without a thorough experience and practice of these, are utterly vain and ineffectual?

8. Part of your Ninth Query is to the same effect:—

“A few young heads set up their own schemes as the great standard of Christianity; and indulge their own notions to such a degree, as to perplex, unhinge, terrify and distract the minds of multitudes of people, who have lived from their infancy under a Gospel ministry, and in the regular exercise of a Gospel worship. And all this by persuading them that they neither are nor can be true Christians but by adhering to their doctrines.”

What do you mean by *their own* schemes, their *own* notions; *their* doctrines? Are they not yours too? Are they not the schemes, the notions, the doctrines of Jesus Christ; the great fundamental truths of his Gospel? Can you deny one of them without denying the Bible? It is hard for you to kick against the pricks!

“They persuade,” you say, “multitudes of people, that they cannot be true Christians but by adhering to their doctrines.” Why, who says they can? Whosoever he be, I will prove him to be an infidel. Do you say that any man can be a true Christian without loving God and his neighbour? Surely you have not so learned Christ! It is *your* doctrine as well as mine, and St. Paul’s: “Though I speak with the tongues of men and angels; though I have all knowledge, and all faith; though I give all my goods to feed the poor, yea, my body to be burned, and have not love, I am nothing.”

Whatever public worship, therefore, people may have attended, or whatever ministry they have lived under from their infancy, they must at all hazards be convinced of this, or they perish for ever; yea, though

that conviction at first unHINGE them ever so much; though it should in a manner distract them for a season. For it is better they should be perplexed and terrified now, than that they should sleep on, and awake in hell.

9. In the Tenth, Twelfth, and Thirteenth queries I am not concerned. But you include me also when you say, in the Eleventh, "They absolutely deny that recreations of any kind, considered as such, are or can be innocent."

I cannot find any such assertion of mine either in the place you refer to, or any other. But what kinds of recreation are innocent it is easy to determine by that plain rule: "Whether ye eat or drink, or whatever ye do, do all to the glory of God."

I am now to take my leave of you for the present. But first I would earnestly entreat you to acquaint yourself what our doctrines are, before you make any further *observations* upon them. Surely, touching the *nature* of salvation we agree,—that "pure religion and undefiled is this, to visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction,"—to do all possible good, from a principle of love to God and man; "and to keep ourselves unspotted from the world,"—inwardly and outwardly to abstain from all evil.

10. With regard to the *condition* of salvation, it may be remembered that I allow, not only faith, but likewise holiness or universal obedience, to be the ordinary condition of final salvation; and that when I say, Faith alone is the condition of present salvation, what I would assert is this: (1.) That without faith no man can be saved from his sins; can be either inwardly or outwardly holy. And, (2.) That at what time soever faith is given, holiness commences in the soul. For that instant "the love of God" (which is the source of holiness) "is shed abroad in the heart."

But it is objected by the author of "The Notions of the Methodists Disproved," "St. James says, 'Can faith save him?'" I answer, Such a faith as is without works cannot "bring a man to heaven." But this is quite beside the present question.

You object, (2.) "St. Paul says that 'faith made perfect by love,' St. James, that 'faith made perfect by works,' is the condition of salvation. You mean final salvation. I say so too: but this also is beside the question.

You object, (3.) "That the belief of the Gospel is called the obedience of faith," Rom. i, 5. And, (4.) That what Isaiah terms *believing*, St. Paul terms *obeying*. Suppose I grant you both the one and the other, what will you infer?

You object, (5.) That in one scripture our Lord is styled, "The Saviour of them that believe;" and in another, "The Author of eternal salvation to all them that obey him." (6.) That to the Galatians St. Paul writes, "Neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision, but faith which worketh by love;" and to the Corinthians, "Circumcision is nothing, and uncircumcision is nothing, but the keeping the commandments of God." And hence you conclude, "There are several texts of Scripture wherein unbelief and disobedience are equivalently used." Very true; but can you conclude from thence that we are not "saved by faith alone?"

11. You proceed to answer some texts which I had quoted. The first is Ephesians ii, 8 : "By grace ye are saved through faith." "But," say you, "faith does not mean here that grace especially so called, but includes also obedience." But how do you prove this? That circumstance you had forgot; and so run off with a comment upon the context; to which I have no other objection, than that it is nothing at all to the question.

Indeed, some time after, you add, "It is plain then that good works are always, in St. Paul's judgment, joined with faith;" (so undoubtedly they are; that is, as an effect is always joined with its cause;) "and therefore we are not saved by faith alone." I cannot possibly allow the consequence.

You afterward cite two more texts, and add, "You see, mere faith cannot be a condition of justification." You are out of your way. We are no more talking now of justification than of final salvation.

In considering Acts xvi, 31, "Believe in the Lord Jesus, and thou shalt be saved," you say again, "Here the word *believe* does not signify faith only. Faith necessarily produces charity and repentance; therefore, these are expressed by the word *believe*;" that is, faith necessarily produces holiness; therefore holiness is a condition of holiness. I want further proof. That "Paul and Silas spake unto him the word of the Lord," and that his faith did "in the same hour" work by love, I take to be no proof at all.

You then undertake to show, that confessing our sins is a condition of justification, and that a confidence in the love of God is not a condition. Some of your words are: "This, good sir, give me leave to say, is the greatest nonsense and contradiction possible. It is impossible you can understand this jargon yourself; and therefore you labour in vain to make it intelligible to others. You soar aloft on eagles' wings, and leave the poor people to gape and stare after you."

This is very pretty, and very lively. But it is nothing to the purpose. For we are not now speaking of justification; neither have I said one word of the condition of justification in the whole tract to which you here refer.

"In the next place," say you, "if we are saved" (finally you mean) "only by a confidence in the love of God." Here I must stop you again; you are now running beside the question, on the other hand. The sole position which I here advance is this: True believers are saved from inward and outward sin by faith. By faith alone the love of God and all mankind is shed abroad in their hearts, bringing with it the mind that was in Christ, and producing all holiness of conversation.

IV. 1. I am now to consider what has been lately objected with regard to the nature of saving faith.

The author last mentioned "cannot understand how those texts of St. John are at all to the purpose:" "Behold, what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called the sons of God," 1 John iii, 1; and, "We love him, because he first loved us," iv, 19. I answer, (1.) These texts were not produced in the "Appeal" by way of proof, but of illustration only. But, (2.) I apprehend they may be produced as a proof, both that Christian faith implies a confidence in the love of God, and that such a confidence has a direct tendency to salvation, to holiness both of heart and life.

“Behold, what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called the sons of God!” Are not these words an expression of Christian faith, as direct a one as can well be conceived? And I appeal to every man, whether they do not express the strongest confidence of the love of God. Your own comment puts this beyond dispute: “Let us consider attentively, and with grateful hearts, the great love and mercy of God in calling us to be his sons, and bestowing on us the privileges belonging to such.” Do you not perceive that you have given up the cause? You have yourself taught us that these words imply a “sense of the great love and mercy of God, in bestowing upon us the privileges belonging to his sons.”

The Apostle adds, “Beloved, now are we the sons of God; and it doth not yet appear what we shall be: but we know that when he shall appear, we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is.”

I suppose no one will say, either that these words are not expressive of Christian faith; or that they do not imply the strongest confidence in the love of God. It follows, “And every man that hath this hope in him, purifieth himself even as he is pure.”

Hence it appears that this faith is a saving faith, that there is the closest connection between this faith and holiness. This text, therefore, is directly to the purpose, in respect of both the propositions to be proved.

The other is, “We love him, because he first loved us.” And here also, for fear I should fail in the proof, you have drawn it up ready to my hands:—

“God sent his only Son to redeem us from sin, by purchasing for us grace and salvation. By which grace we, through faith and repentance, have our sins pardoned; and therefore we are bound to return the tribute of our love and gratitude, and to obey him faithfully as long as we live.”

Now, that we have our sins pardoned, if we do not know they are pardoned, cannot bind us either to love or obedience. But if we do know it, and by that very knowledge or confidence in the pardoning love of God are both bound and enabled to love and obey him, this is the whole of what I contend for.

2. You afterward object against some other texts which I had cited to illustrate the nature of saving faith. My words were, “Hear believing Job declaring his faith: ‘I know that my Redeemer liveth.’” I here affirm two things: (1.) That Job was then a believer. (2.) That he declared his faith in these words. And all I affirm, you allow. Your own words are, “God was pleased to bestow upon him a strong assurance of his favour; to inspire him with a prophecy of the resurrection, and that he should have a share in it.”

I went on, “Hear Thomas (when having seen he believed) crying out, ‘My Lord and my God.’” Hereon you comment thus: “The meaning of which is, that St. Thomas makes a confession both of his faith and repentance.” I agree with you. But you add, “In St. Thomas’s confession there is not implied an assurance of pardon.” You cannot agree with yourself in this; but immediately subjoin, “If it did imply such an assurance, he might well have it, since he had an immediate revelation of it from God himself.”

Yet a little before you endeavoured to prove that one who was not a

whit behind the very chief Apostles had not such an assurance ; where, in order to show that faith does not imply this, you said, “ St. Paul methinks has fully determined this point, ‘ I know nothing by myself,’ says he ; ‘ yet am I not hereby justified,’ ” 1 Cor. iv, 4. “ And if an Apostle, so illuminated, does not think himself justified,” then I grant, he has fully determined the point. But before you absolutely fix upon that conclusion, be pleased to remember your own comment that follows, on those other words of St. Paul : “ The life I now live, I live by faith in the Son of God, who loved me and gave himself for me.” Your words are, “ And, no question, a person endowed with such extraordinary gifts might arrive at a very eminent degree of assurance.” So he did arrive at a very eminent degree of assurance, though he did not think himself justified !

I can scarce think you have read over that chapter to the Colossians ; else, surely, you would not assert that those words on which the stress lies (viz. “ Who hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the kingdom of his dear Son : in whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins”) do not relate to Paul and Timothy who wrote the Epistle, but to the Colossians, to whom they wrote.” I need be at no pains to answer this ; for presently after your own words are, “ He hath made us,” meaning the Colossians, as well as himself, “ meet to be inheritors.”

3. You may easily observe that I quoted the Council of Trent by memory, not having the book then by me. I own, and thank you for correcting, my mistake : but in correcting one you make another ; for the decrees of the sixth session were not published on the thirteenth of January ; but the session itself began on that day.

I cannot help reciting your next words, although they are not exactly to the present question :—

“ The words of the twelfth canon of the Council of Trent are,—

“ If any man shall say that justifying faith is nothing else but a confidence in the divine mercy, remitting sins for Christ’s sake, and that this confidence is that alone by which we are justified, let him be accursed.” You add,—

“ This, sir, I am sure is true doctrine, and perfectly agreeable to the doctrine of our Church. And so you are not only anathematized by the Council of Trent, but also condemned by our own Church.”

“ Our Church holds no such scandalous and disgraceful opinion.” According to our Church, no man can have “ the true faith who has not a loving heart. Therefore, faith is not a confidence that any man’s sins are actually forgiven, and he reconciled to God.” (What have the premises to do with the conclusion ?)

4. To decide this, let our Church speak for herself,—whether she does not suppose and teach, that every particular believer knows that his sins are forgiven, and he himself is reconciled to God.

First, then, our Church supposes and teaches every particular believer to say concerning himself, “ In my baptism I was made a member of Christ, a child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven. And I thank God who hath called me to that state of salvation. And I pray to God that I may continue in the same to my life’s end.”

Now, does this person know what he says to be true ? If not, it is the

grossest hypocrisy. But if he does, then he knows that he in particular is reconciled to God.

The next words I shall quote may be a comment on these: may God write them in our hearts!

“A true Christian man is not afraid to die, who is the very member of Christ, the temple of the Holy Ghost, the son of God, and the very inheritor of the everlasting kingdom of heaven. But plainly contrary, he not only puts away the fear of death, but wishes, desires, and longs heartily for it.” (*Sermon against the Fear of Death*, part i.)

Can this be, unless he has a sure confidence, that he in particular is reconciled to God?

“Men commonly fear death, First, because of leaving their worldly goods and pleasures: Secondly, for fear of the pains of death: and, Thirdly, for fear of perpetual damnation. But none of these causes trouble good men, because they stay themselves by true faith, perfect charity, and sure hope of endless joy and bliss everlasting.” (*Ibid.* part ii.)

“All these therefore have great cause to be full of joy, and not to fear death nor everlasting damnation. For death cannot deprive them of Jesus Christ; death cannot take him from us, nor us from him. Death not only cannot harm us, but also shall profit us and join us to God more perfectly. And thereof a Christian heart may be surely certified. ‘It is God,’ saith St. Paul, ‘which hath given us an earnest of his Spirit.’ As long as we be in the body we are in a strange country. But we have a desire rather to be at home with God.” (*Ibid.*)

He that runneth may read in all these words the confidence which our Church supposes every particular believer to have, that he himself is reconciled to God.

To proceed: “The only instrument of salvation required on our parts is faith; that is, a sure trust and confidence that God both hath and will forgive our sins, that he hath accepted us again into his favour, for the merits of Christ’s death and passion.” (*Second Sermon on the Passion.*)

“But here we must take heed that we do not halt with God through an unconstant, wavering faith. Peter, coming to Christ upon the water, because he fainted in faith, was in danger of drowning. So we, if we begin to waver or doubt, it is to be feared lest we should sink as Peter did,—not into the water, but into the bottomless pit of hell-fire. Therefore I say unto you, that we must apprehend the merits of Christ’s death by faith, and that with a strong and steadfast faith; nothing doubting but that Christ by his own oblation hath taken away our sins, and hath restored us again to God’s favour.” (*Ibid.*)

5. If it be still said that the Church speaks only of men in general, but not of the confidence of this or that particular person; even this last poor subterfuge is utterly cut off by the following words:—

“Thou, O man, hast received the body of Christ which was once broken, and his blood which was shed for the remission of thy sin. Thou hast received his body to have within thee the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, for to endow thee with grace, and to comfort thee with their presence. Thou hast received his body to endow thee with everlasting righteousness, and to assure thee of everlasting bliss.” (*Sermon on the Resurrection.*)

I shall add but one passage more, from the first part of the “Sermon on the Sacrament:”—

“Have a sure and constant faith, not only that the death of Christ is

available for all the world, but that he hath made a full and sufficient sacrifice for thee, a perfect cleansing of thy sins, so that thou mayest say with the Apostle, 'He loved thee, and gave himself for thee.' For this is to make Christ thine own, and to apply his merits unto thyself."

Let every reasonable man now judge for himself, what is the sense of our Church as to the nature of saving faith. Does it not abundantly appear that the Church of England supposes every particular believer to have a sure confidence that his sins are forgiven, and he himself reconciled to God? Yea, and how can the absolute necessity of this faith, this unwavering confidence, be more strongly or peremptorily asserted, than it is in those words: "If we begin to waver or doubt, it is to be feared lest we sink as Peter did,—not into the water, but into the bottomless pit of hell-fire?"

6. I would willingly dismiss this writer here. I had said in the "Earnest Appeal," (what I am daily more and more confirmed in,) that this faith is usually given in a moment. This you greatly dislike. Your argument against it, if put into form, will run thus:—

"They who first apprehended the meaning of the words delivered, then gave their assent to them, then had confidence in the promises to which they assented, and, lastly, loved God, did not receive faith in a moment.

"But the believers mentioned in the Acts first apprehended the meaning of the words, then gave their assent, then had confidence in the promises, and, lastly, loved God: therefore,

"The believers mentioned in the Acts did not receive faith in a moment."

I deny the major. They might first apprehend, then assent, then confide, then love, and yet receive faith in a moment; in that moment wherein their general confidence became particular, so that each could say, "My Lord and my God!"

One paragraph more I will be at the pains to transcribe:

"You insinuate that the sacraments are only requisite to the well being of a visible Church: whereas the Church declares that the due administration of them is an essential property thereof. I suppose you hinted this to satisfy your loving disciples, the Quakers."

This is flat and plain. Here is a fact positively averred; and a reason also assigned for it. Now, do you take yourself to be a man of candour, I had almost said, of common honesty? My very words in the place referred to, are, "A visible Church is a company of faithful people. This is the essence of it. And the properties thereof are, that the pure word of God be preached therein, and the sacraments duly administered."

7. Before I take my leave I cannot but recommend to you that advice of a wise and good man,—

"Be calm in arguing; for fierceness makes
Error a fault, and truth discourtesy."

I am grieved at your extreme warmth: you are in a thorough ill-humour from the very beginning of your book to the end. This cannot hurt me; but it may yourself. And it does not at all help your cause. If you denounce against me all the curses from Genesis to the Revelation, they will not amount to one argument. I am willing (so far as I know myself) to be reproved either by you or any other. But whatever you do, let it be done in love, in patience, in meekness of wisdom.

V. 1. With regard to the Author of faith and salvation, abundance of objections have been made; it being a current opinion, that Christians are not now to receive the Holy Ghost.

Accordingly, whenever we speak of the Spirit of God, of his operations on the souls of men, of his revealing unto us the things of God, or inspiring us with good desires or tempers; whenever we mention the feeling his mighty power "working in us" according to his good pleasure; the general answer we have to expect is, "This is rank enthusiasm. So it was with the Apostles and first Christians. But only enthusiasts pretend to this now."

Thus all the Scriptures, abundance of which might be produced, are set aside at one stroke. And whoever cites them, as belonging to all Christians, is set down for an enthusiast.

The first tract I have seen wrote expressly on this head, is remarkably entitled, "The Operations of the Holy Spirit Imperceptible; and how Men may know when they are under the Guidance and Influence of the Spirit."

You begin: "As we have some among us who pretend to a more than ordinary guidance by the Spirit," (indeed I do not; I pretend to no other guidance than is ordinarily given to all Christians,) "it may not be improper to discourse on the operations of God's Holy Spirit.

"To this end be thou pleased, O gracious fountain of truth, to assist me with thy heavenly direction, in speaking of thee."

Alas, sir, what need have you to speak any more? You have already granted all I desire, viz. that we may all now enjoy, and know that we do enjoy, the heavenly direction of God's Spirit.

However, you go on, and observe that the extraordinary gifts of the Holy Ghost were granted to the first Christians only, but his ordinary graces to all Christians in all ages; both which you then attempt to enumerate; only suspending your discourse a little, when "some conceited enthusiasts" come in your way.

2. You next inquire, "after what manner these graces are raised in our souls;" and answer, "How to distinguish these heavenly motions from the natural operations of our minds, we have no light to discover; the Scriptures declaring, that the operations of the Holy Spirit are not subject to any sensible feelings or perceptions. For what communication can there be between feelings which are properties peculiar to matter, and the suggestions of the Spirit? All reasonable Christians believe that he works his graces in us in an imperceptible manner; and that there is no sensible difference between his and the natural operations of our minds."

I conceive this to be the strength of your cause. To support that conclusion, that the operations of the Spirit are imperceptible, you here allege, (1.) "That all reasonable Christians believe this." So you say; but I want proof. (2.) "That there can be no communications" (I fear you mistook the word) "between the suggestions of the Spirit, and feelings which are properties peculiar to matter." How! Are the feelings now in question "properties peculiar to matter?" the feeling of peace, joy, love, or any feelings at all? I can no more understand the philosophy than the divinity of this. (3.) "That the Scriptures declare the operations of the Spirit are not subject to any sensible feelings." You are here disproving, as you suppose, a proposition of mine. But

are you sure you understand it? By feeling, I mean, being inwardly conscious of. By the operations of the Spirit, I do not mean the manner in which he operates, but the graces which he operates in a Christian. Now, be pleased to produce those scriptures which declare that a Christian cannot feel or perceive these operations.

3. Are you not convinced, sir, that you have laid to my charge things which I know not? I do not gravely tell you (as much an enthusiast as you over and over affirm me to be) that I sensibly feel (in your sense) the motions of the Holy Spirit. Much less do I make this, any more than "convulsions, agonies, howlings, roarings, and violent contortions of the body," either "certain signs of men's being in a state of salvation," or "necessary in order thereunto." You might with equal justice and truth inform the world, and the worshipful the magistrates of Newcastle, that I make *seeing* the wind, or *feeling* the light, necessary to salvation.

Neither do I confound the extraordinary with the ordinary operations of the Spirit. And as to your last inquiry, "What is the best proof of our being led by the Spirit?" I have no exception to that just and scriptural answer which you yourself have given,—“A thorough change and renovation of mind and heart, and the leading a new and holy life.”

4. That I confound the extraordinary with the ordinary operations of the Spirit, and therefore am an enthusiast, is also strongly urged, in a charge delivered to his clergy, and lately published, by the lord bishop of Lichfield and Coventry.

An extract of the former part of this I subjoin, in his lordship's words :

“I cannot think it improper to obviate the contagion of those enthusiastical pretensions, that have lately betrayed whole multitudes either into presumption or melancholy. Enthusiasm, indeed, when detected, is apt to create infidelity; and infidelity is so shocking a thing, that many rather run into the other extreme, and take refuge in enthusiasm. But infidelity and enthusiasm seem now to act in concert against our established religion. As infidelity has been sufficiently opposed, I shall now lay before you the weakness of those enthusiastical pretensions.” (pp. 1, 2.)

“Now, to confute effectually, and strike at the root of, those enthusiastical pretensions,

“First, I shall show that it is necessary to lay down some method for distinguishing real from pretended inspiration.” (pp. 3, 5.)

“Many expressions occur in the New Testament concerning the operations of the Holy Spirit. But men of an enthusiastical temper have confounded passages of a quite different nature, and have jumbled together those that relate to the extraordinary operations of the Spirit, with those that relate only to his ordinary influences. It is therefore necessary to use some method for separating those passages relating to the operations of the Spirit, that have been so misapplied to the service of enthusiastical pretenders.” (pp. 5-7.)

“I proceed therefore to show,

“Secondly, that a distinction is to be made between those passages of Scripture about the blessed Spirit that peculiarly belong to the primitive Church, and those that relate to Christians in all ages.” (p. 7.)

“The exigences of the apostolical age required the miraculous gifts of the Spirit. But these soon ceased. When therefore we meet in the Scripture with an account of those extraordinary gifts, and likewise with an account of his ordinary operations, we must distinguish the one from the

other. And that, not only for our own satisfaction, but as a means to stop the growth of enthusiasm." (pp. 8-10.)

"And such a distinction ought to be made by the best methods of interpreting the Scriptures; which most certainly are an attentive consideration of the occasion and scope of those passages, in concurrence with the general sense of the primitive Church." (p. 11.)

"I propose, Thirdly, to specify some of the chief passages of Scripture that are misapplied by modern enthusiasts, and to show that they are to be interpreted chiefly, if not only, of the apostolical Church; and that they very little, if at all, relate to the present state of Christians." (p. 12.)

"I begin," says your lordship, "with the original promise of the Spirit, as made by our Lord a little before he left the world."

I must take the liberty to stop your lordship on the threshold. I deny that this is the original promise of the Spirit. I expect his assistance, in virtue of many promises some hundred years prior to this.

If you say, "However, this is the original or first promise of the Spirit in the New Testament?" no, my lord; those words were spoken long before: "He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost, and with fire."

Will you reply?—"Well, but this is the original promise made by our Lord." I answer, Not so, neither; for it was before this Jesus himself stood and cried, "If any man thirst, let him come unto me and drink: he that believeth on me, as the Scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water. And this he spake of the Spirit, which they should receive who believed on him." (*Ὁὐ ἐμελλον λαμβανειν ὁ πιστευοντες εις αυτον.*) If I mistake not, this may more justly be termed, our Lord's original promise of the Spirit. And who will assert that this is to be "interpreted chiefly, if not only, of the apostolical Church?"

5. Your lordship proceeds: "It occurs in the fourteenth and sixteenth chapters of St. John's Gospel; in which he uses these words." In what verses, my lord? * Why is not this specified? unless to furnish your lordship with an opportunity of doing the very things whereof you before complained,—of "confounding passages of a quite contrary nature, and jumbling together those that relate to the extraordinary operations of the Spirit, with those that relate to his ordinary influences?"

You cite the words thus: "'When the Spirit of truth is come, he will guide you into all truth, and he will show you things to come.' These are nearly the words that occur, xvi, 13.

"And again: 'The Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you.' These words occur in the fourteenth chapter, at the twenty-sixth verse."

But, my lord, I want the original promise still; the original, I mean, of those made in this very discourse. Indeed your margin tells us where it is, (xiv, 16,) but the words appear not. Taken together with the context, they run thus:—

"If ye love me, keep my commandments. ^ε

"And I will pray the Father, and he will give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you for ever:

"Even the Spirit of truth, whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him," xiv, 15-17.

* I take it for granted, that the citation of texts in the margin, which is totally wrong, is a blunder of the printer's.

My lord, suffer me to inquire why you slipped over this text. Was it not (I appeal to the Searcher of your heart!) because you was conscious to yourself that it would necessarily drive you to that unhappy dilemma, either to assert that *for ever*, εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, meant only sixty or seventy years; or to allow that the text must be interpreted of the ordinary operations of the Spirit, in all future ages of the Church?

And indeed that the promise in this text belongs to all Christians, evidently appears, not only from your lordship's own concession, and from the text itself, (for who can deny that this Comforter, or Paraclete, is now given to all them that believe?) but also from the preceding, as well as following, words. The preceding are, "If ye love me, keep my commandments. And I will pray the Father." None, surely, can doubt but these belong to all Christians in all ages. The following words are, "Even the Spirit of truth, whom the world cannot receive." True, the world cannot; but all Christians can and will receive him for ever.

6. The second promise of the Comforter, made in this chapter, together with its context, stands thus:—

"Judas saith unto him, not Iscariot, Lord, how is it that thou wilt manifest thyself unto us, and not unto the world?"

"Jesus answered, and said unto him, If any man love me, he will keep my word. And my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him.

"He that loveth me not, keepeth not my word: and the word which ye hear is not mine, but the Father's which sent me.

"These things have I spoken unto you, being yet with you.

"But the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he will teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you," verses 22–26.

Now, how does your lordship prove that this promise belongs only to the primitive Church? Why, (1.) you say, "It is very clear from the bare recital of the words." I apprehend not. But this is the very question, which is not to be begged, but proved. (2.) You say, "The Spirit's 'bringing all things to their remembrance, whatsoever he had said unto them,' cannot possibly be applied to any other persons but the Apostles." *Cannot be applied!* This is a flat begging the question again, which I cannot give up without better reasons. (3.) "The gifts of prophecy and of being 'guided into all truth, and taught all things,' can be applied only to the Apostles, and those of that age who were immediately inspired." Here your lordship, in order the more plausibly to beg the question again, "jumbles together the extraordinary with the ordinary operations of the Spirit." The gift of prophecy, we know, is one of his extraordinary operations; but there is not a word of it in this text; nor, therefore, ought it to be "confounded with his ordinary operations," such as the being "guided into all truth," (all that is necessary to salvation,) and taught all (necessary) things, in a due use of the means he hath ordained. (verse 26.)

In the same manner, namely, in a serious and constant use of proper means, I believe the assistance of the Holy Ghost is given to all Christians, to "bring all things needful to their remembrance," whatsoever Christ hath spoken to them in his word. So that I see no occasion to grant, without some kind of proof, (especially considering the occasion

of this, and the scope of the preceding verses,) that even "this promise cannot possibly be applied to any other persons but the Apostles."

7. In the same discourse of our Lord we have a third promise of the Comforter: the whole clause runs thus:—

"If I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I go, I will send him unto you.

"And when he is come, he will reprove," or convince, "the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment:

"Of sin, because they believe not on me;

"Of righteousness, because I go to my Father, and ye see me no more;

"Of judgment, because the prince of this world is judged.

"I have yet many things to say unto you; but ye cannot bear them now: but when he shall come, the Spirit of truth, he will guide you into all truth; and he will show you things to come," xvi, 7-13.

There is only one sentence here which has not already been considered, "He will show you things to come."

And this, it is granted, relates to the gift of prophecy, one of the extraordinary operations of the Spirit.

The general conclusion which your lordship draws is expressed in these words: "Consequently all pretensions to the Spirit, in the proper sense of the words of this promise, (that is, of these several texts of St. John,) are vain and insignificant, as they are claimed by modern enthusiasts." And in the end of the same paragraph you add, "None but the ordinary operations of the Spirit are to be now expected, since those that are of a miraculous (or extraordinary) kind are not pretended to, even by modern enthusiasts."

My lord, this is surprising. I read it over and over before I could credit my own eyes. I verily believe, this one clause, with unprejudiced persons, will be an answer to the whole book. You have been vehemently crying out all along against those enthusiastical pretenders; nay, the very design of your book, as you openly declare, was "to stop the growth of their enthusiasm; who have had the assurance (as you positively affirm, p. 6) to claim to themselves the extraordinary operations of the Holy Spirit." And here you as positively affirm that those extraordinary operations "are not pretended to" by them at all!

8. Yet your lordship proceeds: "The next passage of Scripture I shall mention, as peculiarly belonging to the primitive times, though misapplied to the present state of Christians by modern enthusiasts, is what relates to the 'testimony of the Spirit,' and 'praying by the Spirit,' in the eighth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans." (p. 16.)

I believe it incumbent upon me thoroughly to weigh the force of your lordship's reasoning on this head. You begin: "After St. Paul had treated of that spiritual principle in Christians, which enables them 'to mortify the deeds of the body,' he says, 'If any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his.' This makes the distinction of a true Christian, particularly in opposition to the Jews." I apprehend it is just here that your lordship turns out of the way, when you say, "particularly in opposition to the Jews." Such a particular opposition I cannot allow, till some stronger proof is produced, than St. Paul's occasionally mentioning, six verses before, "the imperfection of the Jewish law."

Yet your lordship's mind is so full of this, that after repeating the fourteenth and fifteenth verses, "As many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God: for ye have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear; but ye have received the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father!" you add, "In the former part of this verse, the Apostle shows again the imperfection of the Jewish law." This also calls for proof; otherwise it will not be allowed, that he here speaks of the Jewish law at all; not, though we grant that "the Jews were subject to the fear of death, and lived, in consequence of it, in a state of bondage." For are not all unbelievers, as well as the Jews, more or less, in the same fear and bondage?

Your lordship goes on: "In the latter part of the verse he shows the superiority of the Christian law to that of the Jews." (p. 18.) Where is the proof, my lord? How does it appear that he is speaking either of the Christian or Jewish law in those words, "Ye have received the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father?" However, you infer, "Christians then are the adopted sons of God, in contradistinction to the Jews, as the former had the gifts of the Holy Ghost, which none of the latter had at that time; and the body of the Jews never had." No, nor the body of the Christians neither: so that, if this be a proof against the Jews, it is the very same against the Christians.

I must observe farther on the preceding words, (1.) That your lordship begins here, to take the word Christians in a new and peculiar sense, for the whole body of the then Christian Church. (2.) That it is a bad inference: "As (or because) they had the gifts of the Holy Ghost, therefore they were the sons of God." On the one hand, if they were the children of God, it was not because they had those gifts. On the other, a man may have all those gifts, and yet be a child of the devil.

9. I conceive, not only that your lordship has proved nothing hitherto, not one point that has any relation to the question, but that, strictly speaking, you have not attempted to prove any thing, having taken for granted whatever came in your way. In the same manner you proceed, "The Apostle goes on, 'The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God.' This passage, as it is connected with the preceding one, relates to the general adoption of Christians, or their becoming the sons of God instead of the Jews."—"This passage relates"—How is that proved? by its connection with the preceding? In nowise, unless it be good arguing to prove *ignotum per ignotius*. [A thing unknown by what is more unknown.] It has not yet been proved, that the preceding passage itself has any relation to this matter.

Your lordship adds, "But what was the ground of this preference that was given to Christians? It was plainly the miraculous gifts of the Spirit, which they had, and which the Jews had not." This preference given to Christians was just before expressed by their becoming the sons of God instead of the Jews. Were the gifts of the Spirit then the ground of this preference, the ground of their becoming the sons of God? What an assertion is this! And how little is it mended, though I allow that "these miraculous gifts of the Spirit were a testimony that God acknowledged the Christians to be his people, and not the Jews; since the Christians, who worked miracles, did it, not "by the works of the law," but by "the hearing of faith!"

Your lordship concludes, "From these passages of St. Paul, compared together, it clearly follows, that the fore-mentioned testimony of the Spirit was the public testimony of miraculous gifts; and, consequently, the witness of the Spirit that we are the children of God, cannot possibly be applied to the private testimony of the Spirit given to our own consciences, as is pretended by modern enthusiasts." (p. 20.)

If your conclusion, my lord, will stand without the premises, it may; but that it has no manner of connection with them, I trust does partly, and will more fully, appear, when we view the whole passage to which you refer; and I believe that passage, with very little comment, will prove, in direct opposition to that conclusion, that the testimony of the Spirit, there mentioned, is not the public testimony of miraculous gifts, but must be applied to the private testimony of the Spirit, given to our own consciences.

10. St. Paul begins the eighth chapter of his Epistle to the Romans, with the great privilege of every Christian believer, (whether Jew or Gentile before,) "There is now no condemnation for them that are in Christ Jesus," engrafted into him by faith, "who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit. For" now every one of them may truly say, "The law," or power, "of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus," given unto me for his sake, "hath made me free from the law," or power, "of sin and death. For that which the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son, in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin," did, when he "condemned," crucified, put to death, destroyed, "sin in the flesh; that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit. For they that are after the flesh, mind the things of the flesh; but they that are after the Spirit, the things of the Spirit." (verses 1-5.)

Is it not evident, that the Apostle is here describing a true Christian, a holy believer?—in opposition, not particularly to a Jew, much less to the Jewish law, but to every unholy man, to all, whether Jews or Gentiles, "who walk after the flesh?" He goes on:—

"For to be carnally minded is death; but to be spiritually minded is life and peace. Because the carnal mind is enmity against God: for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be. So then they that are in the flesh cannot please God." (verses 6-8.)

The opposition between a holy and unholy man is still glaring and undeniable. But can any man discern the least glimmering of opposition between the Christian and the Jewish law.

The Apostle goes on: "But ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you. Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his. And if Christ be in you, the body is dead because of sin; but the Spirit is life because of righteousness. But if the Spirit of Him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by his Spirit which dwelleth in you. Therefore, brethren, we are debtors, not to the flesh, to live after the flesh. For if ye live after the flesh, ye shall die: but if ye through the Spirit do mortify the deeds of the body, ye shall live. For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God." (verses 9-14.)

Is there one word here, is there any the least intimation, of miraculous gifts, or of the Jewish law?

It follows, "For ye have not received the Spirit of bondage again to fear;" such as all sinners have, when they are at first stirred up to seek God, and begin to serve him from a slavish fear of punishment; "but ye have received the Spirit of adoption," of free love, "whereby we cry, Abba, Father. The Spirit itself," which God "hath sent forth into our hearts, crying, Abba, Father, beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God." (verses 15, 16.)

I am now willing to leave it, without farther comment, to the judgment of every impartial reader, whether it does not appear from the whole scope and tenor of the text and context taken together, that this passage does not refer to the Jewish law, nor to the public testimony of miracles; neither of which can be dragged in without putting the utmost force on the natural meaning of the words. And if so, it will follow, that this "witness of the Spirit," is the private testimony given to our own consciences; which, consequently, all sober Christians may claim, without any danger of enthusiasm.

II. "But I go on," says your lordship, "to the consideration of the other passages in the same chapter, relating to our praying by the Spirit, namely, at verses 26 and 27, which run thus: 'Likewise the Spirit also helpeth our infirmities: for we know not what we should pray for as we ought: but the Spirit itself maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered. And He that searcheth the hearts knoweth what is the mind of the Spirit, because he maketh intercession for the saints according to the will of God.'" (p. 21.)

Here is a circumstance highly needful to be observed, before we enter upon this question. Your lordship undertakes to fix the meaning of an expression used by St. Paul, in the fourteenth chapter of his First Epistle to the Corinthians. And in order thereto, you laboriously explain part of the eighth chapter of the Romans. My lord, how is this? Will it be said, "Why, this is often alleged to prove the wrong sense of that scripture?" I conceive this will not salve the matter at all. Your lordship had before laid down a particular method, as the only sure one whereby to distinguish what scriptures belong to all Christians, and what do not. This method is, the considering the occasion and scope of those passages, by comparing the text and context together. You then propose, by the use of this method, to show, that several texts have been misapplied by enthusiasts. One of these is the fifteenth verse of the fourteenth chapter of the First Epistle to the Corinthians. And to show, that enthusiasts have misapplied this, you comment on the eighth chapter to the Romans!

However, let us weigh the comment itself. The material part of it begins thus: "Now he adds another proof of the truth of Christianity: 'Likewise the Spirit helpeth our infirmities,' or our distresses, for *ἀνευρεταις* signifies both." (p. 22.) I doubt that: I require authority for it. "And then he mentions, in what instances he does so, viz. in prayers to God about afflictions."—In nothing else, my lord? Did he "help their infirmities" in no other instance than this? "'We know not,' says he, 'what we should pray for as we ought.' That is, whether it be best for us to bear afflictions, or to be delivered from them. But the

Spirit, or the gift of the Spirit, instructs us how to pray in a manner agreeable to the will of God." "The Spirit, or the gift of the Spirit!" What marvellous reasoning is this? If these "are often put for each other," what then? How is that evinced to be the case here?

12. "The Apostle goes on, 'The Spirit itself maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered.' That is, the spiritual or inspired person prayed in that capacity for the whole assembly." (p. 23.) "That is!" Nay, that is again the very point to be proved, else we get not one step farther.

"The Apostle goes on thus, (verse 27,) 'And he that searcheth the hearts knoweth what is the mind of the Spirit,' that is, of the spiritual or inspired person, 'because he maketh intercession for the saints, according to the will of God.' That is, God knows the intention of the spiritual person, who has the gift of prayer, which he uses for the benefit of the whole assembly; he, I say, leaves it entirely to God, whether it be best that they should suffer afflictions, or be delivered from them." (pp. 24, 25.)

My lord, this is more astonishing than all the rest! I was expecting all along, in reading the preceding pages, (and so, I suppose, was every thinking reader,) when your lordship would mention, that the person miraculously inspired for that intent, and praying, *κατα Θεου*, (according to [the will of] God,) either for the support or deliverance of the people, should have the very petition which he asked of him. Whereas you intended no such thing! but shut up the whole with that lame and impotent conclusion, "He leaves it to God whether it be best they should suffer afflictions, or be delivered from them."

Had he then that miraculous gift of God, that he might do what any common Christian might have done without it? Why, any person in the congregation might have prayed thus; nay, could not pray otherwise, if he had the ordinary grace of God: "Leaving it to God, whether he should suffer afflictions still, or be delivered from them." Was it only in the apostolical age, that "the Spirit instructed Christians thus to pray?" Cannot a man pray thus, either for himself or others, unless he has the miraculous gift of prayer!—So, according to your lordship's judgment, "to pray in such a manner, as in the event to leave the continuance of our sufferings, or our deliverance from them, with a due submission to the good pleasure of God," is one of those extraordinary operations of the Spirit, which none now pretend to but modern enthusiasts!

I beseech your lordship to consider. Can you coolly maintain, that the praying with a due submission to the will of God, even in heavy affliction is a miraculous gift, an extraordinary operation of the Holy Ghost? Is this peculiar to the primitive times? Is it what none but enthusiasts now pretend to? If not, then your lordship's own account of praying by the Spirit indisputably proves, that this is one of the ordinary privileges of all Christians to the end of the world.

13. "I go on," your lordship adds, "to another passage of Scripture, that has been entirely misapplied by modern enthusiasts: 'And my speech and my preaching were not with enticing words of man's wisdom, but in the demonstration of the Spirit and of power; that your faith should not stand in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God,' 1 Cor. ii, 4, 5.

"It is only necessary to evince, that by 'the demonstration of the

Spirit and of power' is meant the demonstration of the truth of Christianity, that arises from the prophecies of the Old Testament, and the miracles of Christ and his Apostles." (pp. 27, 29.) Yes, it is necessary farther to evince, that these words have no other meaning. But, First, how will you evince that they bear this? In order thereto your lordship argues thus:—

"The former seems to be the demonstration of the Spirit, with regard to the prophetic testimonies of him.—And the demonstration of power must signify the power of God, exerted in miracles." (p. 30.) "Must;" Why so? That *δυναμις* often signifies *miraculous power*, is allowed,—but what follows? that it must mean so in this place? That still remains to be proved.

Indeed your lordship says, this "appears from the following verse, in which is assigned the reason for using this method of proving Christianity to be true, namely, 'That your faith should not stand in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God.' By the power of God, therefore, must necessarily be understood the miracles performed by Christ and his Apostles." By the illative particle, therefore, this proposition should be an inference from some other: but what other I cannot yet discern. So that for the present, I can only look upon it as a fresh instance of begging the question.

"He goes on in the seventh, tenth, and following verses, to explain this 'demonstration of the Spirit and of power.'" But he does not say one syllable therein, either of the ancient prophecies, or of miracles. Nor will it be easily proved, that he speaks either of one or the other, from the beginning of the chapter to the end.

After transcribing the thirteenth verse, "Which things also we speak, not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth, comparing spiritual things with spiritual," your lordship adds, "From which last passage it appears, that the words which the Holy Ghost is said to teach, must be the prophetic revelations of the Old Testament, which were discovered to the Apostles by the same Spirit." I cannot apprehend how this appears. I cannot as yet see any connection at all between the premises and the conclusion.

Upon the whole, I desire any calm and serious man to read over this whole chapter; and then he will easily judge what is the natural meaning of the words in question; and whether (although it be allowed, that they were peculiarly fulfilled in the Apostles, yet) they do not manifestly belong, in a lower sense, to every true minister of Christ. For what can be more undeniable than this, that our preaching also is vain, unless it be attended with the power of that Spirit who alone pierceth the heart? and that your hearing is vain, unless the same power be present to heal your soul, and to give you a faith which "standeth not in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God?"

14. "Another passage that," your lordship thinks, "has been misapplied by enthusiasts, but was really peculiar to the times of the Apostles, is 1 John ii, 20, 27: 'Ye have an unction from the Holy One, and ye know all things.—But the anointing which ye have received of him abideth in you: and ye need not that any man teach you, but as the same anointing teacheth you of all things, and is truth, and is no lie. And even as it hath taught you, ye shall abide in him.' Here the Apostle arms the true Christians against seducers, by an argument drawn from 'the

unction from the Holy One,' that was in, or rather, among them; that is, from the immediate inspiration of some of their teachers." (pp. 35, 37.)

Here it rests upon your lordship to prove, (as well as affirm,) (1.) That *ev* should be translated *among*: (2.) That this "unction from the Holy One" means the inspiration of some of their teachers.

The latter your lordship attempts to prove thus:—

"The inspired teachers of old were set apart for that office, by an extraordinary effusion of the Holy Ghost: Therefore

"'The unction from the Holy One' here means such an effusion." (p. 38.) I deny the consequence; so the question is still to be proved.

Your lordship's second argument is drawn from the twenty-sixth verse of the fourteenth chapter of St. John's Gospel.

Proposed in form, it will stand thus:—

"If those words, 'He shall teach you all things,' relate only to a miraculous gift of the Holy Ghost, then these words, 'The same anointing teacheth you of all things,' relate to the same miraculous gift:

"But those words relate only to a miraculous gift:

"Therefore these relate to the same."

I conceive it will not be very easy to make good the consequence in the first proposition. But I deny the minor also: the contradictory whereto, I trust, has appeared to be true.

I grant indeed, that these words were more eminently fulfilled in the age of the Apostles: but this is altogether consistent with their belonging, in a lower sense, to all Christians, in all ages; seeing they have no need of "an unction from the Holy One," a supernatural assistance from the Holy Ghost, that they may know, in the due use of all proper means, all things needful for their souls' health. Therefore it is no enthusiasm, to teach that "the unction from the Holy One" belongs to all Christians in all ages.

15. There is one topic of your lordship's yet untouched; that is, authority; one you have very frequently made use of, and wherein, probably, the generality of readers suppose your lordship's great strength lies. And indeed when your lordship first mentioned (p. 11) "the general sense of the primitive Church," I presumed you would have produced so numerous authorities, that I should not easily be able to consult them all. But I soon found my mistake; your lordship naming only Chrysostom, Jerome, Origen, and Athanasius.

However, though these four can no more be termed the primitive Church, than the Church universal, yet I consent to abide by their suffrage. Nay, I will go a step farther still: if any two of these affirm, that those seven texts belong only to the apostolic age, and not to the Christians of succeeding times, I will give up the whole cause.

But let it be observed, if they should affirm that these primarily belong to the Christians of the apostolic age, that does not prove the point, because they may in a secondary sense belong to others notwithstanding: nor does any of them speak home to the question, unless he maintain, in express terms, that these texts refer only to the miraculous gifts of the Spirit, and not at all to the state of ordinary Christians.

16. Concerning those three texts, John xiv, 16, 26; and John xvi, 13, "I could easily add," says your lordship, "the authorities of Chrysostom and the other ancient commentators." (p. 15.) St. Chrysostom's

authority I will consider now, and that of the others when they are produced.

It is granted, that he interprets not only John xvi, 13, but also both the passages in the fourteenth chapter, as primarily belonging to the Apostles. Yet part of his comment on the twenty-sixth verse is as follows :—

“Such is that grace,” of the Comforter, “that if it finds sadness, it takes it away; if evil desire, it consumes it. It casts out fear, and suffers him that receives it to be a man no longer, but translates him, as it were, into heaven. Hence, ‘none of them counted any thing his own, but continued in prayer, with gladness and singleness of heart.’ For this chiefly is their need of the Holy Ghost; for the fruit of the Spirit is joy, peace, faith, meekness. Indeed spiritual men often grieve; but that grief is sweeter than joy: for whatever is of the Spirit is the greatest gain, as whatever is of the world is the greatest loss. Let us therefore in keeping the commandments,” according to our Lord’s exhortation, verse 15, “secure the unconquerable assistance of the Spirit, and we shall be nothing inferior to angels.”

St. Chrysostom here, after he had shown that the promise of the Comforter primarily belonged to the Apostles, (and who ever questioned it?) undeniably teaches, that, in a secondary sense, it belongs to all Christians; to all spiritual men, all who keep the commandments. I appeal, therefore, to all mankind, whether his authority, touching the promise of our Lord in these texts, does not overthrow the proposition it was cited to prove?

Although your lordship names no other author here, yet you say, “The assigned sense of these passages was confirmed by the authority of Origen.” (p. 42.) It is needful therefore to add what occurs in his Works with regard to the present question.

He occasionally mentions this promise of our Lord, in four several places. But it is in one only that he speaks pertinently to the point in hand, (vol. ii, p. 403, Edit. Bened.,) where his words are these :—

“‘When the Spirit of truth is come, he will guide you into all truth, and he will teach you all things.’ The sum of all good things consists in this, that a man be found worthy to receive the grace of the Holy Ghost. Otherwise, nothing will be accounted perfect in him who hath not the Holy Spirit.”

Do these words confirm that “sense of those passages which your lordship had assigned?” Rather do they not utterly overturn it, and prove (as above) that although this promise of our Lord primarily belongs to the Apostles, yet, in the secondary sense, it belongs (according to Origen’s judgment) to all Christians in all ages?

17. The fourth text mentioned as belonging to the first Christians only, is Romans viii, 15, 16; and it is said, page 26, “This interpretation is confirmed by the authority of the most eminent fathers.” The reader is particularly referred to Origen and Jerome *in locum*. But here seems to be a mistake of the name. Jerome *in locum* should mean, Jerome upon the place, upon Romans viii, 15, 16. But I cannot perceive that there is one word upon that place, in all St. Jerome’s Works.

Nor indeed has Origen commented upon it any more than Jerome. But he occasionally mentions it in these words :—

“He is a babe who is fed with milk; but if he seeks the things that are

above, without doubt he will be of the number of those who 'receive not the spirit of bondage again unto fear, but the Spirit of adoption,' through whom they cry, 'Abba, Father.' (Vol. i, p. 79.)

Again: "The fulness of time is come; when they who are willing receive the adoption, as Paul teaches in these words, 'Ye have not received the spirit of bondage again unto fear; but ye have received the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father!' And it is written in the Gospel according to St. John, 'To as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe in his name.'" (Vol. i, pp. 231, 232.)

Yet again: "Every one that is born of God, and doth not commit sin, by his very actions saith, 'Our Father which art in heaven;' 'the Spirit itself bearing witness with their spirit, that they are the children of God.'" (*Ibid.*)

According to Origen, therefore, this testimony of the Spirit is not any public testimony by miracles, peculiar to the first times, but an inward testimony, belonging in common to all that are born of God; and consequently the authority of Origen does not "confirm that interpretation" neither, but absolutely destroys it.

18. The last authority your lordship appeals to on this text is, "that of the great John Chrysostom, who reckons the testimony of the Spirit of adoption, by which we cry, 'Abba, Father,' among the miraculous gifts of the Spirit." "I rather choose" (your lordship adds, p. 26) "to refer you to the words of St. Chrysostom, than to transcribe them here, as having almost translated them in the present account of the testimony of the Spirit."

However, I believe it will not be labour lost to transcribe a few of those words.

It is in his comment on the fourteenth verse, that he first mentions St. Paul's comparison between a Jew and a Christian. How fairly your lordship has represented this, let every reader judge:—

"'As many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God.'—Whereas the same title had been given of old to the Jews also, he shows in the sequel, how great a difference there is between that honour and this. For though, says he, the titles are the same, yet the things are not. And he plainly proves it, by comparing both what they had received, and what they looked for. And first he shows what they had received, viz. a 'spirit of bondage.' Therefore he adds, 'Ye have not received the spirit of bondage again unto fear; but ye have received the Spirit of adoption.' What means the spirit of fear?—Observe their whole life, and you will know clearly. For punishments were at their heels, and much fear was on every side, and before their face. But with us it is not so. For our mind and conscience are cleansed, so that we do all things well, not for fear of present punishment, but through our love of God, and a habit of virtue. They therefore, though they were called sons, yet were as slaves; but we, being made free, have received the adoption, and look not for a land of milk and honey, but for heaven.

"He brings also another proof, that we have the Spirit of adoption, by which, says he, we cry, 'Abba, Father.' This is the first word we utter *μετα τας θουμασας ωδινας εκεινας, και τον ξνον και παραδοξον λοχευματων νομον*; after those amazing throes (or birth pangs) and that strange and wonderful manner of bringing forth.

"He brings yet another proof of the superiority of those who had this Spirit of adoption: 'The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit that we are the children of God.' I prove this, says he, not only from the

voice itself, but also from the cause whence that voice proceeds: for the Spirit suggests the words while we thus speak, which he hath elsewhere expressed more plainly, 'God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into our hearts, crying, Abba, Father!' But what is, 'The Spirit beareth witness with our spirit?' He means, the Paraclete by the gift given unto us." (But that this was an extraordinary gift, we have no intimation at all, neither before nor after.) "And when 'the Spirit beareth witness,' what doubt is left? If a man or an angel spake, some might doubt; but when the Most High beareth witness to us, who can doubt any longer?"

Now, let any reasonable man judge how far your lordship has "translated the words of St. Chrysostom; and whether he reckons the testimony of the Spirit among the *miraculous* gifts of the Holy Ghost," or among those *ordinary* gifts of the Spirit of Christ which if a man have not he is none of his.

19. The fifth text your lordship quotes, as describing a miraculous gift of the Spirit, is 1 Cor. xiv, 15: to prove which, you comment on the eighth chapter to the Romans, particularly the twenty-sixth verse; and here again it is said, that "the interpretation assigned is confirmed by several of the most eminent fathers, more especially the great John Chrysostom, as well as by Origen and Jerome upon the place."

I cannot find St. Jerome to have writ one line upon the place. And it is obvious, that St. Chrysostom supposes the whole context from the seventeenth to the twenty-fifth verse, to relate to all Christians in all ages. How this can be said to "confirm the interpretation assigned," I cannot conjecture. Nay, it is remarkable, that he expounds the former part of the twenty-sixth verse, as describing the ordinary privilege of all Christians. Thus far, therefore, he does not confirm but overthrow, the "interpretation before assigned." But in the middle of the verse he breaks off, and expounds the latter part, as describing one of the *miraculous* gifts.

Yet I must do the justice to this venerable man to observe, he does not suppose that a miraculous gift was given, only that the inspired might do what any ordinary Christian might have done without it; (this interpretation, even of the latter part of the verse, he does in no wise confirm;) but that he might ask, in every particular circumstance, the determinate thing which it was the will of God to give.

20. The third father by whom it is said this interpretation is confirmed, is Origen. The first passage of his, which relates to Rom. viii, 26, runs thus:—

"Paul, perceiving how far he was, after all these things, from knowing to pray for what he ought, as he ought, says, 'We know not what we should pray for as we ought.' But he adds, whence, what is wanting may be had by one who indeed does not know, but labours to be found worthy of having the defect supplied. For he says, 'Likewise the Spirit also helpeth our infirmities. For we know not what we should pray for as we ought. But the Spirit itself maketh intercession for us, with groanings which cannot be uttered. And he that searcheth the hearts knoweth what is the mind of the Spirit; because he maketh intercession for the saints, according to the will of God.' The Spirit which crieth, 'Abba, Father,' in the hearts of the saints, knowing well our groanings in this tabernacle, 'maketh intercession for us to God, with groanings which cannot be uttered.' To the same effect is that Scripture: 'I will pray with the Spirit, I will pray with the understanding also,' 1 Cor. xiv, 15.

For our understanding (or mind, ο νοῦς) cannot pray, if the Spirit do not pray before it, and the understanding, as it were, listen to it." (Vol. i, p. 199.)

Again: "I would know how the saints cry to God without a voice. The Apostle shows, 'God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into our hearts, crying, Abba, Father!' and he adds, 'The Spirit itself maketh intercession for us, with groanings which cannot be uttered.' And again, 'He that searcheth the hearts knoweth what is the mind of the Spirit, because he maketh intercession for the saints, according to the will of God. Thus, therefore, the Spirit making intercession for us with God, the cry of the saints is heard without a voice.'" (Vol. ii, p. 146.)

Once more in his homily on Joshua:—

"Jesus our Lord doth not forsake us; but although when we would pray 'we know not what to pray for as we ought,' yet 'the Spirit itself maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered. Now the Lord is that Spirit:' the Spirit assists our prayers, and offers them to God with groanings which we cannot express in words." (Vol. ii, p. 419.)

I believe all rational men will observe from hence, that Origen is so far from confirming, that he quite overturns, your lordship's interpretation of the sixteenth as well as the twenty-sixth verse of this chapter; seeing, in his judgment, both that testimony of the Spirit and this prayer belong to all Christians in all ages.

21. The sixth scripture which your lordship has undertaken to show "relates only to the apostolical times," is 1 Cor. ii, 4, 5. And "this interpretation also," it is said, "is confirmed by the authority of Chrysostom, Origen, and other ancient writers," (p. 33.) With those "other ancient writers" I have no concern yet. St. Chrysostom so far confirms this interpretation, as to explain that whole phrase "the demonstration of the Spirit and of power;" of "the power of the Spirit shown by miracles." But he says not one word of any "proof of the Christian religion arising from the types and prophecies of the Old Testament."

Origen has these words:—

"Our word has a certain peculiar demonstration, more divine than the Grecian logical demonstration. This the Apostle terms, 'the demonstration of the Spirit and of power;' *of the Spirit*, because of the prophecies, sufficient to convince any one, especially of the things that relate to Christ; *of power*, because of the miraculous powers, some footsteps of which still remain." (Vol. i, p. 321.)

Hence we may doubtless infer, that Origen judged this text to relate, in its primary sense, to the Apostles; but can we thence infer, that he did not judge it to belong, in a lower sense, to all true ministers of Christ?

Let us hear him speaking for himself in the same treatise:—

"And my speech and my preaching were not with enticing words of man's wisdom, but in demonstration of the Spirit and of power; that your faith should not stand in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God.' Those who hear the word preached with power are themselves filled with power," (N. B. not the power of working miracles,) "which they demonstrate both in their disposition, and in their life, and in their striving for the truth unto death. But some, although they profess to believe, have not this power of God in them, but are empty thereof." (p. 377.)

(Did Origen, then, believe that the power mentioned in this text belonged only to the apostolical age?)

“See the force of the word, conquering believers by a persuasiveness attended with the power of God! I speak this to show the meaning of him that said, ‘And my speech and my preaching were not with the enticing words of man’s wisdom, but in demonstration of the Spirit and of power; that your faith should not stand in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God.’ This divine saying means, that what is spoken is not sufficient of itself (although it be true, and most worthy to be believed) to pierce a man’s soul, if there be not also a certain power from God given to the speaker, and grace bloom upon what is spoken; and this grace cannot be but from God.”

After observing that this is the very passage which your lordship mentions at the close of the other, but does not cite, I desire every unprejudiced person to judge, whether Origen does not clearly determine that the power spoken of in this text, is in some measure given to all true ministers in all ages.

22. The last scripture which your lordship affirms “to be peculiar to the times of the Apostles,” is that in the First Epistle of St. John, concerning the “unction of the Holy One.”

To confirm this interpretation, we are referred to the authority of “Origen and Chrysostom, on the parallel passages in St. John’s Gospel.” (p. 42.)

But it has appeared, that both these fathers suppose those passages to belong to all Christians; and, consequently, their authority (if these are parallel passages) stands full against this interpretation.

Your lordship subjoins, “I shall here only add that of the great Athanasius, who, in his epistle to Serapion, interprets the ‘unction from the Holy One,’ not merely of divine grace, but of the extraordinary gifts of the Holy Spirit.”

Nay, it is enough, if he interprets it at all of ordinary grace, such as is common to all Christians.

And this your lordship allows he does. But I cannot allow that he interprets it of any thing else. I cannot perceive that he interprets it at all “of the *extraordinary* gifts of the Holy Spirit.”

His words are, “The Holy Spirit is called, and is, the unction and the seal. For John writes, ‘The anointing which ye have received of him, abideth in you; and ye need not that any man should teach you, but as his anointing,’ his Spirit, ‘teacheth you of all things.’ Again: It is written in the Prophet Isaiah, ‘The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me.’ And Paul writes thus: ‘In whom also ye were sealed.’ And again: ‘Grieve not the Holy Spirit of God, whereby ye are sealed unto the day of redemption.’ This anointing is the breath of the Son; so that he who hath the Spirit may say, ‘We are the sweet smelling savour of Christ.’ Because we are partakers of the Holy Spirit, we have the Son; and having the Son, we have ‘the Spirit crying in our hearts, Abba, Father.’”

And so in his Oration against the Arians:—

“‘He sendeth the Spirit of his Son into our hearts, crying, Abba, Father.’ His Son in us, invoking the Father, makes him to be called our Father. Certainly God cannot be called their Father, who have not the Son in their hearts.”

Is it not easy to be observed here, (1.) That Athanasius makes “that testimony of the Spirit” common to all the children of God: (2.) That he joins “the anointing of the Holy One,” with that seal of the Spirit

wherewith all that persevere are “sealed to the day of redemption:” and, (3.) That he does not, throughout this passage, speak of the *extraordinary gifts* at all?

Therefore, upon the whole, the sense of the primitive Church, so far as it can be gathered from the authors above cited, is, that “although some of the scriptures primarily refer to those extraordinary gifts of the Spirit which were given to the Apostles, and a few other persons in the apostolical age; yet they refer also, in a secondary sense, to those ordinary operations of the Holy Spirit which all the children of God do and will experience, even to the end of the world.”

23. What I mean by the ordinary operations of the Holy Ghost, I sum up in the words of a modern writer:—

“Sanctification being opposed to our corruption, and answering fully to the latitude thereof, whatsoever of holiness and perfection is wanting in our nature must be supplied by the Spirit of God. Wherefore, being by nature we are totally void of all saving truth, and under an impossibility of knowing the will of God, this ‘Spirit searcheth all things, yea, even the deep things of God,’ and revealeth them unto the sons of men, so that thereby the darkness of their understanding is expelled, and they are enlightened with the knowledge of God. The same Spirit which revealeth the object of faith generally to the universal Church, doth also illuminate the understanding of such as believe, that they may receive the truth. For ‘faith is the gift of God,’ not only in the object, but also in the act. And this gift is a gift of the Holy Ghost working within us.—And as the increase of perfection, so the original of faith, is from the Spirit of God, by an internal illumination of the soul.”

“The second part of the office of the Holy Ghost, is the renewing of man in all the parts and faculties of his soul. For our natural corruption consisting in an aversion of our wills, and a depravation of our affections, an inclination of them to the will of God is wrought within us by the Spirit of God.

“The third part of this office is, to lead, direct, and govern us in our actions and conversations. ‘If we live in the Spirit,’ quickened by his renovation, we must also ‘walk in the Spirit,’ following his direction, led by his manuduction. We are also animated and acted by the Spirit of God, who giveth ‘both to will and to do:’ and ‘as many as are’ thus ‘led by the Spirit of God, are the sons of God,’ Rom. viii, 14. Moreover, that this direction may prove more effectual, we are guided in our prayers by the same Spirit; according to the promise, ‘I will pour upon the house of David, and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the Spirit of grace and supplication,’ Zech. xii, 10. Whereas then ‘this is the confidence which we have in him, that if we ask any thing according to his will, he heareth us;’ and whereas ‘we know not what we should pray for as we ought, the Spirit itself maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered;’ and ‘he that searcheth the hearts knoweth what is the mind of the Spirit, because he maketh intercession for the saints, according to the will of God,’ Rom. viii, 27. From which intercession,” (made for all true Christians,) “he hath the name of the Paraclete given him by Christ, who said, ‘I will pray the Father, and he will give you another Paraclete,’ John xiv, 16, 26. ‘For if any man sin, we have a Paraclete with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous,’ saith St. John; ‘who maketh intercession for us,’ saith St. Paul: Rom. viii, 34. And we have ‘another Paraclete,’ saith our Saviour, (John xiv, 16,) ‘which also maketh intercession for us,’ saith St. Paul: Rom. viii, 27. A Paraclete, then, in the notion of the Scriptures, is an intercessor.

“It is also the office of the Holy Ghost, to ‘assure us of the adoption

of sons,' to create in us a sense of the paternal love of God toward us, to give us an earnest of our everlasting inheritance. 'The love of God is shed abroad in our hearts, by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us.' 'For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God.' 'And because we are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into our hearts, crying, Abba, Father.' 'For we have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear; but we have received the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father; the Spirit itself bearing witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God.' (Verses 15, 16.)

"As, therefore, we are born again by the Spirit, and receive from him our regeneration, so we are also by the same Spirit 'assured of our adoption.' Because, being 'sons, we are also heirs, heirs of God, and joint heirs with Christ,' by the same Spirit we have the *pledge*, or rather the 'earnest, of our inheritance.' For 'he which establisheth us in Christ, and hath anointed us, is God; who hath also sealed us, and hath given us the earnest of his Spirit in our hearts:' so that 'we are sealed with that Holy Spirit of promise, which is the earnest of our inheritance.' The Spirit of God, as given unto us in this life, is to be looked upon as an earnest, being part of that reward which is promised, and, upon performance of the covenant which God hath made with us, certainly to be received."

Your lordship observed, that "the interpretation of those passages which relate to the 'unction from the Holy One,' depends on the sense of those other passages of Holy Scripture, particularly those in St. John's Gospel." Now, if so, then these words fix the sense of six out of the seven texts in question; and every one of them, in the judgment of this writer, describes the *ordinary gifts* bestowed on all Christians.

It now rests with your lordship to take your choice; either to condemn or to acquit both. Either your lordship must condemn Bishop Pearson for an enthusiast; (a man no ways inferior to Bishop Chrysostom;) or you must acquit me: for I have his express authority on my side, concerning every text which I affirm to belong to all Christians.

24. But I have greater authority than his, and such as I reverence only less than that of the oracles of God; I mean, that of our own Church. I shall close this head by setting down what occurs in her authentic records, concerning either our "receiving the Holy Ghost," or his ordinary operations in all true Christians.

In her daily service she teaches us all to beseech God "to grant us his Holy Spirit, that those things may please him which we do at this present, and that the rest of our life may be pure and holy;" to pray for our sovereign lord the king, that God would "replenish him with the grace of his Holy Spirit;" for all the royal family, that they may be "endued with his Holy Spirit, and enriched with his heavenly grace;" for all the clergy and people, that he would "send down upon them the healthful Spirit of his grace;" for "the Catholic Church, that it may be guided and governed by his good Spirit;" and for all therein who at any time "make their common supplication unto him," that "the fellowship" or communication "of the Holy Ghost may be with them all evermore."

Her collects are full of petitions to the same effect: "Grant that we may daily be renewed by thy Holy Spirit." (*Collect for Christmas-Day.*) "Grant that in all our sufferings here, for the testimony of thy truth, we may by faith behold the glory that shall be revealed, and, 'being filled with the Holy Ghost,' may love and bless our persecutors." (*St. Stephen's Day.*) "Send thy Holy Ghost, and pour into our hearts that most excellent gift of charity." (*Quinquagesima Sunday.*) "O Lord, from whom all

good things do come, grant to us, thy humble servants, that by thy *holy inspiration* we may think those things that are good, and by thy merciful guidance may perform the same." (*Fifth Sunday after Easter.*) "We beseech thee, leave us not comfortless, but send us the Holy Ghost to comfort us." (*Sunday after Ascension Day.*) "Grant us by the same Spirit to have a right judgment in all things, and evermore to rejoice in his holy comfort." (*Whit-Sunday.*) (N. B. The Church here teaches all Christians to claim *the Comforter*, in virtue of the promise made, John xiv.) "Grant us, Lord, we beseech thee, the Spirit, to think and do always such things as be rightful." (*Ninth Sunday after Trinity.*) "O God, forasmuch as without thee we are not able to please thee; mercifully grant that thy Holy Spirit may in all things direct and rule our hearts." (*Nineteenth Sunday after Trinity.*) "Cleanse the thoughts of our hearts by *the inspiration of thy Holy Spirit*, that we may perfectly love thee, and worthily magnify thy holy name." (*Communion Office.*)

"Give thy Holy Spirit to this infant, (or this person,) that he may be born again.—Give thy Holy Spirit to these persons," (N. B. already baptized,) "that they may continue thy servants.

"Almighty God, who hast vouchsafed to regenerate these persons by water and the Holy Ghost; strengthen them with the Holy Ghost the Comforter, and daily increase in them the manifold gifts of thy grace." (*Office of Confirmation.*)

From these passages it may sufficiently appear, for what purposes every Christian, according to the doctrine of the Church of England, does now "receive the Holy Ghost." But this will be still more clear from those that follow; wherein the reader may likewise observe a plain, rational sense of God's *revealing* himself to us, of the *inspiration* of the Holy Ghost, and of a believer's *feeling* in himself "the mighty working" of the Spirit of Christ:—

25. "God gave them of old grace to be his children, as he doth us now. But now, by the coming of our Saviour Christ, we have received more abundantly the Spirit of God in our hearts." (*Homily on Faith*, part ii.)

"He died to destroy the rule of the devil in us; and he rose again to send down his Holy Spirit, to 'rule in our hearts.'" (*Homily on the Resurrection.*)

"We have the Holy Spirit in our hearts, as a seal and pledge of our everlasting inheritance." (*Ibid.*)

"The Holy Ghost sat upon each of them, like as it had been cloven tongues of fire; to teach, that it is he which giveth eloquence and utterance in preaching the Gospel; which engendereth a burning zeal toward God's word, and giveth all men a tongue, yea, a fiery tongue." (N. B. Whatever occurs in any of the Journals, of God's "giving me utterance," or "enabling me to speak *with power*," cannot therefore be quoted as *enthusiasm*, without wounding the Church through my side.) "So that if any man be a dumb Christian, not professing his faith openly, he giveth men occasion to doubt lest he have not the grace of the Holy Ghost within him." (*Homily on Whit-Sunday*, part i.)

"It is the office of the Holy Ghost to sanctify; which the more it is hid from our understanding," (that is, the more particular manner of his working,) "the more it ought to move all men to wonder at the secret and mighty workings of God's Holy Spirit which is within us. For it is the Holy Ghost that doth *quicken* the minds of men, *stirring up* godly motions in their hearts. Neither doth he think it sufficient inwardly to work the new birth of man, unless he do also dwell and abide in him. 'Know ye not,' saith St. Paul, 'that ye are the temple of God, and that his Spirit dwelleth in you? Know ye not that your bodies are the tem-

ple of the Holy Ghost, which is in you?' Again he saith, 'Ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit.' For why? 'The Spirit of God dwelleth in you.' To this agreeth St. John: 'The anointing which ye have received' (he meaneth the Holy Ghost) 'abideth in you,' 1 John ii, 27. And St. Peter saith the same: 'The Spirit of glory and of God resteth upon you.' O what comfort is this to the heart of a true Christian, to think that the Holy Ghost dwelleth in him! 'If God be with us,' as the Apostle saith, 'who can be against us?' He giveth patience and joyfulness of heart, in temptation and affliction, and is therefore worthily called 'the Comforter,' John xiv, 16. He doth instruct the hearts of the simple in the knowledge of God and his word; therefore he is justly termed 'the Spirit of truth,' xvi, 13. And where the Holy Ghost doth instruct and teach, there is no delay at all in learning." (*Ibid.*)

From this passage I learn, First, that every true Christian now "receives the Holy Ghost," as the Paraclete or Comforter promised by our Lord, John xiv, 16: Secondly, that every Christian receives him as "the Spirit of truth," (promised John xvi,) to "teach him all things:" and, Thirdly, that "the anointing," mentioned in the First Epistle of St. John, "abides in every Christian."

26. "In reading of God's word, he profiteth most that is most *inspired* with the Holy Ghost." (*Homily on reading the Scripture*, part i.)

"Human and worldly wisdom is not needful to the understanding of Scripture, but the *revelation* of the Holy Ghost, who *inspireth* the true meaning unto them that with humility and diligence search for it." (*Ibid.* part ii.)

"Make him know and *feel* that there is no other name under heaven given unto men, whereby we can be saved.

"If we *feel* our conscience at peace with God, through remission of our sin,—all is of God." (*Homily on Rogation Week*, part iii.)

"If you *feel* such a faith in you, rejoice in it, and let it be daily increasing by well working." (*Homily on Faith*, part iii.)

"The faithful may *feel* wrought tranquillity of conscience, the increase of faith and hope, with many other graces of God." (*Homily on the Sacrament*, part i.)

"Godly men *feel* inwardly God's Holy Spirit, inflaming their hearts with love." (*Homily on certain places of Scripture*, part i.)

"God give us grace to know these things, and to *feel* them in our hearts! This knowledge and *feeling* is not of ourselves. Let us therefore meekly call upon the bountiful Spirit, the Holy Ghost, to *inspire* us with his presence, that we may be able to hear the goodness of God to our salvation. For without his lively inspiration, can we not so much as speak the name of the Mediator. 'No man can say that Jesus is the Lord, but by the Holy Ghost;' much less should we be able to believe and know these great mysteries that be opened to us by Christ. 'But we have received,' saith St. Paul, 'not the spirit of the world, but the Spirit which is of God;' for this purpose, 'that we may know the things which are freely given to us of God.' In the power of the Holy Ghost resteth all ability to *know* God, and to *please* him. It is he that *purifieth* the mind by his secret working. He *enlighteneth* the heart, to conceive worthy thoughts of Almighty God. He sitteth in the *tongue* of man, to stir him to speak his honour. He only ministereth spiritual *strength* to the powers of the *soul* and *body*. And if we have any gift whereby we may profit our neighbour, all is wrought by this one and the self-same Spirit." (*Homily for Rogation Week*, part iii.)

27. Every proposition which I have any where advanced concerning

those *operations* of the Holy Ghost, which, I believe, are *common* to all Christians in all ages, is here clearly maintained by our own Church.

Under a full sense of this, I could not well understand, for many years, how it was, that on the mentioning any of these great truths, even among men of education, the cry immediately arose, "An enthusiast! An enthusiast!" But I now plainly perceive this is only an old fallacy in a new shape. To object *enthusiasm* to any person or doctrine is but a decent method of begging the question. It generally spares the objector the trouble of reasoning, and is a shorter and easier way of carrying his cause.

For instance, I assert that "till a man 'receives the Holy Ghost,' he is without God in the world; that he cannot know the things of God, unless God reveal them unto him by the Spirit; no, nor have even one holy or heavenly temper, without the inspiration of the Holy One." Now, should one who is conscious to himself that he has experienced none of these things, attempt to confute these propositions, either from Scripture or antiquity, it might prove a difficult task. What then shall he do? Why, cry out, "Enthusiasm! Enthusiasm!" and the work is done.

But what does he mean by *enthusiasm*? Perhaps nothing at all: few have any distinct idea of its meaning. Perhaps "something very bad," or, "something I never experienced and do not understand." Shall I tell you then what that "terrible something" is? I believe, thinking men mean by *enthusiasm*, a sort of religious madness; a *false imagination* of being inspired by God: and by an *enthusiast*, one that *fancies* himself under the influence of the Holy Ghost, when, in fact, he is not.

Let him prove me guilty of this who can. I will tell you once more the whole of my belief on these heads: and if any man will show me (by arguments, not hard names) what is wrong, I will thank God and him.

28. Every good gift is from God, and is given to man by the Holy Ghost. By nature there is in us no good thing; and there can be none, but so far as it is wrought in us by that good Spirit. Have we any true knowledge of what is good? This is not the result of our natural understanding. "The natural man discerneth not the things of the Spirit of God:" so that we never can discern them, until God "reveals them unto us by his Spirit." *Reveals*, that is, unveils, uncovers; gives us to know what we did not know before. Have we love? It "is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us." He *inspires*, breathes, infuses into our soul, what of ourselves we could not have. Does our spirit rejoice in God our Saviour? It is "joy in," or by, "the Holy Ghost." Have we true inward peace? It is "the peace of God," wrought in us by the same Spirit. Faith, peace, joy, love, are all his fruits. And as we are figuratively said to *see* the light of faith; so, by a like figure of speech, we are said to *feel* this peace and joy and love; that is, we have an inward experience of them, which we cannot find any fitter word to express.

The reasons why, in speaking of these things, I use those terms, (*inspiration* particularly,) are, (1.) Because they are scriptural: (2.) Because they are used by our Church: (3.) Because I know none better. The word, "*influence* of the Holy Ghost," which I suppose you use, is both a far stronger and a less natural term than inspiration. It is far

stronger; even as far as “flowing into the soul” is a stronger expression than “breathing upon it;”—and less natural, as *breathing* bears a near relation to spirit; to which *flowing in* has only a distant relation.

But you thought I had “meant *immediate inspiration*.” So I do, or I mean nothing at all. Not indeed such inspiration as is *sine mediis*. [Without means.] But all inspiration, though by means, is *immediate*. Suppose, for instance, you are employed in private prayer, and God pours his love into your heart. God then acts *immediately* on your soul; and the love of him which you then experience, is as *immediately* breathed into you by the Holy Ghost, as if you had lived seventeen hundred years ago. Change the term: say, God then *assists* you to love him. Well, and is not this *immediate assistance*? Say, His Spirit *concurrs* with yours. You gain no ground. It is *immediate concurrence*, or none at all. God, a spirit, acts upon your spirit. Make it out any otherwise if you can.

I cannot conceive how that harmless word *immediate* came to be such a bugbear in the world: “Why, I thought you meant such inspiration as the Apostles had; and such a receiving the Holy Ghost as that was at the day of Pentecost.” I do, in part: indeed I do not mean, that Christians now receive the Holy Ghost in order to work miracles; but they do doubtless now “receive,” yea are “filled with, the Holy Ghost,” in order to be filled with the fruits of that blessed Spirit. And he inspires into all true believers now, a degree of the same peace and joy and love which the Apostles felt in themselves on that day, when they were first “filled with the Holy Ghost.”

29. I have now considered the most material objections I know, which have been lately made against the great doctrines I teach. I have produced, so far as in me lay, the strength of those objections, and then answered them, I hope, in the spirit of meekness. And now I trust it appears, that these doctrines are no other than the doctrines of Jesus Christ; that they are all evidently contained in the word of God, by which alone I desire to stand or fall; and that they are fundamentally the same with the doctrines of the Church of England, of which I do, and ever did, profess myself a member.

But there remains one objection, which, though relating to the head of doctrine, yet is independent on all that went before. And that is, “You cannot agree in your doctrines among yourselves. One holds one thing, and one another. Mr. Whitefield anathematizes Mr. Wesley; and Mr. Wesley anathematizes Mr. Whitefield. And yet each pretends to be led by the Holy Ghost, by the infallible Spirit of God! Every reasonable man must conclude from hence, that neither one nor the other is led by that Spirit.”

I need not say, how continually this has been urged, both in common conversation and from the press: (I am grieved to add, and from the pulpit too; for, if the argument were good, it would overturn the Bible:) nor, how great stress has been continually laid upon it. Whoever proposes it, proposes it as demonstration, and generally claps his wings, as being quite assured, it will admit of no answer.

And indeed I am in doubt, whether it does admit (I am sure it does not require) any other answer, than that coarse one of the countryman to the Romish champion, “Bellarmine, thou liest.” For every proposition contained herein is grossly, shamelessly false. (1.) “You cannot

agree in your doctrines among yourselves.”—Who told you so? All our fundamental doctrines I have recited above. And in every one of these we do and have agreed for several years. In these we hold one and the same thing. In smaller points each of us thinks, and lets think. (2.) “Mr. Whitefield anathematizes Mr. Wesley.” Another shameless untruth. Let any one read what Mr. Whitefield wrote, even in the heat of controversy, and he will be convinced of the contrary. (3.) “And Mr. Wesley anathematizes Mr. Whitefield.” This is equally false and scandalous. I reverence Mr. Whitefield, both as a child of God, and a true minister of Jesus Christ. (4.) “And yet each pretends to be led by the Holy Ghost, by the infallible Spirit of God.” Not in our private opinions; nor does either of us pretend to be any farther led by the Spirit of God, than every Christian must pretend to be, unless he will deny the Bible. For only “as many as are led by the Spirit of God, are the sons of God.” Therefore, if you do not pretend to be led by him too, yea, if it be not so in fact, “you are none of his.”

And now, what is become of your demonstration? Leave it to the carmen and porters, its just proprietors; to the zealous apple-women, that cry after me in the street, “This is he that rails at the *Whole Dutiful of Man*.” But let every one that pretends to learning or reason be ashamed to mention it any more.

30. The first inference easily deduced from what has been said, is, that we are not false prophets. In one sense of the word we are no prophets at all; for we do not foretel things to come. But in another, (wherein every minister is a prophet,) we are; for we do speak in the name of God. Now, a false prophet (in this sense of the word) is one who declares as the will of God what is not so. But we declare (as has been shown at large) nothing else as the will of God, but what is evidently contained in his written word, as explained by our own Church. Therefore, unless you can prove the Bible to be a false book, you cannot possibly prove us to be false prophets.

The text which is generally cited on this occasion is Matthew vii, 15. But how unhappily chosen! In the preceding chapters, our Lord had been describing that “righteousness which exceeds the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees,” and without which we cannot “enter into the kingdom of heaven.” Even the life of God in the soul; holiness of heart, producing all holiness of conversation. In this, he closes that rule which sums up the whole, with those solemn words, “Enter ye in at the strait gate;” (such indeed is that of universal holiness;) “for wide is the gate, and broad is the way that leadeth to destruction.” The gate of hell is wide as the whole earth; the way of unholiness is broad as the great deep. “And many there be which go in thereat;” yea, and excuse themselves in so doing, “because strait is the gate and narrow is the way that leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it.” It follows, “Beware of false prophets;” of those who speak as from God what God hath not spoken; those who show you any other way to life, than that which I have now shown. So that the false prophets here spoken of are those who point out any other way to heaven than this; who teach men to find a wider gate, a broader way, than that described in the foregoing chapters. But it has been abundantly shown that we do not. Therefore (whatever we are beside) we are not false prophets.

Neither are we (as has been frequently and vehemently affirmed) “deceivers of the people.” If we teach “the truth as it is in Jesus,” if “we speak as the oracles of God,” it follows, that we do not deceive those that hear, though they should believe whatever we speak. “Let God be true, and every man a liar;” every man that contradicts his truth. But he will “be justified in his saying, and clear when he is judged.”

31. One thing more I infer, that we are not enthusiasts. This accusation has been considered at large; and the main arguments hitherto brought to support it have been weighed in the balance and found wanting: particularly this, “that none but enthusiasts suppose either that promise of the Comforter, John xiv, 16, 26; xvi, 13, or the witness of the Spirit, Rom. viii, 15, 16, or that unutterable prayer, Rom. viii, 26, 27, or the ‘unction from the Holy One,’ 1 John ii, 20, 27, to belong in common to all Christians.” O my lord, how deeply have you condemned the generation of God’s children! Whom have you represented as rank, dreaming enthusiasts, as either deluded or designing men? Not only Bishop Pearson, a man hitherto accounted both sound in heart, and of good understanding; but likewise Archbishop Cranmer, Bishop Ridley, Bishop Latimer, Bishop Hooper; and all the venerable compilers of our Liturgy and Homilies; all the members of both the houses of convocation, by whom they were revised and approved; yea, King Edward, and all his lords and commons together, by whose authority they were established; and, with these *modern enthusiasts*, Origen, Chrysostom, and Athanasius, are comprehended in the same censure!

I grant, a Deist might rank both us and them in the number of religious madmen; nay, ought so to do, on his supposition that the Gospel is but a “cunningly-devised fable.” And on this ground some of them have done so in fact. One of them was asking me, some years since, “What! are you one of the knight errants? How, I pray, got this Quixotism into your head? You want nothing; you have a good provision for life; and are in a fair way of preferment. And must you leave all, to fight windmills; to convert savages in America?” I could only reply, “Sir, if the Bible is a lie, I am as very a madman as you can conceive. But if it be true, I am in my senses; I am neither a madman nor enthusiast. ‘For there is no man who hath left father, or mother, or wife, or house, or land, for the Gospel’s sake; but he shall receive a hundred fold, in this world, with persecutions, and in the world to come, eternal life.’”

Nominal, outside Christians too, men of form, may pass the same judgment. For we give up all our pretensions to what they account happiness, for what they (with the Deists) believe to be a mere dream. We expect, therefore, to pass for enthusiasts with these also: “But wisdom is justified of” all “her children.”

32. I cannot conclude this head without one obvious remark: suppose we really were enthusiasts; suppose our doctrines were false, and unsupported either by reason, Scripture, or authority; then why hath not some one, “who is a wise man, and endued with knowledge among you,” attempted at least to show us our fault “in love and meekness of wisdom?” Brethren, “if ye have bitter zeal in your hearts, your wisdom descendeth not from above. The wisdom that is from above, is pure,

peaceable, gentle, easy to be entreated, full of mercy," or pity. Does this spirit appear in one single tract of all those which have been published against us? Is there one writer that has reprov'd us in love? Bring it to a single point. "Love hopeth all things." If you had loved us in any degree, you would have hoped that God would some time give us the knowledge of his truth. But where shall we find even this slender instance of love? Has not every one who has wrote at all (I do not remember so much as one exception) treated us as incorrigible? Brethren, how is this? Why do ye labour to teach us an evil lesson against yourselves? O may God never suffer others to deal with you as ye have dealt with us!

VI. 1. Before I enter upon the consideration of those objections which have been made to the manner of our preaching, I believe it may be satisfactory to some readers, if I relate how I began to preach in this manner:—

I was ordained deacon in 1725, and priest in the year following. But it was many years after this before I was convinced of the great truths above recited. During all that time I was utterly ignorant of the nature and condition of justification. Sometimes I confounded it with sanctification; (particularly when I was in Georgia;) at other times I had some confused notion about the forgiveness of sins; but then I took it for granted the time of this must be either the hour of death or the day of judgment.

I was equally ignorant of the nature of saving faith; apprehending it to mean no more than a "firm assent to all the propositions contained in the Old and New Testaments."

2. As soon as, by the great blessing of God, I had a clearer view of these things, I began to declare them to others also. "I believed, and therefore I spake." Wherever I was now desired to preach, salvation by faith was my only theme. My constant subjects were, "Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved." "Him hath God exalted to be a Prince and a Saviour, to give repentance and remission of sins." These I explained and enforced with all my might, both in every church where I was asked to preach, and occasionally in the religious societies of London and Westminster; to some or other of which I was continually pressed to go by the stewards or other members of them.

Things were in this posture, when I was told I must preach no more in this, and this, and another church; the reason was usually added without reserve, "Because you preach such doctrines." So much the more those who could not hear me there flocked together when I was at any of the societies; where I spoke, more or less, though with much inconvenience, to as many as the room I was in would contain.

3. But after a time, finding those rooms could not contain a tenth part of the people that were earnest to hear, I determined to do the same thing in England, which I had often done in a warmer climate; namely, when the house would not contain the congregation, to preach in the open air. This I accordingly did, first at Bristol, where the society rooms were exceeding small, and at Kingswood, where we had no room at all; afterward, in or near London.

And I cannot say I have ever seen a more awful sight, than, when on

Rose Green, or the top of Hannam Mount, some thousands of people were calmly joined together in solemn waiting upon God, while

They stood, and under open air adored
The God who made both air, earth, heaven, and sky.

And, whether they were listening to his word with attention still as night, or were lifting up their voice in praise as the sound of many waters, many a time have I been constrained to say in my heart, "How dreadful is this place! This" also "is no other than the house of God! This is the gate of heaven!"

Be pleased to observe: (1.) That I was forbidden, as by a general consent, to preach in any church, (though not by any judicial sentence,) "for preaching such doctrine." This was the open, avowed cause; there was at that time no other, either real or pretended, except that the people crowded so. (2.) That I had no desire or design to preach in the open air, till after this prohibition. (3.) That when I did, as it was no matter of choice, so neither of premeditation. There was no scheme at all previously formed, which was to be supported thereby; nor had I any other end in view than this,—to save as many souls as I could. (4.) Field preaching was therefore a sudden expedient, a thing submitted to, rather than chosen; and therefore submitted to because I thought preaching even thus, better than not preaching at all: First, in regard to my own soul, because, "a dispensation of the Gospel being committed to me," I did not dare "not to preach the Gospel:" Secondly, in regard to the souls of others, whom I every where saw "seeking death in the error of their life."

4. But the author of the "Observations," and of "The Case of the Methodists briefly stated, more particularly in the point of Field Preaching," thinks field preaching worse than not preaching at all, "because it is illegal."

Your argument in form runs thus:—

"That preaching which is contrary to the laws of the land is worse than not preaching at all:

"But field preaching is contrary to the laws of the land:

"Therefore it is worse than not preaching at all."

The first proposition is not self-evident, nor, indeed, universally true: for the preaching of all the primitive Christians was contrary to the whole tenor of the Roman law; the worship of the devil-gods being established by the strongest laws then in being. Nor is it ever true, but on supposition, that the preaching in question is an indifferent thing.

But waiving this, I deny the second proposition; I deny that field preaching is contrary to the laws of our land.

To prove which, you begin thus: "It does not appear that any of the preachers among the Methodists have qualified themselves, and the places of their assembling, according to the act of toleration.

I answer, (1.) That act grants toleration to those who dissent from the established Church: but we do not dissent from it: therefore we cannot make use of that act. (2.) That act exempts Dissenters from penalties consequent on their breach of preceding laws: but we are not conscious of breaking any law at all: therefore we need not make use of it.

In the next section you say, "They have broken through all these provisions in open defiance of government; and have met, not only in

houses, but in the fields, notwithstanding the statute (22 Car. II, c. 1) which forbids this by name."

I answer, (1.) We do nothing in defiance of government: we reverence magistrates, as the ministers of God. (2.) Although we have met in the fields, yet we do not conceive that statute at all affects us; not only because that act points wholly at Dissenters; whereas we are members of the established Church; but also because (they are your own words) "it was evidently intended to suppress and prevent sedition;" whereas, no sedition, nor any the least approach thereto, can with any colour be laid to our charge.

In your third section you affirm that the act of toleration itself cannot secure us in field preaching from the penalties of former laws. We have no desire it should; as not apprehending ourselves to be condemned by any former law whatever. Nor does what you add, "that the act of toleration forbids any assembly of persons dissenting from the Church of England, to meet with the doors locked," affect us at all; because we do not dissent from it.

5. In "The Case of the Methodists briefly stated," your first observation is, "The act of toleration leaves them liable to the penalties of several statutes made against unlawful assemblies."

I suppose then these several statutes specify what those unlawful assemblies are; and whether unlawful, as being condemned by previous laws, or made unlawful by those statutes.

And it still remains to be proved, that our assemblies are unlawful, in one or other of these senses.

You next observe, that "the Dissenters of all denominations qualify themselves according to the act of toleration; otherwise, they are liable to the penalties of all the laws recited in this act."

I answer as before, all this strikes wide. It relates wholly to "persons dissenting from the Church." But we are not the men: we do not dissent from the Church: whoever affirms it, we put him to the proof.

You go on: "One of those laws so recited (viz. 22 Car. II, c. 1) is that which forbids field preaching by name; and was evidently intended, not only to suppress, but also to prevent sedition: as the title of the act declares, and as the preamble expresses it, 'to provide farther and more speedy remedies against it.'"

Was this then, in your own judgment, the evident intention of that act, viz. to provide remedies against sedition? Does the very title of the act declare this, and the preamble also express it? With what justice then, with what ingenuity or candour, with what shadow of truth or reason, can any man cite this act against us; whom you yourself no more suspect of a design to raise sedition, (I appeal to your own conscience in the sight of God,) than of a design to blow up the city of London?

6. Hitherto, therefore, it hath not been made to appear that field preaching is contrary to any law in being. However, "it is dangerous." This you strongly insist on. "It may be attended with mischievous consequences. It may give advantages to the enemies of the established government. It is big with mischief?" (*Observations*, sect. i, and ii.)

With what mischief? Why, "evil-minded men, by meeting together

in the fields, under pretence of religion, may raise riots and tumults ; or, by meeting secretly, may carry on private cabals against the state." (*Case of the Methodists*, p. 2.)

"And if the Methodists themselves are a harmless and loyal people, it is nothing to the point in hand. For disloyal and seditious persons may use such an opportunity of getting together, in order to execute any private design. Mr. Whitefield says, thirty, fifty, or eighty thousand have attended his preaching at once. Now, (1.) he cannot know one tenth part of such a congregation: (2.) all people may come and carry on what designs they will: therefore, (3.) this is a great opportunity put into the hands of seditious persons to raise disturbances.

"With what safety to the public these field preachings may be continued, let the world judge." (*Ibid.* pp. 2-4.)

May I speak without offence? I cannot think you are in earnest. You do not mean what you say. Do you believe Mr. Whitefield had eighty thousand hearers at once? No more than you believe he had eighty millions. Is not all this talk of danger mere finesse, thrown in purely *ad movendam iridiam*? [To excite suspicion.] You know governments generally are suspicious; especially in the time of war; and therefore apply, as you suppose, to their weak side; in hopes, if possible, to deliver over these heretics to the secular arm. However, I will answer as if you spoke from your heart: for I am in earnest, if you are not.

(1.) "The preacher cannot know a tenth part of his congregation." Let us come to the *present* state of things. The largest congregation that *now* attend the preaching of any Methodist, are those (God be merciful to me!) that attend mine. And cannot I know a tenth part of one of these congregations, either at Bristol, Kingswood, Newcastle, or London? As strange as it may seem, I generally know two thirds of the congregation in every place, even on Sunday evening, and nine in ten of those who attend at most other times. (2.) "All people may come and carry on what designs they will." Not so. All field preaching is now in the open day. And were only ten persons to come to such an assembly with arms, it would soon be inquired with what design they came. This is therefore, (3.) no "great opportunity put into the hands of seditious persons to raise disturbances." And if ever any disturbance has been raised, it was quite of another kind.

The public, then, is entirely safe, if it be in no other danger than arises from field preaching.

7. There is one other sentence belonging to this head, in the eighth section of the "Observations." "The religious societies," you say, "in London and Westminster, for many years past, have received no discouragements, but, on the contrary, have been countenanced and encouraged both by the bishops and clergy." How is this? Have *they* then "qualified themselves and places of their assembling, according to the act of toleration?" Have *they* "embraced the protection which that act might give them, in case they complied with the conditions of it?" If not, are they not all "liable to the penalties of the several statutes made before that time against unlawful assemblies?"

How can they escape? Have they "qualified themselves for holding these separate assemblies, according to the tenor of that act?" Have, then, "the several members thereof taken the oaths to the government?"

And are the "doors of the places wherein they meet always open at the time of such meetings?" I presume you know they are not; and that neither "the persons nor places are so qualified as that act directs."

How then come "the bishops and clergy to countenance and encourage" unlawful assemblies? If it be said, "They meet in a private, inoffensive way;" that is nothing to the point in hand. If those meetings are unlawful in themselves, all their inoffensiveness will not make them lawful. "O, but they behave with modesty and decency." Very well; but the law! What is that to the law? There can be no solid defence but this: They are not Dissenters from the Church; therefore they cannot use, and they do not need, the act of toleration. And their meetings are not seditious; therefore the statute against seditious meeting does not affect them.

The application is obvious. If our meetings are illegal, so are theirs also. But if this plea be good (as doubtless it is) in the one case, it is good in the other also.

8. You propose another objection to our *manner* of preaching, in the second part of the "Observations." The substance of it I will repeat, and answer as briefly as I can:—

"They run up and down from place to place, and from county to county;" that is, they preach in several places. This is undoubtedly true. "They draw after them confused multitudes of people;" that is, many come to hear them. This is true also. "But they would do well to remember, God is not the author of confusion or of tumult, but of peace." I trust we do: nor is there any confusion or tumult at all in our largest congregations; unless at some rare times when the sons of Belial mix therewith, on purpose to disturb the peaceable worshippers of God.

"But our Church has provided against this preaching up and down, in the ordination of a priest, by expressly limiting the exercise of the powers then conferred upon him, to the congregation where he shall be lawfully appointed thereunto."

I answer, (1.) Your argument proves too much. If it be allowed just as you proposed it, it proves that no priest has authority, either to preach or minister the sacraments, in any other than his own congregation.

(2.) Had the powers conferred been so limited when I was ordained priest, my ordination would have signified just nothing. For I was not appointed to any congregation at all; but was ordained as a member of that "college of divines," (so our statutes express it,) "founded to overturn all heresies, and defend the Catholic faith."

(3.) For many years after I was ordained priest, this limitation was never heard of. I heard not one syllable of it, by way of objection, to my preaching up and down in Oxford or London, or the parts adjacent; in Gloucestershire, or Worcestershire; in Lancashire, Yorkshire, or Lincolnshire. Nor did the strictest disciplinarian scruple suffering me to exercise those powers wherever I came.

(4.) And in fact, is it not universally allowed, that every priest, as such, has a power, in virtue of his ordination, either to preach or to administer the sacraments, in any congregation, wherever the rector or curate desires his assistance? Does not every one then see through this thin pretence?

9. "The bishops and universities indeed have power to grant licenses to itinerants. But the Church has provided in that case; they are not to preach in any church (canon 50) till they show their license."

The Church has well provided in that case. But what has that case to do with the case of common clergymen? Only so much as to show how grossly this canon has been abused, at Islington in particular; where the churchwardens were instructed to hinder, by main force, the priest whom the vicar himself had appointed, from preaching, and to quote this canon; which, as you plainly show, belongs to quite another thing.

In the note you add, "Mr. Wesley being asked, by what authority he preached, replied, 'By the authority of Jesus Christ conveyed to me by the (now) archbishop of Canterbury, when he laid his hands upon me and said, Take thou authority to preach the Gospel.' In this reply he thought fit, for a plain reason, to leave out this latter part of the commission; for that would have shown his reader the restraint and limitation under which the exercise of the power is granted." Nay, I did not print the latter part of the words, for a plainer reason, because I did not speak them. And I did not speak them then, because they did not come into my mind. Though probably, if they had, I should not have spoken them; it being my only concern, to answer the question proposed, in as few words as I could.

But before those words, which you suppose to imply such a restraint as would condemn all the bishops and clergy in the nation, were those, spoken without any restraint or limitation at all, which I apprehend to convey an indelible character: "Receive the Holy Ghost, for the office and work of a priest in the Church of God, now committed unto thee, by the imposition of our hands. Whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven; and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained. And be thou a faithful dispenser of the word of God, and of his holy sacraments, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."

You proceed; "In the same Journal he declares, that he looks upon all the world as his parish, and explains his meaning as follows: 'In whatever part of it I am, I judge it meet, right, and my bounden duty, to declare, unto all that are willing to hear, the glad tidings of salvation. This is the work which I know God hath called me to;'" namely, "by the laying on of the hands of the presbytery," which directs me how to obey that general command, "While we have time, let us do good unto all men."

10. You object farther, "that the Methodists do not observe the rubric before the communion service; which directs, so many as desire to partake of the holy communion, to signify their names to the curate the day before." What curate desires they should? Whenever any minister will give but one week's notice of this, I undertake, all that have any relation to me shall signify their names within the time appointed.

You object also, that they break through the twenty-eighth canon, which requires, "That if strangers come often to any church from other parishes, they should be remitted to their own churches, there to receive the communion with their neighbours."

But what, if there be no communion there? Then this canon does

not touch the case; nor does any one break it, by coming to another church purely because there is no communion at his own.

As to your next advice, "To have a greater regard to the rules and orders of the Church," I cannot; for I now regard them next to the word of God. And as to your last, "To renounce communion with the Church," I dare not. Nay, but let them thrust us out. We will not leave the ship; if you cast us out of it, then our Lord will take us up.

11. To the same head may be referred the objection some time urged, by a friendly and candid man, viz. "That it was unlawful to use extemporary prayer, because there was a canon against it."

It was not quite clear to me, that the canon he cited was against extemporary prayer. But supposing it were, my plain answer would be, "That canon I dare not obey; because the law of man binds only so far as it is consistent with the word of God."

The same person objected my not obeying the bishops and governors of the Church. I answer, I both do and will obey them, in whatsoever I can with a clear conscience. So that there is no just ground for that charge,—that I despise either the rules, or the governors of the Church. I obey them in all things where I do not apprehend there is some particular law of God to the contrary. Even in that case, I show all the deference I can; I endeavour to act as inoffensively as possible; and am ready to submit to any penalty which can by law be inflicted upon me. Would to God every minister and member of the Church were herein altogether as I am!

VII. 1. I have considered the chief objections that have lately been urged against the doctrines I teach. The main arguments brought against this manner of teaching have been considered also. It remains, to examine the most current objections, concerning the effects of this teaching.

Many affirm, "that it does abundance of hurt; that it has had very bad effects; insomuch that if any good at all has been done, yet it bears no proportion to the evil."

But, to come to particulars: "First, then, you are disturbers of the public peace."

What, do we either teach or raise sedition? Do we speak evil of the ruler of our people? Or do we stir them up against any of those that are put in authority under him? Do we directly or indirectly promote faction, mutiny, or rebellion? I have not found any man in his senses yet, that would affirm this.

"But it is plain, peace is broke and disturbances do arise, in consequence of your preaching." I grant it. But what would you infer? Have you never read the Bible? Have you not read, that the Prince of Peace himself was, in this sense, a disturber of the public peace? "When he came into Jerusalem, all the city was moved," Matt. xxi, 10, *εσεισθη*, shaken as with an earthquake. And the disturbance rose higher and higher, till "the whole multitude" cried out together, "Away with him, away with him; crucify him, crucify him!" and Pilate gave sentence it should be done. Such another disturber of the public peace was that Stephen, even from the time he began "disputing with the Libertines and Cyrenians," till the people "stopped their ears, and ran upon him with one accord, and cast him out of the city and stoned him."

Such disturbers of the peace were all those ringleaders of the sect of the Nazarenes, (commonly called Apostles,) who, wherever they came, "turned the world upside down:" and above all the rest, that Paul of Tarsus, who occasioned so much disturbance at Damascus, Acts ix, at Antioch of Pisidia, xiii, at Iconium, xiv, at Lystra, xiv, 19, at Philippi, xvi, at Thessalonica, xvii, and particularly at Ephesus. The consequence of his preaching there was, that "the whole city was filled with confusion." And "they all ran together with one accord, some crying one thing, some another;" inasmuch "as the greater part of them knew not wherefore they were come together."

2. And can we expect it to be any otherwise now? Although what we preach is the Gospel of peace, yet if you will violently and illegally hinder our preaching, must not this create disturbance? But observe, the disturbance begins on *your* part. All is peace, till you raise that disturbance. And then you very modestly impute it to *us*, and lay your *own* riot at *our* door!

But of all this, our Lord hath told us before: "Think not that I am come to send peace upon earth;" that this will be the immediate effect, wherever my Gospel is preached with power. "I am not come to send peace, but a sword;" this (so far as the wisdom of God permits, by whom "the hairs of your head are all numbered") will be the first consequence of my coming, whenever my word turns sinners "from darkness to light, from the power of Satan unto God."

I would wish all you who see this scripture fulfilled, by disturbance following the preaching the Gospel, to remember the behaviour of that wise magistrate at Ephesus on the like occasion. He did not lay the disturbance to the preacher's charge, but "beckoned to the multitude, and said, Ye men of Ephesus, ye ought to be quiet, and to do nothing rashly. For ye have brought these men, who are neither robbers of temples, nor yet blasphemers of your goddess;" not convicted of any such notorious crime, as can at all excuse this lawless violence. "But if Demetrius hath a matter against any, the law is open, and there are deputies," (or proconsuls, capable of hearing and deciding the cause,) "let them implead one another. But if ye inquire any thing concerning other things, it shall be determined in a lawful assembly."

3. "But you create divisions in private families." Accidentally, we do. For instance: suppose an entire family to have the form but not the power of godliness; or to have neither the form nor the power; in either case, they may in some sort agree together. But suppose, when these hear the plain word of God, one or two of them are convinced, "This is the truth; and I have been all this time in the broad way that leadeth to destruction:" these then will begin to mourn after God, while the rest remain as they were. Will they not therefore of consequence divide, and form themselves into separate parties? Must it not be so, in the very nature of things? And how exactly does this agree with the words of our Lord? "Suppose ye that I am come to send peace upon earth? I tell you, nay; but rather division: for from henceforth there shall be five divided in one house, three against two, and two against three. The father shall be divided against the son, and the son against the father; the mother against the daughter, and the daughter against the mother; the mother-in-law against the daughter-in-law, and the

daughter-in-law against the mother-in-law," Luke xii, 51-53. "And the foes of a man shall be they of his own household," Matt. x, 36.

Thus it was from the very beginning. For is it to be supposed that a Heathen parent would long endure a Christian child, or that a Heathen husband would agree with a Christian wife? unless either the believing wife could gain her husband; or the unbelieving husband prevailed on the wife to renounce her way of worshipping God; at least, unless she would obey him in going no more to those societies, or conventicles, (*συναγῆαι*), as they termed the Christian assemblies?

4. Do you think, now, I have an eye to *your* case? Doubtless I have; for I do not fight as one that beateth the air. "Why have not I a right to hinder my own wife or child from going to a conventicle? And is it not the duty of wives to obey their husbands, and of children to obey their parents?" Only set the case seventeen hundred years back, and your own conscience gives you the answer. What would St. Paul have said to one whose husband forbade her to follow this way any more? What directions would our Saviour have given to him whose father enjoined him not to hear the Gospel? His words are extant still: "He that loveth father or mother more than me, is not worthy of me. And he that loveth son or daughter more than me, is not worthy of me," Matt. x, 37. Nay more, "If any man cometh to me, and hateth not," in comparison of me, "his father, and mother, and wife, and children, yea, and his own life, he cannot be my disciple," Luke xiv, 26.

"O, but this is not a parallel case! For they were Heathens; but I am a Christian." *A Christian!* Are you so? Do you understand the word? Do you know what a Christian is? If you are a Christian, you have the mind that was in Christ; and you so walk as he also walked. You are holy as he is holy, both in heart and in all manner of conversation. Have you then that mind that was in Christ? And do you walk as Christ walked? Are you inwardly and outwardly holy? I fear, not even outwardly. No; you live in known sin. Alas! How then are you a Christian? What, a railer a Christian? a common swearer a Christian? a Sabbath-breaker a Christian? a drunkard or whoremonger a Christian? Thou art a Heathen barefaced; the wrath of God is on thy head, and the curse of God upon thy back. Thy damnation slumbereth not. By reason of such Christians it is that the holy name of Christ is blasphemed. Such as thou they are that cause the very savages in the Indian woods to cry out, "Christian much drunk; Christian beat men; Christian tell lies; devil Christian! Me no Christian."

And so *thou* wilt direct thy wife and children in the way of salvation! Wo unto thee, thou devil Christian! Wo unto thee, thou blind leader of the blind! What wilt thou make them? two-fold more the children of hell than thyself? Be ashamed. Blush, if thou canst blush. Hide thy face. Lay thee in the dust. Out of the deep cry unto God, if haply he may hear thy voice. Instantly smite upon thy breast. Who knoweth but God may take thee out of the belly of hell?

5. But you are not one of these. You fear God, and labour to have a conscience void of offence. And it is from a principle of conscience that you restrain your wife and children from hearing false doctrine.—But how do you know it is false doctrine? Have you heard for your-

self? Or, if you have not heard, have you carefully read what we have occasionally answered for ourselves? A man of conscience cannot condemn any one unheard. This is not common humanity. Nor will he refrain from hearing what may be the truth, for no better reason than fear of his reputation. Pray observe, I do not say, every man, or any man, is obliged in conscience to hear us: but I do say, every man in England who condemns us is obliged to hear us first. This is only common justice, such as is not denied to a thief or a murderer. Take your choice therefore: either hear us, or condemn us not; either speak nothing at all, or hear before you speak.

But suppose you have both read and heard more than you like: did you read and hear fairly? Was not you loaden with prejudice? Did you not read or hear, expecting no good; perhaps, desiring to find fault? If so, what wonder you judge as you do! What a poor mock trial is this! You had decided the cause in your own breast before you heard one word of the evidence. And still do *you* talk of acting out of conscience? yea, a conscience void of offence?

We will put the case farther yet. Suppose your censure was just, and this was actually false doctrine. Still every one must give an account of himself to God; and you cannot force the conscience of any one. You cannot compel another to see as you see; you ought not to attempt it. Reason and persuasion are the only weapons you ought to use, even toward your own wife and children. Nay, and it is impossible to starve them into conviction, or to beat even truth into their head. You may destroy them in this way, but cannot convert them. Remember what our own poet has said:—

By force beasts act, and are by force restrain'd;
The human mind by gentle means is gain'd.
Thou canst not take what I refuse to yield;
Nor reap the harvest, though thou spoil'st the field.

6. Every reasonable man is convinced of this. And perhaps you do not concern yourself so much about the doctrine, but the mischief that is done: "How many poor families are starved, ruined, brought to beggary!" By what? Not by contributing a penny a week, (the usual contribution in our societies,) and letting that alone when they please, when there is any shadow of reason to suppose they cannot afford it. You will not say any are brought to beggary by this. Not by gifts to me; for I receive none; save (sometimes) the food I eat. And public collections are nothing to me. That it may evidently appear they are not, when any such collection is made, to clothe the poor, or for any other determinate purpose, the money is both received and expended before many witnesses, without ever going through my hands at all. And then, likewise, all possible regard is had to the circumstances of those who contribute any thing. And they are told over and over, "If there be a willing mind, it is accepted according to that a man hath."

But where are all these families that have been brought to beggary? How is it that none of them is forthcoming? Are they all out of town? Then, indeed, I am in no danger of clearing myself from *their* indictment. It is the easiest thing of a thousand, for one at Newcastle to say that I have beggared him and all his kindred. If one of the long-bearded men on Tyne Bridge were to say so just now, I could not readily con-

fute him. But why will you not bring a few of these to tell me so to my face? I have not found one that would do this yet. They pray you would have them excused.

I remember a man coming to me with a doleful countenance, putting himself into many lamentable postures, gaping as wide as he could, and pointing to his mouth, as though he would say he could not speak. I inquired of his companion, what was the matter; and was informed, he had fallen into the hands of the Turks, who had used him in a barbarous manner, and cut out his tongue by the roots. I believed him. But when the man had had a cheerful cup, he could find his tongue as well as another. I reflected, How is it that I could so readily believe that tale? The answer was easy: "Because it was told of a Turk." My friend, take knowledge of your own case. If you had not first took me for a Turk, or something equally bad, you could not so readily have believed that tale.

7. "But can it be, that there is no ground at all for a report, which is in every one's mouth?" I will simply tell you all the ground which I can conceive. I believe many of those who attend on my ministry have less of this world's goods than they had before, or, at least, might have had if they did not attend it. This fact I allow; and it may be easily accounted for in one or other of the following ways:—

First. I frequently preach on such texts as these: "Having food and raiment, let us be content therewith." "They who desire to be rich, fall into temptation and a snare, and many foolish and hurtful lusts, which drown men in destruction and perdition." "Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth, where the rust and moth doth corrupt, and where thieves break through and steal. But lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven, where neither rust nor moth doth corrupt, and where thieves do not break through and steal."

Now, should any of those who are labouring by all possible means "to lay up treasure upon earth," feel these words, they would not "enlarge their desires as hell," but be "content with such things as they had." They then probably might not heap up so much for their heirs as otherwise they would have done. These would therefore have less than if they had not heard me; because they would grasp at less.

Secondly. Wherever the Gospel takes effect, "the foes of a man will be those of his own household." By this means then some who hear and receive it with joy will be poorer than they were before. Their domestic foes will, in many cases, hinder, embroil, and disturb the course of their affairs. And their relations, who assisted them before, or promised at least so to do, will probably withdraw or deny that assistance, unless they will be advised by them: perhaps their nearest relations; it being no new thing, for parents to disown their children, if "after the way which they call heresy, these worship the God of their fathers." Hence, therefore, some have less of this world's goods than they had in times past, either because they earn less, or because they receive less from them on whom they depend.

Thirdly. It is written, that "those who received not the mark of the beast, either on their foreheads, or in their right hands," either openly or secretly, were not permitted "to buy or sell any more." Now, whatever the mystery contained herein may be, I apprehend the plain mark of the

beast is wickedness; inward and outward unholiness; whatever is secretly or openly contrary to justice, mercy, or truth. And certain it is, the time is well nigh come when those who have not this mark can neither buy nor sell, can scarce follow any profession so as to gain a subsistence thereby. Therefore, many of those who attend on my ministry are, by this means, poorer than before. They will not receive the mark of the beast, either on their forehead or in their hand; or, if they had received it before, they rid themselves of it as soon as possible. Some cannot follow their former way of life at all; (as pawnbrokers, smugglers, buyers or sellers of uncustomed goods;)—others cannot follow it as they did before; for they cannot oppress, cheat, or defraud their neighbour; they cannot lie, or say what they do not mean; they must now speak the truth from their heart. On all these accounts, they have less of this world's goods; because they gain less than they did before.

Fourthly. "All that will live godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution;" if in no other way, yet at least in this, that "men will by revilings persecute them, and say all manner of evil against them falsely, for his sake." One unavoidable effect of this will be, that men whose subsistence depends on their daily labour will be often in want, for few will care to employ those of so bad a character; and even those who did employ them before, perhaps for many years, will employ them no more; so that hereby some may indeed be brought to beggary.

8. What, does this touch *you*? Are *you* one of those "who will have nothing to do with those scandalous wretches?" Perhaps you will say, "And who can blame me for it? May I not employ whom I please?" We will weigh this:—You employed A. B. for several years. By your own account he was an honest, diligent man. You had no objection to him but his following "this way." For this reason you turn him off. In a short time, having spent his little all, and having no supply, he wants bread. So does his family too, as well as himself. Before he can get into other business to procure it, through want of convenient food to eat, and raiment to put on, he sickens and dies. This is not an imaginary scene. I have known the case, though too late to remedy it.

"And what then?" *What then!* you are a murderer! "O earth, cover not thou his blood!" No; it doth not. "The cry thereof hath entered into the ears of the Lord God of Sabaoth." And God requireth it at your hands; and will require it in an hour when you think not. For you have as effectually murdered that man, as if you had stabbed him to the heart.

It is not I then who ruin and starve that family; it is you; you who call yourself a Protestant! you who cry out against the persecuting spirit of the Papists! Ye fools, and blind! What are ye better than they? Why, Edmund Bonner would have starved the heretics in prison; whereas you starve them in their own houses!

And all this time you talk of liberty of conscience! Yes, liberty for such a conscience as your own; a conscience past feeling; (for sure it had some once;) a conscience "seared with a hot iron!" Liberty to serve the devil, according to your poor, hardened conscience, you allow; but not liberty to serve God!

Nay, and what marvel? Whosoever thou art that readest this, and feelest in thy heart a real desire to serve God, I warn thee, expect no

liberty for thy conscience from him that hath no conscience at all. All ungodly, unthankful, unholy men; all villains, of whatever denomination, will have liberty indeed all the world over, as long as their master is "god of this world:" but expect not liberty to worship God in spirit and in truth, to practise pure and undefiled religion, (unless the Lord should work a new thing in the earth,) from any but those who themselves love and serve God.

9. "However, it is plain you make men idle: and this tends to beggar their families." This objection having been continually urged for some years, I will trace it from the foundation.

Two or three years after my return from America, one Captain Robert Williams, of Bristol, made affidavit before the then mayor of the city, that "it was a common report in Georgia, Mr. Wesley took people off from their work and made them idle by preaching so much."

The fact stood thus: At my first coming to Savannah, the generality of the people rose at seven or eight in the morning. And that part of them, who were accustomed to work, usually worked till six in the evening. A few of them sometimes worked till seven; which is the time of sunset there at midsummer.

I immediately began reading prayers, and expounding the Second lesson, both in the morning and evening. The morning service began at five, and ended at or before six: the evening service began at seven.

Now, supposing all the grown persons in the town had been present every morning and evening, would this have made them idle? Would they hereby have had less, or considerably more, time for working?

10. The same rule I follow now, both at London, Bristol, and Newcastle-upon-Tyne; concluding the service at every place, winter and summer, before six in the morning; and not ordinarily beginning to preach till near seven in the evening.

Now, do you who make this objection work longer, throughout the year, than from six to six? Do you desire that the generality of people should? or can you count them idle that work so long?

Some few are indeed accustomed to work longer. These I advise not to come on week-days; and it is apparent that they take this advice, unless on some rare and extraordinary occasion.

But I hope none of you who turn them out of their employment have the confidence to talk of my making them idle! Do you (as the homely phrase is) cry wh—first? I admire your cunning, but not your modesty.

So far am I from either causing or encouraging idleness, that an idle person, known to be such, is not suffered to remain in any of our societies; we drive him out, as we would a thief or a murderer. "To show all possible diligence," (as well as frugality,) is one of our standing rules; and one, concerning the observance of which we continually make the strictest inquiry.

11. "But you drive them out of their senses. You make them mad." Nay, then they are idle with a vengeance. This objection, therefore, being of the utmost importance, deserves our deepest consideration.

And, First, I grant, it is my earnest desire to drive all the world into what you probably call madness; (I mean, inward religion;) to make them just as mad as Paul when he was so accounted by Festus.

The counting all things on earth but dung and dross, so we may win Christ; the trampling under foot all the pleasures of the world; the seeking no treasure but in heaven; the having no desire of the praise of men, a good character, a fair reputation; the being exceeding glad when men revile us, and persecute us, and say all manner of evil against us falsely; the giving God thanks, when our father and mother forsake us, when we have neither food to eat, nor raiment to put on, nor a friend but what shoots out bitter words, nor a place where to lay our head: this is utter distraction in your account; but in God's it is sober, rational religion; the genuine fruit, not of a distempered brain, not of a sickly imagination, but of the power of God in the heart, of victorious love, "and of a sound mind."

12. I grant, Secondly, it is my endeavour to drive all I can into what you may term another species of madness, which is usually preparatory to this, and which I term *repentance* or *conviction*.

I cannot describe this better than a writer of our own has done. I will therefore transcribe his words:—

"When men feel in themselves the heavy burden of sin, see damnation to be the reward of it, and behold with the eye of their mind the horror of hell; they tremble, they quake, and are inwardly touched with sorrowfulness of heart, and cannot but accuse themselves, and open their grief unto Almighty God, and call unto him for mercy. This being done seriously, their mind is so occupied, partly with sorrow and heaviness, partly with an earnest desire to be delivered from this danger of hell and damnation, that all desire of meat and drink is laid apart, and loathsomeness (or loathing) of all wordly things and pleasure cometh in place. So that nothing then liketh them, more than to weep, to lament, to mourn, and both with words and behaviour of body to show themselves weary of life."

Now, what, if your wife, or daughter, or acquaintance, after hearing one of these field preachers, should come and tell you, that they saw damnation before them, and beheld with the eye of their mind the horror of hell? What, if they should "tremble and quake," and be so taken up "partly with sorrow and heaviness, partly with an earnest desire to be delivered from this danger of hell and damnation, as to weep, to lament, to mourn, and both with words and behaviour to show themselves weary of life;" would you scruple to say, that they were stark mad; that these fellows had driven them out of their senses; and that whatever writer it was that talked at this rate, he was fitter for Bedlam than any other place?

You have overshot yourself now to some purpose. These are the very words of our own Church. You may read them, if you are so inclined, in the first part of the "Homily on Fasting." And consequently, what you have peremptorily determined to be mere lunacy and distraction, is that "repentance unto life," which, in the judgment both of the Church and of St. Paul, is "never to be repented of."

13. I grant, Thirdly, that extraordinary circumstances have attended this conviction in some instances. A particular account of these I have frequently given. While the word of God was preached, some persons have dropped down as dead; some have been, as it were, in strong convulsions; some roared aloud, though not with an articulate voice; and others spoke the anguish of their souls.

This, I suppose, you believe to be perfect madness. But it is easily accounted for, either on principles of reason or Scripture.

First. On principles of reason. For, how easy is it to suppose, that a strong, lively, and sudden apprehension of the heinousness of sin, the wrath of God, and the bitter pains of eternal death, should affect the body as well as the soul, during the present laws of vital union, should interrupt or disturb the ordinary circulations, and put nature out of its course! Yea, we may question, whether, while this union subsists, it be possible for the mind to be affected, in so violent a degree, without some or other of those bodily symptoms following.

It is likewise easy to account for these things, on principles of Scripture. For when we take a view of them in this light, we are to add, to the consideration of natural causes, the agency of those spirits who still excel in strength, and, as far as they have leave from God, will not fail to torment whom they cannot destroy; to tear those that are coming to Christ. It is also remarkable, that there is plain Scripture precedent of every symptom which has lately appeared. So that we cannot allow even the conviction attended with these to be madness, without giving up both reason and Scripture.

14. I grant, Fourthly, that touches of extravagance, bordering on madness, may sometimes attend severe conviction. And this also is easy to be accounted for, by the present laws of the animal economy. For we know, fear or grief, from a temporal cause, may occasion a fever, and thereby a delirium.

It is not strange, then, that some, while under strong impressions of grief or fear, from a sense of the wrath of God, should for a season forget almost all things else, and scarce be able to answer a common question; that some should fancy they see the flames of hell, or the devil and his angels, around them; or that others, for a space, should be "afraid," like Cain, "whosoever meeteth me will slay me." All these, and whatever less common effects may sometimes accompany this conviction, are easily known from the natural distemper of madness, were it only by this one circumstance,—that whenever the person convinced tastes the pardoning love of God, they all vanish away in a moment.

Lastly. I have seen one instance (I pray God I may see no more such!) of real, lasting madness.

Two or three years since, I took one with me to Bristol, who was under deep convictions; but of as sound an understanding in all respects, as ever he had been in his life. I went a short journey, and, when I came to Bristol again, found him really distracted. I inquired particularly, at what time and place, and in what manner, this disorder began. And I believe there are at least threescore witnesses alive, and ready to testify what follows: When I went from Bristol, he contracted an acquaintance with some persons, who were not of the same judgment with me. He was soon prejudiced against me: quickly after, when our society were met together in Kingswood house, he began a vehement invective both against my person and doctrines. In the midst of this, he was struck raving mad. And so he continued till his friends put him into Bedlam; and probably laid his madness too to my charge.

15. I fear there may also be some instances of real madness, proceeding from a different cause.

Suppose, for instance, a person hearing me, is strongly convinced that a liar cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven. He comes home, and relates this to his parents or friends, and appears to be very uneasy. These good Christians are disturbed at this, and afraid he is running mad too. They are resolved, he shall never hear any of those fellows more; and keep to it, in spite of all his intreaties. They will not suffer him, when at home, to be alone, for fear he should read or pray. And perhaps in a while they will constrain him, at least by repeated importunities, to do again the very thing for which he was convinced the wrath of God cometh upon the children of disobedience.

What is the event of this? Sometimes the Spirit of God is quenched and departs from him. Now you have carried the point. The man is easy as ever, and sins on without any remorse. But in other instances, where those convictions sink deep, and the arrows of the Almighty stick fast in the soul, you will drive the person into real, settled madness, before you can quench the Spirit of God. I am afraid there have been several instances of this. You have forced the man's conscience, till he is stark mad. But then, pray do not impute that madness to me. Had you left him to my direction, or rather to the direction of the Spirit of God, he would have been filled with love and a sound mind. But you have taken the matter out of God's hand; and now you have brought it to a fair conclusion!

16. How frequent this case may be, I know not. But doubtless most of those who make this objection, of our driving men mad, have never met with such an instance in their lives. The common cry is occasioned, either by those who are convinced of sin, or those who are inwardly converted to God; mere madness both, (as was observed before,) to those who are without God in the world. Yet I do not deny, but you may have seen one in Bedlam, who said he had followed me. But observe, a madman's saying this, is no proof of the fact; nay, and if he really had, it should be farther considered, that his being in Bedlam is no sure proof of his being mad. Witness the well known case of Mr. Periam; and I doubt more such are to be found. Yea, it is well if some have not been sent thither, for no other reason, but because they followed me; their kind relations either concluding that they must be distracted before they could do this; or, perhaps hoping that Bedlam would make them mad, if it did not find them so.

17. And it must be owned, a confinement of such a sort is as fit to cause as to cure distraction: for what scene of distress is to be compared to it?—To be separated at once from all who are near and dear to you; to be cut off from all reasonable conversation; to be secluded from all business, from all reading, from every innocent entertainment of the mind, which is left to prey wholly upon itself, and day and night to pore over your misfortunes; to be shut up day by day in a gloomy cell, with only the walls to employ your heavy eyes, in the midst either of melancholy silence, or horrid cries, groans, and laughter intermixed; to be forced by the main strength of those

Who laugh at human nature and compassion,

to take drenches of nauseous, perhaps torturing, medicines, which you know you have no need of now, but know not how soon you may, possibly by the operation of these very drugs on a weak and tender

constitution: here is distress! It is an astonishing thing, a signal proof of the power of God, if any creature who has his senses when the confinement begins, does not lose them before it is at an end!

How must it heighten the distress, if such a poor wretch, being deeply convinced of sin, and growing worse and worse, (as he probably will, seeing there is no medicine here for his sickness, no such physician as his case requires,) be soon placed among the incurables! Can imagination itself paint such a hell upon earth? where even "hope never comes, that comes to all!"—For, what remedy? If a man of sense and humanity should happen to visit that house of wo, would he give the hearing to a madman's tale? Or if he did, would he credit it? "Do we not know," might he say, "how well any of these will talk in their lucid intervals?" So that a thousand to one he would concern himself no more about it, but leave the weary to wait for rest in the grave!

18. I have now answered most of the current objections, particularly such as have appeared of weight to religious or reasonable men. I have endeavoured to show, (1.) That the doctrines I teach are no other than the great truths of the Gospel: (2.) That though I teach them, not as I would, but as I can, yet it is in a manner not contrary to law: and, (3.) That the effects of thus preaching the Gospel have not been such as was weakly or wickedly reported; those reports being mere artifices of the devil to hinder the work of God. Whosoever therefore ye are, who look for God to "revive his work in the midst of the years," cry aloud, that he may finish it nevertheless, may "cut it short in righteousness." Cry to Messiah the Prince, that he may soon end the transgression, that he may lift up his standard upon earth, sending by whom he will send, and working his own work, when he pleaseth, and as he pleaseth, till "all the kindreds of the people worship before him," and the earth "be full of the knowledge of the glory of the Lord!"

December 22, 1741.

AN ACT OF DEVOTION.

BEHOLD the servant of the Lord!

I wait thy guiding eye to feel,
To hear and keep thine every word,
To prove and do thy perfect will:
Joyful from all my works to cease,
Glad to fulfil all righteousness.

Me if thy grace vouchsafe to use,
Meanest of all thy creatures me,
The deed, the time, the manner choose;
Let all my fruit be found of thee;
Let all my works in thee be wrought,
By thee to full perfection brought.

My every weak, though good design,
O'errule, or change, as seems thee meet;
Jesus, let all the work be thine;
Thy work, O Lord, is all complete,
And pleasing in thy Father's sight;
'Thou only hast done all things right.

Here then to thee thine own I leave,
Mould as thou wilt the passive clay;
But let me all thy stamp receive,
But let me all thy words obey;
Serve with a single heart and eye,
And to thy glory live and die.

A FARTHER APPEAL

TO

MEN OF REASON AND RELIGION.

PART II.

I. 1. It is not my present design to touch on any particular opinions, whether they are right or wrong; nor on any of those smaller points of practice, which are variously held by men of different persuasions; but, First, to point out some things which, on common principles, are condemned by men of every denomination, and yet found in all; and, Secondly, some wherein those of each denomination are more particularly inconsistent with their own principles.

And, First, it is my design, abstracting from opinions of every kind, as well as from disputable points of practice, to mention such of those things as occur to my mind, which are on common principles condemned, and notwithstanding found, more or less, among men of every denomination.

2. But before I enter on this displeasing task, I beseech you, brethren, by the mercies of God, by whatever love you bear to God, to your country, to your own souls, do not consider *who* speaks, but *what* is spoken. If it be possible, for one hour lay prejudice aside; give what is advanced a fair hearing. Consider simply on each head, Is this true, or is it false? Is it reasonable, or is it not? If you ask, "But in whose judgment?" I answer, In your own; I appeal to the light of your own mind. Is there not a faithful witness in your own breast? By this you must stand or fall. You cannot be judged by another man's conscience. Judge for yourself by the best light you have; and the merciful God teach me and thee whatsoever we know not!

Now, as I speak chiefly to those who believe the Scriptures, the method I propose is this: First, to observe what account is given therein of the Jews, the ancient Church of God, inasmuch as all these things were written for our instruction, who say, We are now the visible Church of the God of Israel: Secondly, to appeal to all who profess to be members thereof, to every one who is called a Christian, how far, in each instance, the parallel holds; and how much we are better than they.

3. First. I am to observe what account the Scriptures give of the Jews, the ancient Church of God. I mean, with regard to their moral character; their tempers and outward behaviour.

No sooner were they brought out of Egypt, than we find them "murmuring against God," Exod. xiv, 12; again, when he had just brought them through the Red Sea "with a mighty hand and stretched out arm," xv, 24; and yet again, quickly after, in the wilderness of Zin: "Your murmurings," saith Moses, "are not against us, but against the Lord," xvi, 8. Nay, even while he was "giving them bread from heaven," they were still "murmuring and tempting God," xvii, 2, 3; and their amazing language at that very season was, "Is the Lord among us or not?" xvii, 7.

The same spirit they showed, during the whole forty years that he "bore their manners in the wilderness:" a solemn testimony whereof, "Moses spake in the ears of all the congregation of Israel," when God was about to take him away from their head. "They have corrupted themselves," saith he; "their spot was not of his children; they are a perverse and crooked generation. The Lord led Jacob about; he instructed him; he kept him as the apple of his eye," Deut. xxxii, 5, 10. "He made him ride on the high places of the earth, that he might eat the increase of the fields; then he forsook God which made him, and lightly esteemed the Rock of his salvation," verses 13, 15.

In like manner God complains long after this: "Hear, O heavens, and give ear, O earth! I have nourished and brought up children, and they have rebelled against me. The ox knoweth his owner, and the ass his master's crib; but Israel doth not know, my people doth not consider. Ah sinful nation, a people laden with iniquity, a seed of evil doers, children that are corrupters, they have forsaken the Lord, they have provoked the Holy One of Israel," Isaiah i, 2-4. "Can a maid forget her ornaments, or a bride her attire? Yet my people have forgotten me days without number," Jer. ii, 32.

4. And "as they did not like to retain God in their knowledge," so they had small regard to the ordinances of God: "Even from the days of your fathers," saith God by his Prophets, "ye are gone away from mine ordinances, and have not kept them," Mal. iii, 7. "Ye have said, It is vain to serve God; and what profit is it that we have kept his ordinances?" verse 14. "Thou hast not called upon me, O Jacob; but thou hast been weary of me, O Israel: thou hast not brought me thy burnt offerings, neither hast thou honoured me with thy sacrifices," Isaiah xliii, 22, 23. And so the Prophet himself confesses: "Thou meetest those that remember thee in thy ways;—but there is none that calleth upon thy name, that stirreth up himself to take hold of thee," Isaiah lxiv, 5, 7.

5. But they called upon his name by vain oaths, by perjury and blasphemy. So Jeremiah: "Because of swearing the land mourneth," xxiii, 10. "And though they say, The Lord liveth, surely they swear falsely," v, 2. So Hosea: "They have spoken words, swearing falsely in making a covenant." So Ezekiel: "They say, The Lord seeth us not, the Lord hath forsaken the earth." So Isaiah: "Their tongue and their doings are against the Lord, to provoke the eyes of his glory," iii, 8. "They say, Let him make speed and hasten his work, that we may see it; and let the counsel of the Holy One draw nigh and come, that we may know it," v, 19. And so Malachi: "Ye have wearied the Lord with your words; ye say, Every one that doeth evil is good in the sight of the Lord, and he delighteth in them; or, Where is the God of judgment?" ii, 17.

6. And as they "despised his holy things," so they "profaned his Sabbaths," Ezekiel xxii, 8. Yea, when God sent unto them, saying, "Take heed unto yourselves, and bear no burden on the Sabbath-day, neither do ye any work, but hallow ye the Sabbath-day, as I commanded your fathers. Yet they obeyed not, neither inclined their ear, but made their neck stiff, that they might not hear, nor receive instruction," Jer. xvii, 21-23.

Neither did they honour their parents, or those whom God, from time to time, appointed to be rulers over them: "In thee" (in Jerusalem, saith the Prophet) "they have set light by father and mother," Ezekiel xxii, 7. And from the very day when God brought them up out of the land of Egypt, their murmurings, chiding, rebellion, and disobedience, against those whom he had chosen to go before them, make the most considerable part of their history. So that had not Moses "stood in the gap," he had even then destroyed them from the face of the earth.

7. How much more did they afterward provoke God, by drunkenness, sloth, and luxury! "They have erred through wine," saith the Prophet Isaiah, "and through strong drink they are out of the way," xxviii, 7: which occasioned those vehement and repeated warnings against that reigning sin: "Wo to the drunkards of Ephraim, them that are overcome with wine!" verse 1. "The drunkards of Ephraim shall be trodden under foot," verse 3. "Wo unto them that rise up early that they may follow strong drink; that continue until night, till wine inflame them!—But they regard not the work of the Lord, neither consider the operation of his hands," v, 11, 12. "Wo unto them that are mighty to drink wine, and men of strength to mingle strong drink!" verse 22. "Wo to them that are at ease in Zion; that lie upon beds of ivory, and stretch themselves upon their couches, and eat the lambs out of the flock, and the calves out of the midst of the stall; that chant to the sound of the viol, and invent to themselves instruments of music; that drink wine in bowls, and anoint themselves with the chief ointments: but they are not grieved for the affliction of Joseph," Amos vi, 1, 4–6. "Behold," saith Ezekiel to Jerusalem, "this was the iniquity of thy sister Sodom, fulness of bread and abundance of idleness was in her and in her daughters," xvi, 49.

8. From sloth and fulness of bread, lewdness naturally followed. It was even while Moses was with them, that "the people began to commit whoredom with the daughters of Moab." Yea, of the daughters of Zion Isaiah complains: "They walk with stretched forth necks and wanton eyes," iii, 16. And of his people in general God complains by Jeremiah: "When I had fed them to the full, they assembled themselves by troops in the harlots' houses. They were as fed horses in the morning: every one neighed after his neighbour's wife," v, 7, 8. "They be all adulterers, an assembly of treacherous men," ix, 2. "The land is full of adulterers," xxiii, 10.

Yea, and some of them were given up to unnatural lusts: thus we read: "The men of Gibeah beset the house," wherein the stranger was, "and beat at the door, and spake to the master of the house, saying, Bring forth the man that came into thine house, that we may know him," Judges xix, 22. "And there were also," long after, "Sodomites in the land," in the days of Rehoboam and of the following kings: "The very show of whose countenance witnessed against them, and they declared their sin as Sodom, they hid it not," Isaiah iii, 9.

9. This was accompanied with injustice in all its forms. Thus all the prophets testify against them: "The Lord looked for judgment, but behold oppression; for righteousness, but behold a cry," Isaiah v, 7. "Thou hast taken usury and increase; thou hast greedily gained of thy neighbour by extortion.—Behold, I have smitten my hand at thy dishonest gain which thou hast made," Ezekiel xxii, 12, 13. "The

balances of deceit are in Jacob's hand; he loveth to oppress," Hosea xii, 7. "Are there not yet the scant measure that is abominable, the wicked balances, and the bag of deceitful weights?" Micah vi, 10, 11. "He that departeth from evil maketh himself a prey. And the Lord saw it, and it displeased him, that there was no judgment," Isaiah lix, 15. "The wicked devoureth the man that is more righteous than he. They take up all of them with the angle, they catch them in their net and gather them in their drag," Hab. i, 13, 15. "They covet fields, and take them by violence; and houses, and take them away," Micah ii, 2. They "pull off the robe with the garment from them that pass by securely," verse 8. "They have dealt by oppression with the stranger; they have vexed the fatherless and the widow," Ezekiel xxii, 7. "The people of the land have used oppression, and exercised robbery, and have vexed the poor and needy: yea, they have oppressed the stranger wrongfully," verse 29. "Their works are works of iniquity, and the act of violence is in their hands," Isaiah lix, 6. "Judgment is turned away backward, and justice standeth afar off; for truth is fallen in the street, and equity cannot enter," verse 14.

10. Truth indeed was fallen, as well as justice: "Every mouth," saith Isaiah, "speaketh folly," ix, 17. "This is a rebellious people, lying children," xxx, 9. Their "lips have spoken lies and muttered perverseness. None calleth for justice, nor any pleadeth for truth: they trust in vanity, and speak lies," lix, 3, 4. This occasioned that caution of Jeremiah: "Take ye heed every one of his neighbour, and trust ye not in any brother; for every brother will utterly supplant, and every neighbour will walk with slanders. And they will deceive every one his neighbour, and will not speak the truth; they have taught their tongue to speak lies, and weary themselves to commit iniquity," ix, 4, 5.

11. And even those who abstained from these gross outward sins were still inwardly corrupt and abominable: "The whole head was sick, and the whole heart was faint; yea, from the sole of the foot even unto the head there was no soundness, but wounds and bruises and putrefying sores," Isaiah i, 5, 6. "All these nations," saith God, "are uncircumcised; and all the house of Israel are uncircumcised in heart," Jer. ix, 26. "Their heart is divided," Hosea x, 2. "They have set up their idols in their heart; they are all estranged from me through their idols," Ezekiel xiv, 3, 5.

Their soul still "clave unto the dust." They "laid up treasures upon earth." "From the least of them," saith Jeremiah, "even unto the greatest, every one is given to covetousness," vi, 13. "They panted after the dust of the earth," Amos ii, 7. "They laded themselves with thick clay," Hab. ii, 6. "They joined house to house, and laid field to field, until there was no place," Isa. v, 8. Yea, they "enlarged their desires as hell:" they were "as death, and could not be satisfied," Hab. ii, 5.

12. And not only for their covetousness, but for their pride of heart, were they an abomination to the Lord: "The pride of Israel," saith Hosea, "doth testify to his face," vii, 10. "Hear ye, give ear," saith Jeremiah, "be not proud.—Give glory to the Lord your God," xiii, 15, 16. But they would not be reprov'd; they were still "wise in their own eyes, and prudent in their own sight;" Isa. v, 21; and continually

saying to their neighbour, "Stand by thyself, come not near to me; for I am holier than thou!" Isaiah lxxv, 5.

They added hypocrisy to their pride: "This people," saith God himself, "draw near me with their mouth, and with their lips do honour me, but have removed their hearts far from me," Isa. xxix, 13. "They have not cried unto me with their heart, when they howled upon their beds," Hosea viii, 14. "They return, but not to the Most High; they are like a deceitful bow," vii, 16. "They did but flatter him with their mouth, and dissemble with him in their tongue," Psalm lxxviii, 36. So that herein they only "profaned the holiness of the Lord." "And this have ye done again," saith Malachi, "covering the altar of the Lord with tears, with weeping, and with crying out, insomuch that he regardeth not the offering any more," ii, 11, 13.

13. This God continually declared to those formal worshippers, that their outside religion was but vain: "To what purpose is the multitude of your sacrifices saith the Lord? I am full of the burnt offerings of rams, and I delight not in the blood of bullocks, or of lambs, or of he-goats. Bring no more vain oblations: incense is an abomination unto me; the new moons and sabbaths, the calling of assemblies, I cannot away with; it is iniquity, even the solemn meeting.—When you spread forth your hands, I will hide mine eyes from you; yea, when ye make many prayers, I will not hear," Isaiah i, 11, 13, 15. "He that killeth an ox is as if he slew a man; he that sacrificeth a lamb, as if he cut off a dog's neck," lxxvi, 3. "When they fast, I will not hear their cry; and when they offer an oblation, I will not accept," Jer. xiv, 12. "Go ye, serve your idols, if ye will not hearken unto me; but pollute ye my holy name no more with your gifts," Ezekiel xx, 39.

14. Yet all this time were they utterly careless and secure; nay, confident of being in the favour of God: they were at ease; they "put far away the evil day," Amos vi, 1, 3. Even when God had "poured his anger upon Israel, it set him on fire round about, yet he knew it not; it burned him, yet he laid it not to heart," Isaiah xlii, 25. "A deceived heart had turned him aside, that he could not say, Is there not a lie in my right hand?" xlv, 20. So far from it, that at this very time they said, "We are innocent, we have not sinned," Jer. ii, 35, 37. "We are wise, and the law of the Lord is with us," viii, 8. "The temple of the Lord, the temple of the Lord, are we," vii, 4.

15. Thus it was that they hardened themselves in their wickedness: "They are impudent children," saith God, "and stiff-hearted," Ezekiel ii, 4. "Were they ashamed when they had committed abomination? Nay, they were not at all ashamed, neither could they blush," Jer. vi, 15. "I have spread out my hand all the day to a rebellious people, that provoketh me to anger continually to my face," Isa. lxxv, 2, 3. "They will not hearken unto me, saith the Lord; for all the house of Israel are impudent and hard-hearted," Ezekiel iii, 7. "Since the day that their fathers came forth out of the land of Egypt unto this day, I have sent unto them all my servants the prophets, rising up early and sending them: yet they hearkened not unto me, nor inclined their ear, but hardened their neck; they did worse than their fathers," Jer. vii, 25, 26.

They were equally hardened against mercies and judgments: when he "gave them rain, both the former and the latter in his season;"

when "he reserved unto them the appointed weeks of the harvest," filling their hearts with food and gladness, still none of this "revolting and rebellious people said, Let us now fear the Lord our God;" Jer. v, 23, 24; nor yet did "they turn unto him when he smote them," Isaiah ix, 13. "In that day did the Lord call to weeping and to mourning: and behold joy and gladness, eating flesh and drinking wine; let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we shall die," Isaiah xxii, 12, 13. Although "he consumed them, yet they refused to receive instruction; they made their faces harder than a rock.—None repented him, but every one turned to his course, as a horse rusheth into the battle," Jer. v, 3; viii, 6. "I have given you want of bread in all your places, yet have ye not returned unto me, saith the Lord. I have also withholden the rain from you when there were yet three months unto the harvest. I have smitten you with blasting and mildew: your gardens and your vineyards, the palmer worm devoured. I have sent among you the pestilence after the manner of Egypt; your young men have I slain with the sword. I have overthrown some of you, as God overthrew Sodom and Gomorrah, and ye were as a firebrand plucked out of the burning; yet have ye not returned unto me, saith the Lord," Amos iv, 6–11.

16. In consequence of their resolution not to return, they would not endure sound doctrine, or those that spake it: they "said to the seers, See not; and to the prophets, Prophecy not unto us right things, speak unto us smooth things, cause the Holy One of Israel to cease from before us," Isaiah xxx, 10, 11. "But they hated him that rebuked in the gate, and they abhorred him that spake uprightly," Amos v, 10. Accordingly, "Thy people," saith God to Ezekiel, "still are talking against thee by the walls, and in the doors of the houses," xxxiii, 30. "And Amaziah the priest sent to Jeroboam, king of Israel, saying, Amos hath conspired against thee in the midst of the house of Israel; the land is not able to bear all his words. Also Amaziah said unto Amos, Go, flee thee away into the land of Judah, and prophesy there. But prophesy not again any more at Bethel, for it is the king's chapel, and it is the king's court," vii, 10, 12, 13. From the same spirit it was that they said of Jeremiah, "Come, and let us devise devices against him.—Come, and let us smite him with the tongue, and let us not give heed to any of his words," xviii, 18. Hence it was that he was constrained to cry out, "O Lord, I am in derision daily; every one mocketh me. Since I spake, the word of the Lord was made a reproach unto me, and a derision daily: for I heard the defaming of many: fear on every side: Report, say they, and we will report it. All my familiars watched for my halting; saying, Peradventure he will be enticed, and we shall prevail against him, and we shall take our revenge on him," xv, 7, 8, 10. And elsewhere, "Wo is me, my mother, that thou hast borne me a man of strife and a man of contention to the whole earth! I have neither lent on usury, nor men have lent to me on usury; yet every one of them doth curse me," xv, 10.

17. But "if a man walking in the spirit of falsehood do lie," saith the prophet Micah, "saying, I will prophesy unto thee of wine and strong drink, he shall even be the prophet of this people," ii, 11. And God gave them pastors after their own hearts; such were those sons of Eli, "sons of Belial, who knew not the Lord;" 1 Sam. ii, 12; rapacious,

covetous, violent men; verses 14–16; by reason of whom “men abhorred the offering of the Lord;” verse 17; who not only “made themselves vile,” iii, 13, but also “made the Lord’s people to transgress,” ii, 24, while they “made themselves fat with the chiefest of all the offerings of Israel,” verse 29. Such were those of whom Isaiah says, “The priest and the prophet have erred through strong drink; they are swallowed up of wine,” xxviii, 7. “Come ye, say they, I will fetch wine, and we will fill ourselves with strong drink; and to-morrow shall be as this day, and much more abundant,” lvi, 12. Therefore, saith he, “The Lord hath poured out upon you the spirit of deep sleep, and hath closed your eyes: the prophets and the seers hath he covered; and the vision of all is become unto you as the words of a book that is sealed,” xxix, 10, 11. Such also were those of whom he saith, “His watchmen are blind, they are all ignorant, they are all dumb dogs, they cannot bark; sleeping, lying down, loving to slumber. Greedy dogs, which can never have enough, and they are shepherds that cannot understand. They all look to their own way, every one for his gain, from his quarter,” lvi, 10, 11.

Little better were those of whom the prophets that followed have left us so dreadful an account: “Both prophet and priest are profane; yea, in my house have I found their wickedness, saith the Lord. And from the prophets of Jerusalem is profaneness gone forth into all the land,” Jer. xxiii, 11, 15. “Her priests have violated my law, and have profaned my holy things: they have put no difference between the holy and the profane, and I am profaned among them,” Ezekiel xxii, 26. “If I be a father, where is mine honour? and if I be a master, where is my fear? saith the Lord of hosts unto you, O priests, that despise my name!” Malachi i, 6.

Yea, some of them were fallen into the grossest sins: “The company of priests,” saith Hosea, “commit lewdness: there is the whoredom of Ephraim, Israel is defiled,” vi, 9, 10. “I have seen also in the prophets of Jerusalem,” saith God by Jeremiah, “a horrible thing; they commit adultery and walk in lies,” xxiii, 14.

18. And those who were clear of this, were deeply covetous: “Who is there among you that would shut the doors for nought? Neither do ye kindle fire on my altar for nought. I have no pleasure in you, saith the Lord of hosts,” Mal. i, 10. “The priests of Zion teach for hire, and the prophets thereof divine for money. Yet will they lean upon the Lord, and say, Is not the Lord among us?” Micah iii, 11. “Thus saith the Lord, The prophets bite with their teeth, and cry, Peace; and he that putteth not into their mouths, they even prepare war against him,” iii, 5. Therefore, “the word of the Lord came unto Ezekiel, saying, Prophesy against the shepherds of Israel, and say, Wo be to the shepherds of Israel that do feed themselves! Should not the shepherds feed the flocks? Ye eat the fat, and ye clothe you with the wool; but ye feed not the flock. The diseased have ye not strengthened, neither have ye healed that which was sick, neither have ye bound up that which was broken, neither have ye brought again that which was driven away, neither have ye sought that which was lost; but with force and with cruelty have ye ruled them. And they were scattered because there was no shepherd; and they became meat to all the beasts of the field.

Yea, my flock was scattered upon all the face of the earth, and none did search or seek after them," xxxiv, 1-6.

19. To the same effect do the other prophets declare: "Ye are departed out of the way, ye have caused many to stumble: therefore have I also made you contemptible and base before all the people," Malachi ii, 8, 9. "From the prophet even unto the priest, every one dealeth falsely. They have healed also the hurt of the daughter of my people slightly, saying, Peace, peace; when there is no peace," Jer. vi, 13, 14. "They prophesy lies in my name," xiv, 14. "They say still unto them that despise me, The Lord had said, Ye shall have peace; and they say unto every man that walketh after the imagination of his own heart, No evil shall come upon you," xxiii, 17. "The prophets of Jerusalem strengthen the hands of the evil-doers, that none doth return from his wickedness," verse 14. "They have seduced my people; and one built up a wall, and lo, others daubed it with untempered mortar," Ezekiel xiii, 10. "With lies they have made the hearts of the righteous sad, whom I have not made sad; and strengthened the hands of the wicked, that he shall not return from his wicked way, by promising him life," verse 22. "Many pastors have destroyed my vineyard; they have trodden my portion under foot; they have made my pleasant portion a desolate wilderness," Jer. xii, 10. "There is a conspiracy of her prophets in the midst of her, like a roaring lion ravening the prey; they have devoured souls," Ezekiel xxii, 25. "Thus saith the Lord, Feed the flock of the slaughter; whose possessors slay them, and hold themselves not guilty: and they that sell them say, Blessed be the Lord; for I am rich: and their own shepherds pity them not," Zechariah xi, 4, 5.

II. 1. Such is the general account which the Scriptures give of the Jews, the ancient Church of God. And since all these things were "written for our instruction," who are now the visible Church of the God of Israel, I shall, in the next place, appeal to all who profess this, to every one who calls himself a Christian, how far in each instance the parallel holds, and how much we are better than they.

And, First, Were they discontented? Did they repine at the providence of God? Did they say, "Is the Lord among us or not?" when they were in imminent danger, or pressing want, and saw no way to escape. And which of us can say, "I am clear from this sin: I have washed my hands and my heart in innocency?" Have not we who "judge others, done the same things;" murmured and repined times without number; yea, and that when we were not in pressing want, nor distressed with imminent danger? Are we not in general, (our own writers being the judges,) have we not ever been from the earliest ages, a "repining, murmuring, discontented people;" never long satisfied either with God or man? Surely in this we have great need to humble ourselves before God; for we are in no wise better than they.

But "Jeshurun forsook God which made him, and lightly esteemed the Rock of his salvation." And did not England too? Ask ye of the generations of old, inquire from the rising of the sun to the going down thereof, whether there was ever a people called by his name, which had less of "God in all their thoughts;" who, in the whole tenor of their behaviour, showed so light an "esteem for the Rock of their salvation."

Could there ever be stronger cause for God to cry out, "Hear,

O heavens, and give ear, O earth!" For hath he not "nourished and brought us up" as his children? And yet, how have we "rebelled against" him! If Israel of old, "did not know God," if his ancient people "did not consider," was this peculiar to them? Are not we also under the very same condemnation? Do we, as a people, know God? Do we consider him as God? Do we tremble at the presence of his power? Do we revere his excellent majesty? Do we remember, at all times, "God is here! He is now reading my heart; he spieth out all my ways; there is not a word in my tongue but he knoweth it altogether?" Is this the character of us English Christians; the mark whereby we are known from the Heathen? Do we thus know God; thus consider his power, his love, his all-seeing eye? Rather, are we not likewise a "sinful nation, who have forgotten him days without number; a people laden with iniquity, continually forsaking the Lord, and provoking the Holy One of Israel?"

2. There is indeed a wide difference in this respect between the Jews and us: they happened (if I may so speak) to forget God, because other things came in their way; but we design to forget him; we do it of set purpose, because we do not like to remember him. From the accounts given by Jeremiah, we have reason to believe that when that people were most deeply corrupted, yet the greatest men in the nation, the ministers of state, the nobles and princes of Judah, talked of God sometimes, perhaps, as frequently as upon any other subject. But is it so among us? Rather, is it not a point of good breeding to put God far away, out of our sight? Is he talked of at all among the great,—the nobles or ministers of state in England? among any persons of rank or figure in the world? Do they allow God any place in their conversation? From day to day, from year to year, do you discourse one hour of the wonders he doeth for the children of men? If one at a gentleman or a nobleman's table was to begin a discourse of the wisdom, greatness, or power of God would it not occasion, at least, as much astonishment, as if he had begun to talk blasphemy? And if the unbred man persisted therein, would it not put all the company in confusion? And what do you sincerely believe the more favourable part would say of him when he was gone, but that, "He is a little touched in his head!" or, "Poor man! he has not seen the world?"

You know this is the naked truth. But how terrible is the thought to every serious mind! Into what a state is this Christian nation fallen! Nay, the men of eminence, of fortune, of education! Would not a thinking foreigner, who should be present at such an interview, be apt to conclude, that the men of quality in England were Atheists? that they did not believe there was any God at all; or, at best, but an epicurean god, who sat at ease upon the circle of the heavens, and did not concern himself about us worms of the earth? Nay, but He understands every thought now rising in your heart. And how long can you put him out of your sight? Only till this veil of flesh is rent in sunder; for your pomp will not then follow you. Will not your body be mingled with common dust, and your soul stand naked before God? O that you would now "acquaint yourself with God," that you may then be clothed with glory and immortality!

3. Did God complain of the Jews, "Even from the days of your

fathers ye are gone away from mine ordinances, and have not kept them?" And how justly may He make the same complaint of us; for how exceeding small a proportion do we find of those in any place who call themselves Christians, that make a conscience of attending them! Does one third of the inhabitants in any one parish throughout this great city constantly attend public prayer, and the ministry of his word, as of conscience toward God? Does one tenth of those who acknowledge it is an institution of Christ duly attend the Lord's Supper? Does a fiftieth part of the nominal members of the Church of England observe the fasts of the Church, or so much as the forty days of Lent, and all Fridays in the year? Who of these, then, can cast the first stone at the Jews for neglecting the ordinances of God?

Nay, how many thousands are found among us who have never partook of the Supper of the Lord! How many thousands are there that live and die in this unrepented disobedience! What multitudes, even in this Christian city, do not attend any public worship at all; no, nor spend a single hour from one year to another, in privately pouring out their hearts before God! Whether God "meeth him that remembereth him in his ways," or not, is no concern of theirs: so the man eats and drinks, and "dies as a beast dieth:"

Drops into the dark, and disappears.

It was not, therefore, of the children of Israel alone that the messenger of God might say, "There is none" (comparatively) "that calleth upon thy name, that stirreth himself up to take hold of thee."

4. Ye have heard that it was said to them of old time, "Because of swearing, the land mourneth." But if this might be said of the land of Canaan, how much more of this land! In what city or town, in what market or exchange, in what street or place of public resort, is not the holy "name whereby we are called" taken in vain, day by day? From the noble to the peasant, who fails to call upon God, in this, if in no other, way? Whither can you turn, where can you go, without hearing some praying to God for damnation, either on his neighbour or himself? cursing those, without either fear or remorse, whom Christ hath bought to inherit a blessing!

Are you one of these stupid, senseless, shameless wretches, that call so earnestly for damnation on your own soul? What, if God should take you at your word? Are you "able to dwell with everlasting burnings?" If you are, yet why should you be in haste to be in the "lake of fire burning with brimstone?" God help you! or you will be there soon enough, and long enough; for that "fire is not quenched!" But the "smoke thereof ascendeth up, day and night, for ever and ever."

And what is that important affair, concerning which you was but now appealing to God? Was you "calling God to record upon your soul," touching your everlasting salvation? No; but touching the beauty of your horse, the swiftness of your dog, or the goodness of your drink. How is this? What notion have you of God? What do you take him to be!—

*Idcirco stolidam præbet tibi vellere barbam
Jupiter?*

('Thinkest thou that God is mocked?)

What stupidity, what infaturation is this! thus without either pleasure

or profit, or praise, to set at nought Him that hath "all power both in heaven and earth!" wantonly to "provoke the eyes of his glory!"

Are you a man of letters who are sunk so low? I will not then send you to the inspired writers, (so called;—perhaps you disdain to receive instruction by them,) but the old, blind Heathen. Could you only fix in your mind the idea he had of God, (though it is not strictly just, unless we refer it to God made man,) you would never thus affront him more,—

Η, και κυανησιν επ' οφρυσι νευσε Κρονιων·
 Αμβροσιαι δ' αρα χαιται επερρωσαντο ανακτος
 Κρατος απ' αθανατοις· μεγαν δ' ελελιξεν Ολυμπον·

(Jove spake, and nodded with his sable brow,
 And huge Olympus to his centre shook.)

Shall not the very Heathen then "rise up in judgment against this generation and condemn it?" Yea, and not only the learned Heathens of Greece and Rome, but the savages of America; for I never remember to have heard a wild Indian name the name of *Sootaleicatee*, (Him that sitteth in heaven,) without either laying his hand upon his breast, or casting his eyes down to the ground. And you are a Christian! O how do you cause the very name of Christianity to be blasphemed among the Heathen!

5. But is it light swearing only, (inexcusable as that is,) because of which our "land mourneth?" May it not also be said of us, "Though they say, The Lord liveth, surely they swear falsely?" yea, to such a degree, that there is hardly the like in any nation under heaven; that almost every corner of the land is filled with wilful, deliberate perjury.

I speak not now of the perjuries which every common swearer cannot but run into day by day: (and indeed common "swearing notoriously contributes to the growth of perjury; for oaths are little minded when common use has sullied them, and every minute's repetition has made them cheap and vulgar:") nor of those which are continually committed and often detected in our open courts of justice. Only with regard to the latter I must remark, that they are a natural consequence of that monstrous, shocking manner wherein oaths are usually administered therein; without any decency or seriousness at all; much less with that awful solemnity which a rational Heathen would expect in an immediate appeal to the great God of heaven.

I had once designed to consider all the oaths which are customarily taken by any set of men among us. But I soon found this was a work too weighty for me; so almost *in infinitum* [infinitely] are oaths multiplied in England: I suppose, to a degree which is not known in any other nation in Europe.

What I now propose is, to instance only in a few, (but those not of small importance,) and to show how amazingly little regard is had to what is solemnly promised or affirmed before God.

6. This is done in part to my hands by a late author. So far as he goes, I shall little more than transcribe his words:—

"When a justice of peace is sworn into the commission, he makes oath, — that he shall do equal right to the poor and to the rich, after his cunning, wit, and power, and after the laws and customs of the realm and statutes thereof made, in all articles in the king's commission to him

directed.² What those articles are, you will find in the first assignavimus of the commission: 'We have assigned you and every one of you, jointly and severally, to keep, and cause to be kept, all ordinances and statutes made for the quiet rule and government of our people, in all and every the articles thereof, according to the force, form, and effect of the same, and to chastise and punish all persons offending against any of them, according to the form of those statutes and ordinances.' So that he is solemnly sworn to the execution of all such statutes as the legislative power of the nation has thought fit to throw upon his care. Such are all those (among others) made against drunkenness, tippling, profane swearing, blasphemy, lewd and disorderly practices, and profanation of the Lord's day. And it is hard to imagine how a justice of peace can think himself more concerned to suppress riots or private quarrels, than he is to levy twelve pence on a profane swearer, five shillings on a drunkard, ten shillings on the public house that suffers tippling, or any other penalty which the law exacts on vice and immorality. The same oath binds him both to one and the other, laying an equal obligation on his conscience. How a magistrate who neglects to punish excess, profaneness, and impiety, can excuse himself from the guilt of perjury, I do not pretend to know. If he reasons fairly, he will find himself as much forsworn, as an evidence who being upon his oath to declare the whole truth, nevertheless conceals the most considerable part of it. And his perjury is so much the more infamous, as the ill example and effects of it will be mischievous." (*Mr. Disney's First Essay*, p. 30.)

7. The same author (in the preface to his Second Essay) goes on:—

"You, gentlemen of the grand juries, take a solemn oath, that 'you will diligently inquire, and true presentment make, of all such articles, matters, and things as shall be given you in charge: as also, that you will (not only present no person for envy, hatred, or malice, but) not leave any unpresented, for fear, favour, or affection.' Now, are not the laws against immorality and profaneness given you in charge, as well as those against riots, felony, and treason? Are not presentment and indictment one method expressly appointed by the statutes, for the punishment of drunkenness and tippling? Are not houses of bawdry and gaming punishable in the same courts, and, consequently, presentable by you? Is not the proclamation for the punishing of vice, profaneness, and immorality always read before you as soon as you are sworn? And does not the judge of assize, or chairman of the bench, in the charge given immediately after the reading it, either recite to you the particular laws against such offences, or refer you for them to that proclamation? It is plain from all this, that you are bound upon your oaths to present all vice and immorality, as well as other crimes, that fall within your knowledge, because they are expressly given you in charge. And this you are to do, not only when evidence is offered before you by the information of others, but with regard to all such offences as you or any of you are able, of your own personal knowledge, to present; all which you have sworn to do impartially, without fear, favour, or affection."

I leave it now with all reasonable men to consider, how few grand jurors perform this; and, consequently, what multitudes of them, throughout the nation, fall under the guilt of wilful perjury!

8. The author proceeds: "I shall next address myself to you that are constables. And to you I must needs say, that if you know your duty, it is no thanks to us that are justices. For the oath we usually give you is so short, and in such general terms, that it leaves with you no manner of instruction in the particulars of the office to which you are sworn. But

that which ought to be given you, recites part of your duty in the following words:—

“You shall do your best endeavour, that rogues, vagabonds, and night walkers be apprehended; and that the statutes made for their punishment be duly put in execution. You shall have a watchful eye to such as shall keep any house or place where any unlawful game is used; as also to such as shall frequent such places, or shall use any unlawful game there or elsewhere. You shall present all and every the offences contrary to the statutes made to restrain the tipping in inns, alehouses, and other victualling houses, and for repressing of drunkenness. You shall once in the year, during your office, present all Popish recusants. You shall well and duly execute all precepts and warrants to you directed. And you shall well and duly, according to your knowledge, power, and ability, do and execute all other things belonging to the office of a constable, so long as you shall continue therein.” (p. 8.)

“Upon this, I would observe, first, that actors of plays are expressed by name within the statute, to be taken up for vagabonds, and punished accordingly; and that though a statute of Queen Elizabeth’s excepts such companies as have a license under the hand and seal of a nobleman, yet a later statute in the reign of King James the First has taken away that protection from them, by declaring, that ‘from thenceforth no authority to be given by any peer of the realm shall be available to free or discharge them from the pains and punishments of that former statute.’ Every constable, therefore, in those parishes where any of these strolling players come, is bound by his oath, to seize upon, correct, and send them packing without delay.

“The next part of your oath obliges you to keep a watchful eye on such houses that keep and such persons as use unlawful gaming. The statute directs you weekly, or at least monthly, to search within your liberties all houses or places suspected of this offence, and, upon discovering, to bring them to punishment. Upon this article, I would observe, (1.) That the law makes some allowance for artificers, husbandmen, apprentices, labourers, and servants, to play in Christmas, but at no other time of the year; and, (2.) That all sports and pastimes whatsoever are made unlawful upon the Lord’s day, by a statute of King Charles II. You are therefore bound upon oath, to bring to punishment such as are guilty of profaning that day by any sports or pastimes whatsoever.

“The following parts of your oath are, (1.) That you shall present all and every the offences of tipping and drunkenness that come to your knowledge. (2.) That you shall once in the year present all Popish recusants; nay, and by the statute on which your oath is grounded, you are obliged once a year to present in session all those within your parishes who (not being Dissenters) come not once in a month, at least, to church. And, (3.) That you shall well and duly execute all precepts and warrants to you directed. I believe no constable will pretend to be ignorant of this. How is it then, that when we send out warrants, to levy on offenders for swearing, drunkenness, and the like, those warrants are so ill obeyed? Are you not sworn to execute these as well as any other, and that duly too, according to the tenor of your precept? Your precept tells you, You shall demand such a sum; and if the offender will not pay, you shall levy it by distress of his goods; and if no distress can be taken, you are then only to set him in the stocks; otherwise you have no authority so to do; nor is the setting him in the stocks, when you might have restrained, any execution of your precept.

“The last part of your oath is in general terms: that you shall well and duly, according to your knowledge, power, and ability, do and execute all other things belonging to the office of a constable. I shall instance in some things which certainly belong to your office, because you, and

none else, can do them. (1.) A constable may, without a warrant, apprehend any persons, and carry them before a justice, who are driving carts, horses, or cattle on the Lord's day. (2.) Such as he shall find at sports and pastimes on that day. (3.) Such as he shall find tippling in public houses. (4.) Shopkeepers selling, or exposing goods to sale, on the Lord's day. And, Lastly, such as he shall find drunk or blaspheming, or profanely swearing or cursing.

"Thus I have shown you, in part, what belongs to your office: it is well, if, according to the tenor of your oath, you duly, according to your knowledge and ability, do and execute all these things. But remember, that, if you do not, if you neglect any of them, you are forsworn."

Now let all men judge, how many constables in England are clear of wilful perjury!

9. "I will now," he goes on, "address myself to churchwardens. Your oath is, 'that you shall well and truly execute the office of a churchwarden, for the ensuing year; and, to the best of your skill and knowledge, present such persons and things as are presentable by the ecclesiastical laws of this realm.' I shall set down only a few of these.

"The statute of King James I. obliges you to present, once a year, all monthly absenters from church.

"The ninetieth canon enjoins you, first to admonish, and then, if they reform not, to present, all your parishioners who do not duly resort to church on Sundays, and there continue the whole time of divine service. On this article observe, (1.) That a person's being absent from church, is ground sufficient for you to proceed. (2.) That you are not only to present those who do not come to church, but also those that behave irreverently or indecently there, either walking about or talking; all who do not abide there, orderly and soberly, the whole time of service and sermon, and all that loiter away any part of that time in the churchyard or in the fields.

"The one hundred and twelfth canon enjoins you, within forty days after Easter, to exhibit to the bishop, or his chancellor, the names of all above the age of sixteen, within your parish, that did not receive the communion.

"Other statutes oblige you to present drunkenness, tippling, and public houses suffering persons to tittle in them.

"And the one hundred and ninth canon binds you to present all manner of vice, profaneness, and debauchery, requiring you faithfully to present all and every the offenders in adultery, whoredom, drunkenness, profane swearing, or any other uncleanness and wickedness of life. It is therefore a part of that office to which you are solemnly sworn, to present, not only all drunkenness and tippling, but profane swearing, lewdness, and whatsoever else is contrary to Christian piety. So that if you know any of your parishioners, be his quality or circumstances what they will, that is guilty of any of these, you are obliged to present him at the next visitation, or you are yourselves guilty of perjury. And the twenty-sixth canon expresses such an abhorrence of a churchwarden's neglect in this matter, that it forbids the minister, in any wise, to admit you to the holy communion, 'who,' as the words of the canon are, 'having taken your oaths to present all such offences in your several parishes, shall, notwithstanding your said oaths, either in neglecting or refusing to present, wittingly and willingly, desperately and irreligiously, incur the horrid guilt of perjury.'"

And who is clear? I appeal to every minister of a parish, from one end of England to the other, how many churchwardens have you known,

in twenty, thirty, forty years, who did not thus “desperately and irreli-
giously incur the horrid guilt of perjury?”

10. I proceed to perjuries of another kind. The oath taken by all captains of ships, every time they return from a trading voyage, runs in these terms :—

“I do swear, that the entry above written, now tendered and subscribed by me, is a just report of the name of my ship, its burden, bulk, property, number and country of mariners, the present master and voyage; and that it doth farther contain a true account of my lading, with the particular marks, numbers, quantity, quality, and consignment of all the goods and merchandises in my said ship, to the best of my knowledge; and that I have not broke bulk, or delivered any goods out of my said ship, since her loading in. So help me God.”

These words are so clear, express, and unambiguous, that they require no explanation. But who takes this plain oath, without being *knowingly and deliberately forsworn*? Does one captain in fifty? Does one in five hundred? May we not go farther yet? Are there five captains of vessels now in London, who have not, at one time or another, by this very oath, which they knew to be false when they took it, incurred the guilt of wilful perjury?

11. The oath which all officers of his majesty’s customs take, at their admission into the office, runs thus :—

“I do swear to be true and faithful in the execution, to the best of my knowledge and power, of the trust committed to my charge and inspection, in the service of his majesty’s customs; and that I will not take or receive any reward or gratuity, directly or indirectly, other than my salary, or what is or shall be allowed me from the crown, or the regular fees established by law, for any service done or to be done in the execution of my employment in the customs, on any account whatsoever. So help me God.”

On this it may be observed, (1.) That there are regular fees, “established by law,” for some of these officers: (2.) That the rest do hereby engage not to take or receive “any reward or gratuity, directly or indirectly,” other than their salary or allowance from the crown, “on any account whatsoever.”

How do the former keep this solemn engagement? they whose fees are “established by law?” Do they take those established fees, and no more? Do they not “receive any farther gratuity,” not “on any account whatsoever?” If they do, they are undeniably guilty of wilful perjury.

And do the latter take no fees at all? Do they receive “no reward or gratuity, for any service done, or to be done, in the execution of their employment?” Do they not take any money, “directly or indirectly, on any account whatsoever?” Every time they do receive either more or less, they also are flatly forsworn.

Yet who scruples either the one or the other? either the taking a larger fee than the law appoints; or the taking any fee, large or small, which is offered, even where the law appoints none at all?

What innumerable perjuries, then, are here committed, over and over, day by day! and without any remorse; without any shame; without any fear either of God or man!

12. I will produce but one instance more. The oath of one who votes for a member of parliament is this :—

“I do swear, I have not received or had, by myself, or of any person whatsoever in trust for me, or for my use and benefit, directly or indirectly, any sum or sums of money, office, place, or employment, gift, or reward, or any promise or security for any money, office, employment, or gift, in order to give my vote at this election, and that I have not before been polled at this election. So help me God.”

We may observe here, (1.) That this oath is taken once in seven years (if required) by all the freeholders, in every county throughout England and Wales, as well as by all the freemen in every city and borough-town: and, (2.) That hereby every voter swears, in words liable to no evasion, that he has not received, directly or indirectly, any gift or reward, or promise of any.

But, to pass over those godless and shameless wretches who frequently vote twice at one election, how few are there who can take this oath with a conscience void of offence! who have not received, directly or indirectly, any gift, or promise of any! No! have not *you*? If you have received nothing else, have not you received meat or drink? And did you pay for the meat or drink you received? If not, that was a gift; and, consequently, you are as really perjured as the man that has received a hundred pounds.

What a melancholy prospect is then before us! Here are almost all the common people of any substance throughout the land, both in the city and country, calling God to record to a known, wilful falsehood!

13. I shall conclude this head in the weighty words of the author before cited:—

“Most of these, I am afraid, look upon their oaths as things of course, and little to be regarded. But can there be any thing in the world more sacred than an oath? Is it not a solemn appeal to God for your sincerity? And is not that very appeal an acknowledgment, that he will surely punish falsehood? Nay, farther, is it not a calling down the vengeance of God upon yourselves, if you are false? Do you not, by laying your hand upon the Gospel, declare that you hope for no salvation by Christ, if you perform not what you then promise, or if what you then affirm is not true? And do not the words, ‘So help me God,’ sufficiently prove, that the intention of your oath is so; and that if you swear false, you are to expect no mercy from God, either in this world or the next? And do you not personally and expressly give your consent to this heavy curse, by kissing the book? How, then, dare any of you to venture to play with so awful an engagement? Is it that you think the oath of a grand-juryman or parish officer” (of a captain, an officer of the customs, or a voter in elections) “is not as sacred and binding as that of an evidence at the bar? What is it can make the difference? Both of them are equally appeals to God, and imprecations of his vengeance upon wilful perjury.”

14. If there be, then, a God that is not mocked, what a weight of sin lies on this nation! and sin of no common die; for perjury has always been accounted one of the deepest stain. And how will any one attempt to excuse this? by adding blasphemy thereto! So indeed some have done; saying, like those of old, “Tush, thou God carest not for it. The Lord seeth” (that is, regardeth) “us not. The Lord hath forsaken the earth.” He has left second causes to take their course, and man “in the hand of his own counsel.”

How many are they who now speak thus! according to whose minute

philosophy the particular providence of God is utterly exploded, the hairs of our head are no longer numbered; and not only a sparrow, but a city, an empire, may fall to the ground, without the will or care of our heavenly Father. You allow, then, only a general providence. I do not understand the term. Be so kind as to let me know what you mean by a "general providence, contradistinguished from a particular one." I doubt you are at a loss for an answer; unless you mean some huge, unwieldy thing, (I suppose, resembling the *primum mobile* [the prime mover] in the Ptolemaic system,) which continually whirls the whole universe round, without affecting one thing more than another. I doubt this hypothesis will demand more proof than you are at present able to produce; beside that, it is attended with a thousand difficulties, such as you cannot readily solve. It may be, therefore, your wisest way for once to think with the vulgar, to acquiesce in the plain scriptural account. This informs us, that although God dwelleth in heaven, yet he still "ruleth over all;" that his providence extends to every individual in the whole system of beings which he hath made; that all natural causes of every kind depend wholly upon his will; and he increases, lessens, suspends, or destroys their efficacy, according to his own good pleasure; that he uses preternatural causes at his will,—the ministry of good or of evil angels; and that he hath never yet precluded himself from exerting his own immediate power, from speaking life or death into any of his creatures, from looking a world into being or into nothing.

"Thinkest thou then, O man, that thou shalt escape the judgment of" this great God? O, no longer "treasure up unto thyself wrath against the day of wrath!" Thou canst not recall what is past; but now "keep thyself pure," even were it at the price of all that thou hast; and acknowledge the goodness of God, in that he did not long since cut thee off, and send thee to thy own place.

15. The Jews of old were charged by God with profaning his Sabbath also. And do we Christians come behind them herein? (I speak of those who acknowledge the obligation.) Do we call "the Sabbath a delight, holy of the Lord, honourable; not doing our own ways, not finding our own pleasure, nor speaking our own words?" Do our "man servant and maid servant" rest thereon, and the "stranger that is within our gates?" Is no business, but what is really necessary, done within our house? You know in your own conscience, and God knoweth, that the very reverse of this is true.

But setting aside these things, which are done, as it were, by stealth, whether by mean or honourable men; how many are they, in every city, as well as in this, who profane the Sabbath with a high hand? How many in this, that openly defy both God and the king, that break the laws, both divine and human, by working at their trade, delivering their goods, receiving their pay, or following their ordinary business, in one branch or another, and "wiping their mouths and saying, I do no evil." How many buy and sell on the day of the Lord, even in the open streets of this city? How many open or (with some modesty) half open their shops? even when they have not the pretence of perishable goods; without any pretence at all; money is their god, and gain their godliness. But what are all these droves in the skirts of the town, that well nigh cover the face of the earth? till they drop one after another into the

numerous receptacles prepared for them in every corner. What are these to gain by profaning the day of the Lord? Nothing at all. They "drink in iniquity like water." Nay, many of them pay for their sin; perhaps great part of what should sustain their family the ensuing week. I know not what is "finding our own pleasure, or doing our own ways," if this is not. What then shall we plead in your excuse? that "many others do it as well as you?" Nay, number is so far from extenuating your fault, that it aggravates it above measure. For this is open war against God. And a whole army of you joins together, and with one consent, in the face of the sun, "runs upon the thick bosses of his buckler."

16. It is once mentioned in the Prophets, "In thee" (Jerusalem) "they have set light by father and mother." But frequent mention is made of their setting light by their civil parents, of their murmurings and rebellions against their governors. Yet surely our boasting against them is excluded, even in this respect. For do not all our histories witness such a series of mutinies, seditions, factions, and rebellions, as are scarce to be paralleled in any other kingdom since the world began? And has not the wild, turbulent, ungovernable spirit of our countrymen been continually acknowledged and lamented (as abundance of their writings testify to this day) by the cool, rational part of the nation? Terrible effects whereof have been seen and felt, more or less, in every generation.

But did this spirit exist only in times past? Blessed be God, it is now restrained, it does not break out; but the traces thereof are still easy to be found. For, whence springs this continual "speaking evil of dignities?" of all who are at the helm of public affairs? Whence this "speaking evil of the ruler of our people," so common among all orders of men? I do not include those whose province it is to inspect all the public administrations. But is not almost every private gentleman in the land, every clergyman, every tradesman, yea, every man or woman that has a tongue, a politician, a settler of the state? Is not every carman and porter abundantly more knowing than the king, lords, and commons together? able to tell you all their foibles, to point out their faults and mistakes, and how they ought to proceed, if they will save the nation? Now all this has a natural undeniable tendency to mutiny and rebellion. O what need have we, above any nation upon earth, of His continual care and protection, who alone is able to "rule the raging of the sea, and still the madness of the people!"

17. But to proceed: Were there "drunkards in Ephraim, mighty to drink wine, men of strength to mingle strong drink?" And are there not in England? Are they not the growth of every county, city, and town therein? These do not indeed, or not often, "rise up early, that they may follow strong drink;" and so "continue till night, till wine inflame them." They have found a readier way; namely, to begin at night, and continue following their wine or strong drink till the morning. And what numbers are there of these throughout the land! lost to reason and humanity, as well as to religion; so that no wonder "they regard not the works of the Lord, neither consider the operation of his hands."

Nor indeed have our drunkards need to continue from morning "to night, until wine inflame them;" seeing they have found a far more

compendious method of casting aside all sense and reason, and disencumbering themselves of all remains either of conscience, or understanding. So that whatever work of darkness is speedily to be done, and that without any danger of being interrupted, either by fear, compassion, or remorse, they may be in a few moments, by one draught, as effectually qualified for it, as if they could swallow a legion of devils. Or, (if that be all their concern,) they may, at a moderate expense, destroy their own body as well as soul, and plunge through this liquid fire into that "prepared for the devil and his angels."

Friend! stop. You have the form of a man still; and perhaps some remains of understanding. O may the merciful God lay hold of that! Unto him all things are possible. Think a little for once. What is it you are doing? Why should you destroy yourself? I could not use the worst enemy I have in the world as you use yourself. Why should you murder yourself inch by inch? Why should you burn yourself alive? O spare your own body at least, if you have no pity for your soul! But have you a soul then? Do you really believe it? What, a soul that must live for ever! O spare thy soul! Do not destroy thy own soul with an everlasting destruction! It was made for God. Do not give it into the hands of that old murderer of men! Thou canst not stupify it long. When it leaves the body, it will awake and sleep no more. Yet a little while, and it launches out into the great deep, to live, and think, and feel for ever. And what will cheer thy spirit there, if thou hast not a drop of water to cool thy tongue? But the die is not yet cast: now cry to God, and iniquity shall not be thy ruin.

18. Of old time there were also those that "were at ease in Zion, that lay upon beds of ivory, and stretched themselves upon their couches, that ate the lambs out of the flock, and calves out of the stall." But how inelegant were these ancient epicures! "Lambs out of the flock, and calves out of the stall!" Were these the best dainties they could procure? How have we improved since Jeroboam's time! Who can number the varieties of our tables; or the arts we have "to enlarge the pleasure of tasting?" And what are their couches, or beds of ivory, to the furniture of our apartments? or their "chains, and bracelets, and mantles, and changeable suits of apparel," to the ornaments of our persons? What comparison is there between their diversions and ours? Look at Solomon in all his glory, and yet may we not question, whether he was not an utter stranger to the pleasures of the chase? And, notwithstanding his forty thousand horses, did he ever see a race in his life? He "made gardens, and orchards, and pools of water; he planted vineyards, and built houses;" but had he one theatre among them all? No. This is the glory of later times. Or had he any conception of a ball, an assembly, a masquerade, or a ridotto? And who imagines that all his instruments of music, put together, were any more to be compared to ours, than his or his father's rumbling Hebrew verses,

To the soft sing-song of Italian lays.

In all these points, our pre-eminence over the Jews is much every way.

Yea, and over our own ancestors, as well as theirs. But is this our glory, or our shame? Were Edward III, or Henry V, to come among us now, what would they think of the change in their people? Would

they applaud the elegant variety at the old baron's table? or the costly delicacy of his furniture and apparel? Would they listen to these instruments of music, or find pleasure in those diversions? Would they rejoice to see the nobles and gentry of the land lying "at ease, stretching themselves on beds" of down? too delicate to use their own limbs, even in the streets of the city; to bear the touch of the people, the blowing of the wind, or the shining of the sun! O how would their hearts burn within them! What indignation, sorrow, shame must they feel, to see the ancient hardiness lost, the British temperance, patience, and scorn of superfluities, the rough, indefatigable industry, exchanged for softness, "idleness, and fulness of bread!" Well for them that they were gathered unto their fathers before this exchange was made!

19. To prove at large, that the luxury and sensuality, the sloth and indolence, the softness and idleness, the effeminacy and false delicacy of our nation are without a parallel, would be but lost labour. I fear, we may say, the lewdness too; for if the Jews, as the prophet speaks, "assembled themselves by troops in the harlots' houses," so do the English, and much more abundantly. Indeed, where is male chastity to be found? among the nobility, among the gentry, among the tradesmen, or among the common people of England? How few lay any claim to it at all! How few desire so much as the reputation of it! Would you yourself account it an honour or a reproach, to be ranked among those of whom it is said, "These are they which are not defiled with women: for they are virgins?" And how numerous are they now, even among such as are accounted men of honour and probity, "who are as fed horses, every one neighing after his neighbour's wife!"

But as if this were not enough, is not the sin of Sodom, too, more common among us than ever it was in Jerusalem? Are not our streets beset with those monsters of uncleanness, who "burn in their lust one toward another," whom God hath "given up to a reprobate mind, to do those things which are not convenient?" O Lord, thy compassions fail not: therefore we are not consumed.

20. Neither do we yield to them in injustice, any more than uncleanness. How frequent are open robberies among us! Is not "the act of violence" even "in our streets?" And what laws are sufficient to prevent it? Does not theft of various kinds abound in all parts of the land, even though death be the punishment of it? And are there not among us, who "take usury and increase," who "greedily gain of their neighbour by extortion?" yea, whole trades which subsist by such extortion as was not named either among the Jews or Heathens? "Is there not" yet "the scant measure, the wicked balances, and the bag of deceitful weights?" beside the thousand nameless ways of overreaching and defrauding, the craft and mystery of every trade and profession. It were an endless task to descend to particulars, to point out in every circumstance, how not only sharpers and gamesters, (those public nuisances, those scandals to the English nation,) but high and low, rich and poor, men of character, and men of none, in every station of public or private life, "have corrupted themselves," and generally applaud themselves, and count it policy and wisdom so to do; so that if gain be at hand, they care not though "justice stand afar off;" so that "he which departeth from evil," which cometh not into their secret, still "maketh himself a

prey;" and "the wicked" still "devoureth the man that is more righteous than he."

And what redress? Suppose a great man to oppress the needy; suppose the rich grinds the face of the poor; what remedy against such oppression can he find in this Christian country? If the one is rich and the other poor, doth not justice stand afar off? And is not the poor under the utmost improbability (if not impossibility) of obtaining it? Perhaps the hazard is greater among us, than either among Jews, Turks, or Heathens.

For example: Suppose a great man, with or without form of law, does wrong to his poor neighbour. What will he do? sue his lordship at common law? have the cause tried at the next sessions or assizes? Alas! your own neighbours, those who know the whole case, will tell you, "You are out of your senses." "But twelve good men and true will do me justice." Very well; but where will you find them;—men unbiassed, incapable of corruption, superior both to fear and favour, to every view, whether of gain or loss? But this is not all; they must not only be good and true, but wise and understanding men. Else how easy is it for a skilful pleader to throw a mist before their eyes? even supposing too the judge to be quite impartial, and proof against all corruption. And should all these circumstances concur, (of which I fear there are not many precedents,) supposing a verdict is given in your favour, still you have gained nothing. The suit is removed into a higher court, and you have all your work to begin again. Here you have to struggle with all the same difficulties as before, and perhaps many new ones too. However, if you have money enough, you may succeed; but if that fails, your cause is gone. Without money, you can have no more law; poverty alone utterly shuts out justice.

But "cannot an honest attorney procure me justice?" An *honest* attorney! Where will you find one? Of those who are called exceeding honest attorneys, who is there that makes any scruple,—

- (1.) To promote and encourage needless suits, if not unjust ones too:
- (2.) To defend a bad cause, knowing it so to be,—by making a demur, and then withdrawing it; by pleading some false plea, to the plaintiff's declaration; by putting in an evasive answer to his bill; by protracting the suit, if possible, till the plaintiff is ruined:
- (3.) To carry a cause not amounting to ten shillings into Westminster Hall, by laying it in his declaration as above forty:
- (4.) To delay his own client's suit knowingly and wilfully, in order to gain more thereby:
- (5.) To draw himself the pleadings or conveyances of his client, instead of giving them to be drawn by able counsel:
- (6.) To charge his client with the fees which should have been given to such counsel, although they were not given:
- (7.) To charge for drawing fair copies, where none were drawn:
- (8.) To charge fees for expedition given to clerks, when not one farthing has been given them:
- (9.) To send his clerk a journey (longer or shorter) to do business with or for different persons; and to charge the horse hire and expense of that journey to every person severally:
- (10.) To send his clerk to Westminster, on the business of ten (it

may be) or twenty persons, and to charge each of these twenty for his attendance, as if he had been sent on account of one only :

(11.) To charge his own attendance in like manner : and,

(12.) To fill up his bill with attendances, fees, and term-fees, though his client is no whit forwarder in his cause ?

This is he that is called an *honest* attorney ! How much *honest*er is a pickpocket !

But there is a magistrate whose peculiar office it is to redress the injured and oppressed. Go, then, and make trial of this remedy ; go, and tell your case to the lord chancellor. Hold ; you must go on regularly ; you must tell him your case in form of law, or not at all. You must therefore file a bill in chancery, and retain a lawyer belonging to that court. “ But you have already spent all you have ; you have no money.” Then I fear you will have no justice. You stumble at the threshold. If you have either lost or spent all, your case is nought ; it will not even come to a hearing. So, if the oppressor has secured all that you had, he is as safe as if you was under the earth.

21. Now, what an amazing thing is this ! The very greatness of the villany makes it beyond redress ! But suppose he that is oppressed has some substance left, and can go through all the courts of justice, what parallel can we find among Jews, Turks, or Heathens, for either the delays or the expense attending it ? With regard to the former, how monstrous is it, that in a suit relating to that inheritance which is to furnish you and your family with food and raiment, you must wait month after month, perhaps year after year, before it is determined whether it be yours or not ! And what are you to eat or to wear in the mean time ? Of that the court takes no cognizance ! Is not this very delay (suppose there were no other grievance attending the English course of law) wrong beyond all expression ? contrary to all sense, reason, justice, and equity ? A capital cause is tried in one day, and finally decided at once. And “ is the life less than meat ; or the body of less concern than raiment ?” What a shameless mockery of justice, then, is this putting off pecuniary causes from term to term, yea, from year to year !

With regard to the latter : a man has wronged me of a hundred pounds. I appeal to a judge for the recovery of it. How astonishing is it that this judge himself cannot give me what is my right, and what evidently appears so to be, unless I first give, perhaps, one half of the sum to men I never saw before in my life !

22. I have hitherto supposed that all causes, when they are decided, are decided according to justice and equity. But is it so ? Ye learned in the law, is no unjust sentence given in your courts ? Have not the same causes been decided quite opposite ways ? one way this term, just the contrary the next ? Perhaps one way in the morning, (this I remember an instance of,) and another way in the afternoon. How is this ? Is there no justice left on earth ; no regard for right or wrong ? Or have causes been puzzled so long, that you know not now what is either wrong or right ; what is agreeable to law, or contrary to it ? I have heard some of you frankly declare, that it is in many cases next to impossible to know what is law, and what is not. So are your folios of law multiplied upon you, that no human brain is able to contain them ; no, nor any consistent scheme or abstract of them all.

But is it really owing to ignorance of the law (this is the most favourable supposition) that so few of you scruple taking fees on either side of almost any cause that can be conceived; and that you generally plead in the manner you do on any side of any cause; rambling to and fro in a way so abhorrent from common sense, and so utterly foreign to the question? I have been amazed at hearing the pleadings of some eminent counsel; and when it has fallen out that the pleader on the other side understood only the common rules of logic, he has made those eminent men appear either such egregious knaves, if they could help it, or such egregious blockheads, if they could not, that one would have believed they would show their face there no more. Meantime, if there be a God that judgeth righteously, what horrid insults upon him are these! "Shall I not visit for these things, saith the Lord? Shall not my soul be avenged on such a nation as this?"

23. There is one instance more of (I know not what to term it) injustice, oppression, sacrilege, which hath long cried aloud in the ears of God. For among men, who doth hear? I mean the management of many of those who are entrusted with our public charities. By the pious munificence of our forefathers we have abundance of these of various kinds: but is it not glaringly true, (to touch only on a few generals,) that the managers of many of them either (1.) do not apply the benefaction to that use for which it was designed by the benefactor; or (2.) do not apply it with such care and frugality as in such a case are indispensably required; or (3.) do not apply the whole of the benefaction to any charitable use at all; but secrete part thereof, from time to time, for the use of themselves and their families; or, lastly, by plain, barefaced oppression, exclude those from having any part in such benefaction, who dare (though with all possible tenderness and respect) set before them the things that they have done?

Yet Brutus is an honourable man:

So are they all: All honourable men!

And some of them had in esteem for religion; accounted patterns both of honesty and piety! But God "seeth not as man seeth." He "shall repay them to their face;" perhaps even in the present world. For that scripture is often still fulfilled: "This is the curse that goeth forth over the face of the whole earth. I will bring it forth, saith the Lord of hosts, and it shall enter into the house of the thief," (such he is, and no better, in the eyes of God, no whit honester than a highwayman,) "and it shall remain in the midst of the house, and shall consume it, with the timber thereof, and the stones thereof."

24. And is not truth, as well as "justice, fallen in our streets?" For who "speaketh the truth from his heart?" Who is there that makes a conscience of speaking the thing as it is, whenever he speaks at all? Who scruples the telling of officious lies? the varying from truth, in order to do good? How strange does that saying of the ancient fathers sound in modern ears! "I would not tell a lie, no, not to save the souls of the whole world." Yet is this strictly agreeable to the word of God; to that of St. Paul in particular, If any say, "Let us do evil that good may come, their damnation is just."

But how many of us do this evil without ever considering whether good will come or no; speaking what we do not mean, merely out of

custom, because it is fashionable so to do! What an immense quantity of falsehood does this ungodly fashion occasion day by day! for hath it not overrun every part of the nation? How is all our language swollen with compliment; so that a well-bred person is not expected to speak as he thinks; we do not look for it at his hands! Nay, who would thank him for it? how few would suffer it! It was said of old, even by a warrior and a king, "He that telleth lies shall not tarry in my sight:" but are we not of another mind? Do not we rather say, "He that telleth not lies shall not tarry in my sight?" Indeed the trial seldom comes; for both speakers and hearers are agreed that form and ceremony, flattery and compliment, should take place, and truth be banished from all that know the world.

And if the rich and great have so small regard to truth, as to lie even for lying sake, what wonder can it be that men of lower rank will do the same thing for gain? what wonder that it should obtain, as by common consent, in all kinds of buying and selling? Is it not an adjudged case, that it is no harm to tell lies in the way of trade; to say that is the lowest price which is not the lowest; or that you will not take what you do take immediately? Insomuch that it is a proverb even among the Turks, when asked to abate of their price, "What! do you take me to be a Christian?" So that never was that caution more seasonable than it is at this day: "Take ye heed every one of his neighbour, and trust ye not in any brother: for every brother will utterly supplant, and they will deceive every one his neighbour."

25. And as for those few who abstain from outward sins, is their heart right with God? May he not say of us also, as of the Jews, "This people is uncircumcised in heart?" Are not you? Do you then "love the Lord your God with all your heart, and with all your strength?" Is he your God and your all, the desire of your eyes, the joy of your very heart? Rather, do you not "set up your idols in your heart?" Is not your belly your god, or your diversion, or your fair reputation, or your friend, or wife, or child? That is, plainly, do not you delight in some of these earthly goods, more than in the God of heaven? Nay, perhaps you are one of those grovelling souls that "pant after the dust of the earth!" Indeed, who does not? Who does not get as much as he can? Who of those that are not accounted covetous, yet does not gather all the money he can fairly, and perhaps much more? For are they those only whom the world rank among misers that use every art to increase their fortune; toiling early and late, spending all their strength in "loading themselves with thick clay?" How long? Until the very hour when God calleth them; when he saith unto each of them, "Thou fool! this night shall thy soul be required of thee! And whose shall those things be which thou hast prepared?"

26. And yet doth not our pride, even the pride of those whose soul "cleaves to the dust, testify against us?" Are they not "wise in their own eyes, and prudent in their own conceit?" Have not writers of our own remarked, that there is not upon earth a more self-conceited nation than the English; more opinated both of their own national and personal wisdom, and courage, and strength? And indeed, if we may judge by the inhabitants of London, this is evident to a demonstration; for are not the very meanest of them able to instruct both the king and all

his counsellors? What cobbler in London is not wiser than the principal secretary of state? What coffee house disputer is not an abler divine than his grace of Canterbury? And how deep a contempt of others is joined with this high opinion of ourselves! I know not whether the people of all other nations are greater masters of dissimulation; but there does not appear in any nation whatever such a proneness to despise their neighbour; to despise, not foreigners only, (near two thousand years ago they remarked, *Britannos hospitibus feros*,) [Britons cruel to strangers,] but their own countrymen; and that very often for such surprising reasons as nothing but undeniable fact could make credible. How often does the gentleman in his coach despise those dirty fellows that go a-foot; and these, on the other hand, despise full as much those lazy fellows that loll in their coaches! No wonder then that those who have "the form of godliness" should despise them that have it not; that the saint of the world so frequently says to the gross sinner, in effect, if not in terms, "Stand by thyself; come not near unto me; for I am holier than thou!"

27. Yet what kind of holiness is this? May not God justly declare of us also, "This people draw near me with their mouth, but they have removed their hearts far from me: they do but flatter me with their mouth, and dissemble with me in their tongue?" Is it not so with you? When you speak to God, do your lips and your heart go together? Do you not often utter words by which you mean just nothing? Do not you say and unsay; or say one thing to God, and another to man? For instance, you say to God, "Vouchsafe, O Lord, to keep me this day without sin:" but you say to man, "This cannot be done; it is all folly and madness to expect it." You ask of God that you "may perfectly love him, and worthily magnify his holy name:" but you tell man, "There is no perfect love upon earth; it is only a madman's dream." You pray God to "cleanse the thoughts of your heart, by the inspiration of his Holy Spirit:" but you assure your neighbour there is no such thing as inspiration now, and that none pretend to it but enthusiasts. What gross hypocrisy is this! Surely you think there is no "knowledge in the Most High. O be not deceived! God is not mocked. But whatsoever ye sow, that also shall ye reap!"

28. Such at present is the religion of this Christian nation! So do we honour Him by whose name we are called! And yet was there ever a nation more careless and secure, more unapprehensive of the wrath of God? How can a man more effectually expose himself to the ridicule of those who are esteemed men of understanding, than by showing any concern, as if the judgments of God were hanging over our heads? Surely, then, "a deceived heart hath turned us aside, that we cannot say, Is there not a lie in my right hand?" Surely this our confidence is not of God; it is rather a judicial infatuation, a stupid insensibility, a deep sleep, the forerunner of heavy vengeance.

Ruin behind it stalks, and empty desolation.

Surely never was any people more fitted for destruction! "Impudent children are they, and stiff-hearted. Are they ashamed when they have committed abomination;" when they have openly profaned the day of the Lord; when they have committed lewdness; or when they have uttered such curses and blasphemies as are not heard of among the

Heathens? Nay, "they are not at all ashamed, neither can they blush." And though God send unto them all his servants, rising up early and sending them, yet, "will they not hear; they harden their neck; they do worse than their fathers."

What, then, can "God do more for his vineyard which he hath not done?" He hath long tried us with mercies, "giving rain and fruitful seasons, filling us with the flour of wheat." But still "this revolting and rebellious people say not, Let us now fear the Lord our God." Nay, they gave him no thanks for all his mercies; they did not even acknowledge them to be his gift. They did not see the hand of God in any of these things; they could account for them another way. O ye unwise, when will ye understand? Know ye not yet, there is a God that ruleth the world? What did ye see with your eyes? Was the "race to the swift, or the battle to the strong?" Have ye forgotten Dettingen already? Does not England know that God was there? Or suppose your continuance in peace, or success in war, be the mere result of your own wisdom and strength; do ye command the sun and the clouds also? Can ye pour out or "stay the bottles of heaven?" But let it all be nature, chance, any thing,—so God may have no hand in governing the earth!

29. Will his judgments bring us to a better mind? Do we "hear the rod, and Him that has appointed it?" Let us observe: "What fruit do we find in those who are "even consumed by means of his heavy hand?" Let any one that desires to be clearly satisfied herein visit the hospitals of this city. Let him judge for himself how the patients there receive God's fatherly visitation; especially there, because mercy also is mixed with judgment; so that it is evident "the Lord loveth whom he chasteneth." Go then into any ward, either of men or women; look narrowly from one end to the other: are they humbling themselves under the hand of God? Are they trembling under a sense of his anger? Are they praising him for his love? Are they exhorting one another not to faint when they are rebuked of him? How do nine in ten of them spend the time, that important time, from morning to evening? Why, in such a manner, that you would not easily learn, from thence, whether they were Christians, Pagans, or Mohammedans.

Is there any deeper distress than this to be found? Is there a greater affliction than the loss of health? Perhaps there is,—the loss of liberty, especially as it is sometimes circumstanced. You may easily be convinced of this, by going into either Ludgate or Newgate. What a scene appears as soon as you enter! The very place strikes horror into your soul. How dark and dreary! How unhealthy and unclean! How void of all that might minister comfort! But this is little, compared to the circumstances that attend the being confined in this shadow of death. See that poor wretch, who was formerly in want of nothing, and encompassed with friends and acquaintance, now cut off, perhaps, by an unexpected stroke, from all the cheerful ways of men; ruined, forsaken of all, and delivered into the hands of such masters, and such companions! I know not, if to one of a thinking, sensible turn of mind, there could be any thing like it on this side hell.

What effect then has this heavy visitation of God on those who lie under it for any time? There is perhaps an exception here and there;

but, in general, they are abandoned to all wickedness, utterly divested of all fear of God, and all reverence to man; insomuch, that they commonly go out of that school completely fitted for any kind or degree of villainy, perfectly brutal and devilish, thoroughly furnished for every evil word and work.

30. Are our countrymen more effectually reclaimed when danger and distress are joined? If so, the army, especially in time of war, must be the most religious part of the nation. But is it so indeed? Do the soldiery walk as those who see themselves on the brink of eternity? redeeming every opportunity of glorifying God, and doing good to men, because they know not the hour in which their Lord will require their souls of them? So far from it, that a soldier's religion is a by-word, even with those who have no religion at all; that vice and profaneness in every shape reign among them without control; and that the whole tenor of their behaviour speaks, "Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die."

Have those who are exposed to still more danger, the English sea forces, more religion than those at land? It is said they were once remarkable for this; and it is certain Sir Francis Drake feared God, as did most of his commanders, and, we have reason to believe, his mariners and sailors too. But what shall we say of the navy that now is, more particularly of the ships of war? Is religion there,—either the power or the form? Is not almost every single man-of-war a mere floating hell? Where is there to be found more consummate wickedness, a more full, daring contempt of God and all his laws,—except in the bottomless pit? But here description fails; and the goodness of God endureth yet daily! But "shall I not visit for these things, saith the Lord? Shall not my soul be avenged on such a nation as this?" O that the prospect of national judgments may suffice! that we may remember ourselves, and turn unto the Lord our God, before his long-suffering mercy is at an end, and he pours out the vials of his wrath upon us!

But how small ground have we as yet to hope for this! for who will now "suffer the word of exhortation?" How few will "endure sound doctrine," and the honest, close application of it! Do they not "say unto the seers, See not; and unto the prophets, Prophecy smooth things?" And if a man will do thus, if he will "sew pillows to all arm holes," and "cause the Holy One of Israel to cease from before them, if he will prophesy of wine and strong drink, he shall even be the prophet of this people."

31. I am sensible how nice a subject this is, and how extremely difficult it is so to speak, as neither to say too little nor too much, neither more nor less than the cause of God requires. I know also, that it is absolutely impossible so to speak as not to give offence. But whosoever is offended, I dare not to be silent; neither may I refrain from plainness of speech; only I will endeavour to use all the tenderness I can consistently with that plainness.

In tender love then I ask, Are there none among us, (I speak to you, my brethren, who are priests and prophets of the Lord, set apart to "minister in holy things, and to declare the word of the Lord,")—Are there none among us who commit lewdness, as did those by whom "Israel was defiled?" Hath not the Lord seen a horrible thing in some

of the prophets of this land also, even, that "they commit adultery, and" (to conceal it) "walk in lies?" God forbid that I should affirm this. I only propose (not maintain) the question. If there be such a wretch, I pray God to strike him to the heart, and to say, "Thou art the man!"

Are there none of you, like them, "mighty to drink wine, men of strength to mingle strong drink?" Yea, are there none that "err through strong drink, that are swallowed up of wine?" Are there not found those who say, "I will fetch wine, and we will fill ourselves with strong drink; and to-morrow shall be as this day, and much more abundant?"

Alas, my brother, is this the voice of a "minister of Christ, a steward of the mysteries of God?" Suppose you find at any time trouble and heaviness, "is there no help for you in your God?" Is not the God whom you serve able to deliver you from any plague or trouble? Is the being "drunk with wine" a better relief than the being "filled with his Spirit?" Do you not understand this? Do you "not know the Lord?" Take heed you do not destroy both your own soul and them that hear you! O beware! If you know not his love, fear his power! Make haste to flee from the wrath to come, lest he smite you with a curse great as your sin, and sweep you away from the face of the earth.

32. Can such as you be said to honour or fear God, any more than those spoken of by Malachi? May not God complain, "These priests have violated my law and profaned my holy things?" yea, whensoever you presume with those unhallowed hands to touch the mysteries of God; whensoever you utter his name or his word with those unhallowed lips! But is it on this account only that God may say, "Both prophet and priest are profane?" May he not add, "They have put no difference between the holy and profane; therefore I am profaned among them?" For is it not so? Do you put a difference between the holy and profane; him that feareth God, and him that feareth him not? Do you put an effectual difference between them, even in the most solemn office of our religion? At the table of the Lord, do you take care to "separate the precious from the vile?" to "receive all those who" (as you may reasonably believe) "draw near with penitent hearts and lively faith," and utterly to reject those who testify against themselves, that they are without hope and without God in the world?

Nay, who dares repel one of the greatest men in his parish from the Lord's table; even though he be a drunkard or a common swearer; yea, though he openly deny the Lord that bought him? Mr. Stonehouse *did* this once. But what was the event? The gentleman brought an action against him, for the terror of all such insolent fellows in succeeding times.

33. O my brethren, is it not for want of your making this difference, as well as for many other abominations, that, with regard to some among us, (how many God knoweth,) that scripture is now also fulfilled: "His watchmen are blind, they are ignorant, they are shepherds that cannot understand:—The Lord hath poured out upon them the spirit of deep sleep, and hath closed their eyes; the prophets and the seers hath he covered: and the vision of all is become unto 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?"

If you ask, what those other abominations are; I will speak in love

and in the spirit of meekness. There are found among us covetous men, men who "mind earthly things," who "seek themselves" and not Christ crucified, who "love the world, and the things of the world;" men in whom these words are still fulfilled: "Who is there among you that would shut the door for nought? Neither do ye kindle fire on my altar for nought. I have no pleasure in you, saith the Lord of hosts." Yea, are there not those, at this day, (O that I might be found to fear where no fear is!) who "make themselves fat with the chiefest of all the offerings of Israel?" Are there not those who now "enlarge their desire as hell; who are as death, and cannot be satisfied?" who, though they want neither food to eat nor raiment to put on, yet seek more and more preferment? who are continually studying to "join house to house, and to lay field to field;" to grow rich in the service of that Master who himself "had not where to lay his head?" Is it not to these that those dreadful words belong, enough to cause the ears of him that heareth to tingle: "They are greedy dogs, which never can have enough; they all look to their own way," (not the way of their Lord,) "every one for his gain, from his quarter?"

Is it strange, if among these there should be some who are cruel, oppressive men; inasmuch as covetousness knows no mercy, nor can a lover of money be a lover of his neighbour? Have not some been known even to "grind the face of the poor?" to strip, rather than clothe, the naked? some, who, while they cried out, "as the horse-leech, Give, give," would take, if it was not given; like those of old, who said, "Thou shalt give it me now, and if not, I will take it by force;" or those spoken of by Micah, "The prophets bite with their teeth, and cry, Peace; and he that putteth not into their mouths, they even prepare war against him." Very great is the sin of these men before the Lord. If there be ten such now in the land, may God smite them this day with terror and astonishment, that they may have no rest in their bones till their sin is done away!

34. Are *you* as watchful and zealous to gain souls, as those are to gain the gold that perisheth? Do you know by experience what that meaneth, "The zeal of thine house hath eaten me up?" Or are you one of those watchmen who do not watch at all, who neither know nor care when the sword cometh? of whom the prophet saith, "They are dumb dogs that cannot bark, sleeping, lying down, loving to slumber?"

Can it be supposed that such shepherds will "feed the flock?" will "give to every one his portion of meat in due season?" Will these "warn every man, and exhort every man, that they may present every man perfect in Christ Jesus?" Will they take care to "know all their flock by name, not forgetting the men servants and women servants?" Will they inquire into the state of every soul committed to their charge; and watch over each with all tenderness and long suffering, "as they that must give account;" marking how they either fall or rise; how these wax "weary and faint in their mind;" and those "grow in grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ?" Who can do this, unless his whole heart be in the work; unless he desire nothing but to "spend and be spent for them; and count not his life dear unto himself, so he may present them blameless in the day of the Lord Jesus?"

Can any shepherd do this, (and if he do not, he will never "give an account with joy,") who imagines he has little more to do than to preach once or twice a week; that this is the main point, the chief part of the office, which he hath taken upon himself before God? What gross ignorance is this! What a total mistake of the truth! What a miserable blunder touching the whole nature of his office! It is, indeed, a very great thing to speak in the name of God; it might make him that is the stoutest of heart tremble, if he considered that every time he speaks to others, his own soul is at stake. But great, inexpressibly great, as this is, it is perhaps the least part of our work. To "seek and save that which is lost;" to bring souls from Satan to God; to instruct the ignorant; to reclaim the wicked; to convince the gainsayer; to direct their feet into the way of peace, and then keep them therein; to follow them step by step, lest they turn out of the way, and advise them in their doubts and temptations; to lift up them that fall; to refresh them that are faint; and to comfort the weak hearted; to administer various helps, as the variety of occasions require, according to their several necessities: these are parts of our office; all this we have undertaken at the peril of our own soul. A sense of this made that holy man of old cry out, "I marvel if any ruler in the Church shall be saved;" and a greater than him say, in the fulness of his heart, "Who is sufficient for these things?"

34. But who is not sufficient for these things, for the taking care of a parish, though it contain twenty thousand souls, if this implies no more than the taking care to preach there once or twice a week; and to procure one to read prayers on the other days, and do what is called *the parish duty*? Is any trade in the nation so easy as this? Is not any man sufficient for it, without any more talents, either of nature or grace, than a small degree of common understanding? But O! what manner of shepherds are those who look no farther into the nature of their office, who sink no deeper into the importance of it, than this! Were they not such as these concerning whom "the word of the Lord came unto Ezekiel, saying, Wo be to the shepherds that feed themselves! should not the shepherds feed the flock? Ye eat the fat, and ye clothe you with the wool; but ye feed not the flock. The diseased have ye not strengthened, neither have ye healed that which was sick, neither have ye bound up that which was broken, neither have ye brought again that which was driven away, neither have ye sought that which was lost.—And they were scattered, because there was no shepherd, and they became meat to all the beasts of the field. Yea, my flock was scattered upon all the face of the earth, and none did search or seek after them."

I conjure you, brethren, in the name of the Lord Jesus, the great Shepherd of the sheep, who hath bought them and us with his own blood, apply this each to his own soul. Let every man look unto God, and say, "Lord, is it I? Am I one of these idle, careless, indolent shepherds, that feed myself, not the flock? Am I one that cannot bark, slothful, sleeping, lying down, loving to slumber? one of those who have not strengthened that which was diseased, neither healed that which was sick? 'Search me, O Lord, and prove me; try out my reins and my heart. Look well if there be any way of wickedness in me, and lead me in the way everlasting.'

35. "Have I not, at least, 'healed the hurt of thy people slightly?' Have I not said, 'Peace, peace, when there was no peace?'"—How many are they also that do this? who do not study to speak what is true, especially to the rich and great, so much as what is pleasing? who flatter honourable sinners, instead of telling them plain, "How can ye escape the damnation of hell?" O, what an account have *you* to make, if there be a God that judgeth the earth? Will he not require at *your* hands the blood of all these souls, of whom "ye are the betrayers and murderers?" Well spake the prophets of your fathers, in whose steps ye now tread: "They have seduced my people; and one built up a wall, and another daubed it with untempered mortar. They strengthen the hands of the evil doers, that none doth return from his wickedness. They prophesy lies in my name, saith the Lord. They say unto them that despise me, Ye shall have peace; and unto them that walk after the imagination of their own heart, No evil shall come upon you."

How great will your damnation be, who destroy souls, instead of saving them! Where will you appear, or how will you stand, "in that great and terrible day of the Lord?" How will ye lift up your head, when the Lord "descends from heaven in flaming fire, to take vengeance on his adversaries;" more especially on those who have so betrayed his cause, and done Satan's work under the banner of Christ? With what voice wilt thou say, "Behold me, Lord, and the sheep whom thou hadst given me, whom I gave to the devil, and told them they were in the way to heaven, till they dropped into hell!"

Were they not just such shepherds of souls as you are, concerning whom God spake by Jeremiah,—“Many pastors have destroyed my vineyard; they have trodden my portion under foot; they have made my pleasant portion a desolate wilderness?” by Ezekiel,—“There is a conspiracy of her prophets; like a roaring lion ravening the prey, they have devoured souls?” and by Zechariah,—“Thus saith the Lord, Feed the flock of the slaughter, whose possessors slay them, and hold themselves not guilty; and they that sell them say, Blessed be the Lord, for I am rich; and their own shepherds pity them not?”

36. Is not this the real ground, the principal reason, of the present contempt of the clergy? And long since was it assigned as such by Him who cannot lie. The same men of old, who “made the Lord's people to transgress,” thereby “made themselves vile.” They were despised, both as the natural effect, and the judicial punishment, of their wickedness. And the same cause the prophet observes to have produced the same effect, many hundred years after this: “Ye are departed out of the way, saith the Lord; ye have caused many to stumble; therefore have I also made you contemptible and base before all the people.”

I have now, brethren, “delivered mine own soul;” and in so doing, I have (as I proposed at first) “used great plainness of speech,” as not studying “to please men, but the Lord.” The event I leave to Him in whose name I have spoken, and who hath the hearts of all men in his hand.

I “have brought you heavy tidings this day,” and yet I cannot but be persuaded that some of you will not “count me your enemy, because I tell you the truth.” O that all of us may taste the good word which we declare! may receive that knowledge of salvation which we are com-

manded to preach unto every creature, through the remission of sins! My heart's desire is, that all of us to whom "is committed the ministry of reconciliation" may ourselves be reconciled to God, through the blood of the everlasting covenant; that he may be henceforth unto us a God, and we may be unto him a people; that we may all know, as well as preach, the Lord, "from the least unto the greatest;" even by that token, "I am merciful to thy unrighteousness; thy sins I remember no more!"

III. 1. I have hitherto spoken more immediately to those who profess themselves members of the Church of England. But inasmuch as I am a debtor also to those who do not, my design is now, to apply to them also; and briefly to show, wherein (I fear) they are severally inconsistent with their own principles.

I begin with those who are at the smallest distance from us, whether they are termed Presbyterians or Independents: of whom in general I cannot but have a widely different opinion, from that I entertained some years ago; as having since then conversed with many among them, "in whom the root of the matter is" undeniably found; and who labour "to keep a conscience void of offence, both toward God and toward men." I cannot, therefore, doubt, but every serious man, of either one or the other denomination, does utterly condemn all that inward as well as outward unholiness which has been above described.

But do you, as a people, avoid what you condemn? Are no whoremongers or adulterers found among you; no children disobedient to their parents; no servants that are slothful or careless, that answer again, that do not "honour their masters as is meet in the Lord?" Are there none among you that censure or "speak evil of the ruler of their people?" Are there no drunkards, no gluttons, no luxurious men, no regular epicures, none "whose belly is their god," who, as their fortune permits, "fare sumptuously every day?" Have you no dishonest dealers, no unfair traders, no usurers, or extortioners? Have you no liars, either for gain, or for good manners, so called? Are you clear of ceremony and compliment? Alas, you are sensible, in most (if not all) these respects, you have now small pre-eminence over us.

How much more sensible must you be of this, if you do not rest on the surface, but inquire into the bottom of religion, the religion of the heart! For, what inward unholiness, what evil tempers, are among us, which have not a place among you also? You likewise bewail that ignorance of God, that want of faith and of the love of God and man, that inward idolatry of various kinds, that pride, ambition, and vanity, which rule in the hearts even of those who still have "the form of godliness." You lament before God the deep covetousness that "eats so many souls as doth a gangrene;" and perhaps are sometimes ready to cry out, "Help, Lord, for there is scarce one godly man left!" Lay to thine hand; "for the faithful are diminished from the children of men!"

2. And yet you retain "the truth that is after godliness," at least as to the substance of it. You own what is laid down in Scripture, both touching the nature and condition of justification and salvation. And with regard to the author of faith and salvation, you have always avowed, even in the face of your enemies, that "it is God which worketh in us, both to will and to do, of his good pleasure;" that it is his Spirit alone

who "teacheth us all things," all we know of "the deep things of God;" that every true believer has "an unction from the Holy One to lead him into all" necessary "truth;" that, "because we are sons, God sendeth forth the Spirit of his Son into our hearts, crying, Abba, Father;" and that "this Spirit beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God."

How is it then, my brethren; (so I can call you now, although I could not have done it heretofore;) how is it that the generality of you also are fallen from your steadfastness! In the times of persecution ye stood as a rock, though "all the waves and storms went over you." But who can bear ease and fulness of bread? How are you changed, since these came upon you! Do not many of you now (practically, I mean) put something else in the room of "faith that worketh by love?" Do not some of you suppose, that gravity and composedness of behaviour are the main parts of Christianity? especially, provided you neither swear, nor take the name of God in vain. Do not others imagine, that to abstain from idle songs, and those fashionable diversions commonly used by persons of their fortune, is almost the whole of religion? To which, if they add family prayer, and a strict observation of the Sabbath, then doubtless all is well. Nay, my brethren, this is well so far as it goes; but how little a way does it go toward Christianity! All these things, you cannot but see, are merely external; whereas Christianity is an inward thing, without which the most beautiful outward form is lighter than vanity.

Do not others of you rest in convictions or good desires? Alas, what do these avail? A man may be convinced he is sick, yea, deeply convinced, and yet never recover. He may desire food, yea, with earnest desire; and nevertheless perish with hunger. And thus I may be convinced I am a sinner; but this will not justify me before God. And I may desire salvation, (perhaps by fits and starts, for many years,) and yet be lost for ever. Come close then to the point, and keep to your principles. Have you received the Holy Ghost; the Spirit which is of God, and is bestowed by him on all believers, "that we may know the things which are freely given to us of God?" The time is short. Do you experience now that "unction from the Holy One," without which you confess outward religion, whether negative or positive, is nothing? Nay, and inward conviction of our wants is nothing, unless those wants are in fact supplied. Good desires also are nothing, unless we actually attain what we are stirred up to desire. For still, "if any man have not the Spirit of Christ," whatever he desires, "he is none of his." O my brother, beware you stop not short! Beware you never account yourself a Christian, no, not in the lowest degree, till God "hath sent forth the Spirit of Christ into your heart;" and that "Spirit bear witness with your spirit, that you are a child of God."

3. One step farther from us, are you who are called (though not by your own choice) Anabaptists. The smallness of your number, compared to that of either the Presbyterians, or those of the Church, makes it easier for you to have an exact knowledge of the behaviour of all your members, and to put away from among you every one that "walketh not according to the doctrine you have received."

But is this done? Do all your members adorn the Gospel? Are

they all "holy as He which hath called us is holy?" I fear not. I have known some instances to the contrary; and doubtless you know many more. There are unholy, outwardly unholy men in your congregations also; men that profane either the name or the day of the Lord; that do not honour their natural or civil parents; that know not how to possess their bodies in sanctification and honour; that are intemperate, either in meat or drink, gluttonous, sensual, luxurious; that variously offend against justice, mercy, or truth, in their intercourse with their neighbour, and do not walk by that royal law, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself."

But how is this consistent with your leading principle,—“That no man ought to be admitted to baptism, till he has that repentance whereby we forsake sin, and living faith in God through Christ?”

For if no man ought to be admitted into a church or congregation, who has not actual faith and repentance; then neither ought any who has them not, to continue in any congregation: and, consequently, an open sinner cannot remain among you, unless you practically renounce your main principle.

4. I refer it to your own serious consideration, whether one reason why unholy men are still suffered to remain among you may not be this,—That many of you have unawares put opinion in the room of faith and repentance? But how fatal a mistake is this! Supposing your opinion to be true, yet a true opinion concerning repentance is wholly different from the thing itself; and you may have a true opinion concerning faith all your life, and yet die an unbeliever.

Supposing therefore the opinion of particular redemption true, yet how little does it avail toward salvation! Nay, were we to suppose that none can be saved who do not hold it, it does not follow that all will be saved who do: so that if the one proved a man to be in ever so bad a state, the other would not prove him to be in a good one; and, consequently, whosoever leans on this opinion, leans on the staff of a broken reed.

Would to God that ye would mind this one thing, to “make your own calling and election sure!” that every one of you (leaving the rest of the world to Him that made it) would himself “repent and believe the Gospel!” Not repent alone, (for then you know only the baptism of John,) but believe, and be “baptized with the Holy Ghost and with fire.” Are you still a stranger to that inward baptism wherewith all true believers are baptized? May the Lord constrain you to cry out, “How am I straitened till it be accomplished!” even till the love of God inflame your heart, and consume all your vile affections! Be not content with any thing less than this! It is this loving faith alone which opens our way into “the general Church of the first-born, whose names are written in heaven!” which giveth us to “enter within the veil, where Jesus our forerunner is gone before us!”

5. There is a still wider difference in some points between us and the people usually termed Quakers. But not in these points. You, as well as we, condemn “all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men;” all those works of the devil which were recited above, and all those tempers from which they spring.

You agree, that we are all to be taught of God, and to be “led by his Spirit;” that the Spirit alone reveals all truth, and inspires all holiness,

that by his inspiration men attain perfect love, the love which “purifies them as he is pure;” and that, through this knowledge and love of God, they have power to “do always such things as please him;” to worship God, a Spirit, according to his own will, that is, “in spirit and in truth.”

Hence you infer, that formal worship is not acceptable to God, but that alone that springs from God in the heart. You infer also, that they who are led by him will use great “plainness of speech,” and great plainness of dress, seeking no “outward adorning,” but only “the ornament of a meek and quiet spirit.”

I will look no farther now, than simply to inquire whether you are consistent with these principles.

To begin with the latter: “He that is led by the Spirit will use great plainness of speech.”

You would have said, “will use the plain language.” But that term leads you into a grand mistake. That term, *the plain language*, naturally leads you to think of one particular way of speaking; as if “plainness of speech” implied no more than the use of that particular form.

Alas, my brethren! know ye not, that your ancestors designed this only as a specimen of plain language? And is it possible that you should mistake the sample for the whole bale of cloth?

Consult the light God has given you, and you must see that “plainness of speech” does not lie in a single point, but implies an open, undisguised sincerity, a child-like simplicity in all we speak.

I do not desire you to refrain from saying *thou* or *thee*. I would not spend ten words about it. But I desire you, whenever you speak at all, to speak the truth, and nothing but the truth. I desire your words may always be the picture of your heart. This is truly plain language.

Either do not pretend to plain speech at all, or be uniformly plain. Are you so? I pray, consider. Do you never compliment? I do not suppose you say, “Sir, your very humble servant;” but do you say no civil things? Do you never flatter? Do you not commend any man or woman to their face? Perhaps farther than you do behind their back. Is this plainness of speech? Do you never dissemble? Do you speak to all persons, high or low, rich or poor, just what you think, neither more nor less, and in the shortest and clearest manner you can? If not, what a mere jest is your plain language! You carry your condemnation in your own breast.

6. You hold also, that “he which is led by the Spirit will use great plainness of dress, seeking no ‘outward adorning,’ but only the ‘ornament of a meek and quiet spirit;’” and that, in particular, “he will leave ‘gold and costly apparel’ to those who know not God.”

Now, I appeal to every serious, reasonable man among you,—Do your people act consistently with this principle? Do not many of your women wear gold upon their very feet; and many of your men use “ornaments of gold?” Are you a stranger to these things? Have you not seen with your eyes (such trifles as will scarce bear the naming) their canes and snuff boxes glitter, even in your solemn assembly, while ye were waiting together upon God? Surely, they are not yet so lost to modesty, as to pretend that they do not use them by way of ornament.

If they do not, if it be only out of necessity, a plain oaken stick will

supply the place of the one, and a piece of horn or tin will unexceptionably answer all the reasonable ends of the other.

To speak freely, (and do not count me your enemy for this,) you cannot but observe, upon cool reflection, that you retain just so much of your ancient practice, as leaves your present without excuse; as makes the inconsistency, between the one and the other, glaring and undeniable. For instance: This woman is too strict a Quaker to lay out a shilling in a necklace. Very well; but she is not too strict to lay out fourscore guineas in a repeating watch. Another would not for the world wear any lace; no, not an edging round her cap: but she will wear point, and sees no harm in it at all, though it should be of twelve times the price. In one kind of apron or handkerchief she dares not lay out twenty shillings; but in another sort lays out twenty pounds. And what multitudes of you are very jealous, as to the colour and form of your apparel, (the least important of all the circumstances that relate to it,) while in the most important, the expense, they are without any concern at all! They will not put on a scarlet or crimson stuff, but the richest velvet, so it be black or grave. They will not touch a coloured riband; but will cover themselves with a stiff silk from head to foot. They cannot bear purple; but make no scruple at all of being clothed in fine linen; yea, to such a degree, that the linen of the Quakers is grown almost into a proverb.

Surely you cannot be ignorant, that the sinfulness of fine apparel lies chiefly in the expensiveness: in that it is robbing God and the poor; it is defrauding the fatherless and widow; it is wasting the food of the hungry, and withholding his raiment from the naked to consume it on our own lusts.

7. Let it not be said that this affects only a few among you, and those of the younger and lighter sort. Yes, it does your whole body: for why do you, who are older and graver, suffer such things? Why do ye not vehemently reprove them; and if they repent not, in spite of all worldly considerations, expel them out of your society? In conniving at their sin, you make it your own; you, especially, who are preachers. Do you say, "They cannot bear it; they will not hear?" Alas! into what state, then, are ye fallen! But whether they will bear it or not, what is that to thee? Thou art to "speak, whether they will hear, or whether they will forbear." To say the very truth, I am afraid you rather strengthen their hands in their wickedness. For you not only do not testify against it in the congregation,* but even sit at their table and

* You say you do testify against it in the congregation. Against what? "Against gay and gaudy apparel." I grant it. But this is not the thing I speak of. You quite mistake my mark. Do you testify against the costliness of their apparel, however plain and grave it may be? against the price of the velvet, the linen, the silk, or raiment of whatever kind? If you do this frequently and explicitly, you are clear. If not, own and amend the fault.

It is easy to discern how your people fell into this snare of the devil. You were at first a poor, despised, afflicted people. Then what some of you had to spare was little enough to relieve the needy members of your own society. In a few years you increased in goods, and were able to relieve more than your own poor. But you did not bestow all that you had to spare from them, on the poor belonging to other societies. It remained either to lay it up, or to expend it in superfluities. Some chose one way, and some the other.

Lay this deeply to heart, ye who are now a poor, despised, afflicted people.

reprove them not. Why, then, thou also art one of "the dumb dogs that cannot bark, sleeping, lying down, loving to slumber."

I fix this charge upon every preacher, in particular, who saw a young woman, daughter to one of the Quakers in London, going to be married in apparel suitable to her diamond buckle, which cost a hundred guineas. Could you see this, and not call heaven and earth to witness against it? Then I witness against thee, in the name of the Lord, thou art a blind leader of the blind; thou "strainest a gnat and swallowest a camel!"

Verily, the sin both of teachers and hearers is herein exceeding great. And the little attempts toward plainness of apparel, which are still observable among you, (I mean, in the colour and form of your clothes, and the manner of putting them on,) only testify against you, that you were once what you know in your hearts you are not now.

8. I come now to your main principle: "We are all to be 'taught of God,' to be inspired and 'led by his Spirit:' and then we shall 'worship him,' not with dead form, but 'in spirit and in truth.'"

These are deep and weighty words; but many hold fast the words, and are utterly ignorant of their meaning. Is not this an exceeding common case? Are you not conscious abundance of your friends have done so? with whom the being "taught of God" and "led by his Spirit" are mere words of course, that mean just nothing. And their crude and indigested accounts of the things they did not understand have raised that deep prejudice against these great truths which we find in the generality of men.

Do some of you ask, "But dost thou acknowledge the inward principle?" I do, my friends: and I would to God every one of you acknowledged it as much. I say, all religion is either empty show, or perfection by inspiration; in other words, the obedient love of God, by the supernatural knowledge of God; yea, all that which "is not of faith is sin;" all which does not spring from this loving knowledge of God; which knowledge cannot begin or subsist one moment without immediate inspiration; not only all public worship, and all private prayer, but every thought in common life, and word, and work. What think you of this? Do you not stagger? Dare you carry the inward principle so far? Do you acknowledge it to be the very truth? But alas! what is the acknowledging it? Dost thou experience this principle in thyself? What saith thy heart? Does God dwell therein? And doth it now echo to the voice of God? Hast thou the continual inspiration of his Spirit, filling thy heart with his love, as with a well of water, springing up into everlasting life?

9. Art thou acquainted with the "leading of his Spirit," not by notion only, but by living experience? I fear very many of you talk of this, who do not so much as know what it means. How does the Spirit of God lead his children to this or that particular action? Do you imagine it is by blind impulse only? by moving you to do it, you know not why? Not so. He leads us by our eye, at least, as much as by the hand; and by light as well as by heat. He shows us the way wherein we should go,

Hitherto ye are not able to relieve your own poor. But if ever your substance increase, see that ye be not straitened in your own bowels, that ye fall not into the same snare of the devil. Before any of you either lay up treasures on earth, or indulge needless expense of any kind, I pray the Lord God to scatter you to the corners of the earth, and blot out your name from under heaven!

as well as incites us to walk therein. For example: here is a man ready to perish with hunger. How am I "led by the Spirit" to relieve him? First, by His convincing me it is the will of God I should; and, Secondly, by His filling my heart with love toward him. Both this light and this heat are the gift of God; are wrought in me by the same Spirit, who leads me, by this conviction as well as love, to go and feed that man. This is the plain, rational account of the ordinary leading of the Spirit; but how far from that which some have given!

Art thou thus led by the Spirit to every good word and work, till God hath thereby made thy faith perfect? Dost thou know what faith is? It is a loving, obedient sight of a present and reconciled God. Now, where this is, there is no dead form; neither can be so long as it continues. But all that is said or done is full of God, full of spirit, and life, and power.

10. But perhaps, as much as you talk of them, you do not know the difference between *form* and *spirit*; or between worshipping God in a formal way, and worshipping him "in spirit and in truth."

The Lord is that Spirit. The seeing and feeling and loving him is spiritual life. And whatever is said or done in the sight or love of God, that is full of spirit and life. All beside this is form; mere dead form; whether it be in our public addresses to God, or in our private; or in our worldly business, or in our daily conversation.

But if so, how poor and mean and narrow have your views and conceptions been! You was afraid of formality in public worship: and reason good. But was you afraid of it no where else? Did not you consider that formality in common life is also an abomination to the Lord; and that it can have no place in any thing we say or do, but so far as we forget God? O watch against it in every place, every moment, that you may every moment see and love God; and, consequently, at all times and in all places, worship him "in spirit and in truth!"

My brethren, permit me to add a few words in tender love to your souls. Do not you lean too much on the spirit and power which you believe rested upon your forefathers? Suppose it did! Will that avail you, if you do not drink into the same spirit? And how evident is this,—that, whatever you once were, ye are now "shorn of your strength." Ye are weak and become like other men. The Lord is well nigh departed from you. Where is now the spirit, the life, the power? Be not offended with my plain dealing, when I beseech you who are able to weigh things calmly, to open your eyes, and see multitudes, even in the Church, pursuing, yea, and attaining, the substance of spiritual life, and leaving unto you the shadow. Nay, a still greater evil is before you: for, if ye find not some effectual means to prevent it, your rising generation will utterly cast off the shadow as well as the substance.

11. There is an abundantly greater difference still, according to your own account, between us who profess ourselves members of the Church of England, and you who are members of the Church of Rome. But notwithstanding this, do you not agree with us in condemning the vices above recited; profaneness, drunkenness, whoredom, adultery, theft, disobedience to parents, and such like? And how unhappily do you agree with us in practising the very vices which you condemn!

And yet you acknowledge, (nay, and frequently contend for this with

a peculiar earnestness,) that every Christian is called to be “zealous of good works,” as well as to “deny himself and take up his cross daily.” How, then, do you depart from your own principles, when you are gluttons, drunkards, or epicures? when you live at your ease, in all the elegance and voluptuousness of a plentiful fortune? How will you reconcile the being adorned with gold, arrayed in purple and fine linen, and faring sumptuously every day, with the “denying yourself and taking up your cross daily?” Surely, while you indulge the desire of the flesh, the desire of the eye, and the pride of life, the excellent rules of self-denial that abound in your own writers leave you of all men most inexcusable.

12. Neither can this self-indulgence be reconciled with the being “zealous of good works.” For by this needless and continual expense, you disable yourself from doing good. You bind your own hands. You make it impossible for you to do that good which otherwise you might. So that you injure the poor in the same proportion as you poison your own soul. You might have clothed the naked; but what was due to them was thrown away on your costly apparel. You might have fed the hungry, entertained the stranger, relieved them that were sick or in prison; but the superfluities of your own table swallowed up that whereby they should have been profited. And so this wasting of thy Lord’s goods is an instance of complicated wickedness; since hereby thy poor brother perisheth, for whom Christ died.

I will not recommend to you either the writings or examples of those whom you account *heretics*: (although some of these, if you could view them with impartial eyes, might “provoke you to jealousy:”) but O that God would write in your hearts the rules of self-denial and love laid down by Thomas à Kempis! or that you would follow, both in this and in good works, that burning and shining light of your own Church, the Marquis de Renty! Then would all who knew and loved the Lord rejoice to acknowledge you as the “Church of the living God;” when ye were zealous of every good word and work, and abstained from all appearance of evil; when it was hereby shown that you were filled with the Holy Ghost, and delivered from all unholy tempers; when ye were all “unblamable and unrebukable, without spot or wrinkle, or any such thing; a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a peculiar people, showing forth” to all Jews, infidels, and heretics, by your active, patient, spotless love of God and man, “the praises of Him who had called you out of darkness into his marvellous light.”

13. “Men and brethren, children of the seed of Abraham,” suffer me to speak a few words to you also; you who do not allow that Messiah the Prince is already come and cut off. However, you so far hear Moses and the Prophets as to allow, (1.) That “it is the inspiration of the Holy One which giveth man understanding,” and that all the true children of God “are taught of God.” (2.) That the substance both of the Law and the Prophets is contained in that one word, “Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and thy neighbour as thyself.” And, (3.) That the sure fruit of love is obedience, “ceasing from evil, and doing good.”

And do you walk by this rule? Have you yourselves that “inspiration of the Holy One?” Are you taught of God? Hath he opened your

understanding? Have you the inward knowledge of the Most High? I fear not. Perhaps you know little more, even of the meaning of the words, than a Mohammedan.

Let us go a little farther. Do you "love the Lord your God with all your heart, with all your soul, with all your strength?" Can you say, "Whom have I in heaven but thee? and there is none upon earth that I desire beside thee?" Do you desire God at all? Do you desire to have any thing to do with him, till you can keep the world no longer? Are you not content, so you enjoy the good things of earth, to let God stand afar off? only calling upon him now and then, when you cannot do without him. Why then you do not love God at all, though you will sometimes condescend to use him. You love the world. This possesses your heart. This, therefore, is your god. You renounce the God of your fathers, the God of Israel; you are still unrenewed in heart. Your own conscience bears witness, you in this no more hear Moses and the Prophets, than you do Jesus of Nazareth.

14. From Moses and the Prophets it has been shown, that your forefathers were a "faithless and stubborn generation; a generation which set not their hearts aright, and whose spirit cleaved not steadfastly unto God." And this you acknowledge yourselves. If you are asked, "How is it that the promise is not fulfilled? Seeing 'the sceptre is' long since 'departed from Judah,' why is not Shiloh come?" your usual answer is, "Because of the sins of our fathers God hath delayed his coming." Have you then reformed from the sins of your fathers? Are you turned unto the Lord your God? Nay, do ye not tread in the same steps? Bating that single point of outward idolatry, what abomination did they ever commit, which you have not committed also, which the generality of you do not commit still according to your power? If therefore the coming of the Messiah was hindered by the sins of your forefathers, then, by the same rule, your continuance therein will hinder his coming to the end of the world.

"Brethren, my heart's desire and prayer to God" is, that he would "gather the outcasts of Israel." And I doubt not, but, when the fulness of the Gentiles is come in, then "all Israel shall be saved." But, mean time, is there not great cause that ye should say with Daniel, "O Lord, righteousness belongeth unto thee, but unto us confusion of face, as at this day, to the men of Judah, and unto all Israel. O Lord, we have sinned, we have rebelled against thee, neither have we obeyed the voice of the Lord our God. Yet, O our God, incline thine ear, and hear; open thine eyes, and behold our desolation; for we do not present our supplications before thee for our righteousnesses, but for thy great mercies. O Lord, hear! O Lord, forgive! O Lord, hearken and do! Defer not, for thine own sake; for thy city and thy people that are called by thy name."

15. I cannot conclude without addressing myself to you also, who do not admit either the Jewish or Christian Revelation. But still you desire to be happy. You own the essential difference between vice and virtue; and acknowledge, (as did all the wiser Greeks and Romans,) that vice cannot consist with happiness. You allow likewise that gratitude and benevolence, self-knowledge and modesty, mildness, temperance, patience, and generosity, are justly numbered among virtues; and

that ingratitude and malice, envy and ill nature, pride, insolence, and vanity, gluttony and luxury, covetousness and discontent, are vices of the highest kind.

Now, let us calmly inquire how far your life is consistent with your principles.

You seek happiness. But you find it not. You come no nearer it with all your labours. You are not happier than you was a year ago. Nay, I doubt you are more unhappy. Why is this, but because you look for happiness there, where you own it cannot be found? Indeed, what is there on earth which can long satisfy a man of understanding? His soul is too large for the world he lives in. He wants more room.

*Æstuat infelix angusto limite mundi,
Ut brevibus clausus Gyaris, parvâque Seripho.
(Frets at the narrow limits of the world,
As in a prison pent.)*

He has already travelled through all which is called pleasure; diversions and entertainments of every kind. But among these he can find no enjoyment of any depth; they are empty, shallow, superficial things: they pleased for a while; but the gloss is gone, and now they are dull and tasteless. And what has he next? Only the same things again; for this world affords nothing more. It can supply him with no change. Go, feed again; but it is upon one dish still. Thus

*Occidit miseris crambe repetita.
(They are surfeited with the dull repetition.)*

Yet what remedy under the sun?

16. The sounder judgment, the stronger understanding you have, the sooner are you sated with the world; and the more deeply convinced, all that cometh is vanity, foolish, insipid, nauseous. You see the foibles of men in so much clearer a light, and have the keener sense of the emptiness of life. Here you are, a poor, unsatisfied inhabitant of an unquiet world; turning your weary eyes on this side and on that side; seeking rest, but finding none. You seem to be out of your place: neither the persons nor things that surround you are such as you want. You have a confused idea of something better than all this; but you know not where to find it. You are always gasping for something which you cannot attain, no, not if you range to the uttermost parts of the earth.

But this is not all. You are not only negatively unhappy, as finding nothing whereon to stay the weight of your soul; but positively so, because you are unholy: you are miserable, because you are vicious. Are you not vicious? Are you then full of gratitude to Him who giveth you life, and breath, and all things? Not so; you rather spurn his gifts, and murmur at Him that gave them. How often has your heart said, God did not use you well? How often have you questioned either his wisdom or goodness? Was this well done? What kind of gratitude is this? It is the best you are master of. Then take knowledge of yourself. Black ingratitude is rooted in your inmost frame. You can no more love God, than you can see him; or than you can be happy without that love.

Neither (how much soever you may pique yourself upon it) are you a lover of mankind. Can love and malice consist, benevolence and envy?

Put out your own eyes! And are not these horrid tempers in
 Do not you envy one man, and bear malice or ill will to another?
 Now you call these dispositions by softer names; but names change
 of the nature of things. You are pained that one should enjoy what you
 cannot enjoy yourself. Call this what you please, it is rank envy. You
 are grieved that a second enjoys even what you have yourself; you
 rejoice in seeing a third unhappy. Do not flatter yourself; this is malice,
 venomous malice, and nothing else. And how could you ever think of
 being happy, with malice and envy in your heart? Just as well might
 you expect to be at ease, while you held burning coals in your bosom.

17. I entreat you to reflect, whether there are not other inhabitants in
 your breast, which leave no room for happiness there. May you not
 discover, through a thousand disguises, pride? too high an opinion of
 yourself? vanity, thirst of praise, even (who would believe it?) of the
 applause of knaves and fools? unevenness or sourness of temper? prone-
 ness to anger or revenge? peevishness, fretfulness, or pining discontent?
 Nay, perhaps even covetousness.—And did you ever think happiness
 could dwell with these? Awake out of that senseless dream. Think
 not of reconciling things incompatible. All these tempers are essential
 misery: so long as any of these are harboured in your breast, you must
 be a stranger to inward peace. What avails it you if there be no other
 hell? Whenever these fiends are let loose upon you, you will be con-
 strained to own,

Hell is where'er I am: myself am hell.

And can the Supreme Being love those tempers, which you yourself
 abhor in all but yourself? If not, they imply guilt as well as misery.
 Doubtless they do. Only inquire of your own heart. How often in the
 mid career of your vice have you felt a secret reproof, which you knew
 not how to bear, and therefore stifled as soon as possible!

18. And did not even this point at a hereafter; a future state of
 existence? The more reasonable among you have no doubt of this;
 you do not imagine the whole man dies together; although you hardly
 suppose the soul, once disengaged, will dwell again in a house of clay.
 But how will your soul subsist without it? How are you qualified for
 a separate state? Suppose this earthly covering, this vehicle of organ-
 ized matter, whereby you hold commerce with the material world, were
 now to drop off! Now, what would you do in the regions of immortal-
 ity? You cannot eat or drink there. You cannot indulge either the
 desire of the flesh, the desire of the eye, or the pride of life. You love
 only worldly things; and they are gone, fled as smoke, driven away for
 ever. Here is no possibility of sensual enjoyments; and you have a
 relish for nothing else. O what a separation is this, from all that you
 hold dear! What a breach is made, never to be healed!

But beside this, you are unholy, full of evil tempers; for you did not
 put off these with the body; you did not leave pride, revenge, malice,
 envy, discontent, behind you, when you left the world. And now you
 are no longer cheered by the light of the sun, nor diverted by the flux of
 various objects; but those dogs of hell are let loose to prey upon your
 soul, with their whole unrelaxed strength. Nor is there any hope that
 your spirit will now ever be restored to its original purity; not even that
 poor hope of a purging fire, so elegantly described by the heathen poet,

some ages before the notion was revived among the doctrines of the Romish Church

*Alia panduntur inanes
Suspensæ ad ventos: aliis sub gurgite vasto
Infectum cluitur seclus, aut exurit igni.—
Donec longa dies perfecto temporis orbe
Concretam exemit labem, perunq̄ue reliquit
Æthereum sensum, atque aurâi simplicis ignem.**

19. What a great gulf then is fixed between you and happiness, both in this world and that which is to come! Well may you shudder at the thought! more especially when you are about to enter on that untried state of existence. For what a prospect is this, when you stand on the verge of life, ready to launch out into eternity! What can you then think! You see nothing before you. All is dark and dreary. On the very best supposition, how well may you address your parting soul in the words of dying Adrian:—

Poor, little, pretty, fluttering thing,
Must we no longer live together?
And dost thou prune thy trembling wing,
To take thy flight thou know'st not whither?
Thy pleasing vein, thy humorous folly
Is all neglected, all forgot;
And pensive, wavering, melancholy,
Thou hop'st and fear'st thou know'st not what.

“Thou know'st not what!” Here is the sting, suppose there were no other. To be “thou know'st not what!” not for a month, or a year, but through the countless ages of eternity! What a tormenting uncertainty must this be! What racking unwillingness must it occasion, to exchange even this known vale of tears for the unknown valley of the shadow of death!

And is there no cure for this? Indeed there is an effectual cure; even the knowledge and love of God. There is a knowledge of God which unveils eternity, and a love of God which endears it. That knowledge makes the great abyss visible; and all uncertainty vanishes away. That love makes it amiable to the soul, so that fear has no more place! But the moment God says, by the welcome angel of death, “Come thou up hither!” she

Claps the glad wing, and towers away,
And mingles with the blaze of day.

20. See ye not what advantage every way a Christian has over you? Probably the reason you saw it not before was, because you knew none but nominal Christians; men who professed to believe more, (in their way of believing,) but had no more of the knowledge or love of God than yourselves: so that with regard to real, inward religion, you stood upon even ground. And perhaps in many branches of outward religion the advantage was on your side.

May the Lord, the God of the Christians, either reform these wretches,

* Some to the piercing winds are stretch'd abroad;
Some plunged beneath the watery gulf: The fire
In some burns out the deep-imprinted stain
Till the long course of slowly-rolling years
Has purged out every spot, and pure remains
The' ethereal spirit, and simple heavenly fire.

or take them away from the earth, that lay this grand stumbling block in the way of those who desire to know the will of God!

O ye who desire to know his will, regard them not! If it be possible, blot them out of your remembrance.

They neither can nor will do you any good. O, suffer them not to do you harm! Be not prejudiced against Christianity by those who know nothing at all of it: nay, they condemn it, all real substantial Christianity; they speak evil of the thing they know not; they have a kind of cant word for the whole religion of the heart; they call it enthusiasm.

I will briefly lay before you the ground of the matter, and appeal to you yourselves for the reasonableness of it.

21. What a miserable drudgery is the service of God, unless I love the God whom I serve! But I cannot love one whom I know not. How then can I love God till I know him? And how is it possible I should know God, unless he make himself known unto me? By analogy or proportion? Very good. But where is that proportion to be found? What proportion does a creature bear to its Creator? What is the proportion between finite and infinite?

I grant, the existence of the creatures demonstratively shows the existence of their Creator. The whole creation speaks that there is a God. But that is not the point in question. I know there is a God. Thus far is clear. But who will show me what that God is? The more I reflect the more convinced I am, that it is not possible for any or all the creatures to take off the veil which is on my heart, that I might discern this unknown God; to draw the curtain back which now hangs between, that I may see Him which is invisible.

This veil of flesh now hides him from my sight; and who is able to make it transparent? so that I may perceive, through this glass, God always before me, till I see him "face to face."

I want to know this great God who filleth heaven and earth; who is above, beneath, and on every side, in all places of his dominion; who just now besets me behind and before, and lays his hand upon me; and yet I am no more acquainted with him, than with one of the inhabitants of Jupiter or Saturn.

O my friend, how will you get one step farther, unless God reveal himself to your soul?

22. And why should this seem a thing incredible to you; that God, a spirit, and the Father of the spirits of all flesh, should discover himself to your spirit, which is itself "the breath of God," *divine particula aurea*; any more than that material things should discover themselves to your material eye? Is it any more repugnant to reason, that spirit should influence spirit, than that matter should influence matter? Nay, is not the former the more intelligible of the two? For there is the utmost difficulty in conceiving how matter should influence matter at all; how that which is totally passive should act. Neither can we rationally account either for gravitation, attraction, or any natural motion whatsoever, but by supposing in all the finger of God, who alone conquers that *vis inertiae* [a property of matter by which, if left to itself, it will never change its state] which is essential to every particle of matter, and worketh all in all.

Now, if God should ever open the eyes of your understanding, must not the love of God be the immediate consequence? Do you imagine

you can see God without loving him? Is it possible in the nature of things? *Si virtus conspiceretur oculis, (said the old Heathen,) mirabiles amores excitaret sui.* [If virtue could be seen, she would excite wonderful love.] How much more if you see Him who is the original fountain, the great archetype of all virtue, will that sight raise in you a love that is wonderful, such as the gay and busy world know not of!

23. What benevolence also, what tender love to the whole of human kind, will you drink in, together with the love of God, from the unexhausted source of love! And how easy is it to conceive that more and more of his image will be then transfused into your soul; that from disinterested love, all other divine tempers will, as it were naturally, spring: mildness, gentleness, patience, temperance, justice, sincerity, contempt of the world; yea, whatsoever things are venerable and lovely, whatsoever are justly of good report!

And when you thus love God and all mankind, and are transformed into his likeness, then the commandments of God will not be grievous; you will no more complain that they destroy the comforts of life: so far from it, that they will be the very joy of your heart; ways of pleasantness, paths of peace! You will experience here that solid happiness which you had elsewhere sought in vain. Without servile fear or anxious care, so long as you continue on earth, you will gladly do the will of God here as the angels do it in heaven; and when the time is come that you should depart hence, when God says, "Arise, and come away," you will pass with joy unspeakable out of the body, into all the fulness of God.

Now, does not your own heart condemn you if you call this religion enthusiasm? O leave that to those blind zealots who tack together a set of opinions and an outside worship, and call this poor, dull, lifeless thing by the sacred name of Christianity! Well might you account such Christianity as this a mere piece of empty pageantry, fit indeed to keep the vulgar in awe, but beneath the regard of a man of understanding.

But in how different a light does it now appear! If there be such a religion as I have sketched out, must not every reasonable man see there is nothing on earth to be desired in comparison of it? But if any man desire this, let him ask of God; he giveth to all men liberally, and upbraideth not.

24. May you not ask, quite consistently with your principles, in some manner, resembling this?—

"O thou Being of beings, thou cause of all, thou seest my heart; thou understandest all my thoughts: but how small a part of thy ways do I understand! I know not what is above, beneath, on every side; I know not my own soul. Only this I know, I am not what I ought to be. I see and approve the virtue which I have not. I do not love thee, neither am I thankful. I commend the love of mankind; but I feel it not. Thou hast seen hatred, malice, envy in my heart; thou hast seen anger, murmuring, discontent. These uneasy passions harrow up my soul. I cannot rest while I am under this yoke; nor am I able to shake it off; I am unhappy, and that thou knowest.

"Have compassion upon me, thou whose years do not fail! on me who have but a short time to live. I rise up, and am cut down as a flower. I flee as it were a shadow. Yet a little while and I return to dust, and have no more place under the sun.

“Yet I know thou hast made my soul to live for ever; but I know not where, and I am unwilling to try. I tremble, I am afraid to go thither, whence I shall not return. I stand quivering on the edge of the gulf; for clouds and darkness rest upon it. O God! must I go always ‘creeping with terrors, and plunge into eternity with a peradventure!’”

“O thou Lover of men, is there no help in thee? I have heard (what indeed my heart cannot conceive) that thou revealest thyself to those that seek thee, and pourest thy love into their hearts; and that they who know and love thee, walk through the shadow of death and fear no evil. O that this were so! that there was such an unspeakable gift given to the children of men! for then might I hope for it. O God, if there be, give it unto me! Speak, that I may see thee! Make thyself known unto me also in the manner that thou knowest! In any wise, let me know thee, and love thee, that I may be formed after thy likeness! That I may be love, as thou art love; that I may now be happy in thee; and, when thou wilt, fall into the abyss of thy love, and enjoy thee through the ages of eternity.”

A FARTHER APPEAL

TO

MEN OF REASON AND RELIGION

And when he came near, he beheld the city, and wept over it, saying, If thou hadst known, even thou, at least in this thy day, the things which belong unto thy peace! Luke xix, 41, 42.

PART III.

I. 1. Now, what can an impartial person think concerning the present state of religion in England? Is there a nation under the sun which is so deeply fallen from the very first principles of all religion? Where is the country in which is found so utter a disregard to even Heathen morality; such a thorough contempt of justice and truth, and all that should be dear and honourable to rational creatures?

What species of vice can possibly be named, even of those that nature itself abhors, of which we have not had, for many years, a plentiful and still increasing harvest? What sin remains either in Rome or Constantinople, which we have not imported long ago, (if it was not of our native growth,) and improved upon ever since? Such a complication of villainies of every kind, considered with all their aggravations, such a scorn of whatever bears the face of virtue, such injustice, fraud, and falsehood; above all, such perjury, and such a method of law, we may defy the whole world to produce.

What multitudes are found throughout our land, who do not even profess any religion at all! And what numbers of those who profess much, confute their profession by their practice! yea, and perhaps by their exorbitant pride, vanity, covetousness, rapaciousness, or oppression, cause the very name of religion to stink in the nostrils of many (otherwise) reasonable men!

2. "However, we have many thousands still of truly virtuous and religious men." Wherein does their religion consist? in righteousness and true holiness; in love stronger than death; fervent gratitude to God, and tender affection to all his creatures? Is their religion the religion of the heart; a renewal of soul in the image of God? Do they resemble Him they worship? Are they free from pride, from vanity, from malice and envy; from ambition and avarice; from passion and lust; from every uneasy and unlovely temper? Alas, I fear neither they (the greater part at least) nor you know what this religion means; or have any more notion of it, than the peasant that holds the plough of the religion of a Gymnosophist.

It is well if the genuine religion of Christ has any more alliance with what you call religion, than with the Turkish pilgrimages to Mecca, or the Popish worship of our Lady of Loretto. Have not you substituted, in the place of the religion of the heart, something (I do not say equally sinful, but) equally vain, and foreign to the worshipping of God "in spirit and in truth?" What else can be said even of prayer, (public or private,) in the manner wherein you generally perform it? as a thing of course, running round and round in the same dull track, without either the knowledge or love of God, without one heavenly temper, either attained or improved! O what mockery^{of} God is this!

And yet even this religion, which can do you no good, may do you much harm. Nay, it is plain it does; it daily increases your pride, as you measure your goodness by the number and length of your performances. It gives you a deep contempt of those who do not come up to the full tale of your virtues. It inspires men with a zeal which is the very fire of hell, furious, bitter, implacable, unmerciful; often to a degree that extinguishes all compassion, all good nature and humanity. Inasmuch that the execrable fierceness of spirit, which is the natural fruit of such a religion, hath many times, in spite of all ties, divine and human, broke out into open violence, into rapine, murder, sedition, rebellion, civil war, to the desolation of whole cities and countries.

Tantum hæc religio potuit suadere malorum!
(So much mischief *this* religion does!)

3. Now, if there be a God, and one that is not a mere idle spectator of the things that are done upon earth, but a rewarder of men and nations according to their works, what can the event of these things be? It was reasonable to believe that he would have risen long ago and maintained his own cause, either by sending the famine or pestilence among us, or by pouring out his fury in blood. And many wise and holy men have frequently declared that they daily expected this; that they daily looked for the patience of God to give place, and judgment to rejoice over mercy.

4. Just at this time, when we wanted little of "filling up the measure of our iniquities," two or three clergymen of the Church of England began vehemently to "call sinners to repentance." In two or three years they had sounded the alarm to the utmost borders of the land. Many thousands gathered together to hear them; and in every place where they came, many began to show such a concern for religion as they never had done before. A stronger impression was made on their minds, of the importance of things eternal, and they had more earnest

desires of serving God than they had ever had from their earliest childhood. Thus did God begin to draw them toward himself, with the cords of love, with the bands of a man.

Many of these were in a short time deeply convinced of the number and heinousness of their sins. They were also made thoroughly sensible of those tempers which are justly hateful to God and man, and of their utter ignorance of God, and entire inability, either to know, love, or serve him. At the same time, they saw in the strongest light the insignificancy of their outside religion; nay, and often confessed it before God, as the most abominable hypocrisy. Thus did they sink deeper and deeper into that repentance, which must ever precede faith in the Son of God.

And from hence sprung "fruits meet for repentance." The drunkard commenced sober and temperate; the whoremonger abstained from adultery and fornication; the unjust from oppression and wrong. He that had been accustomed to curse and swear for many years, now swore no more. The sluggard began to work with his hands, that he might eat his own bread. The miser learned to deal his bread to the hungry, and to cover the naked with a garment. Indeed, the whole form of their life was changed: they had "left off doing evil, and learned to do well."

5. But this was not all. Over and above this outward change, they began to experience inward religion. "The love of God was shed abroad in their hearts," which they continue to enjoy to this day. They "love him, because he first loved us," and withheld not from us his Son, his only Son. And this love constrains them to love all mankind, all the children of the Father of heaven and earth; and inspires them with every holy and heavenly temper, the whole mind that was in Christ. Hence it is that they are now uniform in their behaviour, unblamable in all manner of conversation. And in whatsoever state they are, they have learned therewith to be content; insomuch that now they can "in every thing give thanks." They more than patiently acquiesce, they rejoice and are exceeding glad, in all God's dispensations toward them. For as long as they love God, (and that love no man taketh from them,) they are always happy in God. Thus they calmly travel on through life, being never weary nor faint in their minds, never repining, murmuring, or dissatisfied, casting all their care upon God, till the hour comes that they should drop this covering of earth, and return unto the great Father of spirits. Then, especially, it is that they "rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory." You who credit it not, come and see. See these living and dying Christians.

Happy while on earth they breathe;
Mightier joys ordain'd to know,
Trampling on sin, hell, and death,
To the third heaven they go!

Now, if these things are so, what reasonable man can deny (supposing the Scriptures to be true) that God is now visiting this nation, in a far other manner than we had cause to expect! Instead of pouring out his fierce displeasure upon us, he hath made us yet another tender of mercy: so that even when sin did most abound, grace hath much more abounded.

6. Yea, "the grace of God, which bringeth salvation," present salva-

tion from inward and outward sin, hath abounded of late years in such a degree, as neither we nor our fathers had known. How extensive is the change which has been wrought on the minds and lives of the people! Know ye not that the sound is gone forth into all the land; that there is scarce a city or considerable town to be found, where some have not been roused out of the sleep of death, and constrained to cry out, in the bitterness of their soul, "What must I do to be saved?" that this religious concern has spread to every age and sex; to most orders and degrees of men? to abundance of those, in particular, who, in time past, were accounted monsters of wickedness, "drinking in iniquity like water," and committing all "uncleanness with greediness."

7. In what age has such a work been wrought, considering the swiftness as well as the extent of it? When have such numbers of sinners in so short a time been recovered from the error of their ways? When hath religion, I will not say since the Reformation, but since the time of Constantine the Great, made so large a progress in any nation, within so small a space? I believe, hardly can either ancient or modern history supply us with a parallel instance.

8. Let understanding men observe also the depth of the work, so extensively and swiftly wrought. It is not a slight or superficial thing; but multitudes of men have been so thoroughly "convinced of sin," that their "bones were smitten asunder, as it were with a sword dividing the very joints and marrow." Many of these have been shortly after so filled with "peace and joy in believing," that, whether they were in the body or out of the body, they could scarcely tell. And in the power of this faith they have trampled under foot whatever the world accounts either terrible or desirable; having evidenced, in the severest trials, so fervent a love to God, so invariable and tender a good will to mankind, particularly to their enemies, and such a measure of all the fruits of holiness, as were not unworthy the apostolic age. Now, so deep a repentance, so firm a faith, so fervent love and unblemished holiness, wrought in so many persons, within so short a time, the world has not seen for many ages.

9. No less remarkable is the purity of the religion which has extended itself so deeply and swiftly. I speak particularly with regard to the doctrines held by those among whom it is so extended. Those of the Church of England, at least, must acknowledge this. For where is there a body of people in the realm, who, number for number, so closely adhere to what our Church delivers as pure doctrine? Where are those who have approved and do approve themselves more orthodox, more sound in their opinions? Is there a Socinian or Arian among them all? Nay, were you to recite the whole catalogue of heresies enumerated by Bishop Pearson, it might be asked, Who can lay any one of these to their charge?

Nor is their religion more pure from heresy than it is from superstition. In former times, wherever an unusual concern for the things of God hath appeared, on the one hand, strange and erroneous opinions continually sprung up with it; on the other, a zeal for things which were no part of religion, as though they had been essential branches of it. And many have laid as great, if not greater, stress on trifles, as on the weightier matters of the law. But it has not been so in the present

case. No stress has been laid on any thing, as though it were necessary to salvation, but what is undeniably contained in the word of God. And of the things contained therein, the stress laid on each has been in proportion to the nearness of its relation to what is there laid down as the sum of all, the love of God and our neighbour. So pure from superstition, so thoroughly scriptural, is that religion which has lately spread in this nation!

10. It is likewise rational as well as scriptural; it is as pure from enthusiasm as from superstition. It is true, the contrary has been continually affirmed: but to affirm is one thing, to prove is another. Who will prove that it is enthusiasm to love God, even though we love him with all our heart? to rejoice in the sense of his love to us? to praise him, even with all our strength? Who is able to make good this charge against the love of all mankind? or, laying rhetorical flourishes aside, to come close to the question, and demonstrate that it is enthusiasm, in every state we are in, therewith to be content? I do but just touch on the general heads. Ye men of reason, give me a man who, setting raillery and ill names apart, will maintain this by dint of argument. If not, own this religion is the thing you seek; sober, manly, rational, divine; however exposed to the censure of those who are accustomed to revile what they understand not.

11. It may be farther observed, the religion of those we now speak of is entirely clear from bigotry. (Perhaps this might have been ranked with superstition, of which it seems to be only a particular species.) They are in nowise bigoted to opinions. They do indeed hold right opinions; but they are peculiarly cautious not to rest the weight of Christianity there. They have no such overgrown fondness for any opinions, as to think those alone will make them Christians, or to confine their affection or esteem to those who agree with them therein. There is nothing they are more fearful of than this, lest it should steal upon them unawares. Nor are they bigoted to any particular branch even of practical religion. They desire indeed to be exact in every jot and tittle, in the very smallest points of Christian practice. But they are not attached to one point more than another; they aim at uniform, universal obedience. They contend for nothing trifling, as if it was important; for nothing indifferent, as if it were necessary; for nothing circumstantial, as if it were essential to Christianity; but for every thing in its own order.

12. Above all, let it be observed, that this religion has no mixture of vice or unholiness. It gives no man of any rank or profession the least license to sin. It makes no allowance to any person for ungodliness of any kind. Not that all who follow after have attained this, either are already perfect. But however that be, they plead for no sin, either inward or outward. They condemn every kind and degree thereof, in themselves as well as in other men. Indeed, most in themselves; it being their constant care to bring those words home to their own case, "Whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all."

13. Yet there is not found among them that bitter zeal in points either of small or of great importance, that spirit of persecution, which has so often accompanied the spirit of reformation. It is an idle conceit, that

the spirit of persecution is among the Papists only: it is wheresoever the devil, that old murderer, works; and he still "worketh in" all "the children of disobedience." Of consequence, all the children of disobedience will, on a thousand different pretences, and in a thousand different ways, so far as God permits, persecute the children of God. But what is still more to be lamented is, that the children of God themselves have so often used the same weapons, and persecuted others, when the power was in their own hands.

Can we wholly excuse those venerable men, our great reformers themselves, from this charge? I fear not, if we impartially read over any history of the Reformation. What wonder is it then, that, when the tables were turned, Bishop Bonner or Gardiner should make reprisals; that they should measure to others (indeed good measure, shaken together,) what had before been measured to them? Nor is it strange, when we consider the single case of Joan Bocher, that God should suffer those (otherwise) holy men, Archbishop Cranmer, Bishop Ridley, and Bishop Latimer, to drink of the same cup with her.

14. But can you find any tincture of this in the case before us? Do not all who have lately known the love of God, know "what spirit they are of;" and that the Son of Man is not come to destroy men's lives, but to save them? Do they approve of the using any kind or degree of violence, on any account or pretence whatsoever, in matters of religion? Do they not hold the right every man has to judge for himself, to be sacred and inviolable? Do they allow any method of bringing even those who are farthest out of the way, who are in the grossest errors, to the knowledge of the truth, except the methods of reason and persuasion; of love, patience, gentleness, long suffering? Is there any thing in their practice which is inconsistent with this their constant profession? Do they in fact hinder their own relations or dependents from worshipping God according to their own conscience? When they believe them to be in error, do they use force of any kind, in order to bring them out of it? Let the instances, if there are such, be produced. But if no such are to be found, then let all reasonable men, who believe the Bible, own that a work of God is wrought in our land; and such a work (if we survey in one view the extent of it, the swiftness with which it has spread, the depth of that religion which was so swiftly diffused, and its purity from all corrupt mixtures) as, it must be acknowledged, cannot easily be paralleled, in all these concurrent circumstances, by any thing that is found in the English annals, since Christianity was first planted in this island.

II. 1. And yet those "who can discern the face of the sky, cannot discern the signs of the times." Yet those who are esteemed wise men do not know that God is now reviving his work upon earth. Indeed, concerning some of these, the reason is plain; they know not, because they think not of it. Their thoughts are otherwise employed; their minds are taken up with things of quite a different nature: or, perhaps, they may think of it a little now and then, when they have nothing else to do; but not seriously or deeply; not with any closeness or attention of thought. They are too much in haste to weigh the facts whereof we speak, and to draw the just inference therefrom: nor is the conviction which they may sometimes feel, suffered to sink into their hearts; but

things that have a larger share in their affections soon destroy the very traces of it.

2. True it is, that there are some who think more deeply, who are accustomed to consider things from the foundation, and to lay circumstances together, that they may judge of nothing before they have full evidence; and yet even some of these appear to be in doubt concerning the present work. Now, supposing it to be a work of God, how can this be accounted for,—that they who so diligently inquire concerning it, do not know the time of their visitation? Perhaps because of the deeply rooted prejudice which they brought with them to the inquiry; and which, still hanging on their minds, makes it scarce possible for them to form an impartial judgment. Perhaps, even a slight prepossession might occasion their stumbling on some of those rocks of offence, which, by the wise permission of God, always did and always will attend any revival of his work. Nay, it may be, their very caution was carried to excess. They would not judge before they had such evidence as the nature of the thing would not admit, or, at least, God did not see fit to give.

3. All this is very easy to conceive. But it may at first appear surprising, to find men of renown, men supposed to be endowed with knowledge, and with abilities of every kind, flatly, openly, peremptorily denying, that there has been any unusual work of God at all! Yea, a late eminent writer goes farther yet, accounts it an instance of downright enthusiasm, to imagine that there is any extraordinary work now wrought upon the earth. (*Observations*, part iii.)

It avails not to say, “No; he does not deny this, but he denies it to be the work of God.” This is palpably trifling; for the work under consideration is of such a nature, (namely, the conversion of men from all manner of sins, to holiness of heart and life,) that if it be at any time wrought at all, it must be the work of God; seeing it is God alone, and not any child of man, who is able to “destroy the works of the devil.”

Yet neither is this difficult to be accounted for, if we consider things more closely; for the same prejudice which keeps some in doubt, may easily be conceived so to influence others, as to make them wholly deny the work of God. And this it may do in several ways: it may either bring them to question the facts related, and hinder their endeavouring to be more fully informed; or prevent their drawing such inferences from those facts, as they would otherwise see to be plain and undeniable. Yea, and it will give tenfold weight to the offences which must come, so as to overbalance all evidence whatsoever.

4. This also may account for the behaviour of those who, not content to suspend their judgment, or to deny the work of God, go farther still, even to the length of contradicting and blaspheming. Nay, some of these have expressed a deeper abhorrence, and shown a stronger enmity against this, than they were ever known to do against Popery, Infidelity or any heresy whatsoever. Some have persecuted the instruments whom it pleased God to use herein, only not to the death; and others have treated in the same manner all those whom they termed their followers. A few instances of this it may be proper to mention, out of very many which might be recited.

5. On the 20th of June, 1743, a great multitude of people gathered together, chiefly from Walsal, Darlaston, and Bilston, in Wednesbury

church yard, Staffordshire. They went from thence (when by sounding a horn they had gathered their whole company together) to Mr. Eaton's house, in the middle of the town, who was at that time constable. He went to the door with his constable's staff, and began reading the act of parliament against riots; but the stones flew so thick about his head, that he was forced to leave off reading and retire. They broke all his windows, the door of his house, and a large clock in pieces. They went then to above fourscore houses, in many of which there were not three panes of glass left.

6. On June 20, 1743, John Baker, at the head of a large mob, came to the house of Jonas Turner, at West Bromwich, near Wednesbury, and asked him, whether he would keep from these men that went preaching about, and go to the church. He answered, "I do go to the church; but I never see any of you there." Presently one Dan. Oniens, with a great club, broke great part of the window at one blow. Others laid hold of him, and dragged him about sixty yards before he could get loose from them. Afterward they broke all his windows, and threw into the house abundance of stones, to break his goods.

About four in the afternoon they came to the house of widow Turner of West Bromwich. They threw in bricks and stones so fast, that she was forced to open the door and run out among them. One of her daughters cried out, "My mother will be killed!" On which, they fell to throwing stones at her. She ran into a neighbour's house; but before she could shut the door, they broke the bottom off with a brick end. They followed her other daughter with stones, and one with a great stake. She ran into another house, much frightened, expecting to be murdered. The widow asked, "How can you come and abuse us thus?" On which, one came with a large club, and swore, if she spoke another word, he would knock her on the head, and bury her in the ditch. Then he went and broke all the glass that was left. The same they did to many of the neighbouring houses.

7. On the 19th of June, James Yeoman, of Walsal, saw Mary Bird in her father's house at Wednesbury, and swore, "By G—, you are there now; but we will kill you to-morrow." Accordingly, he came with a mob the next day; and after they had broken all the windows, he took up a stone, and said, "Now, by God, I will kill you." He threw it, and struck her on the side of the head. The blood gushed out, and she dropped down immediately.

Another of them took Mr. Hands, of Wednesbury, by the throat, swore he would be the death of him, gave him a great swing round, and threw him upon the ground. As soon as he rose, one Equal Baker gave him a blow on the eye, and knocked him down again. In about half an hour the mob came to his house, and broke all the windows, except about twenty panes. The kitchen windows they cleared, lead, bars, and all, broke the window posts, and threw them into the house. The shop was shut up; (he being an apothecary;) but they quickly broke it open, broke all the pots and bottles in pieces, and destroyed all his medicines. They broke also the shelves and drawers in the shop to pieces, and many of his household goods.

8. On January 13, 1743–4, the mob rose again at Darlaston, broke all the windows of all who followed "this way," (except two or three

who bought themselves off,) broke open several houses, and took what they liked, the people belonging to them being fled for their lives.

About the same time the Rev. Mr. E—— came to Darlaston; and meeting some others at Thomas Forshew's, they drew up a writing; and Nicholas Winspur, the crier of the town, gave public notice, That all the people of the society must come to Mr. Forshew's, and sign it, or else their houses would be pulled down immediately. It was to this effect, That they would never read, or sing, or pray together, or hear these parsons any more.

Several signed this through fear. They made every one who did, lay down a penny,—“to make the mob drink.”

9. About Candlemas, the wife of Joshua Constable, of Darlaston, was going to Wednesbury, when a mob met her in the road, threw her down several times, and abused her in a manner too horrible to write. A warrant was procured for some of these; but one of them only was carried before Mr. G—, who came back and told his companions, the justice said that they might go home about their business. On this the mob rose again, came to Joshua's house, and destroyed all the necessary goods therein. They likewise broke and spoiled all his shop tools, threw the tiles off the roof of the house, and pulled down one room, the joist of which they carried away with them. All his gun-locks they took away; they tore in pieces all his wife's linen, cut the bed and bedstead, so that it was good for nothing, and tore her Bible and Common-Prayer Book all to pieces. She and her husband retired to another house; but one telling the mob they were there, they swore they would tear it down immediately, if the man let them stay any longer: so they went out in the frost and snow, not knowing where to lay their head.

10. On Tuesday, January 31, 1743–4, Henry Old came to John Griffith's house, saying, if he did not leave following “this way,” he had a hundred men at his command, who should come and pull his house down. Soon after he brought some with him; but the neighbours gave him money, and sent him away for that time.

Monday, February 6, between seven and eight at night, came part of the same company. Hearing them afar off, John and his wife fastened the door, and left the house. Some of the neighbours going in soon after, found them destroying all they could: two chairs and several bundles of linen were laid upon the fire. After they had destroyed what they could, they loaded themselves with clothes and meat, and went their way.

The same day public notice was given at Walsal, by a paper fixed up there, That all who designed to assist in breaking the windows, and plundering the houses, of the Methodists at Wednesbury, should be ready at ten o'clock, the next morning, on the Church hill.

11. The next morning, February 7, (being Shrove-Tuesday,) about half an hour after ten, great numbers of men were gathered together on the Church hill. Thence they marched down, some armed with swords, some with clubs, and some with axes. They first fell upon Benjamin Watson's house, and broke many of the tiles, and all the windows. Next they came to Mr. Addinbrook's, broke a fine clock, with many of his goods, and stole all the things they could carry away. The next house was Jane Smith's, whose windows they broke, with what little

goods she had. The next was Mr. Bird's, where they destroyed every thing they found, except what they carried away; cutting the beds in pieces, as they did all the beds which they could any where find. Thence they went to Mr. Edge's house: he was ill of a fever; so, for a sum of money, they passed it over. The next house was Mr. Hands's. They broke all his counter, boxes, and drawers, and all (except some bedsteads) that axe or hammer could break. They spilt all his drugs and chemical medicines, and stole every thing they could carry, even all his and his wife's wearing apparel beside what they had on.

12. Mr. Eaton's house was next. They broke all his windows, and all his inside doors in pieces, cut the lead off his house, destroyed or stole whatever they could lay their hands on. Some gentlemen offered to stop them, if he would sign a paper, implying that he would never hear those parsons more. But he told them, he had felt already what a wounded conscience was; and, by the grace of God, he would wound his conscience no more.

After they had done at Mr. Eaton's, they plundered several other houses in Wednesbury and West Bromwich. It is scarce possible to describe the outrages they committed; only they left them they plundered alive.

While they were plundering John Turner's house, he waded through the brook, to try if he could save some of his goods, which one David Garington was carrying away: upon which Garington told him, it would be the same here as it was in Ireland; for there would be a massacre very quickly; and he wished it was now.

13. About eleven o'clock, Sarah, the wife of John Sheldon, being told the mob was coming to her house, went and met them at the gate. She asked John Baker, their captain, what they were come for. He answered, if she would have nothing more to do with these people, not a pennyworth of her goods should be hurt. She made no reply. Then they broke the door open, and began breaking and plundering the goods. One coming out with a fire shovel, she begged him not to take it away. He swore, if she spoke another word, he would beat her brains out.

John Sheldon was this while helping Thomas Parkes to hide his goods, though he knew by the noise they were breaking his own to pieces. Between two and three he came to his house with William Sitch. William asked Sarah how she did, saying, for his part, he took joyfully the spoiling of his goods. She answered, that, seeing so much wickedness, she could not rejoice; but she blessed God she could bear it patiently, and found not the least anger in her. John Sheldon seeing the spoil they had made, smiled and said, "Here is strange work." His wife told him, if she had complied with their terms, not one pennyworth would have been hurt. He replied, that if she had complied to deny the truth, and he had found his goods whole on that account, he should never have been easy as long as he lived; but he blessed God that she had rather chosen to suffer wrong.

I believe every reasonable man will allow, that nothing can possibly excuse these proceedings; seeing they are open, bare-faced violations both of justice and mercy, and of all laws divine and human.

III. 1. I suppose no Protestant will undertake to defend such proceedings, even toward the vilest miscreants. But abundance of excuses

have been made, if not for opposing it thus, yet for denying this work to be of God, and for not acknowledging the time of our visitation.

Some allege that the doctrines of these men are false, erroneous, and enthusiastic; that they are new, and unheard of till of late; that they are Quakerism, fanaticism, Popery.

This whole pretence has been already cut up by the roots; it having been shown at large, that every branch of this doctrine is the plain doctrine of Scripture, interpreted by our own Church. Therefore it cannot be either false or erroneous, provided the Scripture be true. Neither can it be enthusiastic, unless the same epithet belongs to our Articles, Homilies, and Liturgy. Nor yet can these doctrines be termed new, no newer, at least, than the reign of Queen Elizabeth; not even with regard to the way of expression, or the manner wherein they are proposed. And as to the substance, they are more ancient still; as ancient, not only as the Gospel, as the times of Isaiah, or David, or Moses, but as the first revelation of God to man. If, therefore, they were unheard of till of late, in any that is termed a Christian country, the greater guilt is on those who, as ambassadors of Christ, ought to publish them day by day.

Fanaticism, if it means any thing at all, means the same with enthusiasm, or religious madness, from which (as was observed before) these doctrines are distant as far as the east from the west. However, it is a convenient word to be thrown out upon any thing we do not like; because scarce one reader in a thousand has any idea of what it means. If any part of this doctrine is held by the Quakers, there is the more reason to rejoice. I would to God they held it all, though the doctrine itself would be neither better nor worse for this.

Popery in the mouth of many men means just nothing; or, at most, something very horrid and bad. But Popery, properly speaking, is the distinguishing doctrines of the Church of Rome. They are summed up in the Twelve Articles which the Council of Trent added to the Nicene Creed. Now, who can find the least connection between any of these, and the doctrines whereof we are speaking?

2. Others allege, "Their doctrine is too strict; they make the way to heaven too narrow." And this is in truth the original objection, (as it was almost the only one for some time,) and is secretly at the bottom of a thousand more, which appear in various forms. But do they make the way to heaven any narrower than our Lord and his Apostles made it? Is their doctrine stricter than that of the Bible? Consider only a few plain texts: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy mind, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength." "For every idle word which men shall speak, they shall give an account in the day of judgment."—"Whether ye eat, or drink, or whatever ye do, do all to the glory of God." If their doctrine is stricter than this, they are to blame; but you know in your conscience, it is not. And who can be one jot less strict, without corrupting the word of God? Can any steward of the mysteries of God be found faithful, if he change any part of that sacred depositum? No. He can abate nothing, he can soften nothing; he is constrained to declare to all men, "I may not bring down the Scripture to your taste. You must come up to it or perish for ever."

3. This is the real ground of that other popular cry concerning "the

uncharitableness of these men." Uncharitable, are they? In what respect? Do they not feed the hungry, and clothe the naked? "No; that is not the thing: they are not wanting in this: but they are so uncharitable in judging! they think none can be saved but those of their own way. They damn all the world beside themselves."

What do you mean? "They think none can be saved but those of their own way." Most surely they do. For as there is but one heaven, so there is but one way to it, even the way of faith in Christ, (for we speak not of opinions or outward modes of worship,) the way of love to God and man, the highway of holiness. And is it uncharitable to think or say that none can be saved but those who walk in this way? Was He then uncharitable who declared, "He that believeth not shall be damned?" or he that said, "Follow holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord?" and again: "Though I bestow all my goods to feed the poor, and though I give my body to be burned," yet, "if I have not *αγαπην*, charity," love, all this "profiteth me nothing."

"But they damn all," you say, "beside themselves." *Damn* all! What kind of word is this? They damn no man. None is able to damn any man, but the Lord and Judge of all. What you probably mean by that strange expression is, they declare that God condemns all beside those who believe in Jesus Christ, and love him and keep his commandments. And so must you also, or you sin against God, and your neighbour, and your own soul. But is there any uncharitableness in this, in warning sinners to flee from the wrath to come? On the contrary, not to warn a poor, blind, stupid wretch that he is hanging over the mouth of hell, would be so inexcusable a want of charity, as would bring his blood upon our own head.

4. But there is no room for dispute, touching these doctrines in general, seeing our Lord gives you so plain a rule, by which you may easily and infallibly know whether they be of God: "The tree is known by its fruit; either therefore make the tree good, and its fruit good; or else make the tree corrupt, and its fruit corrupt," Matt. xii, 33. Now, what fruit does the tree before us bring forth? Look and see; believe your own eyes and ears. Sinners leave their sins: the servants of the devil become the servants of God. Is this good or evil fruit; that vice loses ground, and virtue, practical religion, gains? O dispute no more! Know the tree by its fruit. Bow, and own the finger of God.

5. But many who own these doctrines to be of God, yet cannot be reconciled to the instruments he hath made use of. A very common exception taken against these is, and was from the beginning, that "they are so young:" therefore, (abundance of men have readily inferred,) this work cannot be of God.

Perhaps they are not so young as you conceive. Mr. Whitefield is now upward of thirty; my brother is thirty-seven years of age; I have lived above forty-two years; and a gentleman in Cornwall, for whom I often preach, has the merit of having lived threescore and seventeen years.

But, supposing the antecedent true, what a consequence is this! What shadow of Scripture have you to support it? Doth not God "send by whom he *will* send?" And who shall say to him, "What doest thou?" "These are too young; send elder men." What shadow of reason?

Is it not possible that a person of thirty or forty may have as true a judgment in the things of God, and as great a blessing attending his preaching, as one of fifty or fourscore?

I wish you would explain yourself a little on this head:—

Scire velim, verbo, pretium quotus arroget annus?
(How old must a book be before it is good for any thing?)

How old do you require a man to be, before God should have leave to speak by his mouth? O my brethren, who could have believed any serious man would once have named such an argument as this; seeing both Scripture and reason teach, that God herein “giveth account to none of his ways?” But he worketh by whomsoever he *will* work; he showeth mercy by whom he *will* show mercy.

6. “But there are only a few young heads.” I cannot but observe here what great pains have been taken, what diligence shown, to make and to keep them few. What arts have not been used to keep back those, of the clergy in particular, who have been clearly convinced, from time to time, that they ought to join hearts and hands in the work? On this occasion it has been accounted meritorious to “say all manner of evil of us falsely;” to promise them whatever their hearts desired, if they would refrain from these men; and, on the other hand, to threaten them with heavy things if ever they went among them more. So that how fully soever they were convinced, they could not act according to their conviction, unless they could give up at once all thought of preferment either in Church or State; nay, all hope of even a Fellowship, or poor Scholarship, in either University. Many also have been threatened, that if they went on in this way, what little they had should be taken from them. And many have, on this very account, been disowned by their dearest friends and nearest relations: so that there was no possibility the number of these labourers should ever be increased at all, unless by those who could break through all these ties, who desired nothing in the present world, who counted neither their fortunes, nor friends, nor lives, dear unto themselves, so they might only keep “a conscience void of offence toward God and toward men.”

7. But what do you infer from their fewness? that, because they are few, therefore God cannot work by them? Upon what scripture do you ground this? I thought it was the same to Him, to save by many or by few. Upon what reason? Why cannot God save ten thousand souls by one man, as well as by ten thousand? How little, how inconsiderable a circumstance is number before God! Nay, is there not reason to believe that whensoever God is pleased to work a great deliverance, spiritual or temporal, he may first say, as of old, “The people are too many for me to give the Midianites into their hands?” May he not purposely choose few as well as inconsiderable instruments, for the greater manifestation of his own glory? Very few, I grant, are the instruments now employed; yet a great work is wrought already. And the fewer they are by whom this large harvest hath hitherto been gathered in, the more evident must it appear to unprejudiced minds, that the work is not of man, but of God.

8. “But they are not only few, but unlearned also.” This is a grievous offence, and is by many esteemed a sufficient excuse for not acknowledging the work to be of God.

The ground of this offence is partly true. Some of those who now preach are unlearned. They neither understand the ancient languages, nor any of the branches of philosophy. And yet this objection might have been spared by many of those who have frequently made it; because they are unlearned too, though accounted otherwise. They have not themselves the very thing they require in others.

Men in general are under a great mistake with regard to what is called *the learned world*. They do not know, they cannot easily imagine, how little learning there is among them. I do not speak of abstruse learning; but of what all divines, at least, of any note, are supposed to have, namely, the knowledge of the tongues, at least, Latin, Greek, and Hebrew, and of the common arts and sciences.

How few men of learning, so called, understand Hebrew; even so far as to read a plain chapter in Genesis! Nay, how few understand Greek! Make an easy experiment. Desire that grave man, who is urging this objection, only to tell you the English of the first paragraph that occurs in one of Plato's Dialogues. I am afraid we may go farther still. How few understand Latin! Give one of them an Epistle of Tully, and see how readily he will explain it without his dictionary. If he can hobble through that, it is odds but a Georgic in Virgil, or a Satire of Persius, sets him fast.

And with regard to the arts and sciences; how few understand so much as the general principles of logic! Can one in ten of the clergy, (O grief of heart!) or of the Masters of Arts in either university, when an argument is brought, tell you even the mood and figure wherein it is proposed; or complete an enthymeme? Perhaps you do not so much as understand the term;—supply the premiss which is wanting, in order to make it a full categorical syllogism. Can one in ten of them demonstrate a problem or theorem in Euclid's Elements, or define the common terms used in metaphysics, or intelligibly explain the first principles of it? Why then will they pretend to that learning which they are conscious to themselves they have not? nay, and censure others who have it not, and do not pretend to it? Where are sincerity and candour fled?

It will easily be observed, that I do not depreciate learning of any kind. The knowledge of the languages is a valuable talent; so is the knowledge of the arts and sciences. Both the one and the other may be employed to the glory of God and the good of men. But yet I ask, Where hath God declared in his word, that he cannot, or will not, make use of men that have it not? Has Moses or any of the prophets affirmed this? or our Lord, or any of his Apostles? You are sensible all these are against you: you know the Apostles themselves, all except St. Paul, were *ἀνδρες ἀγράμματοι καὶ ἰδιῶται*, “common, unphilosophical, unlettered men.”

9. “What! Then you make yourselves like the Apostles.” Because this silly objection has so often been urged, I will for once spend a few words upon it, though it does not deserve that honour. Why, must not every man, whether clergyman or layman, be in some respects like the Apostles, or go to hell? Can any man be saved if he be not holy like the Apostles; a follower of them, as they were of Christ? And ought not every preacher of the Gospel to be in a peculiar manner like the

Apostles, both in holy tempers, in exemplariness of life, and in his indefatigable labours for the good of souls? Wo unto every ambassador of Christ, who is not like the Apostles in this! in holiness, in making full proof of his ministry, in spending and being spent for Christ! We cannot, and therefore we need not, be like them in working outward miracles; but we may, and ought, in working together with God for the salvation of men. And the same God who was always ready to help their infirmities, is ready to help ours also. He who made them "workmen that needed not to be ashamed," will teach us also "rightly to divide the word of truth." In this respect likewise, in respect of his "having help from God," for the work whereunto he is called, every preacher of the Gospel is like the Apostles: otherwise, he is of all men most miserable.

10. And I am bold to affirm, that these unlettered men have help from God for that great work,—the saving souls from death; seeing he hath enabled, and doth enable them still, to "turn many to righteousness." Thus hath he "destroyed the wisdom of the wise, and brought to nought the understanding of the prudent." When they imagined they had effectually shut the door, and locked up every passage whereby any help could come to two or three preachers, weak in body as well as soul, who they might reasonably believe would, humanly speaking, wear themselves out in a short time;—when they had gained their point by securing, as they supposed, all the men of learning in the nation, "He that sitteth in heaven laughed them to scorn," and came upon them by a way they thought not of. "Out of the stones he raised up" those who should beget "children to Abraham." We had no more foresight of this than you: nay, we had the deepest prejudices against it; until we could not but own that God gave "wisdom from above" to these unlearned and ignorant men, so that the work of the Lord prospered in their hand, and sinners were daily converted to God.

Indeed, in the one thing which they profess to know, they are not ignorant men. I trust there is not one of them who is not able to go through such an examination, in substantial, practical, experimental divinity, as few of our candidates for holy orders, even in the university, (I speak it with sorrow and shame, and in tender love,) are able to do. But, O! what manner of examination do most of those candidates go through! and what proof are the testimonials commonly brought, (as solemn as the form is wherein they run,) either of their piety or knowledge to whom are entrusted those sheep which God hath purchased with his own blood!

11. "But they are laymen. You seem to be sensible yourself of the strength of this objection. For as many as you have answered, I observe you have never once so much as touched on this."

I have not. Yet it was not distrust of my cause, but tenderness to you, which occasioned my silence. I had something to advance on this head also; but I was afraid you could not bear it. I was conscious to myself that, some years since, to touch this point, was to touch the apple of my eye: and this makes me almost unwilling to speak now, lest I should shock the prejudices I cannot remove.

Suffer me, however, just to intimate to you some things which I would leave to your farther consideration: the scribes of old, who were the ordinary preachers among the Jews, were not priests; they were not

better than laymen. Yea, many of them were incapable of the priesthood, being of the tribe of Simeon, not of Levi.

Hence, probably, it was that the Jews themselves never urged it as an objection to our Lord's preaching, (even those who did not acknowledge or believe that he was sent of God in an extraordinary character,) that he was no priest after the order of Aaron: nor, indeed, could be; seeing he was of the tribe of Judah.

Nor does it appear that any objected this to the Apostles: so far from it, that at Antioch, in Pisidia, we find the rulers of the synagogue sending unto Paul and Barnabas, strangers just come into the city, "saying, Men and brethren, if ye have any word of exhortation for the people, say on," Acts xiii, 15.

If we consider these things, we shall be the less surprised at what occurs in the eighth chapter of the Acts: "At that time there was a great persecution against the Church; and they were all scattered abroad" (that is, all the Church, all the believers in Jesus) "throughout the regions of Judea and Samaria," verse 1. "Therefore, they that were scattered abroad went every where preaching the word," verse 4. Now, what shadow of reason have we to say, or think, that all these were ordained before they preached?

12. If we come to later times: was Mr. Calvin ordained? Was he either priest or deacon? And were not most of those whom it pleased God to employ in promoting the Reformation abroad, laymen also? Could that great work have been promoted at all in many places, if laymen had not preached? And yet how seldom do the very Papists urge this as an objection against the Reformation! Nay, as rigorous as they are in things of this kind, they themselves appoint, even in some of their strictest orders, that "if any lay-brother believes himself called of God to preach as a missionary, the superior of the order, being informed thereof, shall immediately send him away."

In all Protestant Churches it is still more evident that ordination is not held a necessary prerequisite of preaching; for in Sweden, in Germany, in Holland, and, I believe, in every Reformed Church in Europe, it is not only permitted but required, that before any one is ordained, (before he is admitted even into deacon's orders, wherever the distinction between priests and deacons is retained,) he should publicly preach a year or more *ad probandum facultatem*. [On trial.] And for this practice they believe they have the authority of an express command of God: "Let these first be proved; then let them use the office of a deacon, being found blameless," 1 Tim. iii, 10.

13. "In England, however, there is nothing of this kind: no layman permitted to speak in public." No! Can you be ignorant, that in a hundred churches they do it continually? In how many (particularly in the west of England) does the parish clerk read one of the lessons? (In some he reads the whole service of the Church, perhaps every Lord's day.) And do not other laymen constantly do the same thing, yea, in our very cathedrals? which, being under the more immediate inspection of the bishops, should be patterns to all other churches.

Perhaps it will be said, "But this is not preaching." Yes, but it is essentially such. For what is it to preach, but *prædicare verbum Dei*; "to publish the word of God?" And this laymen do all over England,

particularly under the eye of every bishop in the nation. Nay, is it not done in the universities themselves? Who ordained that singing man at Christ-Church; who is likewise utterly unqualified for the work, murdering every lesson he reads? not even endeavouring to read it as the word of God, but rather as an old song! Such a layman as this, meddling at all with the word of God, I grant, is a scandal to the English nation.

To go a step farther: do not the fundamental constitutions of the university of Oxford, the statutes, even as revised by Archbishop Laud, require every bachelor of arts, nine in ten of whom are laymen, to read three public lectures in moral philosophy, on whatever subject he chooses? My subject, I well remember, was, “the *love* of God.” Now, what was this but preaching?

Nay, may not a man be a doctor of divinity even in Oxford, though he never was ordained at all? The instance of Dr. Atwell, (late) rector of Exeter College, is fresh in every one’s memory.

These are a few of the considerations that may readily occur to any thinking man on this head. But I do not rest the cause on these. I believe it may be defended a shorter way.

14. It pleased God, by two or three ministers of the Church of England, to call many sinners to repentance; who, in several parts were undeniably turned from a course of sin, to a course of holiness.

The ministers of the places where this was done ought to have received those ministers with open arms; and to have taken them who had just begun to serve God into their peculiar care; watching over them in tender love, lest they should fall back into the snare of the devil.

Instead of this, the greater part spoke of those ministers as if the devil, not God, had sent them. Some repelled them from the Lord’s table; others stirred up the people against them, representing them, even in their public discourses, as fellows not fit to live; Papists, heretics, traitors; conspirators against their king and country.

And how did they watch over the sinners lately reformed? Even as a leopard watcheth over his prey. They drove some of them also from the Lord’s table; to which till now they had no desire to approach. They preached all manner of evil concerning them, openly cursing them in the name of the Lord. They turned many out of their work; persuaded others to do so too, and harassed them all manner of ways.

The event was, that some were wearied out, and so turned back to their vomit again. And then these good pastors gloried over them, and endeavoured to shake others by their example.

15. When the ministers by whom God had helped them before came again to those places, great part of their work was to begin again; (if it could be begun again;) but the relapsers were often so hardened in sin, that no impression could be made upon them.

What could they do in a case of so extreme necessity, where many souls lay at stake?

No clergyman would assist at all. The expedient that remained was, to find some one among themselves, who was upright of heart, and of sound judgment in the things of God; and to desire him to meet the rest as often as he could, in order to confirm them, as he was able, in the ways of God, either by reading to them, or by prayer, or by exhortation.

God immediately gave a blessing hereto. In several places, by means of these plain men, not only those who had already begun to run well were hindered from drawing back to perdition; but other sinners also, from time to time, were converted from the error of their ways.

This plain account of the whole proceeding I take to be the best defence of it. I know no scripture which forbids making use of such help, in a case of such necessity. And I praise God who has given even this help to those poor sheep, when "their own shepherds pitied them not."

"But does not the Scripture say, 'No man taketh this honour to himself, but he that is called of God, as was Aaron?'" Nor do these. The honour here mentioned is the priesthood. But they no more take upon them to be priests than to be kings. They take not upon them to administer the sacraments,—an honour peculiar to the priests of God. Only, according to their power, they exhort their brethren to continue in the grace of God.

"But for these laymen to exhort at all is a violation of all order."

What is this order of which you speak? Will it serve instead of the knowledge and love of God? Will this order rescue those from the snare of the devil, who are now taken captive at his will? Will it keep them who are escaped a little way, from turning back into Egypt? If not, how should I answer it to God, if, rather than violate I know not what order, I should sacrifice thousands of souls thereto? I dare not do it. It is at the peril of my own soul.

Indeed, if by order were meant true Christian discipline, whereby all the living members of Christ are knit together in one, and all that are putrid and dead immediately cut off from the body; this order I reverence, for it is of God. But where is it to be found? in what diocese, in what town or parish, within England or Wales? Are you rector of a parish? Then let us go no farther. Does this order obtain there? Nothing less. Your parishioners are a rope of sand. As few (if any) of them are alive to God; so they have no connection with each other, unless such as might be among Turks or Heathens. Neither have you any power to cut off from that body, were it alive, the dead and putrid members. Perhaps you have no desire; but all are jumbled together without any care or concern of yours.

It is plain, then, that what order is to be found is not among you who so loudly contend for it, but among that very people whom you continually blame for their violation and contempt of it. The little flock you condemn is united together in one body, by one Spirit; so that "if one member suffers, all the members suffer with it; if one be honoured, all rejoice with it." Nor does any dead member long remain; but as soon as the hope of recovering it is past, it is cut off.

Now, suppose we were willing to relinquish our charge, and to give up this flock into your hands, would you observe the same order as we do now with them and the other souls under your care? You dare not; because you have respect of persons. You fear the faces of men. You cannot; because you have not overcome the world. You are not above the desire of earthly things. And it is impossible you should ever have any true order, or exercise any Christian discipline, till you are wholly crucified to the world, till you desire nothing more but God.

Consider this matter, I entreat you, a little farther. Here are thirty thousand persons* (perhaps somewhat more) of whom I take care, watching over their souls as he that must give account. In order hereto it lies upon me, (so I judge,) at the peril of my own salvation, to know, not only their names, but their outward and inward states, their difficulties and dangers. Otherwise, how can I know either how to guide them aright, or to commend them to God in prayer? Now, if I am willing to make these over to you, will you watch over them in the same manner? Will you take the same care (or as much more as you please) of each soul as I have hitherto done? Not such *curam animarum* ["cure of souls"] as you have taken these ten years in your own parish. Poor empty name! Has not your parish been, in fact, as much a sinecure to you as your prebend? O what an account have you to give to the great Shepherd and Bishop of souls!

18. There is one more excuse for denying this work of God, taken from the instruments employed therein; that is, "that they are wicked men." And a thousand stories have been handed about to prove it.

But you may observe, their wickedness was not heard of till after they "went about doing good." Their reputation for honesty was till then unblemished. But it was impossible it should continue so, when they were publicly employed in "testifying of the world, that its deeds were evil." It could not be but the Scriptures should be fulfilled: "The servant is not above his master. If they have called the Master of the house Beelzebub, how much more them of his household!"

Yet I cannot but remind considerate men, in how remarkable a manner the wisdom of God has for many years guarded against this pretence, with respect to my brother and me in particular. Scarce any two men in Great Britain, of our rank, have been so held out, as it were, to all the world; especially of those who from their childhood had always loved and studiously sought retirement. And I had procured what I sought; I was quite safe, as I supposed, in a little country town, when I was required to return to Oxford, without delay, to take the charge of some young gentlemen, by Dr. Morley, the only man then in England to whom I could deny nothing. From that time both my brother and I (utterly against our will) came to be more and more observed and known, till we were more spoken of, than perhaps two so inconsiderable persons ever were before in the nation. To make us more public still, as honest madmen at least, by a strange concurrence of providences, overturning all our preceding resolutions, we were hurried away to America. However, at our return from thence, we were resolved to retire out of the world at once; being sated with noise, hurry, and fatigue, and seeking nothing but to be at rest. Indeed, for a long season, the greatest pleasure I had desired on this side eternity was,

*Tacitum sylvas inter reptare salubres,
Quærentem quicquid dignum sapiente bonoque.
(Creeping silent through the sylvan shades,
Exploring what is wise and good in man.)*

And we had attained our desire. We wanted nothing. We looked for

[* This Farther Appeal was originally written in 1745. The number of members in Mr. Wesley's societies did not amount to 30,000 till about the year 1771, or 1772. This passage, therefore, must have been first inserted in some edition published about that time.]

nothing more in this world when we were dragged out again, by earnest importunity, to preach at one place, and another, and another, and so carried on, we knew not how, without any design but the general one of saving souls, into a situation, which, had it been named to us at first, would have appeared far worse than death.

19. What a surprising apparatus of Providence was here! And what stronger demonstrations could have been given, of men's acting from a zeal for God, whether it were "according to knowledge" or no? What persons could, in the nature of things, have been (antecedently) less liable to exception, with regard to their moral character, at least, than those the all-wise God hath now employed? Indeed I cannot devise what manner of men could have been more unexceptionable on all accounts. Had God endued us with greater natural or acquired abilities, that very thing might have been turned into an objection. Had we been remarkably defective, it would have been matter of objection on the other hand. Had we been Dissenters of any kind, or even Low Church men, (so called,) it would have been a great stumbling block in the way of those who are zealous for the Church. And yet had we continued in the impetuosity of our High Church zeal, neither should we have been willing to converse with Dissenters, nor they to receive any good at our hands. Some objections were kept out of the way, by our known contempt of money and preferment; and others, by that rigorous strictness of life which we exacted, not of others, but ourselves only. Insomuch, that, twelve or fourteen years ago, the censure of one who had narrowly observed us (me in particular) went no farther than this:—

Does John beyond his strength persist to go,
To his frail carcass literally a foe?
Careless of health, as if in haste to die,
And lavish time to' insure eternity!

So that upon the whole, I see not what God could have done more in this respect which he hath not done; or what instruments he could have employed in such a work, who would have been less liable to exception.

20. Neither can I conceive how it was possible to do that work, the doing of which, we are still under the strongest conviction, is bound upon us at the peril of our own souls, in a less exceptionable manner. We have, by the grace of God, behaved, not only with meekness, but with all tenderness toward all men; with all the tenderness which we conceived it was possible to use, without betraying their souls. And from the very first it has been our special care, to deal tenderly with our brethren, the clergy. We have not willingly provoked them at any time; neither any single clergyman. We have not sought occasion to publish their faults; we have not used a thousand occasions that offered. When we were constrained to speak something, we spake as little as we believed we could, without offending God; and that little, though in plain and strong words, yet as mildly and lovingly as we were able. And in the same course we have steadily persevered, (as well as in earnestly advising others to tread in our steps,) even though we saw that, with regard to them, by all this we profited nothing; though we knew we were still continually represented as implacable enemies to the clergy, as railers against them, as slanderers of them, as seeking all opportunities to blacken and asperse them. When a clergyman himself has

vehemently accused me of doing this, I bless God he could not provoke me to do it. I still "kept my mouth as it were with a bridle," and committed my cause to a higher hand.

21. The truth is, you impute that hatred to us, which is in your own breast. (I speak not this of all the clergy; God forbid! But let it fall on whom it concerns.) You, it is certain, have shown the utmost hatred to us, and in every possible way; unless you were actually to beat us, (of which also we are not without precedent,) or to shoot us through the head. And if you could prevail upon others to do this, I suppose you would think you did God service. I do not speak without ground. I have heard with my own ears such sermons, (in Staffordshire particularly,) that I should not have wondered if, as soon as we came out of the church, the people had stoned me with stones. And it was a natural consequence of what that poor minister had lately heard at the bishop's visitation; as it was one great cause of the miserable riots and outrages which soon followed.

It is this, my brethren, it is your own preaching, and not ours, which sets the people against you. The very same persons who are diverted with those sermons, cannot but despise you for them in their hearts; even those who on your authority believe most of the assertions which you advance. What then must they think of you, who know the greatest part of what you assert to be utterly false? They may pity and pray for you; but they can esteem you no other than false witnesses against God and your brethren.

22. "But what need is there," say even some of a milder spirit, "of this preaching in fields and streets? Are there not churches enough to preach in?" No, my friend, there are not; not for us to preach in. You forget; we are not suffered to preach there, else we should prefer them to any places whatever. "Well, there are ministers enough without you." *Ministers enough, and churches enough!* for what? to reclaim all the sinners within the four seas? If there were, they would all be reclaimed. But they are not reclaimed: therefore, it is evident that there are not churches enough. And one plain reason why, notwithstanding all these churches, they are no nearer being reclaimed is this,—they never come into a church, perhaps not once in a twelve-month, perhaps not for many years together. Will you say, (as I have known some tender-hearted Christians,) "Then it is their own fault; let them die, and be damned?" I grant it is their own fault; and so it was my fault and yours when we went astray like sheep that were lost. Yet the Shepherd of souls sought after us, and went after us into the wilderness. And "oughtest not thou to have compassion on thy fellow servants, as he had pity on thee?" Ought not we also "to seek," as far as in us lies, "and to save, that which is lost?"

Behold the amazing love of God to the outcasts of men! His tender condescension to their folly! They would regard nothing done in the usual way. All this was lost upon them. The ordinary preaching of the word of God, they would not even deign to hear. So the devil made sure of these careless ones; for who should pluck them out of his hand? Then God was moved to jealousy, and went out of the usual way to save the souls which he had made. Then, over and above what was ordinarily spoken in his name in all the houses of God in the land, he com-

manded a voice to cry in the wilderness, "Prepare ye the way of the Lord. The time is fulfilled. The kingdom of heaven is at hand. Repent ye, and believe the Gospel."

23. Consider coolly, if it was not highly expedient that something of this kind should be. How expedient, were it only on the account of those poor sinners against their own souls who, to all human appearance, were utterly inaccessible every other way! And what numbers of these are still to be found, even in or near our most populous cities! What multitudes of them were, some years since, both in Kingswood, and the Fells about Newcastle! who, week after week, spent the Lord's day, either in the ale house, or in idle diversions, and never troubled themselves about going to church, or to any public worship at all. Now, would you really have desired that these poor wretches should have sinned on till they dropped into hell? Surely you would not. But by what other means was it possible they should have been plucked out of the fire? Had the minister of the parish preached like an angel, it had profited them nothing; for they heard him not. But when one came and said, "Yonder is a man preaching on the top of the mountain," they ran in droves to hear what he would say; and God spoke to their hearts. It is hard to conceive any thing else which could have reached them. Had it not been for field preaching, the uncommonness of which was the very circumstance that recommended it, they must have run on in the error of their way, and perished in their blood.

24. But suppose field preaching to be, in a case of this kind, ever so expedient, or even necessary, yet who will contest with us for this province? May we not enjoy this quiet and unmolested? Unmolested, I mean, by any competitors: for who is there among you, brethren, that is willing (examine your own hearts) even to save souls from death at this price? Would not you let a thousand souls perish, rather than you would be the instruments of rescuing them thus? I do not speak now with regard to conscience, but to the inconveniencies that must accompany it. Can you sustain them, if you would? Can you bear the summer sun to beat upon your naked head? Can you suffer the wintry rain or wind, from whatever quarter it blows? Are you able to stand in the open air without any covering or defence when God casteth abroad his snow like wool, or scattereth his hoar frost like ashes? And yet these are some of the smallest inconveniencies which accompany field preaching. Far beyond all these, are the contradiction of sinners, the scoffs both of the great vulgar and the small; contempt and reproach of every kind; often more than verbal affronts, stupid, brutal violence, sometimes to the hazard of health, or limbs, or life. Brethren, do you envy us this honour? What, I pray, would buy you to be a field preacher? Or what, think you, could induce any man of common sense to continue therein one year, unless he had a full conviction in himself that it was the will of God concerning him?

Upon this conviction it is (were we to submit to these things on any other motive whatsoever, it would furnish you with a better proof of our distraction than any that has yet been found) that we now do, for the good of poor souls, what you cannot, will not, dare not do: and we desire not that you should. But this one thing we may reasonably desire of you,—Do not increase the difficulties, which are already so

great, that, without the mighty power of God, we must sink under them. Do not assist in trampling down a little handful of men, who, for the present, stand in the gap between ten thousand poor wretches and destruction, till you find some others to take their places.

25. Highly needful it is that some should do this, lest those poor souls be lost without remedy : and it should rejoice the hearts of all who desire the kingdom of God should come, that so many of them have been snatched already from the mouth of the lion, by an uncommon, though not unlawful, way. This circumstance, therefore, is no just excuse for not acknowledging the work of God ; especially, if we consider, that whenever it has pleased God to work any great work upon the earth, even from the earliest times, he hath stepped more or less out of the common way ;—whether to excite the attention of a greater number of people than might otherwise have regarded it ; or to separate the proud and haughty of heart, from those of an humble, child-like spirit ; the former of whom he foresaw, trusting in their own wisdom, would fall on that stone and be broken ; while the latter, inquiring with simplicity, would soon know of the work, that it was of God.

26. “ Nay,” say some, “ but God is a God of wisdom : and it is his work to give understanding. Whereas this man is one of them, and he is a fool. You see the fruits of their preaching.” No, my friend, you do not. That is your mistake. A fool very possibly he may be. So it appears by his talking, perhaps writing too. But this is none of the fruits of our preaching. He was a fool before ever he heard us. We found and are likely to leave him so. Therefore his folly is not to be imputed to us, even if it continue to the day of his death. As we were not the cause, so we undertake not the cure, of disorders of this kind. No fair man, therefore, can excuse himself thus, from acknowledging the work of God.

Perhaps you will say, “ He is not a natural fool, neither ; but he is so ignorant. He knows not the first principles of religion.” It is very possible. But have patience with him, and he will know them by and by ; yea, if he be in earnest to save his soul, far sooner than you can conceive. And, in the mean time, neither is this an objection of any weight. Many, when they begin to hear us, may, without any fault of ours, be utter strangers to the whole of religion. But this is no incurable disease. Yet a little while, and they may be wise unto salvation.

Is the ignorance you complain of among this people (you who object to the people more than to their teachers) of another kind ? Do not they “ know how in meekness to reprove or instruct those that oppose themselves ?” I believe what you say : all of them do not ; they have not put on gentleness and long suffering. I wish they had : pray for them that they may ; that they may be mild and patient toward all men. But what, if they are not ? Sure, you do not make this an argument that God hath not sent us ! Our Lord came, and we come, “ not to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance ;” passionate sinners, (such as these whereof you complain,) as well as those of every other kind. Nor can it be expected that they should be wholly delivered from their sin as soon as they begin to hear his word.

27. A greater stumbling block than this is laid before you, by those that “ say and do not.” Such, I take it for granted, will be among us,

although we purge them out as fast as we can; persons that talk much of religion, that commend the preachers, perhaps are diligent in hearing them; it may be, read all their books, and sing their hymns; and yet no change is wrought in their hearts. Were they of old time as lions in their houses? They are the same still. Were they (in low life) slothful or intemperate? Were they tricking or dishonest, overreaching or oppressive? Or did they use to borrow and not pay? The Ethiopian hath not changed his skin. Were they (in high life) delicate, tender, self-indulgent? Were they nice in furniture or apparel? Were they fond of trifles, or of their own dear persons? The leopard hath not changed her spots. Yet their being with us for a time proves no more than that we have not the miraculous discernment of spirits.

Others you may find, in whom there was a real change. But it was only for a season. They are now turned back, and are two-fold more the children of hell than before. Yet neither is this any manner of proof that the former work was not of God. No, not though these apostates should, with the utmost confidence, say all manner of evil against us. I expect they should. For every other injury hath been forgiven, and will be to the end of the world. But hardly shall any one forgive the intolerable injury of almost persuading him to be a Christian. When these men, therefore, who were with us, but went out from among us, assert things that may cause your ears to tingle, if you consider either the Scripture or the nature of man it will not stagger you at all: much less will it excuse you for not acknowledging the work in general to be of God.

28. But to all this it may possibly be replied, "When you bring your credentials with you, when you prove by miracles what you assert, then we will acknowledge that God hath sent you."

What is it you would have us prove by miracles? that the doctrines we preach are true? This is not the way to prove that. (As our first reformers replied to those of the Church of Rome, who, you may probably remember, were continually urging them with this very demand.) We prove the doctrines we preach by Scripture and reason, and, if need be, by antiquity.

What else is it then we are to prove by miracles?

Is it, (1.) That A. B. was for many years without God in the world, a common swearer, a drunkard, a Sabbath breaker?

Or, (2.) That he is not so now?

Or, (3.) That he continued so till he heard us preach, and from that time was another man?

Not so. The proper way to prove these facts is by the testimony of competent witnesses; and these witnesses are ready, whenever required, to give full evidence of them.

Or, would you have us prove by miracles,

(4.) That this was not done by our own power or holiness? that God only is able to raise the dead, those who are dead in trespasses and sins? Nay, if you "hear not Moses and the Prophets" and Apostles, on this head, neither would you believe, "though one rose from the dead."

It is therefore utterly unreasonable and absurd to require or expect the proof of miracles, in questions of such a kind as are always decided by proofs of quite another nature.

29. "But you relate them yourself." I relate just what I saw, from time to time: and this is true, that some of those circumstances seem to go beyond the ordinary course of nature. But I do not peremptorily determine, whether they were supernatural or no; much less do I rest upon them either the proof of other facts, or of the doctrines which I preach. I prove these in the ordinary way; the one by testimony, the other by Scripture and reason.

"But if you can work miracles when you please, is not this the surest way of proving them? This would put the matter out of dispute at once, and supersede all other proof."

You seem to lie under an entire mistake, both as to the nature and use of miracles. It may reasonably be questioned, whether there ever was that man living upon earth, except the man Christ Jesus, that could work miracles when he pleased. God only, when he pleased, exerted that power, and by whomsoever it pleased him.

But if a man could work miracles when he pleased, yet there is no Scripture authority, nor even example, for doing it in order to satisfy such a demand as this. I do not read that either our Lord, or any of his Apostles, wrought any miracle on such an occasion. Nay, how sharply does our Lord rebuke those who made a demand of this kind! When "certain of the Scribes and of the Pharisees answered, saying, Master, we would see a sign from thee;" (observe, this was their method of answering the strong reasons whereby he had just proved the works in question to be of God!) "he answered and said to them, An evil and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign; but there shall no sign be given to it, but the sign of the Prophet Jonas," Matt. xii, 38, 39. "An evil and adulterous generation!" else they would not have needed such a kind of proof. Had they been willing to do his will, they would, without this, have known that the doctrine was of God.

Miracles, therefore, are quite needless in such a case. Nor are they so conclusive a proof as you imagine. If a man could and did work them in defence of any doctrine, yet this would not supersede other proof; for there may be *τερατα ψευδης*, "lying wonders," miracles wrought in support of falsehood. Still, therefore, his doctrine would remain to be proved from the proper topics of Scripture and reason: and these even without miracles are sufficient; but miracles without these are not. Accordingly, our Saviour and all his Apostles, in the midst of their greatest miracles, never failed to prove every doctrine they taught by clear Scripture and cogent reason.

30. I presume, by this time you may perceive the gross absurdity of demanding miracles in the present case; seeing one of the propositions in question, (over and above our general doctrines,) viz. "That sinners are reformed," can only be proved by testimony; and the other, "This cannot be done but by the power of God," needs no proof, being self evident.

"Why, I did once myself rejoice to hear," says a grave citizen, with an air of great importance, "that so many sinners were reformed, till I found they were only turned from one wickedness to another; that they were turned from cursing or swearing, or drunkenness, into a no less damnable sin, that of schism."

Do you know what you say? You have, I am afraid, a confused

huddle of ideas in your head; and I doubt you have not capacity to clear them up yourself, nor coolness enough to receive help from others.

However, I will try. What is schism? Have you any determinate idea of it? I ask the rather, because I have found, by repeated experiments, that a common English tradesman receives no more light when he hears or reads, "This is schism," than if he heard or read,—

Bombalio, stridor, clangor, tarantara, murmur.

Honest neighbour, do not be angry. Lay down your hammer, and let us talk a little on this head.

You say, we are in the damnable sin of schism, and therefore in as bad a state as adulterers or murderers.

I ask once more, What do you mean by schism? "Schism! schism! why, it is separating from the Church." Ay, so it is. And yet every separating from the Church to which we once belonged is not schism; else you will make all the English to be schismatics, by separating from the Church of Rome. "But we had just cause." So doubtless we had; whereas schism is a causeless separation from the Church of Christ. So far so good. But you have many steps to take before you can make good that conclusion, that a separation from a particular national church, such as the Church of England is, whether with sufficient cause or without, comes under the scriptural notion of schism.

However, taking this for granted, will you aver in cool blood, that all who die in such a separation, that is, every one who dies a Quaker, a Baptist, an Independent, or a Presbyterian, is as infallibly damned as if he died in the act of murder or adultery? Surely you start at the thought! It makes even nature recoil. How then can you reconcile it to the love that "hopeth all things?"

31. But whatever state they are in, who causelessly separate from the Church of England, it affects not those of whom we are speaking; for they do not separate from it at all.

You may easily be convinced of this, if you will only weigh the particulars following:—

(1.) A great part of these went to no church at all before they heard us preach. They no more pretended to belong to the Church of England, than to the Church of Muscovy. If, therefore, they went to no church now, they would be no farther from the Church than they were before.

(2.) Those who did sometimes go to church before, go three times as often now. These, therefore, do not separate from the Church. Nay, they are united to it more closely than before.

(3.) Those who never went to church at all before, do go now, at all opportunities. Will common sense allow any one to say, that these are separated from the Church?

(4.) The main question is, Are they turned from doing the works of the devil, to do the works of God? Do they now live soberly, righteously, and godly, in the present world? If they do, if they live according to the directions of the Church, believe her doctrines, and join in her ordinances; with what face can you say, that these men separate from the Church of England?

32. But in what state are they whom the clergy and gentry (and perhaps you for one) have successfully laboured to preserve from this

damnable sin of schism, whom you have kept from hearing these men, and separating from the Church?

Is not the drunkard that was, a drunkard still? Inquire of his poor wife and family. Is not the common swearer still horribly crying to God for damnation upon his soul? Is not the sinner in every other kind, exactly the same man still? Not better at least, if he be not worse, than he was ten years ago.

Now, consider, (1.) Does the Church of England gain either honour, or strength, or blessing, by such wretches as these calling themselves her members? by ten thousand drunkards, or whoremongers, or common swearers? Nay, ought she not immediately to spew them out, to renounce all fellowship with them? Would she not be far better without them than with them? Let any man of reason judge.

(2.) Is the drunkard's calling himself of the Church of England, of any more use to him than to the Church? Will this save him from hell, if he die in his sin? Will it not rather increase his damnation?

(3.) Is not a drunkard of any other church just as good as a drunkard of the Church of England? Yea, is not a drunken Papist as much in the favour of God as a drunken Protestant?

(4.) Is not a cursing, swearing Turk (if there be such a one to be found) full as acceptable to God, as a cursing, swearing Christian?

Nay, (5.) If there be any advantage, does it not lie on the side of the former? Is he not the less inexcusable of the two, as sinning against less light?

O why will you sink these poor souls deeper into perdition than they are sunk already? Why will you prophesy unto them, "Peace, peace," when there is no peace? Why, if you do it not yourself, (whether you cannot, or will not, God knoweth,) should you hinder us from "guiding them into the way of peace?"

33. Will you endeavour to excuse yourself by saying, "There are not many who are the better for your preaching; and these by and by will be as bad as ever; as such and such a one is already?"

I would to God I could set this in a just light! But I cannot: all language fails.

God begins a glorious work in our land. You set yourself against it with all your might, to prevent its beginning where it does not yet appear, and to destroy it wherever it does. In part you prevail. You keep many from hearing the word that is able to save their souls. Others who had heard it, you induce to turn back from God, and to list under the devil's banner again. Then you make the success of your own wickedness an excuse for not acknowledging the work of God! You urge, that not many sinners were reformed; and that some of those are now as bad as ever!

Whose fault is this? Is it ours, or your own? Why have not thousands more been reformed? Yea, for every one who is now turned to God, why are there not ten thousand? Because you and your associates laboured so heartily in the cause of hell; because you and they spared no pains, either to prevent or to destroy the work of God! By using all the power and wisdom you had, you hindered thousands from hearing the Gospel which they might have found to be the power of God unto salvation. Their blood is upon your heads. By inventing,

or countenancing, or retailing lies, some refined, some gross and palpable, you hindered others from profiting by what they did hear. You are answerable to God for these souls also. Many who began to taste the good word, and run the way of God's commandments, you, by various methods, prevailed on to hear it no more: so they soon drew back to perdition. But know, that, for every one of these also, God will require an account of you in the day of judgment.

34. And yet, in spite of all the malice, and wisdom, and strength, not only of men, but of "principalities and powers," of the "rulers of the darkness of this world," of the "wicked spirits in high places," there are thousands found who are turned from "dumb idols to serve the living and true God." What a harvest then might we have seen before now, if all who say they are "on the Lord's side," had come, as in all reason they ought, "to the help of the Lord against the mighty!" Yea, had they only not opposed the work of God, had they only refrained from his messengers, might not the trumpet of God have been heard long since in every corner of our land; and thousands of sinners in every county been brought to "fear God and honour the king?"

Judge of what immense service we might have been, even in this single point, both to our king and country. All who hear and regard the word we preach, "honour the king" for God's sake. They "render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's," as well as "unto God the things that are God's." They have no conception of piety without loyalty; knowing "the powers that be are ordained of God." I pray God to strengthen all that are of this mind, how many soever they be! But might there not have been at this day a hundred thousand in England, thus minded, more than are now? Yea verily, even by our ministry, had not they who should have strengthened us, weakened our hands.

35. Surely you are not wise! What advantages do you throw away! What opportunities do you lose! Such as, another day, you may earnestly seek, and, nevertheless, may not find them. For if it please God to remove us, whom will you find to supply our place? We are in all things "your servants for Jesus's sake;" though the more we love you, the less we are loved. Let us be employed, not in the highest, but in the meanest, and not in the easiest, but the hottest, service. Ease and plenty we leave to those that want them. Let us go on in toil, in weariness, in painfulness, in cold or hunger, so we may but testify the gospel of the grace of God. The rich, the honourable, the great, we are thoroughly willing (if it be the will of our Lord) to leave to you. Only let us alone with the poor, the vulgar, the base, the outcasts of men. Take also to yourselves the saints of the world: but suffer us "to call sinners to repentance;" even the most vile, the most ignorant, the most abandoned, the most fierce and savage of whom we can hear. To these we will go forth in the name of our Lord, desiring nothing, receiving nothing of any man, (save the bread we eat, while we are under his roof,) and let it be seen whether God hath sent us. Only let not your hands, who fear the Lord, be upon us. Why should we be stricken of you any more?

IV. 1. Surely ye are without excuse, all who do not yet know the day of your visitation! the day wherein the great God, who hath been forgotten among us days without number, is arising at once to be avenged

of his adversaries, and to visit and redeem his people. Are not his judgments and mercies both abroad? and still will ye not learn righteousness? Is not the Lord passing by? Doth not a great and strong wind already begin "to rend the mountains and to break in pieces the rocks before the Lord?" Is not the earthquake also felt already? and a fire hath begun to burn in his anger. Who knoweth what will be the end thereof? But at the same time, he is speaking to many in "a still, small voice." He that hath ears to hear, let him hear, lest he be suddenly destroyed, and that without remedy!

2. What excuse can possibly be made for those who are regardless of such a season as this? who are, at such a crisis, stupid, senseless, unapprehensive? caring for none of these things; who do not give themselves the pains to think about them, but are still easy and unconcerned? What! can there ever be a point on which it more behoves you to think; and that with the coolest and deepest attention? As long as the heaven and the earth remain, can there be any thing of so vast importance, as God's last call to a guilty land, just perishing in its iniquity?

You, with those round about you, deserved long ago to have "drank the dregs of the cup of trembling;" yea, to have been "punished with everlasting destruction, from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power." But he hath not dealt with you according to your sins, neither rewarded you after your iniquities. And once more he is mixing mercy with judgment. Once more he is crying aloud, "Turn ye, turn ye from your evil ways; for why will ye die, O house of Israel?" And will you not deign to give him the hearing? If you are not careful to answer him in this matter, do not still shut your eyes, and stop your ears, and harden your stubborn heart. O beware, lest God laugh at your calamity, and mock when your fear cometh!

3. Will you plead that you have other concerns to mind; that other business engages your thoughts? It does so indeed; but this is your foolishness; this is the very thing that leaves you without excuse. For what business can be of equal moment? The mariner may have many concerns to mind, and many businesses to engage his thoughts; but not when the ship is sinking. In such a circumstance (it is your own) you have but one thing to think of,—save the ship and your own life together! And the higher post you are in, the more deeply intent should you be on this one point. Is this a time for diversions; for eating and drinking, and rising up to play? Keep the ship above water. Let all else go, and mind this one thing!

4. Perhaps you will say, "So I do: I do mind this one thing,—how to save the sinking nation. And therefore now I must think of arms and provisions. I have no time now to think of religion." This is exactly as if the mariner should say, "Now I must think of my guns and stores. I have no time now to think of the hold." Why, man, you must think of this, or perish. It is there the leak is sprung. Stop that, or you and all your stores will go together to the bottom of the sea.

Is not this your very case? Then, whatever you do, stop the leak; else you go to the bottom! I do not speak against your stores: they are good in their kind; and it may be well they are laid in. But all your stores will not save the sinking ship, unless you can stop the leak.

Unless you can some way keep out these floods of ungodliness, that are still continually pouring in, you must soon be swallowed up in the great deep, in the abyss of God's judgments. This, this is the destruction of the English nation. It is vice, bursting in on every side, that is just ready to sink us into slavery first, and then into the nethermost hell. "Who is a wise man, and endued with knowledge among you?" Let him think of this. Think of this, all that love your country, or that care for your own souls. If now especially you do not think of this one thing, you have no excuse before God or man.

5. Little more excuse have you who are still in doubt concerning this day of your visitation. For you have all the proof that you can reasonably expect or desire, all that the nature of the thing requires. That in many places, abundance of notorious sinners are totally reformed, is declared by a thousand eye and ear witnesses both of their present and past behaviour. And you are sensible, the proof of such a point as this must, in the nature of things, rest upon testimony. And that God alone is able to work such a reformation, you know all the Scriptures testify. What would you have more? What pretence can you have for doubting any longer? You have not the least room to expect or desire any other or any stronger evidence.

I trust you are not of those who fortify themselves against conviction; who are resolved they will never believe this. They ask, "Who are these men?" We tell them plainly; but they credit us not. Another and another of their own friends is convinced, and tells them the same thing. But their answer is ready, "Are you turned Methodist too?" So their testimony likewise goes for nothing. Now, how is it possible these should ever be convinced? for they will believe none but those who speak on one side.

6. Do you delay fixing your judgment till you see a work of God, without any stumbling block attending it? That never was yet, nor ever will. "It must needs be that offences will come." And scarce ever was there such a work of God before, with so few as have attended this.

When the reformation began, what mountainous offences lay in the way of even the sincere members of the Church of Rome! They saw such failings in those great men, Luther and Calvin! Their vehement tenaciousness of their own opinions; their bitterness toward all who differed from them; their impatience of contradiction, and utter want of forbearance, even with their own brethren.

But the grand stumbling block of all was their open, avowed separation from the Church; their rejecting so many of the doctrines and practices, which the others accounted the most sacred; and their continual invectives against the Church they separated from, so much sharper than Michael's reproof of Satan.

Were there fewer stumbling blocks attending the reformation in England? Surely no: for what was Henry the Eighth? Consider either his character, his motives to the work, or his manner of pursuing it! And even King Edward's ministry we cannot clear of persecuting in their turns, yea, and burning heretics. The main stumbling block also still remained, viz. open separation from the Church.

7. Full as many were the offences that lay in the way of even the

sincere members of the Church of England, when the people called Quakers first professed that they were sent of God to reform the land. Whether they were or no is beside our question; it suffices for the present purpose to observe, that over and above their open, avowed, total separation from the Church, and their vehement invectives against many of her doctrines, and the whole frame of her discipline, they spent their main strength in disputing about opinions and externals, rather than in preaching faith, mercy, and the love of God.

In these respects the case was nearly the same when the Baptists first appeared in England. They immediately commenced a warm dispute, not concerning the vitals of Christianity, but concerning the manner and time of administering one of the external ordinances of it. And as their opinion hereof totally differed from that of all the other members of the Church of England, so they soon openly declared their separation from it, not without sharp censures of those that continued therein.

8. The same occasion of offence was, in a smaller degree, given by the Presbyterians and Independents; for they also spent great part of their time and strength in opposing the commonly-received opinions concerning some of the circumstantial of religion; and, for the sake of these, separated from the Church.

But I do not include that venerable man, Mr. Philip Henry, nor any that were of his spirit, in this number. I know they abhorred contending about externals. Neither did they separate themselves from the Church. They continued therein till they were driven out, whether they would or no. I cannot but tenderly sympathize with these; and the more, because this is in part our own case. Warm men spare no pains, at this very day, to drive us out of the Church. They cry out to the people, wherever one of us comes, "A mad dog, a mad dog!" if haply we might fly for our lives, as many have done before us. And sure it is, we should have complied with their desire, we should merely for peace and quietness have left the Church long before now, but that we could not in conscience do it. And it is on this single motive, it is for conscience' sake, that we still continue therein; and shall continue, (God being our helper,) unless they by violence thrust us out.

9. But to return: what are the stumbling blocks in the present case, compared to those in any of the preceding?

We do not dispute concerning any of the externals or circumstantial of religion. There is no room; for we agree with you therein. We approve of, and adhere to, them all; all that we learned together when we were children, in our catechism and Common-Prayer Book. We were born and bred up in your own Church, and desire to die therein. We always were, and are now, zealous for the Church; only not with a blind, angry zeal. We hold, and ever have done, the same opinions which you and we received from our forefathers. But we do not lay the main stress of our religion on any opinions, right or wrong; neither do we ever begin, or willingly join in, any dispute concerning them. The weight of all religion, we apprehend, rests on holiness of heart and life. And consequently, wherever we come, we press this with all our might. How wide then is the difference between our ease and the case of any of those that are above mentioned! They avowedly separated from the Church: we utterly disavow any such design. They severely,

and almost continually, inveighed against the doctrines and discipline of the Church they left: we approve both the doctrines and discipline of our Church, and inveigh only against ungodliness and unrighteousness. They spent great part of their time and strength in contending about externals and circumstantials: we agree with you in both; so that having no room to spend any time in such vain contention, we have our desire of spending and being spent, in promoting plain, practical religion. How many stumbling blocks are removed out of your way! Why do not you acknowledge the work of God?

10. If you say, "Because you hold opinions which I cannot believe are true:" I answer, Believe them true or false; I will not quarrel with you about any opinion. Only see that your heart be right toward God, that you know and love the Lord Jesus Christ; that you love your neighbour, and walk as your Master walked; and I desire no more. I am sick of opinions: I am weary to bear them. My soul loathes this frothy food. Give me solid and substantial religion; give me an humble, gentle lover of God and man; a man full of mercy and good fruits, without partiality and without hypocrisy; a man laying himself out in the work of faith, the patience of hope, the labour of love. Let my soul be with these Christians, wheresoever they are, and whatsoever opinion they are of. "Whosoever" thus "doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven, the same is my brother, and sister, and mother."

11. Inexcusably infatuated must you be, if you can even doubt whether the propagation of this religion be of God! Only more inexcusable are those unhappy men who oppose, contradict, and blaspheme it.

How long will you stop your ears against him that still crieth, "Why persecutest thou me? It is hard for thee to kick against the pricks;" for a man to "contend with his Maker." How long will you despise the well-known advice of a great and learned man?—"Refrain from these men, and let them alone. If this work be of man, it will come to nought. But if it be of God, ye cannot overthrow it." And why should you "be found even to fight against God?" If a man fight with God, shall he prevail? "Canst thou thunder with a voice like him?" Make haste! Fall down! Humble thyself before him, lest he put forth his hand, and thou perish!

12. How long will you fight under the banner of the great enemy of God and man? You are now in his service; you are "taking part with the devil" against God. Even supposing there were no other proof, this would undeniably appear from the goodly company among whom you are enlisted, and who war one and the same warfare. I have heard some affirm, that the most bitter enemies to the present work of God were Pharisees. They meant, men who had the form of godliness, but denied the power of it. But I cannot say so. The sharpest adversaries thereof whom I have hitherto known (unless one might except a few honourable men whom I may be excused from naming) were the scum of Cornwall, the rabble of Bilston and Darlaston, the wild beasts of Walsal, and the turnkeys of Newgate.

13. Might not the sight of these troops show any reasonable man to what general they belonged; as well as the weapons they never fail to use;—the most horrid oaths and execrations, and lawless violence, carrying away as a flood whatsoever it is which stands before it; having no

eyes, nor ears, no regard to the loudest cries of reason, justice, or humanity. Can you join heart or hands with these any longer? with such an infamous, scandalous rabble-rout, roaring and raging as if they were just broke loose, with their captain Apollyon, from the bottomless pit? Does it not rather concern you, and that in the highest degree, as well as every friend to his king and country, every lover of peace, justice, and mercy, immediately to join and stop any such godless crew, as they would join to stop a fire just beginning to spread, or an inundation of the sea?

14. If, on the contrary, you join with that godless crew, and strengthen their hands in their wickedness, must not you, in all reason, be accounted (like them) a public enemy of mankind? And indeed such must every one appear, in the eye of unprejudiced reason, who opposes, directly or indirectly, the reformation of mankind. By reformation, I mean the bringing them back (not to this or that system of opinions, or this or that set of rites and ceremonies, how decent and significant soever; but) to the calm love of God and one another, to a uniform practice of justice, mercy, and truth. With what colour can you lay any claim to humanity, to benevolence, to public spirit, if you can once open your mouth, or stir one finger against such a reformation as this?

It is a poor excuse to say, "O, but the people are brought into several erroneous opinions!" It matters not a straw, whether they are or no; (I speak of such opinions as do not touch the foundation;) it is scarce worth while to spend ten words about it. Whether they embrace this religious opinion or that is no more concern to me, than whether they embrace this or that system of astronomy. Are they brought to holy tempers and holy lives? This is mine, and should be, your inquiry; since on this, both social and personal happiness depend, happiness temporal and eternal. Are they brought to the love of God and the love of their neighbour? Pure religion and undefiled is this. How long then will you "darken counsel by words without knowledge?" The plain religion now propagated is *Love*. And can you oppose this without being an enemy to mankind?

15. No, nor without being an enemy to your king and country; especially at such a time as this. For, however men of no thought may not see or regard it, or hectoring cowards may brave it out, it is evident to every man of calm reflection, that our nation stands on the very brink of destruction. And why are we thus, but because "the cry of our wickedness is gone up to heaven?" because we have so exceedingly, abundantly, beyond measure, "corrupted our ways before the Lord?" and because to all our other abominations we have added the open fighting against God; the not only rejecting, but even denying, yea, blaspheming his last offers of mercy; the hindering others who were desirous to close therewith; the despitefully using his messengers, and the variously troubling and oppressing those who did accept of his grace, break off their sins, and turn to him with their whole heart.

16. I cannot but believe, it is chiefly on this account that God hath now "a controversy with our land." And must not any considerate man be inclined to form the same judgment, if he reviews the state of public affairs for only a few years last past? I will not enter into particulars; but, in general, can you possibly help observing, that, whenever there

has been any thing like a public attempt to suppress this new sect, (for so it was artfully represented,) another and another public trouble arose? This has been repeated so often, that it is surprising any man of sense can avoid taking notice of it. May we “turn” at length “to Him that smiteth us, hearing the rod and Him that appointeth it!” May we “humble ourselves under the mighty hand of God,” before the great deep swallow us up!

17. Just now, viz. on the 4th of this instant December, the Reverend Mr. Henry Wickham, one of his majesty’s justices of peace for the West-riding of Yorkshire, writes an order—

To the constable of Keighley, commanding him, “to convey the body of Jonathan Reeves,” (whose real crime is, the calling sinners to repentance,) “to his majesty’s gaol and castle of York; suspected,” said the precept, “of being a spy among us, and a dangerous man to the person and government of his majesty King George.”

God avert the omen! I fear this is no presage either of the repentance or deliverance of our poor nation!

18. If we will not turn and repent, if we will harden our hearts, and acknowledge neither his judgments nor mercies; what remains, but the fulfilling of that dreadful word, which God spake by the Prophet Ezekiel: “Son of man, when the land sinneth against me by trespassing grievously, then will I stretch forth my hand upon it, and break the staff of the bread thereof.—Though these three men, Noah, Daniel, and Job, were in it, they should deliver but their own souls. Or if I bring a sword upon that land, and say, Sword, go through the land:—Or if I send a pestilence into that land, and pour out my fury upon it in blood:—Though Noah, Daniel, and Job, were in it, as I live, saith the Lord God, they shall deliver neither son nor daughter; they shall but deliver their own souls by their righteousness,” xiv, 13, 14, 17, 19, 20.

“Yet, behold, therein shall be left a remnant, that shall be brought forth, both sons and daughters.—And ye shall be comforted concerning the evil that I have brought upon Jerusalem.—And ye shall know that I have not done without cause all that I have done in it, saith the Lord God,” verses 22, 23.

LONDON, December 18, 1745.

A PLAIN ACCOUNT
OF
THE PEOPLE CALLED METHODISTS,
IN A LETTER TO
THE REVEREND MR. PERRONET,
VICAR OF SHOREHAM, IN KENT.

Written in the year 1748.

REVEREND AND DEAR SIR,—1. Some time since, you desired an account of the whole economy of the people commonly called *Methodists*. And you received a true, (as far as it went,) but not a full account. To supply what I think was wanting in that, I send you this account, that you may know, not only their practice on every head, but likewise the reasons whereon it is grounded, the occasion of every step they have taken, and the advantages reaped thereby.

2. But I must premise, that as they had not the least expectation, at first, of any thing like what has since followed, so they had no previous design or plan at all; but every thing arose just as the occasion offered. They saw or felt some impending or pressing evil, or some good end necessary to be pursued. And many times they fell unawares on the very thing which secured the good, or removed the evil. At other times, they consulted on the most probable means, following only common sense and Scripture: though they generally found, in looking back, something in Christian antiquity likewise, very nearly parallel thereto.

I. 1. About ten years ago, my brother and I were desired to preach in many parts of London. We had no view therein, but so far as we were able, (and we knew God could work by whomsoever it pleased him,) to convince those who would hear what true Christianity was, and to persuade them to embrace it.

2. The points we chiefly insisted upon were four: First, that orthodoxy, or right opinions, is, at best, but a very slender part of religion, if it can be allowed to be any part of it at all; that neither does religion consist in negatives, in bare harmlessness of any kind; nor merely in externals, in doing good, or using the means of grace, in works of piety (so called) or of charity; that it is nothing short of, or different from, “the mind that was in Christ;” the image of God stamped upon the heart; inward righteousness, attended with the peace of God; and “joy in the Holy Ghost.” Secondly, that the only way under heaven to this religion is, to “repent and believe the Gospel;” or, (as the Apostle words it,) “repentance toward God, and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ.” Thirdly, that by this faith, “he that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, is justified freely by his grace, through the redemption which is in Jesus Christ.” And, Lastly, that “being justified by faith,” we taste of the heaven to which we are going; we are holy and happy; we tread down sin and fear, and “sit in heavenly places with Christ Jesus.”

3. Many of those who heard this began to cry out that we brought “strange things to their ears;” that this was doctrine which they never heard before, or at least never regarded. They “searched the Scriptures,

whether these things were so," and acknowledged "the truth as it is in Jesus." Their hearts also were influenced as well as their understandings, and they determined to follow "Jesus Christ, and him crucified."

4. Immediately they were surrounded with difficulties;—all the world rose up against them; neighbours, strangers, acquaintance, relations, friends, began to cry out again, "Be not righteous overmuch; why shouldst thou destroy thyself?" Let not "much religion make thee mad."

5. One, and another, and another came to us, asking, what they should do, being distressed on every side; as every one strove to weaken, and none to strengthen, their hands in God. We advised them, "Strengthen you one another. Talk together as often as you can. And pray earnestly with and for one another, that you may 'endure to the end, and be saved.'" Against this advice we presumed there could be no objection; as being grounded on the plainest reason, and on so many scriptures both of the Old Testament and New, that it would be tedious to recite them.

6. They said, "But we want you likewise to talk with us often, to direct and quicken us in our way, to give us the advices which you well know we need, and to pray with us, as well as for us." I asked, Which of you desire this? Let me know your names and places of abode. They did so. But I soon found they were too many for me to talk with severally so often as they wanted it. So I told them, "If you will all of you come together every Thursday, in the evening, I will gladly spend some time with you in prayer, and give you the best advice I can."

7. Thus arose, without any previous design on either side, what was afterward called a *Society*; a very innocent name, and very common in London, for any number of people associating themselves together. The thing proposed in their associating themselves together was obvious to every one. They wanted to "flee from the wrath to come," and to assist each other in so doing. They therefore united themselves "in order to pray together, to receive the word of exhortation, and to watch over one another in love, that they might help each other to work out their salvation."

8. There is one only condition previously required in those who desire admission into this society,—"a desire to flee from the wrath to come, to be saved from their sins." (See the Rules of the United Societies.) They now likewise agreed, that as many of them as had an opportunity would meet together every Friday, and spend the dinner hour in crying to God, both for each other, and for all mankind.

9. It quickly appeared, that their thus uniting together answered the end proposed therein. In a few months, the far greater part of those who had begun to "fear God, and work righteousness," but were not united together, grew faint in their minds, and fell back into what they were before. Meanwhile the far greater part of those who were thus united together continued "striving to enter in at the strait gate," and to "lay hold on eternal life."

10. Upon reflection, I could not but observe, This is the very thing which was from the beginning of Christianity. In the earliest times, those whom God had sent forth "preached the Gospel to every creature." And the *οἱ ἀκροαταί*, "the body of hearers," were mostly either Jews or

Heathens. But as soon as any of these were so convinced of the truth, as to forsake sin and seek the Gospel salvation, they immediately joined them together, took an account of their names, advised them to watch over each other, and met these *κατηχουμενοι*, "catechumens," (as they were then called,) apart from the great congregation, that they might instruct, rebuke, exhort, and pray with them, and for them, according to their several necessities.

11. But it was not long before an objection was made to this, which had not once entered into my thought:—"Is not this making a schism? Is not the joining these people together, gathering churches out of churches?"

It was easily answered, If you mean only gathering people out of buildings called churches, it is. But if you mean, dividing Christians from Christians, and so destroying Christian fellowship, it is not. For, (1.) These were not Christians before they were thus joined. Most of them were barefaced Heathens. (2.) Neither are they Christians, from whom you suppose them to be divided. You will not look me in the face and say they are. What! drunken Christians! cursing and swearing Christians! lying Christians! cheating Christians! If these are Christians at all, they are devil Christians, as the poor Malabarians term them. (3.) Neither are they divided any more than they were before, even from these wretched devil Christians. They are as ready as ever to assist them, and to perform every office of real kindness toward them. (4.) If it be said, "But there are some true Christians in the parish, and you destroy the Christian fellowship between these and them;" I answer, That which never existed, cannot be destroyed. But the fellowship you speak of never existed. Therefore it cannot be destroyed. Which of those true Christians had any such fellowship with these? Who watched over them in love? Who marked their growth in grace? Who advised and exhorted them from time to time? Who prayed with them and for them, as they had need? This, and this alone is Christian fellowship: but, alas! where is it to be found? Look east or west, north or south; name what parish you please: is this Christian fellowship there? Rather, are not the bulk of the parishioners a mere rope of sand? What Christian connection is there between them? What intercourse in spiritual things? What watching over each other's souls? What bearing of one another's burdens? What a mere jest is it then, to talk so gravely of destroying what never was! The real truth is just the reverse of this: we introduce Christian fellowship where it was utterly destroyed. And the fruits of it have been peace, joy, love, and zeal for every good word and work.

II. 1. But as much as we endeavoured to watch over each other, we soon found some who did not live the Gospel. I do not know that any hypocrites were crept in; for indeed there was no temptation: but several grew cold, and gave way to the sins which had long easily beset them. We quickly perceived there were many ill consequences of suffering these to remain among us. It was dangerous to others; inasmuch as all sin is of an infectious nature. It brought such a scandal on their brethren as exposed them to what was not properly the reproach of Christ. It laid a stumbling block in the way of others, and caused the truth to be evil spoken of.

2. We groaned under these inconveniences long, before a remedy could be found. The people were scattered so wide in all parts of the town, from Wapping to Westminster, that I could not easily see what the behaviour of each person in his own neighbourhood was: so that several disorderly walkers did much hurt before I was apprized of it.

3. At length, while we were thinking of quite another thing, we struck upon a method for which we have cause to bless God ever since. I was talking with several of the society in Bristol concerning the means of paying the debts there, when one stood up and said, "Let every member of the society give a penny a week till all are paid." Another answered, "But many of them are poor, and cannot afford to do it." "Then," said he, "put eleven of the poorest with me; and if they can give any thing, well: I will call on them weekly; and if they can give nothing, I will give for them as well as for myself. And each of you call on eleven of your neighbours weekly; receive what they give, and make up what is wanting." It was done. In a while, some of these informed me, they found such and such a one did not live as he ought. It struck me immediately, "This is the thing; the very thing we have wanted so long." I called together all the leaders of the classes, (so we used to term them and their companies,) and desired, that each would make a particular inquiry into the behaviour of those whom he saw weekly. They did so. Many disorderly walkers were detected. Some turned from the evil of their ways. Some were put away from us. Many saw it with fear, and rejoiced unto God with reverence.

4. As soon as possible, the same method was used in London and all other places. Evil men were detected and reprov'd. They were borne with for a season. If they forsook their sins, we received them gladly; if they obstinately persisted therein, it was openly declared that they were not of us. The rest mourned and prayed for them, and yet rejoiced, that, as far as in us lay, the scandal was rolled away from the society.

5. It is the business of a leader,

(1.) To see each person in his class, once a week at the least, in order to inquire how their souls prosper; to advise, reprove, comfort, or exhort, as occasion may require; to receive what they are willing to give, toward the relief of the poor.

(2.) To meet the minister and the stewards of the society, in order to inform the minister of any that are sick, or of any that are disorderly and will not be reprov'd; to pay to the stewards what they have received of their several classes in the week preceding.

6. At first they visited each person at his own house; but this was soon found not so expedient. And that on many accounts: (1.) It took up more time than most of the leaders had to spare. (2.) Many persons lived with masters, mistresses, or relations, who would not suffer them to be thus visited. (3.) At the houses of those who were not so averse, they often had no opportunity of speaking to them but in company. And this did not at all answer the end proposed, of exhorting, comforting, or reprov'g. (4.) It frequently happened that one affirmed what another denied. And this could not be cleared up without seeing them together. (5.) Little misunderstandings and quarrels of various kinds frequently arose among relations or neighbours; effectually to remove

which, it was needful to see them all face to face. Upon all these considerations it was agreed, that those of each class should meet all together. And by this means, a more full inquiry was made into the behaviour of every person. Those who could not be visited at home, or no otherwise than in company, had the same advantage with others. Advice or reproof was given as need required, quarrels made up, misunderstandings removed: and after an hour or two spent in this labour of love, they concluded with prayer and thanksgiving.

7. It can scarce be conceived what advantages have been reaped from this little prudential regulation. Many now happily experienced that Christian fellowship of which they had not so much as an idea before. They began to "bear one another's burdens," and naturally to "care for each other." As they had daily a more intimate acquaintance with, so they had a more endeared affection for, each other. And "speaking the truth in love, they grew up into him in all things, who is the Head, even Christ; from whom the whole body, fitly joined together, and compacted by that which every joint supplied, according to the effectual working in the measure of every part, increased unto the edifying itself in love."

8. But notwithstanding all these advantages, many were at first extremely averse to meeting thus. Some, viewing it in a wrong point of light, not as a privilege, (indeed an invaluable one,) but rather a restraint, disliked it on that account, because they did not love to be restrained in any thing. Some were ashamed to speak before company. Others honestly said, "I do not know why; but I do not like it."

9. Some objected, "There were no such meetings when I came into the society first: and why should there now? I do not understand these things, and this changing one thing after another continually." It was easily answered: It is pity but they had been at first. But we knew not then either the need or the benefit of them. Why we use them, you will readily understand, if you read over the rules of the society. That with regard to these little prudential helps we are continually changing one thing after another, is not a weakness or fault, as you imagine, but a peculiar advantage which we enjoy. By this means we declare them all to be merely prudential, not essential, not of divine institution. We prevent, so far as in us lies, their growing formal or dead. We are always open to instruction; willing to be wiser every day than we were before, and to change whatever we can change for the better.

10. Another objection was, "There is no Scripture for this, for classes and I know not what." I answer, (1.) There is no Scripture against it. You cannot show one text that forbids them. (2.) There is much Scripture for it, even all those texts which enjoin the substance of those various duties whereof this is only an indifferent circumstance, to be determined by reason and experience. (3.) You seem not to have observed, that the Scripture, in most points, gives only general rules; and leaves the particular circumstances to be adjusted by the common sense of mankind. The Scripture, for instance, gives that general rule, "Let all things be done decently and in order." But common sense is to determine, on particular occasions, what order and decency require. So, in another instance, the Scripture lays it down as a general, standing direction: "Whether ye eat or drink, or whatever we do, do all to the

glory of God." But it is common prudence which is to make the application of this, in a thousand particular cases.

11. "But these," said another, "are all man's inventions." This is but the same objection in another form. And the same answer will suffice for any reasonable person. These are man's inventions. And what then? That is, they are methods which men have found, by reason and common sense, for the more effectually applying several Scripture rules, couched in general terms, to particular occasions.

12. They spoke far more plausibly than these, who said, "The thing is well enough in itself. But the leaders are insufficient for the work: they have neither gifts nor graces for such an employment." I answer, (1.) Yet such leaders as they are, it is plain God has blessed their labour. (2.) If any of these is remarkably wanting in gifts or grace, he is soon taken notice of and removed. (3.) If you know any such, tell it to me, not to others, and I will endeavour to exchange him for a better. (4.) It may be hoped they will all be better than they are, both by experience and observation, and by the advices given them by the minister every Tuesday night, and the prayers (then in particular) offered up for them.

III. 1. About this time, I was informed that several persons in Kingswood frequently met together at the school; and, when they could spare the time, spent the greater part of the night in prayer, and praise, and thanksgiving. Some advised me to put an end to this; but, upon weighing the thing thoroughly, and comparing it with the practice of the ancient Christians, I could see no cause to forbid it. Rather, I believed it might be made of more general use. So I sent them word, I designed to watch with them on the Friday nearest the full moon, that we might have light thither and back again. I gave public notice of this the Sunday before, and, withal, that I intended to preach; desiring they, and they only, would meet me there, who could do it without prejudice to their business or families. On Friday abundance of people came. I began preaching between eight and nine; and we continued till a little beyond the noon of night, singing, praying, and praising God.

2. This we have continued to do once a month ever since, in Bristol, London, and Newcastle, as well as Kingswood; and exceeding great are the blessings we have found therein: it has generally been an extremely solemn season; when the word of God sunk deep into the heart, even of those who till then knew him not. If it be said, "This was only owing to the novelty of the thing, (the circumstance which still draws such multitudes together at those seasons,) or perhaps to the awful silence of the night:" I am not careful to answer in this matter. Be it so: however, the impression then made on many souls has never since been effaced. Now, allowing that God did make use either of the novelty or any other indifferent circumstance, in order to bring sinners to repentance, yet they are brought. And herein let us rejoice together.

3. Nay, may I not put the case farther yet? If I can probably conjecture that, either by the novelty of this ancient custom, or by any other indifferent circumstance, it is in my power to "save a soul from death, and hide a multitude of sins," am I clear before God if I do it not, if I do not snatch that brand out of the burning?

IV. 1. As the society increased, I found it required still greater care to separate the precious from the vile. In order to this, I determined,

at least once in three months, to talk with every member myself, and to inquire at their own mouths, as well as of their leaders and neighbours, whether they grew in grace and in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ. At these seasons I likewise particularly inquire whether there be any misunderstanding or difference among them; that every hindrance of peace and brotherly love may be taken out of the way.

2. To each of those of whose seriousness and good conversation I found no reason to doubt, I gave a testimony under my own hand, by writing their name on a ticket prepared for that purpose; every ticket implying as strong a recommendation of the person to whom it was given as if I had wrote at length, "I believe the bearer hereof to be one that fears God, and works righteousness."

3. Those who bore these tickets, (these *συμβολα* or *tesseræ*, as the ancients termed them, being of just the same force with the *επισκολαι συζατικαι*, *commendatory letters*, mentioned by the Apostle,) wherever they came, were acknowledged by their brethren, and received with all cheerfulness. These were likewise of use in other respects. By these it was easily distinguished, when the society were to meet apart, who were members of it, and who not. These also supplied us with a quiet and inoffensive method of removing any disorderly member. He has no new ticket at the quarterly visitation; (for so often the tickets are changed;) and hereby it is immediately known that he is no longer of the community.

V. The thing which I was greatly afraid of all this time, and which I resolved to use every possible method of preventing, was, a narrowness of spirit, a party zeal, a being straitened in our own bowels; that miserable bigotry which makes many so unready to believe that there is any work of God but among themselves. I thought it might be a help against this, frequently to read, to all who were willing to hear, the accounts I received from time to time of the work which God is carrying on in the earth, both in our own and other countries, not among us alone, but among those of various opinions and denominations. For this I allotted one evening in every month; and I find no cause to repent my labour. It is generally a time of strong consolation to those who love God, and all mankind for his sake; as well as of breaking down the partition walls which either the craft of the devil or the folly of men has built up; and of encouraging every child of God to say, (O when shall it once be!) "Whosoever doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven, the same is my brother, and sister, and mother."

VI. 1. By the blessing of God upon their endeavours to help one another, many found the pearl of great price. Being justified by faith, they had "peace with God, through our Lord Jesus Christ." These felt a more tender affection than before, to those who were partakers of like precious faith; and hence arose such a confidence in each other, that they poured out their souls into each other's bosom. Indeed they had great need so to do; for the war was not over, as they had supposed; but they had still to wrestle both with flesh and blood, and with principalities and powers: so that temptations were on every side; and often temptations of such a kind, as they knew not how to speak in a class; in which persons of every sort, young and old, men and women, met together.

2. These, therefore, wanted some means of closer union; they wanted to pour out their hearts without reserve, particularly with regard to the sin which did still easily beset them, and the temptations which were most apt to prevail over them. And they were the more desirous of this, when they observed it was the express advice of an inspired writer: "Confess your faults one to another, and pray one for another, that ye may be healed."

3. In compliance with their desire, I divided them into smaller companies; putting the married or single men, and married or single women, together. The chief rules of these bands (that is, little companies; so that old English word signifies) run thus:—

"In order to 'confess our faults one to another,' and pray one for another that we may be healed, we intend, (1.) To meet once a week, at the least. (2.) To come punctually at the hour appointed. (3.) To begin with singing or prayer. (4.) To speak each of us in order, freely and plainly, the true state of our souls, with the faults we have committed in thought, word, or deed, and the temptations we have felt since our last meeting. (5.) To desire some person among us (thence called a leader) to speak his own state first, and then to ask the rest, in order, as many and as searching questions as may be, concerning their state, sins, and temptations."

4. That their design in meeting might be the more effectually answered, I desired all the men-bands, to meet me together every Wednesday evening, and the women on Sunday, that they might receive such particular instructions and exhortations as, from time to time, might appear to be most needful for them; that such prayers might be offered up to God, as their necessities should require; and praise returned to the Giver of every good gift, for whatever mercies they had received.

5. In order to increase in them a grateful sense of all his mercies, I desired that, one evening in a quarter, all the men in band, on a second, all the women would meet; and on a third, both men and women together; that we might together "eat bread," as the ancient Christians did, "with gladness and singleness of heart." At these love-feasts (so we termed them, retaining the name, as well as the thing, which was in use from the beginning) our food is only a little plain cake and water. But we seldom return from them without being fed, not only with the "meat which perisheth," but with "that which endureth to everlasting life."

6. Great and many are the advantages which have ever since flowed from this closer union of the believers with each other. They prayed for one another, that they might be healed of the faults they had confessed; and it was so. The chains were broken, the bands were burst in sunder, and sin had no more dominion over them. Many were delivered from the temptations out of which, till then, they found no way to escape. They were built up in our most holy faith. They rejoiced in the Lord more abundantly. They were strengthened in love, and more effectually provoked to abound in every good work.

7. But it was soon objected to the bands, (as to the classes before,) "These were not at first. There is no Scripture for them. These are man's works, man's building, man's invention." I reply, as before, these are also prudential helps, grounded on reason and experience, in

order to apply the general rules given in Scripture according to particular circumstances.

8. An objection much more boldly and frequently urged, is, that "all these bands are mere Popery." I hope I need not pass a harder censure on those (most of them at least) who affirm this, than that they talk of they know not what; they betray in themselves the most gross and shameful ignorance. Do not they yet know, that the only Popish confession is, the confession made by a single person to a priest?—and this itself is in nowise condemned by our Church; nay, she recommends it in some cases. Whereas, that we practise is, the confession of several persons conjointly, not to a priest, but to each other. Consequently, it has no analogy at all to Popish confession. But the truth is, this is a stale objection, which many people make against any thing they do not like. It is all Popery out of hand.

VII. 1. And yet while most of these who were thus intimately joined together, went on daily from faith to faith; some fell from the faith, either all at once, by falling into known wilful sin; or gradually, and almost insensibly, by giving way in what they called little things; by sins of omission, by yielding to heart sins, or by not watching unto prayer. The exhortations and prayers used among the believers did no longer profit these. They wanted advice and instruction suited to their case; which as soon as I observed, I separated them from the rest, and desired them to meet me apart on Saturday evenings.

2. At this hour, all the hymns, exhortations, and prayers are adapted to their circumstances; being wholly suited to those who *did* see God, but have now lost sight of the light of his countenance; and who mourn after him, and refuse to be comforted till they know he has healed their backsliding.

3. By applying both the threats and promises of God to these real, not nominal, penitents, and by crying to God in their behalf, we endeavoured to bring them back to the great "Shepherd and Bishop of their souls;" not by any of the fopperies of the Roman Church, although, in some measure, countenanced by antiquity. In prescribing hair shirts, and bodily austerities, we durst not follow even the ancient Church; although we had unawares, both in dividing οἱ πιστοί, the believers, from the rest of the society, and in separating the penitents from them, and appointing a peculiar service for them.

VIII. 1. Many of these soon recovered the ground they had lost. Yea, they rose higher than before; being more watchful than ever, and more meek and lowly, as well as stronger in the faith that worketh by love. They now outran the greater part of their brethren, continually walking in the light of God, and having fellowship with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ.

2. I saw it might be useful to give some advices to all those who continued in the light of God's countenance, which the rest of their brethren did not want, and probably could not receive. So I desired a small number of such as appeared to be in this state, to spend an hour with me every Monday morning. My design was, not only to direct them how to press after perfection; to exercise their every grace, and improve every talent they had received; and to incite them to love one another more, and to watch more carefully over each other; but also to

have a select company, to whom I might unbosom myself on all occasions, without reserve ; and whom I could propose to all their brethren as a pattern of love, of holiness, and of good works.

3. They had no need of being incumbered with many rules ; having the best rule of all in their hearts. No peculiar directions were therefore given to them, excepting only these three :—

First. Let nothing spoken in this society be spoken again. (Hereby we had the more full confidence in each other.)

Secondly. Every member agrees to submit to his minister in all indifferent things.

Thirdly. Every member will bring, once a week, all he can spare toward a common stock.

4. Every one here has an equal liberty of speaking, there being none greater or less than another. I could say freely to these, when they were met together, “Ye may all prophesy one by one,” (taking that word in its lowest sense,) “that all may learn, and all may be comforted.” And I often found the advantage of such a free conversation, and that “in the multitude of counsellors there is safety.” Any who is inclined so to do is likewise encouraged to pour out his soul to God. And here especially we have found, that “the effectual fervent prayer of a righteous man availeth much.”

IX. 1. This is the plainest and clearest account I can give of the people commonly called *Methodists*. It remains only to give you a short account of those who serve their brethren in love. These are leaders of classes and bands, (spoken of before,) assistants, stewards, visitors of the sick, and schoolmasters.

2. In the third part of the “Appeal,” I have mentioned how we were led to accept of lay assistants. Their office is, in the absence of the minister,

(1.) To expound every morning and evening. (2.) To meet the united society, the bands, the select society, and the penitents, once a week. (3.) To visit the classes once a quarter. (4.) To hear and decide all differences. (5.) To put the disorderly back on trial, and to receive on trial for the bands or society. (6.) To see that the stewards, the leaders, and the schoolmasters faithfully discharge their several offices. (7.) To meet the leaders of the bands and classes weekly, and the stewards, and to overlook their accounts.

X. 1. But, long before this, I felt the weight of a far different care, namely, care of temporal things. The quarterly subscriptions amounted, at a mean computation, to above three hundred pounds a year. This was to be laid out, partly in repairs, partly in other necessary expenses, and partly in paying debts. The weekly contributions fell little short of eight pounds a week ; which was to be distributed as every one had need. And I was expected to take thought for all these things : but it was a burden I was not able to bear ; so I chose out first one, then four, and after a time, seven, as prudent men as I knew, and desired them to take charge of these things upon themselves, that I might have no incumbrance of this kind.

2. The business of these stewards is,

To manage the temporal things of the society. To receive the subscriptions and contributions. To expend what is needful from time to

time. To send relief to the poor. To keep an exact account of all receipts and expenses. To inform the minister if any of the rules of the society are not punctually observed. To tell the preachers in love, if they think any thing amiss, either in their doctrine or life.

3. The rules of the stewards are,

(1.) Be frugal. Save every thing that can be saved honestly. (2.) Spend no more than you receive. Contract no debts. (3.) Have no long accounts. Pay every thing within the week. (4.) Give none that asks relief, either an ill word or an ill look. Do not hurt them, if you cannot help. (5.) Expect no thanks from man.

4. They met together at six every Thursday morning; consulted on the business which came before them; sent relief to the sick, as every one had need; and gave the remainder of what had been contributed each week to those who appeared to be in the most pressing want. So that all was concluded within the week; what was brought on Tuesday being constantly expended on Thursday. I soon had the pleasure to find, that all these temporal things were done with the utmost faithfulness and exactness; so that my cares of this kind were at an end. I had only to revise the accounts, to tell them if I thought any thing might be amended, and to consult how deficiencies might be supplied from time to time; for these were frequent and large, (so far were we from abundance,) the income by no means answering the expenses. But that we might not faint, sometimes we had unforeseen helps in times of the greatest perplexity. At other times we borrowed larger or smaller sums: of which the greatest part has since been repaid. But I owe some hundred pounds to this day. So much have I gained by preaching the Gospel!

XI. 1. But it was not long before the stewards found a great difficulty with regard to the sick. Some were ready to perish before they knew of their illness; and when they did know, it was not in their power (being persons generally employed in trade) to visit them so often as they desired.

2. When I was apprized of this, I laid the case at large before the whole society; showed how impossible it was for the stewards to attend all that were sick in all parts of the town; desired the leaders of classes would more carefully inquire, and more constantly inform them, who were sick; and asked, "Who among you is willing, as well as able, to supply this lack of service?"

3. The next morning many willingly offered themselves. I chose six-and-forty of them, whom I judged to be of the most tender, loving spirit; divided the town into twenty-three parts, and desired two of them to visit the sick in each division.

4. It is the business of a visiter of the sick,

To see every sick person within his district thrice a week. To inquire into the state of their souls, and to advise them as occasion may require. To inquire into their disorders, and procure advice for them. To relieve them, if they are in want. To do any thing for them, which he (or she) can do. To bring in his accounts weekly to the stewards. (The leaders now do this.) Upon reflection, I saw how exactly, in this also, we had copied after the primitive Church. What were the ancient deacons? What was Phebe the deaconess, but such a visiter of the sick?

5. I did not think it needful to give them any particular rules beside these that follow :—

(1.) Be plain and open in dealing with souls. (2.) Be mild, tender, patient. (3.) Be cleanly in all you do for the sick. (4.) Be not nice.

6. We have ever since had great reason to praise God for his continued blessing on this undertaking. Many lives have been saved, many sicknesses healed, much pain and want prevented or removed. Many heavy hearts have been made glad, many mourners comforted : and the visitors have found, from Him whom they serve, a present reward for all their labour.

XII. 1. But I was still in pain for many of the poor that were sick ; there was so great expense, and so little profit. And first, I resolved to try, whether they might not receive more benefit in the hospitals. Upon the trial, we found there was indeed less expense, but no more good done, than before. I then asked the advice of several physicians for them ; but still it profited not. I saw the poor people pining away, and several families ruined, and that without remedy.

2. At length I thought of a kind of desperate expedient. “ I will prepare, and give them physic myself.” For six or seven-and-twenty years, I had made anatomy and physic the diversion of my leisure hours ; though I never properly studied them, unless for a few months when I was going to America, where I imagined I might be of some service to those who had no regular physician among them. I applied to it again. I took into my assistance an apothecary, and an experienced surgeon ; resolving, at the same time, not to go out of my depth, but to leave all difficult and complicated cases to such physicians as the patients should choose.

3. I gave notice of this to the society ; telling them, that all who were ill of chronic distempers (for I did not care to venture upon acute) might, if they pleased, come to me at such a time, and I would give them the best advice I could, and the best medicines I had.

4. Many came : (and so every Friday since :) among the rest was one William Kirkman, a weaver, near Old Nichol-street. I asked him, “ What complaint have you ? ” “ O sir,” said he, “ a cough, a very sore cough. I can get no rest day nor night.”

I asked, “ How long have you had it ? ” He replied, “ About three-score years : it began when I was eleven years old.” I was nothing glad that this man should come first, fearing our not curing him might discourage others. However, I looked up to God and said, “ Take this three or four times a day. If it does you no good, it will do you no harm.” He took it two or three days. His cough was cured, and has not returned to this day.

5. Now, let candid men judge, does humility require me to deny a notorious fact ? If not, which is vanity ? to say, I by my own skill restored this man to health ; or to say, God did it by his own almighty power ? By what figure of speech this is called boasting, I know not. But I will put no name to such a fact as this. I leave that to the Rev. Dr. Middleton.

6. In five months, medicines were occasionally given to above five hundred persons. Several of these I never saw before ; for I did not regard whether they were of the society or not. In that time seventy-one of these, regularly taking their medicines, and following the regimen

prescribed, (which three in four would not do,) were entirely cured of distempers long thought to be incurable. The whole expense of medicines during this time, was nearly forty pounds. We continued this ever since, and, by the blessing of God, with more and more success.

XIII. 1. But I had for some years observed many, who, although not sick, were not able to provide for themselves, and had none who took care to provide for them: these were chiefly feeble, aged widows. I consulted with the stewards, how they might be relieved. They all agreed, if we could keep them in one house, it would not only be far less expensive to us, but also far more comfortable for them. Indeed we had no money to begin; but we believed He would provide, "who defendeth the cause of the widow:" so we took a lease of two little houses near; we fitted them up, so as to be warm and clean. We took in as many widows as we had room for, and provided them with things needful for the body; toward the expense of which I set aside, first, the weekly contributions of the bands, and then all that was collected at the Lord's Supper. It is true, this does not suffice: so that we are considerably in debt, on this account also. But we are persuaded, it will not always be so; seeing "the earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof."

2. In this (commonly called the Poor House) we have now nine widows, one blind woman, two poor children, two upper servants, a maid and a man. I might add, four or five preachers; for I myself, as well as the other preachers who are in town, diet with the poor, on the same food, and at the same table; and we rejoice herein, as a comfortable earnest of our eating bread together in our Father's kingdom.

3. I have blessed God for this house ever since it began; but lately much more than ever. I honour these widows; for they "are widows indeed." So that it is not in vain, that, without any design of so doing, we have copied after another of the institutions of the apostolic age. I can now say to all the world, "Come and see how these Christians love one another!" (This has been since dropped for want of support.)

XIV. 1. Another thing which had given me frequent concern was, the ease of abundance of children. Some their parents could not afford to put to school: so they remained like "a wild ass's colt." Others were sent to school, and learned, at least, to read and write; but they learned all kind of vice at the same time: so that it had been better for them to have been without their knowledge, than to have bought it at so dear a price.

2. At length I determined to have them taught in my own house, that they might have an opportunity of learning to read, write, and cast accounts, (if no more,) without being under almost a necessity of learning Heathenism at the same time: and after several unsuccessful trials, I found two such schoolmasters as I wanted; men of honesty and of sufficient knowledge, who had talents for, and their hearts in, the work.

3. They have now under their care near sixty children: the parents of some pay for their schooling; but the greater part, being very poor, do not; so that the expense is chiefly defrayed by voluntary contributions. We have of late clothed them too, as many as wanted. The rules of the school are these that follow: (This also has been dropped for some time, 1772:)

First. No child is admitted under six years of age. Secondly. All

the children are to be present at the morning sermon. Thirdly. They are at school from six to twelve, and from one to five. Fourthly. They have no play-days. Fifthly. No child is to speak in school, but to the masters. Sixthly. The child who misses two days in one week, without leave, is excluded the school.

4. We appointed two stewards for the school also. The business of these is, to receive the school subscriptions, and expend what is needful; to talk with each of the masters weekly; to pray with and exhort the children twice a week; to inquire diligently, whether they grow in grace and in learning, and whether the rules are punctually observed; every Tuesday morning, in conjunction with the masters, to exclude those children that do not observe the rules; every Wednesday morning to meet with and exhort their parents, to train them up at home in the ways of God.

5. A happy change was soon observed in the children, both with regard to their tempers and behaviour. They learned reading, writing, and arithmetic swiftly; and at the same time they were diligently instructed in the sound principles of religion, and earnestly exhorted to fear God, and work out their own salvation.

XV. 1. A year or two ago, I observed among many a distress of another kind. They frequently wanted, perhaps in order to carry on their business, a present supply of money. They scrupled to make use of a pawnbroker; but where to borrow it they knew not. I resolved to try if we could not find a remedy for this also. I went, in a few days, from one end of the town to the other, and exhorted those who had this world's goods, to assist their needy brethren. Fifty pounds were contributed. This was immediately lodged in the hands of two stewards; who attended every Tuesday morning, in order to lend to those who wanted any small sum, not exceeding twenty shillings, to be repaid within three months. (We now, 1772, lend any sum not exceeding five pounds.)

2. It is almost incredible, but it manifestly appears from their accounts, that, with this inconsiderable sum, two hundred and fifty have been assisted, within the space of one year. Will not God put it into the heart of some lover of mankind to increase this little stock? If this is not "lending unto the Lord," what is? O confer not with flesh and blood, but immediately

Join hands with God, to make a poor man live!

3. I think, sir, now you know all that I know of this people. You see the nature, occasion, and design of whatever is practised among them. And, I trust, you may be pretty well able to answer any questions which may be asked concerning them; particularly by those who inquire concerning my revenue, and what I do with it all.

4. Some have supposed this was no greater than that of the bishop of London. But others computed that I received eight hundred a year from Yorkshire only. Now, if so, it cannot be so little as ten thousand pounds a year which I receive out of all England!

5. Accordingly, a gentleman in Cornwall (the rector of Redruth) extends the calculation pretty considerably. "Let me see," said he: "Two millions of Methodists; and each of these paying two-pence a

week." If so, I must have eight hundred and sixty thousand pounds, with some odd shillings and pence, a year.

6. A tolerable competence! But be it more or less, it is nothing at all to me. All that is contributed or collected in every place is both received and expended by others; nor have I so much as the "beholding thereof with my eyes." And so it will be, till I turn Turk or Pagan. For I look upon all this revenue, be it what it may, as sacred to God and the poor; out of which, if I want any thing, I am relieved, even as another poor man. So were originally all ecclesiastical revenues, as every man of learning knows: and the bishops and priests used them only as such. If any use them otherwise now, God help them!

7. I doubt not, but if I err in this, or any other point, you will pray God to show me his truth. To have "a conscience void of offence toward God and toward man" is the desire of,

Reverend and dear sir,

Your affectionate brother and servant,

JOHN WESLEY.

THE NATURE, DESIGN, AND GENERAL RULES

OF THE

UNITED SOCIETIES,

IN LONDON, BRISTOL, KINGSWOOD, NEWCASTLE-UPON-TYNE, ETC.

1. IN the latter end of the year 1739, eight or ten persons came to me in London, who appeared to be deeply convinced of sin, and earnestly groaning for redemption. They desired (as did two or three more the next day) that I would spend some time with them in prayer, and advise them how to flee from the wrath to come; which they saw continually hanging over their heads. That we might have more time for this great work, I appointed a day when they might all come together, which from thenceforward they did every week, namely, on Thursday, in the evening. To these, and as many more as desired to join with them, (for their number increased daily,) I gave those advices, from time to time, which I judged most needful for them; and we always concluded our meeting with prayer suited to their several necessities.

2. This was the rise of the United Society, first in London, and then in other places. Such a society is no other than "a company of men having the form and seeking the power of godliness, united in order to pray together, to receive the word of exhortation, and to watch over one another in love, that they may help each other to work out their salvation."

3. That it may the more easily be discerned, whether they are indeed working out their own salvation, each society is divided into smaller companies, called *classes*, according to their respective places of abode. There are about twelve persons in every class; one of whom is styled *the leader*. It is his business, (1.) To see each person in his class

once a week at least, in order to inquire how their souls prosper; to advise, reprove, comfort, or exhort, as occasion may require; to receive what they are willing to give toward the relief of the poor. (2.) To meet the minister and the stewards of the society once a week; in order to inform the minister of any that are sick, or of any that walk disorderly, and will not be reprov'd; to pay to the stewards what they have received of their several classes in the week preceding; and to show their account of what each person has contributed.

4. There is one only condition previously required in those who desire admission into these societies,—a desire “to flee from the wrath to come, to be saved from their sins:” but, wherever this is really fixed in the soul, it will be shown by its fruits. It is therefore expected of all who continue therein, that they should continue to evidence their desire of salvation,

First, by doing no harm, by avoiding evil in every kind; especially that which is most generally practised: such is, the taking the name of God in vain; the profaning the day of the Lord, either by doing ordinary work thereon, or by buying or selling; drunkenness, buying or selling spirituous liquors, or drinking them, unless in cases of extreme necessity; fighting, quarreling, brawling; brother going to law with brother; returning evil for evil, or railing for railing; the using many words in buying or selling; the buying or selling uncustomed goods; the giving or taking things on usury, that is, unlawful interest; uncharitable or unprofitable conversation, particularly speaking evil of magistrates or of ministers; doing to others as we would not they should do unto us; doing what we know is not for the glory of God, as the “putting on of gold or costly apparel;” the taking such diversions as cannot be used in the name of the Lord Jesus; the singing those songs, or reading those books, which do not tend to the knowledge or love of God; softness, and needless self-indulgence; laying up treasures upon earth; borrowing without a probability of paying; or taking up goods without a probability of paying for them.

5. It is expected of all who continue in these societies, that they should continue to evidence their desire of salvation,

Secondly, by doing good, by being, in every kind, merciful after their power; as they have opportunity, doing good of every possible sort, and as far as is possible, to all men;—to their bodies, of the ability which God giveth, by giving food to the hungry, by clothing the naked, by visiting or helping them that are sick, or in prison;—to their souls, by instructing, reprov'g, or exhorting all they have any intercourse with; trampling under foot that enthusiastic doctrine of devils, that “we are not to do good unless our heart be free to it:” by doing good especially to them that are of the household of faith, or groaning so to be; employing them preferably to others, buying one of another; helping each other in business; and so much the more, because the world will love its own, and them only: by all possible diligence and frugality, that the Gospel be not blamed: by running with patience the race that is set before them, “denying themselves, and taking up their cross daily; submitting to bear the reproach of Christ, to be as the filth and offscouring of the world; and looking that men should “say all manner of evil of them falsely for the Lord's sake.”

6. It is expected of all who desire to continue in these societies, that they should continue to evidence their desire of salvation,

Thirdly, by attending upon all the ordinances of God. Such are, the public worship of God; the ministry of the word, either read or expounded; the supper of the Lord; family and private prayer; searching the Scriptures; and fasting, or abstinence.

7. These are the general rules of our societies; all which we are taught of God to observe, even in his written word, the only rule, and the sufficient rule, both of our faith and practice. And all these, we know, his Spirit writes on every truly awakened heart. If there be any among us who observe them not, who habitually break any of them, let it be made known unto them who watch over that soul as they that must give an account. We will admonish him of the error of his ways; we will bear with him for a season: but then if he repent not, he hath no more place among us. We have delivered our own souls.

JOHN WESLEY,
CHARLES WESLEY.

MAY 1, 1743.

RULES OF THE BAND SOCIETIES,

DRAWN UP DECEMBER 25, 1738.

THE design of our meeting is, to obey that command of God, "Confess your faults one to another, and pray one for another, that ye may be healed."

To this end, we intend,—

1. To meet once a week, at the least.
2. To come punctually at the hour appointed, without some extraordinary reason.
3. To begin (those of us who are present) exactly at the hour, with singing or prayer.
4. To speak each of us in order, freely and plainly, the true state of our souls, with the faults we have committed in thought, word, or deed, and the temptations we have felt, since our last meeting.
5. To end every meeting with prayer, suited to the state of each person present.
6. To desire some person among us to speak his own state first, and then to ask the rest, in order, as many and as searching questions as may be, concerning their state, sins, and temptations.

Some of the questions proposed to every one before he is admitted among us may be to this effect:—

1. Have you the forgiveness of your sins?
2. Have you peace with God, through our Lord Jesus Christ?
3. Have you the witness of God's Spirit with your spirit, that you are a child of God?
4. Is the love of God shed abroad in your heart?
5. Has no sin, inward or outward, dominion over you?
6. Do you desire to be told of your faults?

7. Do you desire to be told of all your faults, and that plain and home?

8. Do you desire that every one of us should tell you, from time to time, whatsoever is in his heart concerning you?

9. Consider! Do you desire we should tell you whatsoever we think, whatsoever we fear, whatsoever we hear, concerning you?

10. Do you desire that, in doing this, we should come as close as possible, that we should cut to the quick, and search your heart to the bottom?

11. Is it your desire and design to be on this, and all other occasions, entirely open, so as to speak every thing that is in your heart without exception, without disguise, and without reserve?

Any of the preceding questions may be asked as often as occasion offers; the four following at every meeting:—

1. What known sins have you committed since our last meeting?

2. What temptations have you met with?

3. How were you delivered?

4. What have you thought, said, or done, of which you doubt whether it be sin or not?

DIRECTIONS GIVEN TO THE BAND SOCIETIES,

DECEMBER 25, 1711.

You are supposed to have the faith that “overcometh the world.” To you, therefore, it is not grievous,—

I. Carefully to abstain from doing evil; in particular,—

1. Neither to buy nor sell any thing at all on the Lord’s day.

2. To taste no spirituous liquor, no dram of any kind, unless prescribed by a physician.

3. To be at a word both in buying and selling.

4. To pawn nothing, no, not to save life.

5. Not to mention the fault of any behind his back, and to stop those short that do.

6. To wear no needless ornaments, such as rings, ear-rings, necklaces, lace, ruffles.

7. To use no needless self-indulgence, such as taking snuff or tobacco, unless prescribed by a physician.

II. Zealously to maintain good works; in particular,—

1. To give alms of such things as you possess, and that to the uttermost of your power.

2. To reprove all that sin in your sight, and that in love and meekness of wisdom.

3. To be patterns of diligence and frugality, of self-denial, and taking up the cross daily.

III. Constantly to attend on all the ordinances of God; in particular,—

1. To be at church and at the Lord’s table every week, and at every public meeting of the bands.

2. To attend the ministry of the word every morning, unless distance, business, or sickness prevent.

3. To use private prayer every day ; and family prayer, if you are at the head of a family.

4. To read the Scriptures, and meditate therein, at every vacant hour. And,—

5. To observe, as days of fasting or abstinence, all Fridays in the year.

MINUTES

OF

SOME LATE CONVERSATIONS BETWEEN THE

REV. MESSRS. WESLEY AND OTHERS.

CONVERSATION I.

Monday, June 25th, 1744.

THE following persons being met at the Foundery,—John Wesley ; Charles Wesley ; John Hodges, rector of Wenvo ; Henry Piers, vicar of Bexley ; Samuel Taylor, vicar of Quinton ; and John Meriton ; after some time spent in prayer, the design of our meeting was proposed ; namely, to consider,

1. What to teach ;
2. How to teach ; and,
3. What to do ; that is, how to regulate our doctrine, discipline, and practice.

We began with considering the doctrine of justification : the questions relating to which, with the substance of the answers given thereto, were as follows :—

Q. 1. What is it to be justified ?

A. To be pardoned and received into God's favour ; into such a state, that, if we continue therein, we shall be finally saved.

Q. 2. Is faith the condition of justification ?

A. Yes ; for every one who believeth not is condemned ; and every one who believes is justified.

Q. 3. But must not repentance, and works meet for repentance, go before this faith ?

A. Without doubt ; if by repentance you mean conviction of sin ; and by works meet for repentance, obeying God as far as we can, forgiving our brother, leaving off from evil, doing good, and using his ordinances, according to the power we have received.

Q. 4. What is faith ?

A. Faith in general is a divine, supernatural ελεγχος (*elenchos*) [evidence or conviction] of things not seen ; that is, of past, future, or spiritual things : it is a spiritual sight of God and the things of God.

First. A sinner is convinced by the Holy Ghost, "Christ loved me, and gave himself for me." This is that faith by which he is justified, or pardoned, the moment he receives it. Immediately the same Spirit bears witness, "Thou art pardoned ; thou hast redemption in his blood."

And this is saving faith, whereby the love of God is shed abroad in his heart.

Q. 5. Have all Christians this faith? May not a man be justified and not know it?

A. That all true Christians have such a faith as implies an assurance of God's love, appears from Romans viii, 15; Ephes. iv, 32; 2 Cor. xiii, 5; Heb. viii, 10; 1 John iv, 10, and 19. And that no man can be justified and not know it, appears farther from the nature of the thing: for faith after repentance is ease after pain, rest after toil, light after darkness. It appears also from the immediate, as well as distant, fruits thereof.

Q. 6. But may not a man go to heaven without it?

A. It does not appear from holy writ that a man who hears the Gospel can, (Mark xvi, 16,) whatever a Heathen may do: Romans ii, 14.

Q. 7. What are the immediate fruits of justifying faith?

A. Peace, joy, love, power over all outward sin, and power to keep down inward sin.

Q. 8. Does any one believe, who has not the witness in himself, or any longer than he sees, loves, obeys God?

A. We apprehend not; seeing God being the very essence of faith; love and obedience, the inseparable properties of it.

Q. 9. What sins are consistent with justifying faith?

A. No wilful sin. If a believer wilfully sins, he casts away his faith. Neither is it possible he should have justifying faith again, without previously repenting.

Q. 10. Must every believer come into a state of doubt, or fear, or darkness? Will he do so, unless by ignorance, or unfaithfulness? Does God otherwise withdraw himself?

A. It is certain, a believer need never again come into condemnation. It seems he need not come into a state of doubt, or fear, or darkness; and that (ordinarily at least) he will not, unless by ignorance or unfaithfulness. Yet it is true, that the first joy does seldom last long; that it is commonly followed by doubts and fears; and that God frequently permits great heaviness before any large manifestation of himself.

Q. 11. Are works necessary to the continuance of faith?

A. Without doubt; for a man may forfeit the free gift of God, either by sins of omission or commission.

Q. 12. Can faith be lost but for want of works?

A. It cannot but through disobedience.

Q. 13. How is faith "made perfect by works?"

A. The more we exert our faith, the more it is increased. "To him that hath shall be given."

Q. 14. St. Paul says, Abraham was not justified by works; St. James, he was justified by works. Do they not contradict each other?

A. No: (1.) Because they do not speak of the same justification. St. Paul speaks of that justification which was when Abraham was seventy-five years old, above twenty years before Isaac was born; St. James, of that justification which was when he offered up Isaac on the altar.

(2.) Because they do not speak of the same works; St. Paul speaking of works that precede faith; St. James, of works that spring from it.

Q. 15. In what sense is Adam's sin imputed to all mankind?

A. In Adam all die; that is, (1.) Our bodies then became mortal. (2.) Our souls died; that is, were disunited from God. And hence, (3.) We are all born with a sinful, devilish nature. By reason whereof, (4.) We are all children of wrath, liable to death eternal: Rom. v, 18; Ephes. ii, 3.

Q. 16. In what sense is the righteousness of Christ imputed to all mankind, or to believers?

A. We do not find it expressly affirmed in Scripture, that God imputes the righteousness of Christ to any; although we do find that "faith is imputed" to us "for righteousness."

That text, "As by one man's disobedience all men were made sinners, so by the obedience of One, all were made righteous," we conceive means, By the merits of Christ, all men are cleared from the guilt of Adam's actual sin.

We conceive farther, that through the obedience and death of Christ, (1.) The bodies of all men become immortal after the resurrection. (2.) Their souls receive a capacity of spiritual life. And, (3.) An actual spark or seed thereof. (4.) All believers become children of grace, reconciled to God; and, (5.) Made partakers of the divine nature.

Q. 17. Have we not then unawares leaned too much toward Calvinism?

A. We are afraid we have.

Q. 18. Have we not also leaned toward Antinomianism?

A. We are afraid we have.

Q. 19. What is Antinomianism?

A. The doctrine which makes void the law through faith.

Q. 20. What are the main pillars hereof?

A. (1.) That Christ abolished the moral law

(2.) That therefore Christians are not obliged to observe it.

(3.) That one branch of Christian liberty is, liberty from obeying the commandments of God.

(4.) That it is bondage to do a thing because it is commanded, or forbear it because it is forbidden.

(5.) That a believer is not obliged to use the ordinances of God, or to do good works.

(6.) That a preacher ought not to exhort to good works; not unbelievers, because it is hurtful; not believers, because it is needless.

Q. 21. What was the occasion of St. Paul's writing his Epistle to the Galatians?

A. The coming of certain men amongst the Galatians, who taught, "Except ye be circumcised, and keep the law of Moses, ye cannot be saved."

Q. 22. What is his main design therein?

A. To prove, (1.) That no man can be justified or saved by the works of the law, either moral or ritual. (2.) That every believer is justified by faith in Christ, without the works of the law.

Q. 23. What does he mean by "the works of the law?" Galatians ii, 16, &c.

A. All works which do not spring from faith in Christ.

Q. 24. What, by being "under the law?" Gal. iii, 23.

A. Under the Mosaic dispensation.

Q. 25. What law has Christ abolished?

A. The ritual law of Moses.

Q. 26. What is meant by liberty? Gal. v, 1.

A. Liberty, (1.) From that law. (2.) From sin.

On Tuesday morning, June 26th, was considered the doctrine of Sanctification :

WITH regard to which, the questions asked, and the substance of the answers given, were as follows:—

Q. 1. What is it to be sanctified?

A. To be renewed in the image of God, in righteousness and true holiness.

Q. 2. Is faith the condition, or the instrument, of sanctification?

A. It is both the condition and instrument of it. When we begin to believe, then sanctification begins. And as faith increases, holiness increases, till we are created anew.

Q. 3. What is implied in being a perfect Christian?

A. The loving the Lord our God with all our heart, and with all our mind, and soul, and strength; Deut. vi, 5, xxx, 6; Ezek. xxxvi, 25–29.

Q. 4. Does this imply that all inward sin is taken away?

A. Without doubt; or how could we be said to be saved “from all our uncleannesses?” verse 29.

Q. 5. Can we know one who is thus saved? What is a reasonable proof of it?

A. We cannot, without the miraculous discernment of spirits, be infallibly certain of those who are thus saved. But we apprehend, these would be the best proofs which the nature of the thing admits: (1.) If we had sufficient evidence of their unblamable behaviour preceding. (2.) If they gave a distinct account of the time and manner wherein they were saved from sin, and of the circumstances thereof, with such sound speech as could not be reprov'd. And, (3.) If, upon a strict inquiry afterward from time to time, it appeared that all their tempers, and words, and actions, were holy and unprov'd.

Q. 6. How should we treat those who think they have attained this?

A. Exhort them to forget the things that are behind, and to watch and pray always, that God may search the ground of their hearts.

Wednesday, June 27th, we began to consider points of Discipline :

WITH regard to which, the questions asked, and the substance of the answers given, were as follows:—

Q. 1. What is the Church of England?

A. According to the twentieth article, the visible Church of England is the congregation of English believers, in which the pure word of God is preached, and the sacraments duly administered.

(But the word “Church” is sometimes taken, in a looser sense, for “a congregation professing to believe.” So it is taken in the twenty-sixth article; and in the first, second, and third chapters of the Revelation.)

Q. 2. Who is a member of the Church of England?

A. A believer, hearing the pure word of God preached, and partaking of the sacraments duly administered, in that Church.

Q. 3. What is it to be zealous for the Church?

A. To be earnestly desirous of its welfare and increase : of its welfare, by the confirmation of its present members, in faith, hearing, and communicating ; and of its increase, by the addition of new members.

Q. 4. How are we to defend the doctrine of the Church ?

A. Both by our preaching and living.

Q. 5. How should we behave at a false or railing sermon ?

A. If it only contain personal reflections, we may quietly suffer it : if it blaspheme the work and Spirit of God, it may be better to go out of the church. In either case, if opportunity serve, it would be well to speak or write to the minister.

Q. 6. How far is it our duty to obey the bishops ?

A. In all things indifferently. And on this ground of obeying them, we should observe the canons, so far as we can with a safe conscience.

Q. 7. Do we separate from the Church ?

A. We conceive not : we hold communion therewith for conscience's sake, by constantly attending both the word preached, and the sacraments administered therein.

Q. 8. What then do they mean, who say, "You separate from the Church?"

A. We cannot certainly tell. Perhaps they have no determinate meaning ; unless, by the Church they mean themselves ; that is, that part of the clergy who accuse us of preaching false doctrine. And it is sure we do herein separate from them, by maintaining that which they deny.

Q. 9. But do you not weaken the Church ?

A. Do not they who ask this, by *the Church*, mean themselves ? We do not purposely weaken any man's hands. But accidentally we may, thus far : they who come to know the truth by us, will esteem such as deny it less than they did before.

But the Church in the proper sense, the congregation of English believers, we do not weaken at all.

Q. 10. Do you not entail a schism on the Church ? that is, Is it not probable that your hearers, after your death, will be scattered into all sects and parties ; or that they will form themselves into a distinct sect ?

A. (1.) We are persuaded the body of our hearers will even after our death remain in the Church, unless they be thrust out.

(2.) We believe notwithstanding, either that they will be thrust out, or that they will leave the whole Church.

(3.) We do, and will do, all we can to prevent those consequences which are supposed likely to happen after our death.

(4.) But we cannot with a good conscience neglect the present opportunity of saving souls while we live, for fear of consequences which may possibly or probably happen after we are dead.

CONVERSATION II.

Bristol, Tuesday, August 1st, 1745.

The following persons being met together at the new room, in Bristol ; John Wesley, Charles Wesley, John Hodges, Thomas Richards, Samuel Larwood, Thomas Meyrick, Richard Moss, John Slocombe,

Herbert Jenkins, and Marmaduke Gwynne; it was proposed to review the minutes of the last conference with regard to justification. And it was asked:

Q. 1. How comes what is written on this subject to be so intricate and obscure? Is this obscurity from the nature of the thing itself; or, from the fault or weakness of those who have generally treated of it?

A. We apprehend this obscurity does not arise from the nature of the subject; but, perhaps, partly from hence, that the devil peculiarly labours to perplex a subject of the greatest importance; and partly from the extreme warmth of most writers who have treated of it.

Q. 2. We affirm, faith in Christ is the sole condition of justification. But does not repentance go before that faith? yea, and, supposing there be opportunity for them, fruits or works meet for repentance?

A. Without doubt they do.

Q. 3. How then can we deny them to be conditions of justification? Is not this a mere strife of words? But is it worth while to continue a dispute on the term condition?

A. It seems not, though it has been grievously abused. But so the abuse cease, let the use remain.

Q. 4. Shall we read over together Mr. Baxter's "Aphorisms concerning Justification?"

A. By all means.

Which were accordingly read. And it was desired that each person present would in the afternoon consult the Scriptures cited therein, and bring what objections might occur the next morning.

Friday, August 2d, the question was proposed:—

Q. 1. Is a sense of God's pardoning love absolutely necessary to our being in his favour? Or may there be some exempt cases?

A. We dare not say there are not.

Q. 2. Is it necessary to inward and outward holiness?

A. We incline to think it is.

Q. 3. Is it indispensably necessary to final salvation? suppose in a Papist; or a Quaker; or, in general, among those who never heard it preached?

A. Love hopeth all things. We know not how far any of these may fall under the case of invincible ignorance.

Q. 4. But what can we say of one of our own society, who dies without it, as J. W., at London?

A. It may be an exempt case, if the fact was really so. But we determine nothing. We leave his soul in the hands of Him that made it.

Q. 5. Does a man believe any longer than he sees a reconciled God?

A. We conceive not. But we allow there may be infinite degrees in seeing God: even as many as there are between him who sees the sun when it shines on his eye-lids closed, and him who stands with his eyes wide open in the full blaze of his beams.

Q. 6. Does a man believe any longer than he loves God?

A. In no wise. For neither circumcision nor uncircumcision avails, without faith working by love.

Q. 7. Have we duly considered the case of Cornelius? Was not he in the favour of God, when "his prayers and alms came up for a memorial before God;" that is, before he believed in Christ?

A. It does seem that he was, in some degree. But we speak not of those who have not heard the Gospel.

Q. 8. But were those works of his "splendid sins?"

A. No; nor were they done without the grace of Christ.

Q. 9. How then can we maintain, that all works done before we have a sense of the pardoning love of God are sin, and, as such, an abomination to him?

A. The works of him who has heard the Gospel, and does not believe, are not done as God hath "willed and commanded them to be done." And yet we know not how to say that they are an abomination to the Lord in him who feareth God, and, from that principle does the best he can.

Q. 10. Seeing there is so much difficulty in this subject, can we deal too tenderly with them that oppose us?

A. We cannot; unless we were to give up any part of the truth of God.

Q. 11. Is a believer constrained to obey God?

A. At first he often is. The love of Christ constraineth him. After this, he may obey, or he may not; no constraint being laid upon him.

Q. 12. Can faith be lost, but through disobedience?

A. It cannot. A believer first inwardly disobeys, inclines to sin with his heart: then his intercourse with God is cut off; that is, his faith is lost: and after this he may fall into outward sin, being now weak, and like another man.

Q. 13. How can such a one recover faith?

A. By "repenting, and doing the first works," Rev. ii, 5.

Q. 14. Whence is it that so great a majority of those who believe fall more or less into doubt or fear?

A. Chiefly from their own ignorance or unfaithfulness: often from their not watching unto prayer: perhaps sometimes from some defect, or want of the power of God in the preaching they hear.

Q. 15. Is there not a defect in us? Do we preach as we did at first? Have we not changed our doctrines?

A. (1.) At first we preached almost wholly to unbelievers. To those therefore we spake almost continually of remission of sins through the death of Christ, and the nature of faith in his blood. And so we do still, among those who need to be taught the first elements of the Gospel of Christ.

(2.) But those in whom the foundation is already laid, we exhort to go on to perfection; which we did not see so clearly at first; although we occasionally spoke of it from the beginning.

(3.) Yet we now preach, and that continually, faith in Christ, as the Prophet, Priest, and King, at least, as clearly, as strongly, and as fully, as we did six years ago.

Q. 16. Do we not discourage visions and dreams too much, as if we condemned them *toto genere*? [entirely?]

A. We do not intend to do this. We neither discourage nor encourage them. We learn from Acts ii, 17, &c, to expect something of this kind "in the last days." And we cannot deny that saving faith is often given in dreams or visions of the night; which faith we account neither better nor worse, than if it came by any other means.

Q. 17. Do not some of our assistants preach too much of the wrath, and too little of the love, of God?

A. We fear they have leaned to that extreme; and hence some of their hearers may have lost the joy of faith.

Q. 18. Need we ever preach the terrors of the Lord to those who know they are accepted of him?

A. No: it is folly so to do; for love is to them the strongest of all motives.

Q. 19. Do we ordinarily represent a justified state so great and happy as it is?

A. Perhaps not. A believer, walking in the light, is inexpressibly great and happy.

Q. 20. Should we not have a care of depreciating justification, in order to exalt the state of full sanctification?

A. Undoubtedly we should beware of this; for one may insensibly slide into it.

Q. 21. How shall we effectually avoid it?

A. When we are going to speak of entire sanctification, let us first describe the blessings of a justified state, as strongly as possible.

Q. 22. Does not the truth of the Gospel lie very near both to Calvinism and Antinomianism?

A. Indeed it does; as it were, within a hair's breadth: so that it is altogether foolish and sinful, because we do not quite agree either with one or the other, to run from them as far as ever we can.

Q. 23. Wherein may we come to the very edge of Calvinism?

A. In ascribing all good to the free grace of God. (2.) In denying all natural free-will, and all power antecedent to grace. And (3.) In excluding all merit from man; even for what he has or does by the grace of God.

Q. 24. Wherein may we come to the edge of Antinomianism?

A. (1.) In exalting the merits and love of Christ. (2.) In rejoicing evermore.

Q. 25. Does faith supersede (set aside the necessity of) holiness or good works?

A. In nowise. So far from it, that it implies both, as a cause does its effects.

About ten, we began to speak of Sanctification: with regard to which, it was inquired:—

Q. 1. When does inward sanctification begin?

A. In the moment we are justified. The seed of every virtue is then sown in the soul. From that time the believer gradually dies to sin, and grows in grace. Yet sin remains in him; yea, the seed of all sin, till he is sanctified throughout in spirit, soul, and body.

Q. 2. What will become of a Heathen, a Papist, a Church of England man, if he dies without being thus sanctified?

A. He cannot see the Lord. But none who seeks it sincerely shall or can die without it; though possibly he may not attain it, till the very article of death.

Q. 3. Is it ordinarily given till a little before death?

A. It is not, to those that expect it no sooner, nor consequently ask for it, at least, not in faith.

Q. 4. But ought we to expect it sooner?

A. Why not? For although we grant, (1.) That the generality of believers whom we have hitherto known were not so sanctified till near death: (2.) That few of those to whom St. Paul wrote his Epistles were so at the time he wrote: (3.) Nor he himself at the time of writing his former Epistles: yet this does not prove that we may not to-day.

Q. 5. But would not one who was thus sanctified be incapable of worldly business?

A. He would be far more capable of it than ever, as going through all without distraction.

Q. 6. Would he be capable of marriage?

A. Why should he not?

Q. 7. Should we not beware of bearing hard on those who think they have attained?

A. We should. And the rather, because if they are faithful to the grace they have received, they are in no danger of perishing at last. No, not even if they remain in luminous faith, as some term it, for many months or years; perhaps till within a little time of their spirits returning to God.

Q. 8. In what manner should we preach entire sanctification?

A. Scarce at all to those who are not pressing forward. To those who are, always by way of promise; always drawing, rather than driving.

Q. 9. How should we wait for the fulfilling of this promise?

A. In universal obedience; in keeping all the commandments; in denying ourselves and taking up our cross daily. These are the general means which God hath ordained for our receiving his sanctifying grace. The particular are, prayer, searching the Scripture, communicating, and fasting.

CONVERSATION III.

Tuesday, May 13th, 1746.

THE following persons being met at the new room, in Bristol: John Wesley, Charles Wesley, John Hodges, Jonathan Reeves, Thomas Maxfield, Thomas Westell, and Thomas Willis; it was inquired,—

Q. 1. Can an unbeliever (whatever he be in other respects) challenge any thing of God's justice?

A. Absolutely nothing but hell. And this is a point which we cannot too much insist on.

Q. 2. Do we empty men of their own righteousness, as we did at first? Do we sufficiently labour, when they begin to be convinced of sin, to take away all they lean upon? Should we not then endeavour with all our might to overturn their false foundations?

A. This was at first one of our principal points: and it ought to be so still. For, till all other foundations are overturned, they cannot build upon Christ.

Q. 3. Did we not then purposely throw them into convictions; into strong sorrow and fear? Nay, did we not strive to make them inconsolable, refusing to be comforted?

A. We did. And so we should do still. For the stronger the conviction, the speedier is the deliverance. And none so soon receive the peace of God, as those who steadily refuse all other comfort.

Q. 4. Let us consider a particular case. Was you, Jonathan Reeves, before you received the peace of God, convinced that, notwithstanding all you did, or could do, you was in a state of damnation?

J. R. I was convinced of it, as fully as that I am now alive.

Q. 5. Are you sure that conviction was from God?

J. R. I can have no doubt but it was.

Q. 6. What do you mean by a state of damnation?

J. R. A state wherein, if a man dies, he perisheth for ever.

Q. 7. How did that conviction end?

J. R. I had first a strong hope that God would deliver me: and this brought a degree of peace. But I had not that solid peace of God till Christ was revealed in me.

Q. 8. But is not such a trust in the love of God, though it be as yet without a distinct sight of God reconciled to me through Christ Jesus, a low degree of justifying faith?

A. It is an earnest of it. But this abides for a short time only; nor is this the proper Christian faith.

Q. 9. By what faith were the Apostles clean before Christ died?

A. By such a faith as this; by a Jewish faith: for "the Holy Ghost was not then given."

Q. 10. Of whom then do you understand those words,—“Who is among you that feareth the Lord, that obeyeth the voice of his servant, that walketh in darkness, and hath no light?” Isaiah I, 10.

A. Of a believer under the Jewish dispensation; one in whose heart God hath not yet shined, to give him the light of the glorious love of God in the face of Jesus Christ.

Q. 11. Who is a Jew, inwardly?

A. A servant of God: one who sincerely obeys him out of fear. Whereas a Christian, inwardly, is a child of God: one who sincerely obeys him out of love. But was not you sincere before Christ was revealed in you?

J. R. It seemed to me that I was, in some measure.

Q. 12. What is sincerity?

A. Willingness to know and do the whole will of God. The lowest species thereof seems to be “faithfulness in that which is little.”

Q. 13. Has God any regard to man’s sincerity?

A. So far, that no man in any state can possibly please God without it; neither, indeed, in any moment wherein he is not sincere.

Q. 14. But can it be conceived that God has any regard to the sincerity of an unbeliever?

A. Yes, so much, that, if he persevere therein, God will infallibly give him faith.

Q. 15. What regard may we conceive him to have to the sincerity of a believer?

A. So much that in every sincere believer he fulfils all the great and precious promises.

Q. 16. Whom do you term a *sincere believer*?

A. One that walks in the light, as God is in the light.

Q. 17. Is sincerity the same with a single eye?

A. Not altogether. The latter refers to our intention; the former, to our will or desires.

Q. 18. Is it not all in all?

A. All will follow persevering sincerity. God gives every thing with it; nothing without it.

Q. 19. Are not then sincerity and faith equivalent terms?

A. By no means. It is at least as nearly related to works as it is to faith. For example, Who is sincere before he believes? He that then does all he can; he that, according to the power he has received, brings forth "fruits meet for repentance." Who is sincere after he believes? He that, from a sense of God's love, is zealous of all good works.

Q. 20. Is not sincerity what St. Paul terms a willing mind, *ἡ προθυμία*? 2 Cor. viii, 12.

A. Yes: if that word be taken in a general sense. For it is a constant disposition to use all the grace given.

Q. 21. But do we not then set sincerity on a level with faith?

A. No. For we allow a man may be sincere, and not be justified, as he may be penitent, and not be justified; (not as yet;) but he cannot have faith, and not be justified. The very moment he believes, he is justified.

Q. 22. But do we not give up faith, and put sincerity in its place, as the condition of our acceptance with God?

A. We believe it is one condition of our acceptance, as repentance likewise is. And we believe it a condition of our continuing in a state of acceptance. Yet we do not put it in the place of faith. It is by faith the merits of Christ are applied to my soul. But if I am not sincere, they are not applied.

Q. 23. Is not this that "going about to establish your own righteousness," whereof St. Paul speaks, Romans x, 3?

A. St. Paul there manifestly speaks of unbelievers, who sought to be accepted for the sake of their own righteousness. We do not seek to be accepted for the sake of our sincerity; but through the merits of Christ alone. Indeed, so long as any man believes, he cannot go about (in St. Paul's sense) to "establish his own righteousness."

Q. 24. But do you consider, that we are under the covenant of grace, and that the covenant of works is now abolished?

A. All mankind were under the covenant of grace, from the very hour that the original promise was made. If by the covenant of works you mean, that of unsinning obedience made with Adam before the fall, no man but Adam was ever under that covenant; for it was abolished before Cain was born. Yet it is not so abolished, but that it will stand, in a measure, even to the end of the world; that is, If we "do this," we shall live; if not, we shall die eternally: if we do well, we shall live with God in glory; if evil, we shall die the second death. For every man shall be judged in that day, and rewarded "according to his works."

Q. 25. What means then, "To him that believeth, his faith is counted for righteousness?"

A. That God forgives him that is unrighteous as soon as he believes, accepting his faith instead of perfect righteousness. But then observe, universal righteousness follows, though it did not precede, faith.

Q. 26. But is faith thus "counted to us for righteousness," at whatsoever time we believe?

A. Yes. In whatsoever moment we believe, all our past sins vanish away: they are as though they had never been, and we stand clear in the sight of God.

Tuesday, ten o'clock.

Mr. Taylor of Quinton, and T. Glascot, being added, it was inquired,

Q. 1. Are not the assurance of faith, the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, and the revelation of Christ in us, terms nearly of the same import?

A. He that denies one of them must deny all; they are so closely connected together.

Q. 2. Are they ordinarily, where the pure Gospel is preached, essential to our acceptance?

A. Undoubtedly they are; and, as such, to be insisted on, in the strongest terms.

Q. 3. Is not the whole dispute of salvation by faith or by works a mere strife of words?

A. In asserting salvation by faith, we mean this: (1.) That pardon (salvation begun) is received by faith producing works. (2.) That holiness (salvation continued) is faith working by love. (3.) That heaven (salvation finished) is the reward of this faith.

If you who assert salvation by works, or by faith and works, mean the same thing, (understanding by faith, the revelation of Christ in us,—by salvation, pardon, holiness, glory,) we will not strive with you at all. If you do not, this is not a strife of words; but the very vitals, the essence of Christianity is the thing in question.

Q. 4. Wherein does our doctrine now differ from that we preached when at Oxford?

A. Chiefly in these two points: (1.) We then knew nothing of that righteousness of faith, in justification; nor (2.) Of the nature of faith itself, as implying consciousness of pardon.

Q. 5. May not some degree of the love of God go before a distinct sense of justification?

A. We believe it may.

Q. 6. Can any degree of sanctification or holiness?

A. Many degrees of outward holiness may; yea, and some degree of meekness, and several other tempers which would be branches of Christian holiness, but that they do not spring from Christian principles. For the abiding love of God cannot spring but from faith in a pardoning God. And no true Christian holiness can exist without that love of God for its foundation.

Q. 7. Is every man, as soon as he believes, a new creature, sanctified, pure in heart? Has he then a new heart? Does Christ dwell therein? And is he a temple of the Holy Ghost?

A. All these things may be affirmed of every believer, in a true sense. Let us not therefore contradict those who maintain it. Why should we contend about words?

CONVERSATION IV.

Tuesday, June 16th, 1747.

THE following persons being met at the Foundery: John Wesley, Charles Wesley, and Charles Manning, vicar of Hayes; Richard Thomas Bateman, rector of St. Bartholomew's the Great; Henry Piers, Howell Harris, and Thomas Hardwick; it was inquired,

Q. 1. Is justifying faith a divine assurance that Christ loved me, and gave himself for me?

A. We believe it is.

Q. 2. What is the judgment of most of the serious Dissenters concerning this?

A. They generally allow, that many believers have such an assurance; and, that it is to be desired and prayed for by all. But then they affirm, that this is the highest species or degree of faith; that it is not the common privilege of believers: consequently, they deny that this is justifying faith, or necessarily implied therein.

Q. 3. And are there not strong reasons for their opinion? For instance: if the true believers of old had not this assurance, then it is not necessarily implied in justifying faith. But the true believers of old had not this assurance.

A. David, and many more of the believers of old, undeniably had this assurance. But even if the Jews had it not, it would not follow that this is not implied in Christian faith.

Q. 4. But do you not know that the Apostles themselves had it not till after the day of Pentecost?

A. The Apostles themselves had not the proper Christian faith till after the day of Pentecost.

Q. 5. But were not those Christian believers, in the proper sense, to whom St. John wrote his First Epistle? Yet to these he says, "These things have I written unto you that believe on the name of the Son of God; that ye may know that ye have eternal life, and that ye may believe on the name of the Son of God," v, 13.

A. This does not prove that they did not know they had eternal life, any more than that they did not believe. His plain meaning is, "I have written unto you that you may be the more established in the faith." Therefore, it does not follow from hence, that they had not this assurance; but only that there are degrees therein.

Q. 6. But were not the Thessalonians true believers? Yet they had not this assurance; they had only a good hope, 2 Thess. ii, 16.

A. The text you refer to runs thus: "Now our Lord Jesus Christ himself, and God, even our Father, which hath loved us, and given us everlasting consolation and good hope through grace, comfort your hearts and stablish you in every good word and work." This *good hope* does not exclude, but necessarily implies, a strong assurance of the love of God.

Q. 7. But does not St. Paul say even of himself, "I know nothing by myself; yet am I not hereby justified?" 1 Cor. iv, 4.

A. He does not say of himself here, that he was not justified, or that he did not know it; but only, that though he had a conscience void of

offence, yet this did not justify him before God. And must not every believer say the same? This, therefore, is wide of the point.

Q. 8. But does he not disclaim any such assurance in those words, "I was with you in weakness, and in fear, and in much trembling?" 1 Cor. ii, 3.

A. By no means. For these words do not imply any fear either of death or hell. They express only a deep sense of his utter insufficiency for the great work wherein he was engaged.

Q. 9. However, does he not exclude Christians in general from such an assurance, when he bids them "work out" their "salvation with fear and trembling?" Phil. ii, 12.

A. No more than from love; which is always joined with filial fear and reverential trembling. And the same answer is applicable to all those texts which exhort a believer to fear.

Q. 10. But does not matter of fact prove, that justifying faith does not necessarily imply assurance? For can you believe that such a person as J. A. or E. V. who have so much integrity, zeal, and fear of God, and walk so unblamably in all things, is void of justifying faith? Can you suppose such as these to be under the wrath and under the curse of God; especially if you add to this, that they are continually longing, striving, praying for the assurance which they have not?

A. This contains the very strength of the cause; and inclines us to think that some of these may be exempt cases. But, however that be, we answer,

(1.) It is dangerous to ground a general doctrine on a few particular experiments.

(2.) Men may have many good tempers, and a blameless life, (speaking in a loose sense,) by nature and habit, with preventing grace; and yet not have faith and the love of God.

(3.) It is scarce possible for us to know all the circumstances relating to such persons, so as to judge certainly concerning them.

(4.) But this we know, if Christ is not revealed in them, they are not yet Christian believers.

Q. 11. But what will become of them then, suppose they die in this state?

A. That is a supposition not to be made. They cannot die in this state: they must go backward or forward. If they continue to seek, they will surely find, righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost. We are confirmed in this belief by the many instances we have seen of such as these finding peace at the last hour. And it is not impossible but others may then be made partakers of like precious faith, and yet go hence without giving any outward proof of the change which God hath wrought.

CONVERSATION V.

Wednesday, June 17th.

Q. 1. How much is allowed by our brethren who differ from us, with regard to entire sanctification?

A. They grant, (1.) That every one must be entirely sanctified in the article of death.

(2.) That, till then, a believer daily grows in grace, comes nearer and nearer to perfection.

(3.) That we ought to be continually pressing after this, and to exhort all others so to do.

Q. 2. What do we allow them?

A. We grant, (1.) That many of those who have died in the faith, yea, the greater part of those we have known, were not sanctified through-out, not made perfect in love, till a little before death.

(2.) That the term, "sanctified," is continually applied by St. Paul to all that were justified, were true believers.

(3.) That by this term alone, he rarely, if ever, means saved from all sin.

(4.) That, consequently, it is not proper to use it in this sense, without adding the word "wholly, entirely," or the like.

(5.) That the inspired writers almost continually speak of or to those who are justified; but very rarely, either of or to those who are wholly sanctified.

(6.) That, consequently, it behooves us to speak in public almost continually of the state of justification; but, more rarely, in full and explicit terms, concerning entire sanctification.

Q. 3. What then is the point wherein we divide?

A. It is this: whether we should expect to be saved from all sin before the article of death.

Q. 4. Is there any clear scripture promise of this; that God will save us from *all* sin?

A. There is: "He shall redeem Israel from *all* his sins," Psalm cxxx, 8. This is more largely expressed in the prophecy of Ezekiel: "Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean: from *all* your filthiness, and from *all* your idols, will I cleanse you. I will also save you from *all* your uncleannesses," xxxvi, 25, 29. No promise can be more clear. And to this the Apostle plainly refers in that exhortation: "Having these promises, let us cleanse ourselves from all filthiness of flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear of God," 2 Cor. vii, 1. Equally clear and express is that ancient promise: "The Lord thy God will circumcise thine heart, and the heart of thy seed, to love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and with all thy soul," Deut. xxx, 6.

Q. 5. But does any assertion answerable to this occur in the New Testament?

A. There does, and that laid down in the plainest terms. So St. John: "For this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that he might destroy the works of the devil;" iii, 8; the works of the devil, without any limitation or restriction: but all sin is the work of the devil. Parallel to which is that assertion of St. Paul: "Christ loved the Church, and gave himself for it; that he might present it to himself a glorious Church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish," Ephes. v, 25, 27. And to the same effect is his assertion in the eighth of the Romans: "God sent his Son—that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, walking not after the flesh, but after the Spirit," verses 3, 4.

Q. 6. Does the New Testament afford any farther ground for expecting to be saved from all sin?

A. Undoubtedly it does, both in those prayers and commands which are equivalent to the strongest assertions.

Q. 7. What prayers do you mean?

A. Prayers for entire sanctification; which, were there no such thing, would be mere mockery of God. Such, in particular, are, (1.) "Deliver us from evil;" or rather, "from the evil one." Now, when this is done, when we are delivered from all evil, there can be no sin remaining. (2.) "Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on me through their word; that they all may be one; as thou Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us: I in them, and thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one," John xvii, 20, 21, 23. (3.) "I bow my knees unto the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ—that he would grant you—that ye, being rooted and grounded in love, may be able to comprehend, with all saints, what is the breadth, and length, and depth, and height; and to know the love of Christ, which passeth knowledge, that ye might be filled with all the fulness of God," Eph. iii, 14, 16–19. (4.) "The very God of peace sanctify you wholly; and I pray God your whole spirit and soul and body be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ," 1 Thess. v, 23.

Q. 8. What command is there to the same effect?

A. (1.) "Be ye perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect," Matt. v, 48. (2.) "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind," Matt. xxii, 37. But if the love of God fill all the heart, there can be no sin there.

Q. 9. But how does it appear that this is to be done before the article of death?

A. First. From the very nature of a command, which is not given to the dead, but to the living. Therefore, "Thou shalt love God with all thy heart," cannot mean, Thou shalt do this when thou diest, but while thou livest.

Secondly. From express texts of Scripture: (1.) "The grace of God that bringeth salvation hath appeared to all men, teaching us that, having renounced (*απησάμενοι*) ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly, in this present world; looking for—the glorious appearing of our Saviour Jesus Christ; who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works," Titus ii, 11–14. (2.) "He hath raised up a horn of salvation for us,—to perform the mercy promised to our fathers; the oath which he sware to our father Abraham, that he would grant unto us, that we, being delivered out of the hand of our enemies, should serve him without fear, in holiness and righteousness before him, all the days of our life," Luke i, 69–75.

Q. 10. Is there any example in Scripture of persons who had attained to this?

A. Yes. St. John, and all those of whom he says in his First Epistle, "Herein is our love made perfect, that we may have confidence in the day of judgment: because as he is, so are we in this world," iv, 17.

Q. 11. But why are there not more examples of this kind recorded in the New Testament?

A. It does not become us to be peremptory in this matter. One

reason might possibly be, because the Apostles wrote to the Church while it was in a state of infancy. Therefore they might mention such persons the more sparingly, lest they should give strong meat to babes.

Q. 12. Can you show one such example now? Where is he that is thus perfect?

A. To some who make this inquiry one might answer, "If I knew one here, I would not tell you. For you do not inquire out of love. You are like Herod. You only seek the young child to slay it."

But more directly we answer, There are numberless reasons why there should be few (if any indisputable) examples. What inconveniences would this bring on the person himself, set as a mark for all to shoot at! What a temptation would it be to others, not only to men who knew not God, but to believers themselves! How hardly would they refrain from idolizing such a person! And yet, how unprofitable to gainsayers! "For if they hear not Moses and the Prophets," Christ and his Apostles, "neither would they be persuaded, though one rose from the dead."

Q. 13. Suppose one had attained to this, would you advise him to speak of it?

A. Not to them who know not God. It would only provoke them to contradict and blaspheme: nor to any without some particular reason, without some particular good in view. And then they should have an especial care to avoid all appearance of boasting.

Q. 14. Is it a sin, not to believe those who say they have attained?

A. By no means, even though they said true. We ought not hastily to believe, but to suspend our judgment, till we have full and strong proof.

Q. 15. But are we not apt to have a secret distaste to any who say they are saved from all sin?

A. It is very possible we may, and that on several grounds; partly from a concern for the honour of God, and the good of souls, who may be hurt, yea, or turned out of the way, if these are not what they profess; partly from a kind of implicit envy at those who speak of higher attainments than our own; and partly from our slowness and unreadiness of heart to believe the works of God.

Q. 16. Does not the harshly preaching perfection tend to bring believers into a kind of bondage, or slavish fear?

A. It does: therefore we should always place it in the most amiable light, so that it may excite only hope, joy, and desire.

Q. 17. Why may we not continue in the joy of faith even till we are made perfect?

A. Why indeed! since holy grief does not quench this joy; since, even while we are under the cross, while we deeply partake of the sufferings of Christ, we may rejoice with joy unspeakable.

Q. 18. Do we not discourage believers from rejoicing evermore?

A. We ought not so to do. Let them all their life long rejoice unto God, so it be with reverence. And even if lightness or pride should mix with their joy, let us not strike at the joy itself, (this is the gift of God,) but at that lightness or pride, that the evil may cease and the good remain.

Q. 19. Ought we to be anxiously careful about perfection, lest we should die before we have attained?

A. In no wise. We ought to be thus careful for nothing, neither spiritual nor temporal.

Q. 20. But ought we not to be troubled on account of the sinful nature which still remains in us?

A. It is good for us to have a deep sense of this, and to be much ashamed before the Lord: but this should only incite us the more earnestly to turn unto Christ every moment, and to draw light, and life, and strength from him, that we may go on conquering and to conquer. And, therefore, when the sense of our sin most abounds, the sense of his love should much more abound.

Q. 21. Will our joy or our trouble increase as we grow in grace?

A. Perhaps both. But without doubt our joy in the Lord will increase as our love increases.

Q. 22. Is not the teaching believers to be continually poring upon their inbred sin the ready way to make them forget that they were purged from their former sins?

A. We find by experience it is; or to make them undervalue and account it a little thing; whereas, indeed, (though there are still greater gifts behind,) this is inexpressibly great and glorious.

MINUTES

OF

SEVERAL CONVERSATIONS BETWEEN THE

REV. MR. WESLEY AND OTHERS;

FROM THE YEAR 1744 TO THE YEAR 1789.*

It is desired that all things be considered as in the immediate presence of God: that every person speak freely whatever is in his heart.

Q. 1. How may we best improve the time of this conference?

A. (1.) While we are conversing, let us have an especial care to set God always before us.

(2.) In the intermediate hours, let us redeem all the time we can for private exercises.

(3.) Therein let us give ourselves to prayer for one another, and for a blessing on this our labour.

Q. 2. Have our conferences been as useful as they might have been?

A. No: we have been continually straitened for time. Hence scarce any thing has been searched to the bottom. To remedy this, let every conference last nine days, concluding on Wednesday in the second week.

* This tract, which is usually denominated, "The Large Minutes," contains the plan of discipline as practised in the Methodist Connection during the life of Mr. Wesley. As its title intimates, it underwent several alterations and enlargements from the year 1744 to 1789, when the last revision took place. It is here reprinted from a copy which bears the date of 1791,—the year in which Mr. Wesley died,—collated with the edition of 1789.—EDIT.

Q. 3. What may we reasonably believe to be God's design in raising up the preachers called Methodists?

A. Not to form any new sect; but to reform the nation, particularly the Church; and to spread scriptural holiness over the land.

Q. 4. What was the rise of Methodism, so called?

A. In 1729, two young men, reading the Bible, saw they could not be saved without holiness, followed after it, and incited others so to do. In 1737, they saw holiness comes by faith. They saw likewise, that men are justified before they are sanctified; but still holiness was their point. God then thrust them out, utterly against their will, to raise a holy people. When Satan could no otherwise hinder this, he threw Calvinism in the way; and then Antinomianism, which strikes directly at the root of all holiness.

Q. 5. Is it advisable for us to preach in as many places as we can, without forming any societies?

A. By no means. We have made the trial in various places; and that for a considerable time. But all the seed has fallen as by the high-way side. There is scarce any fruit remaining.

Q. 6. Where should we endeavour to preach most?

A. (1.) Where there is the greatest number of quiet and willing hearers. (2.) Where there is most fruit.

Q. 7. Is field preaching unlawful?

A. We conceive not. We do not know that it is contrary to any law either of God or man.

Q. 8. Have we not used it too sparingly?

A. It seems we have; (1.) Because our call is, to save that which is lost. Now, we cannot expect them to seek *us*. Therefore we should go and seek *them*. (2.) Because we are particularly called, by "going into the highways and hedges," which none else will do, "to compel them to come in." (3.) Because that reason against it is not good, "The house will hold all that come." The house may hold all that come to the house; but not all that would come to the field.

The greatest hinderance to this you are to expect from rich, or cowardly, or lazy Methodists. But regard them not, neither stewards, leaders, nor people. Whenever the weather will permit, go out in God's name into the most public places, and call all to repent and believe the Gospel; every Sunday, in particular; especially where there are old societies, lest they settle upon their lees. The stewards will frequently oppose this, lest they lose their usual collection. But this is not a sufficient reason against it. Shall we barter souls for money?

Q. 9. Ought we not diligently to observe in what places God is pleased at any time to pour out his Spirit more abundantly?

A. We ought; and at that time to send more labourers than usual into that part of the harvest.

But whence shall we have them? (1.) So far as we can afford it, we will keep a reserve of preachers at Kingswood. (2.) Let an exact list be kept of those who are proposed for trial, but not accepted.

Q. 10. How often shall we permit strangers to be present at the meeting of the society?

A. At every other meeting of the society in every place let no stranger be admitted. At other times they may; but the same person not above

twice or thrice. In order to this, see that all in every place show their tickets before they come in. If the stewards and leaders are not exact herein, employ others that have more resolution.

Q. 11. How may the leaders of classes be made more useful?

A. (1.) Let each of them be diligently examined concerning his method of meeting a class. Let this be done with all possible exactness at the next quarterly visitation. And in order to this, allow sufficient time for the visiting of each society.

(2.) Let each leader carefully inquire how every soul in his class prospers; not only how each person observes the outward rules, but how he grows in the knowledge and love of God.

(3.) Let the leaders converse with the assistant frequently and freely.

Q. 12. Can any thing farther be done, in order to make the meetings of the classes lively and profitable?

A. (1.) Change improper leaders.

(2.) Let the leaders frequently meet each other's classes.

(3.) Let us observe which leaders are the most useful; and let these meet the other classes as often as possible.

(4.) See that all the leaders be not only men of sound judgment, but men truly devoted to God.

Q. 13. How can we farther assist those under our care?

A. (1.) By meeting the married men and women together, the first Sunday after the visitation,—the single men and women apart, on the two following,—in all the large societies: this has been much neglected.

(2.) By instructing them at their own houses. What unspeakable need is there of this! The world say, "The Methodists are no better than other people." This is not true. But it is nearer the truth than we are willing to believe.

N. B. For (1.) Personal religion either toward God or man is amazingly superficial among us.

I can but just touch on a few generals. How little faith is there among us! How little communion with God! How little living in heaven, walking in eternity, deadness to every creature! How much love of the world; desire of pleasure, of ease, of getting money! How little brotherly love! What continual judging one another! What gossiping, evil speaking, tale bearing! What want of moral honesty! To instance only in one or two particulars: who does as he would be done by, in buying and selling, particularly in selling horses! Write him a knave that does not. And the Methodist knave is the worst of all knaves.

(2.) Family religion is shamefully wanting, and almost in every branch.

And the Methodists in general will be little the better, till we take quite another course with them. For what avails public preaching alone, though we could preach like angels? We must, yea, every travelling preacher must, instruct them from house to house. Till this is done, and that in good earnest, the Methodists will be little better than other people. Our religion is not deep, universal, uniform; but superficial, partial, uneven. It will be so, till we spend half as much time in this visiting, as we now do in talking uselessly.

Can we find a better method of doing this than Mr. Baxter's? If not, let us adopt it without delay. His whole tract, intitled *Gildas Salvianus*,

is well worth a careful perusal. A short extract from it I will subjoin. Speaking of this visiting from house to house, he says:—

“We shall find many hinderances, both in ourselves, and in the people.

“1. In ourselves there is much dulness and laziness; so that there will be much ado to get us to be faithful in the work.

“2. We have a base, man-pleasing temper; so that we let men perish, rather than lose their love. We let them go quietly to hell, lest we should anger them.

“3. Some of us have also a foolish bashfulness. We know not how to begin, and blush to contradict the devil.

“4. But the greatest hinderance is, weakness of faith. Our whole motion is weak, because the spring of it is weak.

“5. Lastly, we are unskillful in the work. How few know how to deal with men, so as to get within them, and suit all our discourse to their several conditions and tempers; to choose the fittest subjects, and follow them with a holy mixture of seriousness, and terror, and love, and meekness!” (p. 351.)

And we have many difficulties to grapple with in our people.

1. Too many of them will be unwilling to be taught, till we conquer their perverseness by the force of reason and the power of love.

2. And many are so dull that they will shun being taught for fear of showing their dulness. And indeed you will find it extremely hard to make them understand the very plainest points.

3. And it is still harder to fix things on their hearts, without which all our labour is lost. If you have not, therefore, great seriousness and fervency, what good can you expect? And, after all, it is grace alone that must do the work.

4. And when we have made some impressions on their hearts, if we look not after them, they will soon die away.

But as great as this labour of private instruction is, it is absolutely necessary. For, after all our preaching, many of our people are almost as ignorant as if they had never heard the gospel. I speak as plain as I can, yet I frequently meet with those who have been my hearers many years, who know not whether Christ be God or man. And how few are there that know the nature of repentance, faith, and holiness! Most of them have a sort of confidence that God will save them, while the world has their hearts. I have found by experience, that one of these has learned more from one hour's close discourse, than from ten years' public preaching.

And undoubtedly this private application is implied in those solemn words of the Apostle: “I charge thee, before God and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and dead at his appearing, preach the word, be instant in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort, with all long suffering.”

O brethren, if we could but set this work on foot in all our societies, and prosecute it zealously, what glory would redound to God! If the common ignorance were banished, and every shop and every house busied in speaking of the word and works of God; surely God would dwell in our habitations, and make us his delight.

And this is absolutely necessary to the welfare of our people, many of

whom neither believe nor repent to this day. Look round and see how many of them are still in apparent danger of damnation. And how can you walk and talk and be merry with such people, when you know their case? Methinks, when you look them in the face, you should break forth into tears, as the Prophet did when he looked upon Hazeal; and then set on them with the most vehement and importunate exhortations. O, for God's sake, and for the sake of poor souls, bestir yourselves, and spare no pains that may conduce to their salvation!

What cause have we to bleed before the Lord this day, that we have so long neglected this good work! If we had but set upon it sooner, how many more might have been brought to Christ! And how much holier and happier might we have made our societies before now! And why might we not have done it sooner? There were many hinderances; and so there always will be. But the greatest hinderance was in ourselves, in our littleness of faith and love.

But it is objected, (1.) "This will take up so much time, that we shall not have time to follow our studies."

I answer, (1.) Gaining knowledge is a good thing; but saving souls is a better. (2.) By this very thing you will gain the most excellent knowledge, that of God and eternity. (3.) You will have time for gaining other knowledge too, if you spend all your mornings therein. Only sleep not more than you need; and never be idle, or triflingly employed. But, (4.) If you can do but one, let your studies alone. I would throw by all the libraries in the world, rather than be guilty of the loss of one soul.

I allow, in some of the country circuits, where you have only a day to spend in each place, you have not time for this excellent work. But you have, wherever you spend several days together in one town.

It is objected, (2.) "The people will not submit to it." If some will not, others will. And the success with them will repay all your labour. O let us herein follow the example of St. Paul!

(1.) For our general business, "Serving the Lord with all humility of mind." (2.) Our special work, "Take heed to yourselves and to all the flock." (3.) Our doctrine, "Repentance toward God, and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ." (4.) The place, "I have taught you publicly, and from house to house." The object and manner of teaching: "I ceased not to warn every one, night and day, with tears." (5.) His innocence and self denial herein: "I have coveted no man's silver or gold." (6.) His patience: "Neither count I my life dear unto myself." And among all our motives, let these be ever before our eyes: (1.) "The Church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood." (2.) "Grievous wolves shall enter in; yea, of yourselves shall men arise, speaking perverse things." Write this upon your hearts, and it will do you more good than twenty years' study.

Let every preacher, having a catalogue of those in each society, go to each house. Deal gently with them, that the report of it may move others to desire your coming. Give the children the "Instructions for Children," and encourage them to get them by heart. Indeed, you will find it no easy matter to teach the ignorant the principles of religion. So true is the remark of Archbishop Usher: "Great scholars may think this work beneath them. But they should consider, the laying the found-

ation skilfully, as it is of the greatest importance, so it is the masterpiece of the wisest builder. And let the wisest of us all try, whenever we please, we shall find, that to lay this groundwork rightly, to make the ignorant understand the grounds of religion, will put us to the trial of all our skill."

Perhaps in doing this it may be well, (1.) After a few loving words spoken to all in the house, to take each person singly into another room, where you may deal closely with him, about his sin, and misery, and duty. Set these home, or you lose all your labour. (At least, let none be present but those who are familiar with each other.)

(2.) Hear what the children have learned by heart.

(3.) Choose some of the weightiest points, and try if they understand them. As, "Do you believe you have sin in you? What does sin deserve? What remedy has God provided for guilty, helpless sinners?"

(4.) Often with the question suggest the answer. As, "What is repentance? Sorrow for sin, or a conviction that we are guilty, helpless sinners." "What is faith? A divine conviction of things not seen."

(5.) Where you perceive they do not understand the stress of your question, lead them into it by other questions. For instance, you ask, "How do you think your sins will be pardoned?" They answer, "By repenting and amending my life." You ask farther, "But will your amendment make satisfaction for your past sins?" They will answer, "I hope so, or I know not what will." One would think, these had no knowledge of Christ at all. And some have not. But others have; and give such answers, only because they do not understand the scope of the question. Ask them farther, "Can you be saved without the death of Christ?" They immediately say, "No." And if you ask, "What has he suffered for you?" they will say, "He shed his blood for us." But many cannot express even what they have some conception of; no, not even when expressions are put into their mouths. With these you are to deal exceeding tenderly, lest they be discouraged.

(6.) If you perceive them troubled, that they cannot answer, step in yourself, and take the burden off them; answering the question yourself. And do it thoroughly and plainly, making a full explication of the whole business to them.

(7.) When you have tried their knowledge, proceed to instruct them, according to their several capacities. If a man understand the fundamentals, speak what you perceive he most needs, either explaining farther some doctrines, or some duty, or showing him the necessity of something which he neglects. If he still understands not, go over it again till he does.

(8.) Next inquire into his state, whether convinced or unconvinced, converted or unconverted. Tell him, if need be, what conversion is; and then renew and enforce the inquiry.

(9.) If unconverted, labour with all your power to bring his heart to a sense of his condition. Set this home with a more earnest voice than you spoke before. Get to the heart, or you do nothing.

(10.) Conclude all with a strong exhortation, which should enforce, (1.) The duty of the heart, in order to receive Christ. (2.) The avoiding former sins, and constantly using the outward means. And be sure, if you can, to get their promise, to forsake sin, change their company,

and use the means. And do this solemnly, reminding them of the presence of God, who hears their promises, and expects the performance.

(11.) Before you leave them, engage the head of each family to call all his family together every Sunday before they go to bed, and hear what they can repeat, and so continue, till they have learned the "Instructions" perfectly; and afterward let him take care that they do not forget what they have learned.

Do this in earnest, and you will soon find what a work you take in hand, in undertaking to be a travelling preacher!

Q. 14. How shall we prevent improper persons from insinuating into the society?

A. (1.) Give tickets to none till they are recommended by a leader, with whom they have met at least two months on trial.

(2.) Give notes to none but those who are recommended by one you know, or till they have met three or four times in a class.

(3.) Give them the rules the first time they meet. See that this be never neglected.

Q. 15. When shall we admit new members?

A. In large towns, admit them into the bands at the quarterly love-feast following the visitation: into the society, on the Sunday following the visitation. Then also read the names of them that are excluded.

Q. 16. Should we insist on the band rules, particularly with regard to dress?

A. By all means. This is no time to give any encouragement to superfluity of apparel. Therefore give no band tickets to any till they have left off superfluous ornaments. In order to this, (1.) Let every assistant read the "Thoughts upon Dress" at least once a year, in every large society. (2.) In visiting the classes, be very mild, but very strict. (3.) Allow no exempt case, not even of a married woman. Better one suffer than many. (4.) Give no ticket to any that wear calashes, high-heads, or enormous bonnets.

To encourage meeting in band, (1.) In every large society, have a love-feast quarterly for the bands only. (2.) Never fail to meet them once a week. (3.) Exhort every believer to embrace the advantage. (4.) Give a band ticket to none till they have met a quarter on trial.

Observe! You give none a band ticket before he meets, but after he has met.

Q. 17. Have those in band left off snuff and drams?

A. No. Many are still enslaved to one or the other. In order to redress this, (1.) Let no preacher touch either on any account. (2.) Strongly dissuade our people from them. (3.) Answer their pretences, particularly curing the colic.

Q. 18. Do we observe any evil which has lately prevailed among our societies?

A. Many of our members have married with unbelievers, yea, with unawakened persons. This has had fatal effects. They had either a cross for life, or turned back to perdition.

Q. 19. What can be done to put a stop to this?

A. (1.) Let every preacher publicly enforce the Apostle's caution, "Be not unequally yoked with unbelievers." (2.) Let him openly declare, whoever does this will be expelled the society. (3.) When any

such is expelled, let a suitable exhortation be subjoined. And, (4.) Let all be exhorted to take no step in so weighty a matter without advising with the most serious of their brethren.

Q. 20. Ought any woman to marry without the consent of her parents?

A. In general, she ought not. Yet there may be an exception. For if, (1.) A woman be under a necessity of marrying; if (2.) Her parents absolutely refuse to let her marry any Christian; then she may, nay, ought to, marry without their consent. Yet, even then, a Methodist preacher ought not to marry her.

Q. 21. Do not Sabbath breaking, dram drinking, evil speaking, unprofitable conversation, lightness, expensiveness or gaiety of apparel, and contracting debts without due care to discharge them, still prevail in several places? How may these evils be remedied?

A. (1.) Let us preach expressly on each of these heads. (2.) Read in every society the "Sermon on Evil Speaking." (3.) Let the leaders closely examine and exhort every person to put away the accursed thing. (4.) Let the preacher warn every society, that none who is guilty herein can remain with us. (5.) Extirpate smuggling, buying or selling uncustomed goods, out of every society. Let none remain with us, who will not totally abstain from every kind and degree of it. Speak tenderly, but earnestly, and frequently of it, in every society near the coasts; and read to them, and diligently disperse among them, the "Word to a Smuggler." (6.) Extirpate bribery, receiving any thing, directly or indirectly, for voting in any election. Show no respect of persons herein, but expel all that touch the accursed thing. Largely show, both in public and private, the wickedness of thus selling our country. And every where read the "Word to a Freholder," and disperse it with both hands.

Q. 22. What shall we do to prevent scandal, when any of our members become bankrupt?

A. Let the assistant talk with him at large; and if he has not kept fair accounts, or has been concerned in that base practice of raising money by coining notes, (commonly called the bill trade,) let him be expelled immediately.

Q. 23. What is the office of a Christian minister?

A. To watch over souls, as he that must give account.

Q. 24. In what view may we and our helpers be considered?

A. Perhaps as extraordinary messengers, (that is, out of the ordinary way,) designed, (1.) To provoke the regular ministers to jealousy. (2.) To supply their lack of service toward those who are perishing for want of knowledge. But how hard is it to abide here! Who does not wish to be a little higher? suppose, to be ordained!

Q. 25. What is the office of a helper?

A. In the absence of a minister, to feed and guide the flock; in particular,

(1.) To preach morning and evening. (But he is never to begin later in the evening than seven o'clock, unless in particular cases.)

(2.) To meet the society and the bands weekly.

(3.) To meet the leaders weekly.

Let every preacher be particularly exact in this, and in the morning preaching. If he has twenty hearers, let him preach. If not, let him sing and pray.

N. B. We are fully determined never to drop the morning preaching ; and to continue preaching at five, wherever it is practicable, particularly in London and Bristol.

Q. 26. What are the rules of a helper ?

A. (1.) Be diligent. Never be unemployed a moment. Never be triflingly employed. Never while away time ; neither spend any more time at any place than is strictly necessary.

(2.) Be serious. Let your motto be, "Holiness to the Lord." Avoid all lightness, jesting, and foolish talking.

(3.) Converse sparingly and cautiously with¹ women ; particularly with young women.

(4.) Take no step toward marriage, without first consulting with your brethren.

(5.) Believe evil of no one ; unless you see it done, take heed how you credit it. Put the best construction on every thing. You know the judge is always supposed to be on the prisoner's side.

(6.) Speak evil of no one ; else your word especially would eat as doth a canker. Keep your thoughts within your own breast, till you come to the person concerned.

(7.) Tell every one what you think wrong in him, and that plainly, as soon as may be ; else it will fester in your heart. Make all haste to cast the fire out of your bosom.

(8.) Do not affect the gentleman. You have no more to do with this character than with that of a dancing master. A preacher of the Gospel is the servant of all.

(9.) Be ashamed of nothing but sin : not of fetching wood (if time permit) or drawing water ; not of cleaning your own shoes, or your neighbour's.

(10.) Be punctual. Do every thing exactly at the time. And, in general, do not mend our rules, but keep them ; not for wrath, but for conscience' sake.

(11.) You have nothing to do but to save souls. Therefore spend and be spent in this work. And go always, not only to those that want you, but to those that want you most.

Observe : It is not your business to preach so many times, and to take care of this or that society ; but to save as many souls as you can ; to bring as many sinners as you possibly can to repentance, and with all your power to build them up in that holiness without which they cannot see the Lord. And remember ! A Methodist preacher is to mind every point, great and small, in the Methodist discipline ! Therefore you will need all the sense you have, and to have all your wits about you !

(12.) Act in all things, not according to your own will, but as a son in the Gospel. As such, it is your part to employ your time in the manner which we direct ; partly, in preaching and visiting from house to house ; partly, in reading, meditation, and prayer. Above all, if you labour with us in our Lord's vineyard, it is needful that you should do that part of the work which we advise, at those times and places which we judge most for his glory.

Q. 27. What power is this which you exercise over both the preachers and the societies ?

A. Count Zinzendorf loved to keep all things close : I love to do all

things openly. I will therefore tell you all I know of the matter, taking it from the very beginning.

(1.) In November, 1738, two or three persons who desired "to flee from the wrath to come," and then a few more, came to me in London, and desired me to advise and pray with them. I said, "If you will meet me on Thursday night, I will help you as well as I can." More and more then desired to meet with them, till they were increased to many hundreds. The case was afterward the same at Bristol, Kingswood, Newcastle, and many other parts of England, Scotland, and Ireland. It may be observed, the desire was on their part, not mine. My desire was, to live and die in retirement. But I did not see that I could refuse them my help, and be guiltless before God.

Here commenced my power; namely, a power to appoint when, and where, and how they should meet; and to remove those whose lives showed that they had not a desire "to flee from the wrath to come." And this power remained the same, whether the people meeting together were twelve, or twelve hundred, or twelve thousand.

(2.) In a few days some of them said, "Sir, we will not sit under you for nothing; we will subscribe quarterly." I said, "I will have nothing; for I want nothing. My fellowship supplies me with all I want." One replied, "Nay, but you want a hundred and fifteen pounds to pay for the lease of the Foundery; and likewise a large sum of money to put it into repair." On this consideration, I suffered them to subscribe. And when the society met, I asked, "Who will take the trouble of receiving this money, and paying it where it is needful?" One said, "I will do it, and keep the account for you." So here was the first steward. Afterward, I desired one or two more to help me, as stewards, and, in process of time, a greater number.

Let it be remarked, it was I myself, not the people, who chose these stewards, and appointed to each the distinct work wherein he was to help me, as long as I desired. And herein I began to exercise another sort of power; namely, that of appointing and removing stewards.

(3.) After a time a young man, named Thomas Maxfield, came and desired to help me as a son in the Gospel. Soon after came a second, Thomas Richards; and then a third, Thomas Westell. These severally desired to serve me as sons, and to labour when and where I should direct. Observe: these likewise desired me, not I them. But I durst not refuse their assistance. And here commenced my power, to appoint each of these when, and where, and how to labour; that is, while he chose to continue with me. For each had a power to go away when he pleased; as I had also, to go away from them, or any of them, if I saw sufficient cause. The case continued the same when the number of preachers increased. I had just the same power still, to appoint when, and where, and how each should help me; and to tell any, (if I saw cause,) "I do not desire your help any longer." On these terms, and no other, we joined at first: on these we continue joined. But they do me no favour in being directed by me. It is true, my "reward is with the Lord:" but at present I have nothing from it but trouble and care; and often a burden I scarce know how to bear.

(4.) In 1744 I wrote to several clergymen, and to all who then served me as sons in the Gospel, desiring them to meet me in London, and to

give me their advice concerning the best method of carrying on the work of God. And when their number increased, so that it was not convenient to invite them all, for several years I wrote to those with whom I desired to confer, and they only met me at London, or elsewhere; till at length I gave a general permission, which I afterward saw cause to retract.

Observe: I myself sent for these of my own free choice. And I sent for them to advise, not govern, me. Neither did I at any time divest myself of any part of the power above described, which the providence of God had cast upon me, without any design or choice of mine.

(5.) What is that power? It is a power of admitting into, and excluding from, the societies under my care; of choosing and removing stewards; of receiving or not receiving helpers; of appointing them when, where, and how to help me, and of desiring any of them to confer with me when I see good. And as it was merely in obedience to the providence of God, and for the good of the people, that I at first accepted this power, which I never sought; so it is on the same consideration, not for profit, honour, or pleasure, that I use it at this day.

(6.) But "several gentlemen are offended at your having so much power." I did not seek any part of it. But when it was come unawares, not daring to "bury that talent," I used it to the best of my judgment. Yet I never was fond of it. I always did, and do now, bear it as my burden;—the burden which God lays upon me, and therefore I dare not lay it down.

But if you can tell me any one, or any five men, to whom I may transfer this burden, who can and will do just what I do now, I will heartily thank both them and you.

(7.) But some of our helpers say, "This is shackling freeborn Englishmen;" and demand a free conference, that is, a meeting of all the preachers, wherein all things shall be determined by most votes. I answer, it is possible, after my death, something of this kind may take place; but not while I live. To me the preachers have engaged themselves to submit, to serve me as sons in the Gospel; but they are not thus engaged to any man or number of men besides. To me the people in general will submit; but they will not thus submit to any other.

It is nonsense, then, to call my using this power, "shackling freeborn Englishmen." None needs to submit to it unless he will; so that there is no shackling in the case. Every preacher and every member may leave me when he pleases. But while he chooses to stay, it is on the same terms that he joined me at first.

"But this is making yourself a pope." This carries no face of truth. The pope affirms that every Christian must do all he bids, and believe all he says, under pain of damnation. I never affirmed any thing that bears any the most distant resemblance to this. All I affirm is, the preachers who choose to labour with me, choose to serve me as sons in the Gospel. And the people who choose to be under my care, choose to be so on the same terms they were at first.

Therefore all talk of this kind is highly injurious to me, who bear the burden merely for your sake. And it is exceeding mischievous to the people, tending to confound their understanding, and to fill their hearts

with evil surmisings and unkind tempers toward me; to whom they really owe more, for taking all this load upon me, for exercising this very power, for shackling myself in this manner, than for all my preaching put together; because preaching twice or thrice a day is no burden to me at all; but the care of all the preachers and all the people is a burden indeed!

Q. 28. What reason can be assigned why so many of our preachers contract nervous disorders?

A. The chief reason, on Dr. Cadogan's principles, is either indolence or intemperance. (1.) Indolence. Several of them use too little exercise, far less than when they wrought at their trade. And this will naturally pave the way for many, especially nervous, disorders. (2.) Intemperance,—though not in the vulgar sense. They take more food than they did when they laboured more: and let any man of reflection judge how long this will consist with health. Or they use more sleep than when they laboured more: and this alone will destroy the firmness of the nerves. If, then, our preachers would avoid nervous disorders, let them, (1.) Take as little meat, drink, and sleep as nature will bear; and, (2.) Use full as much exercise daily as they did before they were preachers.

Q. 29. What general method of employing our time would you advise us to?

A. We advise you, (1.) As often as possible to rise at four. (2.) From four to five in the morning, and from five to six in the evening, to meditate, pray, and read, partly the Scripture with the notes, partly the closely practical parts of what we have published. (3.) From six in the morning till twelve, (allowing an hour for breakfast,) to read in order, with much prayer, first, "The Christian Library," and the other books which we have published in prose and verse, and then those which we recommended in our rules of Kingswood school.

Q. 30. Should our helpers follow trades?

A. The question is not, whether they may occasionally work with their hands, as St. Paul did, but whether it be proper for them to keep shop or follow merchandise. After long consideration, it was agreed by all our brethren, that no preacher who will not relinquish his trade of buying and selling, (though it were only pills, drops, or balsams,) shall be considered as a travelling preacher any longer.

Q. 31. Why is it that the people under our care are no better?

A. Other reasons may concur; but the chief is, because we are not more knowing and more holy.

Q. 32. But why are we not more knowing?

A. Because we are idle. We forget our very first rule, "Be diligent. Never be unemployed a moment. Never be triflingly employed. Never while away time; neither spend any more time at any place than is strictly necessary."

I fear there is altogether a fault in this matter, and that few of us are clear. Which of you spends as many hours a day in God's work, as you did formerly in man's work? We talk,—or read history, or what comes next to hand. We must, absolutely must, cure this evil, or betray the cause of God.

But how? (1.) Read the most useful books, and that regularly and

constantly. Steadily spend all the morning in this employ, or, at least, five hours in four-and-twenty.

“But I read only the Bible.” Then you ought to teach others to read only the Bible, and, by parity of reason, to hear only the Bible: but if so, you need preach no more. Just so said George Bell. And what is the fruit? Why, now he neither reads the Bible, nor any thing else. This is rank enthusiasm. If you need no book but the Bible, you are got above St. Paul. He wanted others too. “Bring the books,” says he, “but especially the parchments,” those wrote on parchment. “But I have no taste for reading.” Contract a taste for it by use, or return to your trade.

“But I have no books.” I will give each of you, as fast as you will read them, books to the value of five pounds. And I desire the assistants would take care that all the large societies provide our works, or at least the Notes, for the use of the preachers.

(2.) In the afternoon follow Mr. Baxter’s plan. Then you will have no time to spare: you will have work enough for all your time. Then, likewise, no preacher will stay with us who is as salt that has lost its savour. For to such this employment would be mere drudgery. And in order to it, you will have need of all the knowledge you have, or can procure.

The sum is, Go into every house in course, and teach every one therein, young and old, if they belong to us, to be Christians inwardly and outwardly.

Make every particular plain to their understanding; fix it in their memory; write it in their heart. In order to this, there must be “line upon line, precept upon precept.” What patience, what love, what knowledge is requisite for this!

Q. 33. In what particular method should we instruct them?

A. You may, as you have time, read, explain, enforce, (1.) “The Rules of the Society.” (2.) “Instructions for Children.” (3.) The fourth volume of “Sermons.” And, (4.) Philip Henry’s “Method of Family Prayer.”

We must needs do this, were it only to avoid idleness. Do we not loiter away many hours in every week? Each try himself: no idleness can consist with growth in grace. Nay, without exactness in redeeming time, you cannot retain the grace you received in justification.

But what shall we do for the rising generation? Unless we take care of this, the present revival will be *res unius atatis*; [a thing of one generation;] it will last only the age of a man. Who will labour herein? Let him that is zealous for God and the souls of men begin now.

(1.) Where there are ten children in a society, meet them at least an hour every week.

(2.) Talk with them every time you see any at home.

(3.) Pray in earnest for them.

(4.) Diligently instruct and vehemently exhort all parents at their own houses.

(5.) Preach expressly on education, particularly at Midsummer, when you speak of Kingswood. “But I have no gift for this.” Gift or no gift, you are to do it; else you are not called to be a Methodist preacher. Do it as you can, till you can do it as you would. Pray earnestly for

the gift, and use the means for it. Particularly, study the "Instructions" and "Lessons for Children."

Q. 34. Why are not we more holy? Why do not we live in eternity; walk with God all the day long? Why are we not all devoted to God; breathing the whole spirit of missionaries?

A. Chiefly because we are enthusiasts; looking for the end, without using the means. To touch only upon two or three instances: Who of you rises at four in summer; or even at five, when he does not preach? Do you recommend to all our societies the five o'clock hour for private prayer? Do you observe it, or any other fixed time? Do not you find by experience, that any time is no time? Do you know the obligation and the benefit of fasting? How often do you practise it? The neglect of this alone is sufficient to account for our feebleness and faintness of spirit. We are continually grieving the Holy Spirit of God by the habitual neglect of a plain duty! Let us amend from this hour.

Q. 35. But how can I fast, since it hurts my health?

A. There are several degrees of fasting which cannot hurt your health. I will instance in one: Let you and I every Friday (beginning on the next) avow this duty throughout the nation, by touching no tea, coffee, or chocolate in the morning; but (if we want it) half a pint of milk or water gruel. Let us dine on potatoes, and (if we need it) eat three or four ounces of flesh in the evening. At other times let us eat no flesh-suppers: these exceedingly tend to breed nervous disorders.

Q. 36. What is the best general method of preaching?

A. (1.) To invite. (2.) To convince. (3.) To offer Christ. (4.) To build up; and to do this in some measure in every sermon.

Q. 37. Are there any smaller advices relative to preaching, which might be of use to us?

A. Perhaps these: (1.) Be sure never to disappoint a congregation, unless in case of life or death.

(2.) Begin and end precisely at the time appointed.

(3.) Let your whole deportment before the congregation be serious, weighty, and solemn.

(4.) Always suit your subject to your audience.

(5.) Choose the plainest texts you can.

(6.) Take care not to ramble; but keep to your text, and make out what you take in hand.

(7.) Be sparing in allegorizing or spiritualizing.

(8.) Take care of any thing awkward or affected, either in your gesture, phrase, or pronunciation.

(9.) Sing no hymns of your own composing.

(10.) Print nothing without my approbation.

(11.) Do not usually pray above eight or ten minutes (at most) without intermission.

(12.) Frequently read and enlarge upon a portion of the Notes. And let young preachers often exhort, without taking a text.

(13.) In repeating the Lord's Prayer, remember to say "hallowed," not *hollowed*; "trespass against us;" "amen."

(14.) Repeat this prayer aloud after the minister, as often as he repeats it. (15.) Repeat after him aloud every confession, and both the doxologies in the communion service.

(16.) Always kneel during public prayer.

(17.) Every where avail yourself of the great festivals, by preaching on the occasion, and sing the hymns, which you should take care to have in readiness.

(18.) Avoid quaint words, however in fashion, as *object*, *originate*, *very*, *high*, &c.

(19.) Avoid the fashionable impropriety of leaving out the *u* in many words, as honor, vigor, &c. This is mere childish affectation.

(20.) Beware of clownishness, either in speech or dress. Wear no slouched hat.

(21.) Be merciful to your beast. Not only ride moderately, but see with your own eyes that your horse be rubbed, fed, and bedded.

Q. 38. Have not some of us been led off from practical preaching by what was called preaching Christ?

A. Indeed we have. The most effectual way of preaching Christ, is to preach him in all his offices, and to declare his law as well as his gospel, both to believers and unbelievers. Let us strongly and closely insist upon inward and outward holiness, in all its branches.

Q. 39. How shall we guard against formality in public worship; particularly in singing?

A. (1.) By preaching frequently on the head. (2.) By taking care to speak only what we feel. (3.) By choosing such hymns as are proper for the congregation. (4.) By not singing too much at once; seldom more than five or six verses. (5.) By suiting the tune to the words. (6.) By often stopping short and asking the people, "Now, do you know what you said last? Did you speak no more than you felt?"

Is not this formality creeping in already by those complex tunes, which it is scarcely possible to sing with devotion? Such is, "Praise the Lord, ye blessed ones:" such the long quavering hallelujah annexed to the morning song tune, which I defy any man living to sing devoutly. The repeating the same words so often, (but especially while another repeats different words, the horrid abuse which runs through the modern church music,) as it shocks all common sense, so it necessarily brings in dead formality, and has no more of religion in it than a Lancashire hornpipe. Besides, it is a flat contradiction to our Lord's command, "Use not vain repetitions." For what is a vain repetition, if this is not? What end of devotion does it serve? Sing no anthems.

(7.) Do not suffer the people to sing too slow. This naturally tends to formality, and is brought in by them who have either very strong or very weak voices. (8.) In every large society let them learn to sing; and let them always learn our own tunes first. (9.) Let the women constantly sing their parts alone. Let no man sing with them, unless he understands the notes, and sings the bass, as it is pricked down in the book. (10.) Introduce no new tunes, till they are perfect in the old. (11.) Let no organ be placed any where, till proposed in the conference. (12.) Recommend our tune book every where; and if you cannot sing yourself, choose a person or two in each place to pitch the tune for you. (13.) Exhort every one in the congregation to sing, not one in ten only. (14.) If a preacher be present, let no singer give out the words. (15.) When they would teach a tune to the congregation, they must sing only the tenor.

After preaching, take a little lemonade, mild ale, or candied orange-peel. All spirituous liquors, at that time especially, are deadly poison.

Q. 40 Who is the assistant?

A. That preacher in each circuit who is appointed, from time to time, to take charge of the societies and the other preachers therein.

Q. 41. How should an assistant be qualified for his charge?

A. By walking closely with God, and having his work greatly at heart; by understanding and loving discipline, ours in particular; and by loving the Church of England, and resolving not to separate from it. Let this be well observed. I fear, when the Methodists leave the Church, God will leave them. But if they are thrust out of it, they will be guiltless.

Q. 42. What is the business of an assistant?

A. (1.) To see that the other preachers in his circuit behave well, and want nothing. (2.) To visit the classes quarterly, regulate the bands, and deliver tickets. (3.) To take in or put out of the society or the bands. (4.) To keep watch-nights and love-feasts. (5.) To hold quarterly meetings, and therein diligently to inquire both into the temporal and spiritual state of each society. (6.) To take care that every society be duly supplied with books; particularly with "Kempis," "Instructions for Children," and the "Primitive Physic," which ought to be in every house. O why is not this regarded! (7.) To send from every quarterly meeting a circumstantial account to London of every remarkable conversion and remarkable death. (8.) To take exact lists of his societies every quarter, and send them up to London. (9.) To meet the married men and women, and the single men and women, in the large societies, once a quarter. (10.) To overlook the accounts of all the stewards.

Q. 43. Has the office of an assistant been well executed?

A. No, not by half the assistants. (1.) Who has sent me word, whether the other preachers behave well or ill? (2.) Who has visited all the classes, and regulated the bands quarterly? (3.) Love-feasts for the bands have been neglected: neither have persons been duly taken in and put out of the bands. (4.) The societies are not half supplied with books; not even with those above mentioned. O exert yourselves in this! Be not weary! Leave no stone unturned! (5.) How few accounts have I had, either of remarkable deaths, or remarkable conversions! (6.) How few exact lists of the societies! (7.) How few have met the married and single persons once a quarter!

Q. 44. Are there any other advices which you would give the assistants?

A. Several. (1.) Take a regular catalogue of your societies, as they live in house-row. (2.) Leave your successor a particular account of the state of the circuit. (3.) See that every band leader has the rules of the bands. (4.) Vigorously, but calmly, enforce the rules concerning needless ornaments, drams, snuff, and tobacco. Give no band ticket to any man or woman who does not promise to leave them off. (5.) As soon as there are four men or women believers in any place, put them into a band. (6.) Suffer no love-feast to last above an hour and a half; and instantly stop all breaking the cake with one another. (7.) Warn all, from time to time, that none are to remove from one society to

another without a certificate from the assistant in these words : (else he will not be received in other societies :) "A. B., the bearer, is a member of our society in C. : I believe he has sufficient cause for removing." I beg every assistant to remember this. (8.) Every where recommend decency and cleanliness : cleanliness is next to godliness. (9.) Exhort all that were brought up in the Church, to continue therein. Set the example yourself ; and immediately change every plan that would hinder their being at church at least two Sundays in four. Carefully avoid whatever has a tendency to separate men from the Church ; and let all the servants in our preaching houses go to church once on Sunday at least.

Is there not a cause ? Are we not unawares, by little and little, sliding into a separation from the Church ? O use every means to prevent this ! (1.) Exhort all our people to keep close to the Church and sacrament. (2.) Warn them all against niceness in hearing,—a prevailing evil. (3.) Warn them also against despising the prayers of the Church. (4.) Against calling our society, "the Church." (5.) Against calling our preachers, "ministers ;" our houses, "meeting houses ;" call them plain preaching houses or chapels. (6.) Do not license them as Dissenters. The proper paper to be sent in at the assizes, sessions, or bishop's court, is this : "A. B. has set apart his house in C. for public worship, of which he desires a certificate." N. B. The justice does not license the house, but the act of parliament. (7.) Do not license yourself till you are constrained ; and then, not as a Dissenter, but a Methodist. It is time enough when you are prosecuted to take the oaths. And by so doing you are licensed.

Q. 45. But are we not Dissenters ?

A. No : although we call sinners to repentance in all places of God's dominion ; and although we frequently use extemporary prayer, and unite together in a religious society ; yet we are not Dissenters in the only sense which our law acknowledges, namely, those who renounce the service of the Church. We do not, we dare not, separate from it. We are not Seceders, nor do we bear any resemblance to them. We set out upon quite opposite principles. The Seceders laid the very foundation of their work in judging and condemning others : we laid the foundation of our work in judging and condemning ourselves. They begin every where with showing their hearers how fallen the Church and ministers are : we begin every where with showing our hearers how fallen they are themselves. What they do in America, or what their Minutes say on this subject, is nothing to us. We will keep in the good old way.

And never let us make light of going to church, either by word or deed. Remember Mr. Hook, a very eminent and a zealous Papist. When I asked him, "Sir, what do you do for public worship here, where you have no Romish service ?" he answered, "Sir, I am so fully convinced it is the duty of every man to worship God in public, that I go to church every Sunday. If I cannot have such worship as I would, I will have such worship as I can."

But some may say, "Our own service is public worship." Yes ; but not such as supersedes the Church service ; it presupposes public prayer, like the sermons at the university. If it were designed to be instead of

the Church service, it would be essentially defective; for it seldom has the four grand parts of public prayer, deprecation, petition, intercession, and thanksgiving.

If the people put ours in the room of the Church service, we hurt them that stay with us, and ruin them that leave us; for then they will go no where, but lounge the Sabbath away without any public worship at all.

Q. 46. Nay, but is it not our duty to separate from the Church, considering the wickedness both of the clergy and the people?

A. We conceive not: (1.) Because both the priests and the people were full as wicked in the Jewish Church; and yet it was not the duty of the holy Israelites to separate from them. (2.) Neither did our Lord command his disciples to separate from them; he rather commanded the contrary. (3.) Hence it is clear that could not be the meaning of St. Paul's words: "Come out from among them, and be ye separate."

Q. 47. But what reasons are there why we should not separate from the Church?

A. Among others, those which were printed above twenty years ago, entitled, "Reasons against a Separation from the Church of England."

We allow two exceptions: (1.) If the parish minister be a notoriously wicked man. (2.) If he preach Socinianism, Arianism, or any other essentially false doctrine.

Q. 48. Do we sufficiently watch over our helpers?

A. We might consider those that are with us as our pupils; into whose behaviour and studies we should inquire every day. Should we not frequently ask, Do you walk closely with God? Have you now fellowship with the Father and the Son? At what hour do you rise? Do you punctually observe the morning and evening hour of retirement? Do you spend the day in the manner which we advise? Do you converse seriously, usefully, and closely? To be more particular: Do you use all the means of grace yourself, and enforce the use of them on all other persons?

They are either Instituted or Prudential:—

I. The INSTITUTED are,

(1.) Prayer; private, family, public; consisting of deprecation, petition, intercession, and thanksgiving. Do you use each of these? Do you use private prayer every morning and evening? if you can, at five in the evening; and the hour before or after morning preaching? Do you forecast daily, wherever you are, how to secure these hours? Do you avow it every where? Do you ask every where, "Have you family prayer?" Do you retire at five o'clock?

(2.) Searching the Scriptures by,

(i.) Reading: Constantly, some part of every day; regularly, all the Bible in order; carefully, with the Notes; seriously, with prayer before and after; fruitfully, immediately practising what you learn there?

(ii.) Meditating: At set times? by any rule?

(iii.) Hearing: Every morning? carefully; with prayer before, at, after; immediately putting in practice? Have you a New Testament always about you?

(3.) The Lord's Supper: Do you use this at every opportunity? with solemn prayer before; with earnest and deliberate self devotion?

(4.) Fasting: How do you fast every Friday?

(5.) Christian conference: Are you convinced how important and how difficult it is to "order your conversation right?" Is it "always in grace? seasoned with salt? meet to minister grace to the hearers? Do not you converse too long at a time? Is not an hour commonly enough? Would it not be well always to have a determinate end in view; and to pray before and after it?"

II. PRUDENTIAL MEANS we may use either as common Christians, as Methodists, as preachers, or as assistants.

(1.) As common Christians. What particular rules have you in order to grow in grace? What arts of holy living?

(2.) As Methodists. Do you never miss your class, or band?

(3.) As preachers. Do you meet every society; also the leaders and bands, if any?

(4.) As assistants. Have you thoroughly considered your office; and do you make a conscience of executing every part of it?

These means may be used without fruit; but there are some means which cannot; namely, watching, denying ourselves, taking up our cross, exercise of the presence of God.

(1.) Do you steadily watch against the world, the devil, yourselves, your besetting sin?

(2.) Do you deny yourself every useless pleasure of sense, imagination, honour? Are you temperate in all things? instance in food: do you use only that kind and that degree which is best both for your body and soul? Do you see the necessity of this?

(3.) Do you eat no flesh suppers? no late suppers?

(4.) Do you eat no more at each meal than is necessary? Are you not heavy or drowsy after dinner?

(5.) Do you use only that kind and that degree of drink which is best both for your body and soul?

(6.) Do you drink water? Why not? Did you ever? Why did you leave it off? If not for health, when will you begin again? to-day?

(7.) How often do you drink wine or ale? every day? Do you want it?

(8.) Wherein do you "take up your cross daily?" Do you cheerfully bear your cross (whatever is grievous to nature) as a gift of God, and labour to profit thereby?

(9.) Do you endeavour to set God always before you; to see his eye continually fixed upon you? Never can you use these means but a blessing will ensue. And the more you use them, the more will you grow in grace.

Q. 49. What can be done, in order to a closer union of our helpers with each other?

A. (1.) Let them be deeply convinced of the want there is of it at present, and the absolute necessity of it.

(2.) Let them pray for a desire of union.

(3.) Let them speak freely to each other.

(4.) When they meet let them never part without prayer.

(5.) Let them beware how they despise each other's gifts.

(6.) Let them never speak slightly of each other in any kind.

(7.) Let them defend one another's characters in every thing, so far as consists with truth: And,

(8.) Let them labour in honour each to prefer the other before himself.

Q. 50. How shall we try those who think they are moved by the Holy Ghost to preach?

A. Inquire, (1.) Do they know God as a pardoning God? Have they the love of God abiding in them? Do they desire and seek nothing but God? And are they holy in all manner of conversation? (2.) Have they gifts (as well as grace) for the work? Have they (in some tolerable degree) a clear, sound understanding? Have they a right judgment in the things of God? Have they a just conception of salvation by faith? And has God given them any degree of utterance? Do they speak justly, readily, clearly? (3.) Have they fruit? Are any truly convinced of sin, and converted to God, by their preaching?

As long as these three marks concur in any one, we believe he is called of God to preach. These we receive as sufficient proof that he is "moved thereto by the Holy Ghost."

Q. 51. What method may we use in receiving a new helper?

A. A proper time for doing this is at a conference after solemn fasting and prayer.

Every person proposed is then to be present; and each of them may be asked,—Have you faith in Christ? Are you "going on to perfection?" Do you expect to be "perfected in love" in this life? Are you groaning after it? Are you resolved to devote yourself wholly to God and to his work? Do you know the Methodist plan? Have you read the "Plain Account?" the "Appeals?" Do you know the rules of the society? of the bands? Do you keep them? Do you take no snuff, tobacco, drams? Do you constantly attend the church and sacraments? Have you read the "Minutes of the Conference?" Are you willing to conform to them? Have you considered the rules of a helper; especially the first, tenth, and twelfth? Will you keep them for conscience' sake? Are you determined to employ all your time in the work of God? Will you preach every morning and evening; endeavouring not to speak too long or too loud? Will you diligently instruct the children in every place? Will you visit from house to house? Will you recommend fasting, both by precept and example? Are you in debt? Are you engaged to marry?"

(N. B. A preacher who marries while on trial is thereby set aside.)

We may then receive him as a probationer, by giving him the "Minutes of the Conference," inscribed thus:—

"TO A. B.

"You think it your duty to call sinners to repentance. Make full proof hereof, and we shall rejoice to receive you as a fellow labourer."

Let him then read and carefully weigh what is contained therein, that if he has any doubt it may be removed.

Observe: Taking on trial is entirely different from admitting a preacher. One on trial may be either admitted or rejected, without doing him any wrong; otherwise it would be no trial at all. Let every assistant explain this to them that are on trial.

When he has been on trial four years, if recommended by the assistant, he may be received into full connection, by giving him the "Minutes," inscribed thus:—"As long as you freely consent to, and earnestly endeavour to walk by, these rules, we shall rejoice to acknowledge

you as a fellow labourer." Meantime, let none exhort in any of our societies, without a note of permission from the assistant. Let every exhorter take care to have this renewed yearly; and let every assistant insist upon it.

Q. 52. What is the method wherein we usually proceed in our conferences?

A. We inquire, (1.) What preachers are admitted? Who remain on trial? Who are admitted on trial? Who desist from travelling?

(2.) Are there any objections to any of the preachers? who are named one by one.

(3.) How are the preachers stationed this year?

(4.) What numbers are in the society?

(5.) What is the Kingswood collection?

(6.) What boys are received this year?

(7.) What girls are assisted?

(8.) What is contributed for the contingent expenses?

(9.) How was this expended?

(10.) What is contributed toward the fund for superannuated and supernumerary preachers?

(11.) What demands are there upon it?

(12.) How many preachers' wives are to be provided for? By what societies?

(13.) Where and when may our next Conference begin?

Q. 53. How can we provide for superannuated and supernumerary preachers?

A. Those who can preach four or five times a week are supernumerary preachers. As for those who cannot,

(1.) Let every travelling preacher contribute half a guinea yearly at the Conference.

(2.) Let every one when first admitted as a travelling preacher pay a guinea.

(3.) Let this be lodged in the hands of the stewards.

(4.) The present stewards are John Murlin and John Pawson.

(5.) Out of this let provision be made, first for the worn-out preachers, and then for the widows and children of those that are dead.

(6.) Every worn-out preacher shall receive, if he wants it, at least ten pounds a year.

(7.) Every widow of a preacher shall receive yearly, if she wants it, during her widowhood, a sum not usually exceeding ten pounds.

(8.) Every child left by a preacher shall receive, once for all, a sum not usually exceeding ten pounds.

(9.) But none is entitled to any thing from this fund, till he has subscribed two guineas.

(10.) Nor any who neglects paying his subscription for four years together.

(11.) Let every preacher who does not bring or send his subscription to the Conference, be fined two shillings and sixpence.

(12.) Let the fund never be reduced to less than a hundred pounds.

(13.) Let a committee be named to see these rules duly executed.

The present committee are,—Christopher Hopper, Thomas Coke, Thomas Hanby, John Allen, Robert Roberts, Henry Moore, Thomas Taylor, William Thompson, Andrew Blair.

(14.) Let an exact account of all receipts and disbursements be produced at the Conference.

(15.) Let every assistant bring to the Conference the contribution of every preacher in his circuit.

Q. 54. Are not many of the preachers' wives still straitened for the necessaries of life?

A. Some certainly have been. To prevent this for the time to come, (1.) Let every circuit either provide each with a lodging, coals, and candles, or allow her fifteen pounds a year. (2.) Let the assistant take this money at the quarterly meeting, before any thing else be paid out of it. Fail not to do this.

Q. 55. How can we account for the decrease of the work of God in some circuits, both this year and the last?

A. It may be owing either, (1.) To the want of zeal and exactness in the assistant, occasioning want of discipline throughout: or (2.) To want of life and diligence in the preachers: or (3.) To our people's losing the life of God, and sinking into the spirit of the world.

It may be owing, farther, to the want of more field preaching, and of trying more new places.

Q. 56. What can be done in order to revive the work of God where it is decayed?

A. (1.) Let every preacher read carefully over the "Life of David Brainerd." Let us be followers of him, as he was of Christ, in absolute self devotion, in total deadness to the world, and in fervent love to God and man. Let us but secure this point, and the world and the devil must fall under our feet.

(2.) Let both assistants and preachers be conscientiously exact in the whole Methodist discipline.

(3.) See that no circuit be at any time without preachers. Therefore let no preacher, who does not attend the conference, leave the circuit, at that time, on any pretence whatever. This is the most improper time in the whole year. Let every assistant see to this, and require each of these to remain in the circuit till the new preachers come.

Let not all the preachers in any circuit come to the Conference.

Let those who do come, set out as late and return as soon as possible.

(4.) Wherever you can, appoint prayer meetings, and particularly on Friday.

(5.) Let a fast be observed in all our societies, the last Friday in August, November, February, and May.

(6.) Be more active in dispersing the books, particularly the sermon on "The Good Steward," on "Indwelling Sin," "The Repentance of Believers," and "The Scripture Way of Salvation." Every assistant may give away small tracts: and he may beg money of the rich to buy books for the poor.

(7.) Strongly and explicitly exhort all believers to "go on to perfection." That we may "all speak the same thing," I ask, once for all, Shall we defend this perfection, or give it up? You all agree to defend it, meaning thereby, (as we did from the beginning,) salvation from all sin, by the love of God and man filling our heart. The Papists say, "This cannot be attained, till we have been refined by the fire of purga-

tory." The Calvinists say, "Nay, it will be attained as soon as the soul and body part." The old Methodists say, "It may be attained before we die: a moment after is too late." Is it so or not? You are all agreed, we may be saved from all sin before death. The substance then is settled; but, as to the circumstance, is the change gradual or instantaneous? It is both the one and the other. From the moment we are justified, there may be a gradual sanctification, a growing in grace, a daily advance in the knowledge and love of God. And if sin cease before death, there must, in the nature of the thing, be an instantaneous change; there must be a last moment wherein it does exist, and a first moment wherein it does not. "But should we in preaching insist both on one and the other?" Certainly we must insist on the gradual change; and that earnestly and continually. And are there not reasons why we should insist on the instantaneous also? If there be such a blessed change before death, should we not encourage all believers to expect it? and the rather, because constant experience shows, the more earnestly they expect this, the more swiftly and steadily does the gradual work of God go on in their soul; the more watchful they are against all sin, the more careful to grow in grace, the more zealous of good works, and the more punctual in their attendance on all the ordinances of God. Whereas, just the contrary effects are observed whenever this expectation ceases. They are "saved by hope," by this hope of a total change, with a gradually increasing salvation. Destroy this hope, and that salvation stands still, or rather, decreases daily. Therefore whoever would advance the gradual change in believers, should strongly insist on the instantaneous.

Q. 57. What can be done to increase the work of God in Scotland?

A. (1.) Preach abroad as much as possible. (2.) Try every town and village. (3.) Visit every member of the society at home.

Q. 58. How many circuits are there now?

A. Of America we have no late account. There are seventy-four circuits in England, Wales, and the Isle of Man; seven in Scotland, and twenty-eight in Ireland.

Q. 59. Are our preaching houses safe?

A. Not all; for some of them are not settled on trustees. Several of the trustees for others are dead.

Q. 60. What then is to be done?

A. (1.) Let those who have debts on any of the houses give a bond, to settle them as soon as they are indemnified. (2.) Let the surviving trustees choose others without delay, by endorsing their deed thus:—

"WE, the remaining trustees of the Methodist preaching house in —, do, according to the power vested in us by this deed, choose — to be trustees of the said house, in the place of —.

"Witness our hands —."

N. B. The deed must have three new stamps, and must be enrolled in chancery within six months.

Q. 61. In what form may a house be settled?

A. In the following, which was drawn by three of the most eminent lawyers in London. Whoever therefore objects to it only betrays his own ignorance.

"The Indenture made — —, between Benjamin Heap of —,

in the county of —, on the one part, and Thomas Philips, hatter, &c, on the other part, WITNESSETH, That in consideration of five shillings, lawful money of Great Britain, by the said T. P., &c, to the said B. H., truly paid, before the sealing and delivering hereof, (the receipt whereof the said B. H. doth hereby acknowledge,) and for divers other considerations him thereunto moving, the said B. H. hath granted, bargained, and sold, and by these presents doth bargain and sell unto the said T. P., &c, their heirs and assigns for ever, all that lately erected house or tenement, with the yard thereunto adjoining, situate —, in —, aforesaid, now in the tenure or occupation of —, together with all the ways, drains, and privileges to the said premises appertaining, and all the profits thereof, with all the right, title, and interest in law and equity: TO HAVE AND TO HOLD, the said house, yard, and other premises, to the said T. P., &c, their heirs and assigns for ever. NEVERTHELESS, upon special trust and confidence, and to the intent that they and the survivors of them, and the trustees for the time being, do, and shall permit John Wesley, of the City Road, London, Clerk, and such other persons as he shall from time to time appoint, at all times, during his natural life, and no other persons, to have and enjoy the free use and benefit of the said premises; that the said John Wesley, and such other persons as he appoints, may therein preach and expound God's holy word. And after his decease, upon farther trust and confidence, and to the intent, that the said T. P., &c, or the major part of them, or the survivors of them, and the major part of the trustees of the said premises for the time being, shall, from time to time, and at all times for ever, permit such persons as shall be appointed at the yearly Conference of the people called *Methodists*, in London, Bristol, Leeds, Manchester, or elsewhere, specified by name in a deed enrolled in chancery, under the hand and seal of the said John Wesley, and bearing date the 28th day of February, 1784, and no others, to have and to enjoy the said premises, for the purposes aforesaid: provided always, that the persons preach no other doctrine than is contained in Mr. Wesley's 'Notes upon the New Testament,' and four volumes of 'Sermons.' And upon farther trust and confidence, that, as often as any of these trustees, or the trustees for the time being, shall die, or cease to be a member of the society commonly called *Methodists*, the rest of the said trustees, or of the trustees for the time being, as soon as conveniently may be, shall and may choose another trustee or trustees, in order to keep up the number of — trustees for ever. In witness whereof the said B. H. hath hereunto set his hand and seal, the day and year above written."

In this form the proprietors of the house are to make it over to five, seven, or nine trustees.

Q. 62. But is this form a safe one? Should we not have the opinion of counsel upon it?

A. I think this would be throwing money away; (1.) Because this form was drawn up by three eminent counsellors: But, (2.) It is the way of almost every lawyer to blame what another has done. Therefore, you cannot at all infer, that they think a thing wrong, because they say so. (3.) If they did in reality think it wrong, this would not prove it was so. (4.) If there was (which I do not believe) some defect therein, who would go to law with the body of Methodists? But, (5.) If they

did, would any court in England put them out of possession ; especially when the intent of the deed was plain and undeniable ?

Q. 63. Is any thing farther advisable with regard to building ?

A. (1.) Build all preaching houses, where the ground will permit, in the octagon form. It is best for the voice, and on many accounts, more commodious than any other. (2.) Why should not any octagon house be built after the model of Yarm ? any square house, after the model of Bath or Scarborough ? Can we find any better model ? (3.) Let the roof rise only one third of its breadth : This is the true proportion. (4.) Have doors and windows enough ; and let all the windows be sashes, opening downward. (5.) Let there be no Chinese paling, and no tub pulpit, but a square projection with a long seat behind. (6.) Let there be no pews, and no backs to the seats, which should have aisles on each side, and be parted in the middle by a rail running all along, to divide the men from the women ; just as at Bath. (7.) Let all the preaching houses be built plain and decent ; but not more expensive than is absolutely unavoidable : otherwise the necessity of raising money will make rich men necessary to us. But if so, we must be dependent upon them, yea, and governed by them. And then farewell to the Methodist discipline, if not doctrine too. (8.) Wherever a preaching house is built, see that lodgings for the preachers be built also.

Q. 64. Is there any exception to the rule, “ Let the men and women sit apart ? ”

A. In those galleries where they have always sat together, they may do so still. But let them sit apart every where below, and in all new-erected galleries.

Q. 65. But how can we secure their sitting apart there ?

A. I must do it myself. If I come into any new house, and see the men and women together, I will immediately go out. I hereby give public notice of this : pray let it be observed.

Q. 66. But there is a worse indecency than this creeping in among us,—talking in the preaching houses, before and after service. How shall this be cured ?

A. Let all the preachers join as one man, and the very next Sunday they preach in any place, enlarge on the impropriety of talking before or after service, and strongly exhort them to do it no more. In three months, if we are in earnest, this vile practice will be banished out of every Methodist congregation. Let none stop till he has carried his point.

Q. 67. Is there not another shocking indecency frequently practised by filthy men against the wall of a preaching house ; enough to make any modest woman blush ?

A. There is : But I beg any one who sees another do this will give him a hearty clap on the back.

Q. 68. Complaint has been made that sluts spoil our houses. How may we prevent this ?

A. Let none that has spoiled one, ever live in another. But what a shame is this ! A preacher’s wife should be a pattern of cleanliness, in her person, clothes, and habitation. Let nothing slatternly be seen about her ; no rags, no dirt, no litter. And she should be a pattern of industry ; always at work, either for herself, her husband, or the poor. I am

not willing any should live in the orphan house at Newcastle, or any preaching house, who does not conform to this rule.

Q. 69. It has been complained also, that people crowd into the preachers' houses, as into coffee houses, without any invitation. Is this right?

A. It is utterly wrong. Stop it at once. Let no person come into the preacher's house, unless he wants to ask a question.

Q. 70. May any new preaching houses be built?

A. Not unless, (1.) They are proposed at the Conference: No, nor (2.) Unless two thirds of the expense be subscribed. And if any collection be made for them, it must be made between the Conference and the beginning of February.

Q. 71. What can be done to make the Methodists sensible of the excellency of Kingswood school?

A. Let every assistant read the following account of it yearly in every congregation:—

(1.) The wisdom and love of God have now thrust out a large number of labourers into his harvest; men who desire nothing on earth but to promote the glory of God, by saving their own souls and those that hear them. And those to whom they minister spiritual things are willing to minister to them of their carnal things; so that they "have food to eat, and raiment to put on," and are content therewith.

(2.) A competent provision is likewise made for the wives of married preachers. These also lack nothing, having a weekly allowance over and above for their little children; so that neither they nor their husbands need to be "careful about many things," but may "wait upon the Lord without distraction."

(3.) Yet one considerable difficulty lies on those that have boys, when they grow too big to be under their mother's direction. Having no father to govern and instruct them, they are exposed to a thousand temptations. To remedy this, we have a school on purpose for them, wherein they have all the instruction they are capable of, together with all things necessary for the body, clothes only excepted. And it may be, if God prosper this labour of love, they will have these too, shortly.

(4.) In whatever view we look upon this, it is one of the noblest charities that can be conceived. How reasonable is the institution! Is it fit that the children of those who leave wife, and all that is dear, to save souls from death, should want what is needful either for soul or body? Ought not we to supply what the parent cannot, because of his labours in the Gospel? How excellent are the effects of this institution! The preacher, eased of this weight, can the more cheerfully go on in his labour. And perhaps many of these children may hereafter fill up the place of those that shall "rest from their labours."

(5.) It is not strange, therefore, considering the excellence of this design, that Satan should have taken much pains to defeat it, particularly by lies of every kind, which were plentifully invented and handed about for several years. But truth now generally prevails, and its adversaries are put to silence. It is well known that the children want nothing; that they scarce know what sickness means; that they are well instructed in whatever they are capable of learning; that they are carefully and tenderly governed; and that the behaviour of all in the house, elder and younger, is "as becometh the Gospel of Christ."

(6.) But the expense of such an undertaking is very large, so that we are ill able to defray it. The best means we could think of at our Conference to supply the deficiency, is, once a year to desire the assistance of all those in every place, who wish well to the work of God; who long to see sinners converted to God, and the kingdom of Christ set up in all the earth.

(7.) All of you who are thus minded have an opportunity now of showing your love to the Gospel. Now promote, as far as in you lies, one of the noblest charities in the world. Now forward, as you are able, one of the most excellent designs that ever was set on foot in this kingdom. Do what you can to comfort the parents who give up their all for you, and to give their children cause to bless you. You will be no poorer for what you do on such an occasion. God is a good paymaster. And you know, in doing this, you lend unto the Lord: In due time he shall pay you again.

Q. 72. But how can we keep out of debt?

A. Let a collection be made for this school the Sunday before or after Midsummer, in every preaching house, great and small, throughout England, Scotland, and Ireland.

Q. 73. How may we raise a general fund for carrying on the whole work of God?

A. By a yearly subscription to be proposed by every assistant when he visits the classes at Christmas, and received at the visitation following.

To this end he may then read and enlarge upon the following hints in every society:—

(1.) How shall we send labourers into those parts where they are most of all wanted? suppose the north-west of Ireland, and the north of Scotland. Many are willing to hear, but not to bear the expense. Nor can it as yet be expected of them: stay till the word of God has touched their hearts, and then they will gladly provide for them that preach it. Does it not lie upon us, in the mean time, to supply their lack of service? to raise a general fund, out of which, from time to time, that expense may be defrayed? By this means, those who willingly offer themselves may travel through every part, and stay wherever there is a call, without being burdensome to any. Thus may the Gospel, in the life and power thereof, be spread from sea to sea. Which of you will not rejoice to throw in your mite, to promote this glorious work?

(2.) Besides this, in carrying on so large a work through the three kingdoms, there are calls for money in various ways, and we must frequently be at considerable expense, or the work must be at a full stop. Many too are the occasional distresses of our preachers or their families, which require an immediate supply. Otherwise their hands would hang down, if they were not constrained to depart from the work.

(3.) Let then every member of our society once a year set his shoulder to the work; contributing more or less as God hath prospered him, at the Lady-day visitation of the classes. Let none be excluded from giving something,—be it a penny, a half-penny, a farthing. Remember the widow's two mites! And let those who are able to give shillings, crowns, and pounds, do it willingly. The money contributed will be brought to the ensuing Conference.

(4.) Men and brethren, help! Was there ever a call like this, since

you first heard the Gospel sound? Help to relieve your companions in the kingdom of Jesus, who are pressed above measure.

“Bear ye one another’s burdens, and so fulfil the law of Christ.” Help to send forth able, willing labourers into your Lord’s harvest: so shall ye be assistant in saving souls from death, and hiding a multitude of sins. Help to spread the Gospel of your salvation into the remotest corners of the kingdom, till “the knowledge of our Lord shall cover the land, as the waters cover the sea.” So shall it appear to ourselves, and all men, that we are indeed one body, united by one spirit; so shall the baptized Heathens be yet again constrained to say, “See how these Christians love one another!” In this, may not even the Romanists provoke us to jealousy? They have a general fund at Rome, and another at Paris, which bears all the expenses of their missionaries throughout all the world.

Q. 74. What is the direct antidote to Methodism, the doctrine of heart holiness?

A. Calvinism: all the devices of Satan, for these fifty years, have done far less toward stopping this work of God, than that single doctrine. It strikes at the root of salvation from sin, previous to glory, putting the matter on quite another issue.

Q. 75. But wherein lie the charms of this doctrine? What makes men swallow it so greedily?

A. (1.) It seems to magnify Christ; although in reality it supposes him to have died in vain. For the absolutely elect must have been saved without him; and the non-elect cannot be saved by him.

(2.) It is highly pleasing to flesh and blood, final perseverance in particular.

Q. 76. What can be done to guard against it?

A. (1.) Let all our preachers carefully read over ours and Mr. Fletcher’s tracts.

(2.) Let them frequently and explicitly preach the truth, though not in a controversial way. But let them take care to do it in love and gentleness; not in bitterness, not returning railing for railing: let those who preach it have all this to themselves.

(3.) Do not imitate them in screaming, allegorizing, boasting: rather mildly expose these things when time serves.

(4.) Imitate them in this: they readily seize upon any one that is newly convinced or converted. Be diligent to prevent them, and to guard those tender minds against the predestinarian poison.

(5.) Answer all their objections, as occasion offers, both in public and private. But take care to do this with all possible sweetness both of look and of accent.

(6.) Very frequently, both in public and private, advise our people not to hear them.

(7.) Make it matter of constant and earnest prayer, that God would stop the plague.

Q. 77. We said in 1744, “We have leaned too much toward Calvinism.” Wherein?

A. (1.) With regard to man’s faithfulness. Our Lord himself taught us to use the expression: therefore we ought never to be ashamed of it. We ought steadily to assert upon his authority, that if a man is not

“faithful in the unrighteous mammon, God will not give him the true riches.”

(2.) With regard to “working for life,” which our Lord expressly commands us to do. “Labour,” εργαζομεθα, literally, “work, for the meat that endureth to everlasting life.” And in fact, every believer, till he comes to glory, works *for* as well as *from* life.

(3.) We have received it as a maxim, that “a man is to do nothing in order to justification.” Nothing can be more false. Whoever desires to find favour with God, should “cease from evil, and learn to do well.” So God himself teaches by the prophet Isaiah. Whoever repents, should “do works meet for repentance.” And if this is not in order to find favour, what does he do them for?

Once more review the whole affair :

(1.) Who of us is now accepted of God?

He that now believes in Christ with a loving, obedient heart.

(2.) But who among those that never heard of Christ?

He that, according to the light he has, “feareth God and worketh righteousness.”

(3.) Is this the same with “he that is sincere?”

Nearly, if not quite.

(4.) Is not this salvation by works?

Not by the merit of works, but by works as a condition.

(5.) What have we then been disputing about for these thirty years?

I am afraid about words, namely, in some of the foregoing instances.

(6.) As to merit itself, of which we have been so dreadfully afraid : we are rewarded according to our works, yea, because of our works. How does this differ from, “for the sake of our works?” And how differs this from *secundum merita operum*? which is no more than, “as our works deserve.” Can you split this hair? I doubt I cannot.

(7.) The grand objection to one of the preceding propositions is drawn from matter of fact. God does in fact justify those who, by their own confession, neither “feared God” nor “wrought righteousness.” Is this an exception to the general rule?

It is a doubt whether God makes any exception at all. But how are we sure that the person in question never did fear God and work righteousness? His own thinking so is no proof. For we know how all that are convinced of sin undervalue themselves in every respect.

(8.) Does not talking, without proper caution, of a justified or sanctified state, tend to mislead men; almost naturally leading them to trust in what was done in one moment? Whereas we are every moment pleasing or displeasing to God, according to our works; according to the whole of our present inward tempers and outward behaviour.

THE CHARACTER OF A METHODIST.

Not as though I had already attained.

TO THE READER.

1. SINCE the name first came abroad into the world, many have been at a loss to know what a Methodist is ; what are the principles and the practice of those who are commonly called by that name ; and what the distinguishing marks of this sect, “ which is every where spoken against.”

2. And it being generally believed, that I was able to give the clearest account of these things, (as having been one of the first to whom that name was given, and the person by whom the rest were supposed to be directed,) I have been called upon, in all manner of ways, and with the utmost earnestness, so to do. I yield at last to the continued importunity both of friends and enemies ; and do now give the clearest account I can, in the presence of the Lord and Judge of heaven and earth, of the principles and practice whereby those who are called Methodists are distinguished from other men.

3. I say those who are called Methodists ; for, let it be well observed, that this is not a name which they take to themselves, but one fixed upon them by way of reproach, without their approbation or consent. It was first given to three or four young men at Oxford, by a student of Christ Church ; either in allusion to the ancient sect of physicians so called, from their teaching, that almost all diseases might be cured by a specific *method* of diet and exercise, or from their observing a more regular *method* of study and behaviour than was usual with those of their age and station.

4. I should rejoice (so little ambitious am I to be at the head of any sect or party) if the very name might never be mentioned more, but be buried in eternal oblivion. But if that cannot be, at least let those who will use it, know the meaning of the word they use. Let us not always be fighting in the dark. Come, and let us look one another in the face. And perhaps some of you who hate what I am *called*, may love what I *am* by the grace of God ; or rather, what “ I follow after, if that I may apprehend that for which also I am apprehended of Christ Jesus.”

THE CHARACTER OF A METHODIST.

1. THE distinguishing marks of a Methodist are not his opinions of any sort. His assenting to this or that scheme of religion, his embracing any particular set of notions, his espousing the judgment of one man or of another, are all quite wide of the point. Whosoever, therefore, imagines that a Methodist is a man of such or such an opinion, is grossly ignorant of the whole affair ; he mistakes the truth totally. We believe, indeed, that “ all Scripture is given by the inspiration of God ;” and herein we are distinguished from Jews, Turks, and Infidels. We believe the written word of God to be the only and sufficient rule both of Christian faith and practice ; and herein we are fundamentally distinguished from those of the Romish Church. We believe Christ to be the eternal,

supreme God; and herein we are distinguished from the Socinians and Arians. But as to all opinions which do not strike at the root of Christianity, we think and let think. So that, whatsoever they are, whether right or wrong, they are no distinguishing marks of a Methodist.

2. Neither are words or phrases of any sort. We do not place our religion, or any part of it, in being attached to any peculiar mode of speaking, any quaint or uncommon set of expressions. The most obvious, easy, common words, wherein our meaning can be conveyed, we prefer before others, both on ordinary occasions, and when we speak of the things of God. We never, therefore, willingly or designedly, deviate from the most usual way of speaking; unless when we express Scripture truths in Scripture words, which, we presume, no Christian will condemn. Neither do we affect to use any particular expressions of Scripture more frequently than others, unless they are such as are more frequently used by the inspired writers themselves. So that it is as gross an error to place the marks of a Methodist in his words, as in opinions of any sort.

3. Nor do we desire to be distinguished by actions, customs, or usages, of an indifferent nature. Our religion does not lie in doing what God has not enjoined, or abstaining from what he hath not forbidden. It does not lie in the form of our apparel, in the posture of our body, or the covering of our heads; nor yet in abstaining from marriage, or from meats and drinks, which are all good if received with thanksgiving. Therefore, neither will any man, who knows whereof he affirms, fix the mark of a Methodist here,—in any actions or customs purely indifferent, undetermined by the word of God.

4. Nor, lastly, is he distinguished by laying the whole stress of religion on any single part of it. If you say, "Yes, he is; for he thinks we are saved by faith alone?" I answer, You do not understand the terms. By salvation he means holiness of heart and life. And this he affirms to spring from true faith alone. Can even a nominal Christian deny it? Is this placing a part of religion for the whole? "Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid! Yea, we establish the law." We do not place the whole of religion (as too many do, God knoweth) either in doing no harm, or in doing good, or in using the ordinances of God. No, not in all of them together; wherein we know by experience a man may labour many years, and at the end have no religion at all, no more than he had at the beginning. Much less in any one of these; or, it may be, in a scrap of one of them: like her who fancies herself a virtuous woman, only because she is not a prostitute; or him who dreams he is an honest man, merely because he does not rob or steal. May the Lord God of my fathers preserve me from such a poor, starved religion as this! Were this the mark of a Methodist, I would sooner choose to be a sincere Jew, Turk, or Pagan.

5. "What then is the mark? Who is a Methodist, according to your own account?" I answer: A Methodist is one who has "the love of God shed abroad in his heart by the Holy Ghost given unto him;" one who "loves the Lord his God with all his heart, and with all his soul, and with all his mind, and with all his strength." God is the joy of his heart, and the desire of his soul; which is constantly crying out, "Whom have I in heaven but thee? and there is none upon earth that I desire

beside thee! My God and my all! Thou art the strength of my heart, and my portion for ever!"

6. He is therefore happy in God, yea, always happy, as having in him "a well of water springing up into everlasting life," and overflowing his soul with peace and joy. "Perfect love" having now "cast out fear," he "rejoices evermore." He "rejoices in the Lord always," even "in God his Saviour;" and in the Father, "through our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom he hath now received the atonement." "Having" found "redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of his sins," he cannot but rejoice, whenever he looks back on the horrible pit out of which he is delivered; when he sees "all his transgressions blotted out as a cloud, and his iniquities as a thick cloud." He cannot but rejoice, whenever he looks on the state wherein he now is; "being justified freely, and having peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ." For "he that believeth, hath the witness" of this "in himself;" being now the son of God by faith. "Because he is a son, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into his heart, crying, Abba, Father!" And "the Spirit itself beareth witness with his spirit, that he is a child of God." He rejoiceth also, whenever he looks forward, "in hope of the glory that shall be revealed;" yea, this his joy is full, and all his bones cry out, "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who, according to his abundant mercy, hath begotten me again to a living hope—of an inheritance incorruptible, undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven for me!"

7. And he who hath this hope, thus "full of immortality, in every thing giveth thanks;" as knowing that this (whatsoever it is) "is the will of God in Christ Jesus concerning him." From him, therefore, he cheerfully receives all, saying, "Good is the will of the Lord;" and whether the Lord giveth or taketh away, equally "blessing the name of the Lord." For he hath "learned, in whatsoever state he is, therewith to be content." He knoweth "both how to be abased, and how to abound. Every where and in all things he is instructed both to be full and to be hungry, both to abound and suffer need." Whether in ease or pain, whether in sickness or health, whether in life or death, he giveth thanks from the ground of his heart to Him who orders it for good; knowing that as "every good gift cometh from above," so none but good can come from the Father of lights, into whose hand he has wholly committed his body and soul, as into the hands of a faithful Creator. He is therefore "careful" (anxiously or uneasily) "for nothing;" as having "cast all his care on Him that careth for him," and "in all things" resting on him, after "making his request known to him with thanksgiving."

8. For indeed he "prays without ceasing." It is given him "always to pray, and not to faint." Not that he is always in the house of prayer; though he neglects no opportunity of being there. Neither is he always on his knees, although he often is, or on his face, before the Lord his God. Nor yet is he always crying aloud to God, or calling upon him in words: for many times "the Spirit maketh intercession for him with groans that cannot be uttered." But at all times the language of his heart is this: "Thou brightness of the eternal glory, unto thee is my heart, though without a voice, and my silence speaketh unto thee."

And this is true prayer, and this alone. But his heart is ever lifted up to God, at all times and in all places. In this he is never hindered, much less interrupted, by any person or thing. In retirement or company, in leisure, business, or conversation, his heart is ever with the Lord. Whether he lie down or rise up, God is in all his thoughts; he walks with God continually, having the loving eye of his mind still fixed upon him, and every where "seeing him that is invisible."

9. And while he thus always exercises his love to God, by praying without ceasing, rejoicing evermore, and in every thing giving thanks, this commandment is written in his heart, "That he who loveth God, love his brother also." And he accordingly loves his neighbour as himself; he loves every man as his own soul. His heart is full of love to all mankind, to every child of "the Father of the spirits of all flesh." That a man is not personally known to him, is no bar to his love; no, nor that he is known to be such as he approves not, that he repays hatred for his good will. For he "loves his enemies;" yea, and the enemies of God, "the evil and the unthankful." And if it be not in his power to "do good to them that hate him," yet he ceases not to pray for them, though they continue to spurn his love, and still "despitefully use him and persecute him."

10. For he is "pure in heart." The love of God has purified his heart from all revengeful passions, from envy, malice, and wrath, from every unkind temper or malign affection. It hath cleansed him from pride and haughtiness of spirit, whereof alone cometh contention. And he hath now "put on bowels of mercies, kindness, humbleness of mind, meekness, long suffering;" so that he "forbears and forgives, if he had a quarrel against any; even as God in Christ hath forgiven him." And indeed all possible ground for contention, on his part, is utterly cut off. For none can take from him what he desires; seeing he "loves not the world, nor" any of "the things of the world;" being now "crucified to the world, and the world crucified to him;" being dead to all that is in the world, both to "the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eye, and the pride of life." For "all his desire is unto God, and to the remembrance of his name."

11. Agreeable to this his one desire, is the one design of his life, namely, "not to do his own will, but the will of Him that sent him." His one intention at all times and in all things is, not to please himself, but Him whom his soul loveth. He has a single eye. And because "his eye is single, his whole body is full of light." Indeed, where the loving eye of the soul is continually fixed upon God, there can be no darkness at all, "but the whole is light; as when the bright shining of a candle doth enlighten the house." God then reigns alone. All that is in the soul is holiness to the Lord. There is not a motion in his heart, but is according to his will. Every thought that arises points to Him, and is in obedience to the law of Christ.

12. And the tree is known by its fruits. For as he loves God, so he keeps his commandments; not only some, or most of them, but all, from the least to the greatest. He is not content to "keep the whole law, and offend in one point;" but has in all points, "a conscience void of offence toward God and toward man." Whatever God has forbidden, he avoids; whatever God hath enjoined, he doeth; and that

whether it be little or great, hard or easy, joyous or grievous to the flesh. He "runs the way of God's commandments," now he hath set his heart at liberty. It is his glory so to do; it is his daily crown of rejoicing, "to do the will of God on earth, as it is done in heaven;" knowing it is the highest privilege of "the angels of God, of those that excel in strength, to fulfil his commandments, and hearken to the voice of his word."

13. All the commandments of God he accordingly keeps, and that with all his might. For his obedience is in proportion to his love, the source from whence it flows. And therefore, loving God with all his heart, he serves him with all his strength. He continually presents his soul and body a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable to God; entirely and without reserve devoting himself, all he has, and all he is, to his glory. All the talents he has received, he constantly employs according to his Master's will; every power and faculty of his soul, every member of his body. Once he "yielded" them "unto sin" and the devil, "as instruments of unrighteousness;" but now, "being alive from the dead, he yields" them all "as instruments of righteousness unto God."

14. By consequence, whatsoever he doeth, it is all to the glory of God. In all his employments of every kind, he not only aims at this, (which is implied in having a single eye,) but actually attains it. His business and refreshments, as well as his prayers, all serve this great end. Whether he sit in his house or walk by the way, whether he lie down or rise up, he is promoting, in all he speaks or does, the one business of his life; whether he put on his apparel, or labour, or eat and drink, or divert himself from too wasting labour, it all tends to advance the glory of God, by peace and good will among men. His one invariable rule is this, "Whatsoever ye do, in word or deed, do it all in the name of the Lord Jesus, giving thanks to God and the Father by him."

15. Nor do the customs of the world at all hinder his "running the race that is set before him." He knows that vice does not lose its nature, though it becomes ever so fashionable; and remembers, that "every man is to give an account of himself to God." He cannot, therefore, "follow" even "a multitude to do evil." He cannot "fare sumptuously every day," or "make provision for the flesh to fulfil the lusts thereof." He cannot "lay up treasures upon earth," any more than he can take fire into his bosom. He cannot "adorn himself," on any pretence, "with gold or costly apparel." He cannot join in or countenance any diversion which has the least tendency to vice of any kind. He cannot "speak evil" of his neighbour, any more than he can lie either for God or man. He cannot utter an unkind word of any one; for love keeps the door of his lips. He cannot speak "idle words;" "no corrupt communication" ever "comes out of his mouth," as is all that "which is" not "good to the use of edifying," not "fit to minister grace to the hearers." But "whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are" justly "of good report," he thinks and speaks, and acts, "adorning the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ in all things."

16. Lastly. As he has time, he "does good unto all men;" unto neighbours and strangers, friends and enemies: and that in every possible kind; not only to their bodies, by "feeding the hungry, clothing the

naked, visiting those that are sick or in prison;" but much more does he labour to do good to their souls, as of the ability which God giveth; to awaken those that sleep in death; to bring those who are awakened to the atoning blood, that, "being justified by faith, they may have peace with God;" and to provoke those who have peace with God to abound more in love and in good works. And he is willing to "spend and be spent herein," even "to be offered up on the sacrifice and service of their faith," so they may "all come unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ."

17. These are the principles and practices of our sect; these are the marks of a true Methodist. By these alone do those who are in derision so called, desire to be distinguished from other men. If any man say, "Why, these are only the common, fundamental principles of Christianity!" Thou hast said; so I mean; this is the very truth; I know they are no other; and I would to God both thou and all men knew, that I, and all who follow my judgment, do vehemently refuse to be distinguished from other men, by any but the common principles of Christianity,—the plain, old Christianity that I teach, renouncing and detesting all other marks of distinction. And whosoever is what I preach, (let him be called what he will, for names change not the nature of things,) he is a Christian, not in name only, but in heart and in life. He is inwardly and outwardly conformed to the will of God, as revealed in the written word. He thinks, speaks, and lives, according to the method laid down in the revelation of Jesus Christ. His soul is renewed after the image of God, in righteousness and in all true holiness. And having the mind that was in Christ, he so walks as Christ also walked.

18. By these marks, by these fruits of a living faith, do we labour to distinguish ourselves from the unbelieving world, from all those whose minds or lives are not according to the Gospel of Christ. But from real Christians, of whatsoever denomination they be, we earnestly desire not to be distinguished at all; not from any who sincerely follow after what they know they have not yet attained. No: "Whosoever doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven, the same is my brother, and sister, and mother." And I beseech you, brethren, by the mercies of God, that we be in no wise divided among ourselves. Is thy heart right, as my heart is with thine? I ask no farther question. If it be, give me thy hand. For opinions, or terms, let us not destroy the work of God. Dost thou love and serve God? It is enough. I give thee the right hand of fellowship. If there be any consolation in Christ, if any comfort of love, if any fellowship of the Spirit, if any bowels and mercies; let us strive together for the faith of the Gospel; walking worthy of the vocation wherewith we are called; with all lowliness and meekness, with long suffering, forbearing one another in love, endeavouring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace; remembering, there is one body, and one Spirit, even as we are called with one hope of our calling; "one Lord, one faith, one baptism; one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all."

A SHORT HISTORY OF METHODISM.

1. It is not easy to reckon up the various accounts which have been given of the people called Methodists; very many of them as far remote from truth as that given by the good gentleman in Ireland: "*Methodists! Ay, they are the people who place all religion in wearing long beards.*"

2. Abundance of the mistakes which are current concerning them have undoubtedly sprung from this: Men lump together, under this general name, many who have no manner of connection with each other; and then whatever any of these speaks or does is of course imputed to all.

3. The following short account may prevent persons of a calm and candid disposition from doing this; although men of a warm or prejudiced spirit will do just as they did before. But let it be observed, this is not designed for a defence of the Methodists, (so called,) or any part of them. It is a bare relation of a series of naked facts, which alone may remove abundance of misunderstandings.

4. In November, 1729, four young gentlemen of Oxford,—Mr. John Wesley, fellow of Lincoln College; Mr. Charles Wesley, student of Christ Church; Mr. Morgan, commoner of Christ Church; and Mr. Kirkham, of Merton College,—began to spend some evenings in a week together, in reading, chiefly, the Greek Testament. The next year two or three of Mr. John Wesley's pupils desired the liberty of meeting with them; and afterward one of Mr. Charles Wesley's pupils. It was in 1732, that Mr. Ingham, of Queen's College, and Mr. Broughton, of Exeter, were added to their number. To these, in April, was joined Mr. Clayton, of Brazenose, with two or three of his pupils. About the same time Mr. James Hervey was permitted to meet with them, and in 1735, Mr. Whitefield.

5. The exact regularity of their lives, as well as studies, occasioned a young gentleman of Christ Church to say, "Here is a new set of Methodists sprung up;" alluding to some ancient physicians who were so called. The name was new and quaint; so it took immediately, and the Methodists were known all over the university.

6. They were all zealous members of the Church of England; not only tenacious of all her doctrines, so far as they knew them, but of all her discipline, to the minutest circumstance. They were likewise zealous observers of all the university statutes, and that for conscience' sake. But they observed neither these nor any thing else any farther than they conceived it was bound upon them by their one book, the Bible; it being their one desire and design to be downright Bible Christians; taking the Bible, as interpreted by the primitive Church and our own, for their whole and sole rule.

7. The one charge then advanced against them was, that they were "righteous overmuch;" that they were abundantly too scrupulous, and too strict, carrying things to great extremes: in particular, that they laid too much stress upon the rubrics and canons of the Church; that they insisted too much on observing the statutes of the university; and that they took the Scriptures in too strict and literal a sense; so that if they were right, few indeed would be saved.

8. In October, 1735, Mr. John and Charles Wesley, and Mr. Ingham, left England, with a design to go and preach to the Indians in Georgia: but the rest of the gentlemen continued to meet, till one and another was ordained and left the university. By which means, in about two years' time, scarce any of them were left.

9. In February, 1738, Mr. Whitefield went over to Georgia, with a design to assist Mr. John Wesley; but Mr. Wesley just then returned to England. Soon after he had a meeting with Messrs. Ingham, Stonehouse, Hall, Hutchings, Kinchin, and a few other clergymen, who all appeared to be of one heart, as well as of one judgment, resolved to be Bible Christians at all events; and, wherever they were, to preach with all their might plain, old, Bible Christianity.

10. They were hitherto perfectly regular in all things, and zealously attached to the Church of England. Meantime, they began to be convinced, that "by grace we are saved through faith;" that justification by faith was the doctrine of the Church, as well as of the Bible. As soon as they believed, they spake; salvation by faith being now their standing topic. Indeed this implied three things: (1.) That men are all, by nature, "dead in sin," and, consequently, "children of wrath." (2.) That they are "justified by faith alone." (3.) That faith produces inward and outward holiness: and these points they insisted on day and night. In a short time they became popular preachers. The congregations were large wherever they preached. The former name was then revived; and all these gentlemen, with their followers, were entitled Methodists.

11. In March, 1741, Mr. Whitefield, being returned to England, entirely separated from Mr. Wesley and his friends, because he did not hold the decrees. Here was the first breach, which warm men persuaded Mr. Whitefield to make merely for a difference of opinion. Those, indeed, who believed universal redemption had no desire at all to separate; but those who held particular redemption would not hear of any accommodation, being determined to have no fellowship with men that "were in so dangerous errors." So there were now two sorts of Methodists, so called; those for particular, and those for general, redemption.

12. Not many years passed, before William Cudworth and James Rely separated from Mr. Whitefield. These were properly Antinomians, absolute, avowed enemies to the law of God, which they never preached or professed to preach, but termed all legalists who did. With them, "preaching the law" was an abomination. They had "nothing to do" with the law. They would "preach Christ," as they called it, but without one word either of holiness or good works. Yet these were still denominated Methodists, although differing from Mr. Whitefield, both in judgment and practice, abundantly more than Mr. Whitefield did from Mr. Wesley.

13. In the mean time, Mr. Venn and Mr. Romaine began to be spoken of; and not long after, Mr. Madan and Mr. Berridge, with a few other clergymen, who, although they had no connection with each other, yet preaching salvation by faith, and endeavouring to live accordingly, to be Bible Christians, were soon included in the general name of Methodists. And so indeed were all others who preached salvation by faith, and appeared more serious than their neighbours. Some of

these were quite regular in their manner of preaching; some were quite irregular; (though not by choice; but necessity was laid upon them; they must preach irregularly, or not at all;) and others were between both, regular in most, though not in all, particulars.

14. In 1762, George Bell, and a few other persons, began to speak great words. In the latter end of the year, they foretold that the world would be at an end on the 28th of February. Mr. Wesley, with whom they were then connected, withstood them both in public and private. This they would not endure; so, in January and February, 1763, they separated from him. Soon after, Mr. Maxfield, one of Mr. Wesley's preachers, and several of the people, left Mr. Wesley; but still Mr. Maxfield and his adherents go under the general name of Methodists.

15. At present those who remain with Mr. Wesley are mostly Church-of-England men.* They love her Articles, her Homilies, her Liturgy, her discipline, and unwillingly vary from it in any instance. Meantime, all who preach among them declare, "We are all by nature children of wrath:" but "by grace we are saved through faith;" saved both from the guilt and from the power of sin. They endeavour to live according to what they preach, to be plain Bible Christians. And they meet together, at convenient times, to encourage one another therein. They tenderly love many that are Calvinists, though they do not love their opinions. Yea, they love the Antinomians themselves; but it is with a love of compassion only: for they hate their doctrines with a perfect hatred; they abhor them as they do hell fire; being convinced nothing can so effectually destroy all faith, all holiness, and all good works.

16. With regard to these, Mr. Rely and his adherents, it would not be strange if they should grow into reputation. For they will never shock the world, either by the harshness of their doctrine, or the singularity of their behaviour. But let those who determine both to preach and to live the Gospel expect that men will "say all manner of evil of them." "The servant is not above his Master, nor the disciple above his Lord. If, then, they have called the Master of the house, Beelzebub, how much more them of his household?" It is their duty, indeed, "as much as lieth in them, to live peaceably with all men." But when they labour after peace, the world will "make themselves ready for battle." It is their constant endeavour to "please all men, for their good, to edification." But yet they know it cannot be done: they remember the word of the Apostle, "If I yet please men, I am not the servant of Christ." They go on, therefore, "through honour and dishonour, through evil report and good report;" desiring only, that their Master may say in that day, "Servants of God, well done!"

* I have not been able to ascertain the precise time at which this tract was written. It notices the separation of Maxfield in 1763; and the second edition of it bears the date of 1765. It appears therefore to have been first published some time about 1764; and was probably intended to screen Mr. Wesley and his friends from the reproach attached to the conduct of those who separated from him.—EDIT.

ADVICE TO THE PEOPLE CALLED METHODISTS.

Disce, docendus adhuc quæ censeat amicus.—HOR.

[“To the instruction of an humble friend,
Who would himself be better taught, attend.”—FRANCIS.]

It may be needful to specify whom I mean by this ambiguous term ; since it would be lost labour to speak to Methodists, so called, without first describing those to whom I speak.

By Methodists I mean, a people who profess to pursue (in whatsoever measure they have attained) holiness of heart and life, inward and outward conformity in all things to the revealed will of God ; who place religion in a uniform resemblance of the great object of it ; in a steady imitation of him they worship, in all his imitable perfections ; more particularly, in justice, mercy, and truth, or universal love filling the heart, and governing the life.

You, to whom I now speak, believe this love of human kind cannot spring but from the love of God. You think there can be no instance of one whose tender affection embraces every child of man, (though not endeared to him either by ties of blood, or by any natural or civil relation,) unless that affection flow from a grateful, filial love to the common Father of all ; to God, considered not only as his Father, but as “the Father of the spirits of all flesh ;” yea, as the general Parent and Friend of all the families both of heaven and earth.

This filial love you suppose to flow only from faith, which you describe as a supernatural evidence (or conviction) of things not seen ; so that to him who has this principle,

The things unknown to feeble sense,
Unseen by reason’s glimmering ray,
With strong, commanding evidence
Their heavenly origin display.

Faith lends its realizing light,
The clouds disperse, the shadows fly ;
The’ Invisible appears in sight,
And God is seen by mortal eye.

You suppose this faith to imply an evidence that God is merciful to me a sinner ; that he is reconciled to me by the death of his Son, and now accepts me for his sake. You accordingly describe the faith of a real Christian as “a sure trust and confidence” (over and above his assent to the sacred writings) “which he hath in God, that his sins are forgiven ; and that he is, through the merits of Christ, reconciled to the favour of God.”

You believe, farther, that both this faith and love are wrought in us by the Spirit of God ; nay, that there cannot be in any man one good temper or desire, or so much as one good thought, unless it be produced by the almighty power of God, by the inspiration or influence of the Holy Ghost.

If you walk by this rule, continually endeavouring to know and love and resemble and obey the great God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, as the God of love, of pardoning mercy ; if from this principle of loving, obedient faith, you carefully abstain from all evil, and labour, as you have opportunity, to do good to all men, friends or enemies ; if, lastly, you unite together, to encourage and help each other in thus working out your salvation, and for that end watch over one another in love, you are they whom I mean by Methodists.

The first general advice which one who loves your souls would earnestly recommend to every one of you is: "Consider, with deep and frequent attention, the peculiar circumstances wherein you stand."

One of these is, that you are a new people: your name is new, (at least, as used in a religious sense,) not heard of, till a few years ago, either in our own or any other nation. Your principles are new, in this respect, that there is no other set of people among us (and, possibly, not in the Christian world) who hold them all in the same degree and connection; who so strenuously and continually insist on the absolute necessity of universal holiness both in heart and life; of a peaceful, joyous love of God; of a supernatural evidence of things not seen; of an inward witness that we are the children of God; and of the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, in order to any good thought, or word, or work. And perhaps there is no other set of people, (at least, not visibly united together,) who lay so much and yet no more stress than you do on rectitude of opinions, on outward modes of worship, and the use of those ordinances which you acknowledge to be of God. So much stress you lay even on right opinions, as to profess, that you earnestly desire to have a right judgment in all things, and are glad to use every means which you know or believe may be conducive thereto; and yet not so much as to condemn any man upon earth, merely for thinking otherwise than you do; much less, to imagine that God condemns him for this, if he be upright and sincere of heart. On those outward modes of worship, wherein you have been bred up, you lay so much stress as highly to approve them; but not so much as to lessen your love to those who conscientiously dissent from you herein. You likewise lay so much stress on the use of those ordinances which you believe to be of God, as to confess there is no salvation for you if you wilfully neglect them: and yet you do not judge them that are otherwise minded; you determine nothing concerning those who, not believing those ordinances to be of God, do, out of principle, abstain from them.

Your strictness of life, taking the whole of it together, may likewise be accounted new. I mean, your making it a rule, to abstain from fashionable diversions, from reading plays, romances, or books of humour, from singing innocent songs, or talking in a merry, gay, diverting manner; your plainness of dress; your manner of dealing in trade; your exactness in observing the Lord's day; your scrupulosity as to things that have not paid custom; your total abstinence from spirituous liquors (unless in cases of necessity;) your rule, "not to mention the fault of an absent person, in particular of ministers or of those in authority," may justly be termed new: seeing, although some are scrupulous in some of these things, and others are strict with regard to other particulars, yet we do not find any other body of people who insist on all these rules together. With respect, therefore, both to your name, principles, and practice, you may be considered as a new people.

Another peculiar circumstance of your present situation, is, that you are newly united together; that you are just gathered, or (as it seems) gathering rather, out of all other societies or congregations; nay, and that you have been hitherto, and do still subsist, without power, (for you are a low, insignificant people,) without riches, (for you are poor almost

to a man, having no more than the plain necessaries of life,) and without either any extraordinary gifts of nature, or the advantages of education; most even of your teachers being quite unlearned, and (in other things) ignorant men.

There is yet another circumstance, which is quite peculiar to yourselves: whereas every other religious set of people, as soon as they were joined to each other, separated themselves from their former societies or congregations; you, on the contrary, do not; nay, you absolutely disavow all desire of separating from them. You openly and continually declare you have not, nor ever had, such a design. And whereas the congregations to which those separatists belonged have generally spared no pains to prevent that separation; those to which you belong spare no pains (not to prevent, but) to occasion this separation, to drive you from them, to force you on that division to which you declare you have the strongest aversion.

Considering these peculiar circumstances wherein you stand, you will see the propriety of a Second advice I would recommend to you: "Do not imagine you can avoid giving offence:" your very name renders this impossible. Perhaps not one in a hundred of those who use the term *Methodist* have any ideas of what it means. To ninety-nine of them it is still Heathen Greek. Only they think it means something very bad,—either a Papist, a heretic, an underminer of the Church, or some unheard-of monster; and, in all probability, the farther it goes, it must gather up more and more evil. It is vain, therefore, for any that is called a *Methodist* ever to think of not giving offence.

And as much offence as you give by your name, you will give still more by your principles. You will give offence to the bigots for opinions, modes of worship, and ordinances, by laying no more stress upon them; to the bigots against them, by laying so much; to men of form, by insisting so frequently and strongly on the inward power of religion; to moral men, (so called,) by declaring the absolute necessity of faith, in order to acceptance with God. To men of reason you will give offence, by talking of inspiration and receiving the Holy Ghost; to drunkards, Sabbath breakers, common swearers, and other open sinners, by refraining from their company, as well as by that disapprobation of their behaviour which you will often be obliged to express. And indeed your life must give them continual offence: your sobriety is grievously offensive to a drunkard; your serious conversation is equally intolerable to a gay impertinent; and, in general, that "you are grown so precise and singular, so monstrously strict, beyond all sense and reason, that you scruple so many harmless things, and fancy you are obliged to do so many others which you need not," cannot but be an offence to abundance of people, your friends and relations in particular. Either, therefore, you must consent to give up your principles, or your fond hope of pleasing men.

What makes even your principles more offensive is, this uniting of yourselves together: because this union renders you more conspicuous, placing you more in the eye of men; more suspicious,—I mean, liable to be suspected of carrying on some sinister design; (especially by those who do not, or will not, know your inviolable attachment to his present majesty;) more dreadful, to those of a fearful temper, who imagine you

have any such design ; and more odious to men of zeal, if their zeal be any other than fervent love to God and man.

This offence will sink the deeper, because you are gathered out of so many other congregations : for the warm men in each will not easily be convinced, that you do not despise either them or their teachers ; nay, will probably imagine, that you utterly condemn them, as though they could not be saved. And this occasion of offence is now at the height, because you are just gathered, or gathering rather, so that they know not where it will end ; but the fear of losing (so they account it) more of their members, gives an edge to their zeal, and keeps all their anger and resentment in its strength.

Add to this, that you do not leave them quite, you still rank yourselves among their members ; which, to those who know not that you do it for conscience' sake, is also a provoking circumstance. "If you would but get out of their sight !" But you are a continual thorn in their side, as long as you remain with them.

And (which cannot but anger them the more) you have neither power, nor riches, nor learning ; yet, with all their power, and money, and wisdom, they can gain no ground against you.

You cannot but expect, that the offence continually arising from such a variety of provocations will gradually ripen into hatred, malice, and all other unkind tempers. And as they who are thus affected will not fail to represent you to others in the same light as you appear to them,—sometimes as madmen and fools, sometimes as wicked men, fellows not fit to live upon the earth ; the consequence, humanly speaking, must be, that, together with your reputation, you will lose, first, the love of your friends, relations, and acquaintance, even those who once loved you the most tenderly ; then your business, for many will employ you no longer, nor "buy of such a one as you are ;" and, in due time, (unless He who governs the world interpose,) your health, liberty, and life.

What farther advice can be given to persons in such a situation ? I cannot but advise you, *Thirdly*, "Consider deeply with yourself, Is the God whom I serve able to deliver me ? I am not able to deliver myself out of these difficulties ; much less am I able to bear them. I know not how to give up my reputation, my friends, my substance, my liberty, my life. Can God give me to rejoice in doing this ; and may I depend upon him that he will ? Are the hairs of my head all numbered ; and does he never fail them that trust in him ?" Weigh this thoroughly ; and if you can trust God with your all, then go on in the power of his might.

Go on, I would earnestly advise you, *Fourthly* : "Keep in the very path wherein you now tread. Be true to your principles." Never rest again in the dead formality of religion. Pursue with your might inward and outward holiness ; a steady imitation of Him you worship ; a still increasing resemblance of his imitable perfections,—his justice, mercy, and truth.

Let this be your manly, noble, generous religion, equally remote from the meanness of superstition, which places religion in doing what God hath not enjoined, or abstaining from what he hath not forbidden ; and from the unkindness of bigotry, which confines our affection to our own party, sect, or opinion. Above all, stand fast in obedient faith, faith in the God of pardoning mercy, in the God and Father of our Lord

Jesus Christ who hath loved you, and given himself for you. Ascribe to Him all the good you find in yourself; all your peace, and joy, and love; all your power to do and suffer his will, through the Spirit of the living God. Yet, in the mean time, carefully avoid enthusiasm: impute not the dreams of men to the all-wise God; and expect neither light nor power from him, but in the serious use of all the means he hath ordained.

Be true also to your principles touching opinions and the externals of religion. Use every ordinance which you believe is of God; but beware of narrowness of spirit toward those who use them not. Conform yourself to those modes of worship which you approve; yet love as brethren those who cannot conform. Lay so much stress on opinions, that all your own, if it be possible, may agree with truth and reason; but have a care of anger, dislike, or contempt toward those whose opinions differ from yours. You are daily accused of this; (and, indeed, what is it whereof you are not accused?) but beware of giving any ground for such an accusation. Condemn no man for not thinking as you think: let every one enjoy the full and free liberty of thinking for himself: let every man use his own judgment, since every man must give an account of himself to God. Abhor every approach, in any kind or degree, to the spirit of persecution. If you cannot reason or persuade a man into the truth, never attempt to force him into it. If love will not compel him to come in, leave him to God, the Judge of all.

Yet expect not that others will deal thus with you. No: some will endeavour to fright you out of your principles; some to shame you into a more popular religion, to laugh and rally you out of your singularity: but from none of these will you be in so great danger, as from those who assault you with quite different weapons; with softness, good-nature, and earnest professions of (perhaps real) good will. Here you are equally concerned to avoid the very appearance of anger, contempt, or unkindness, and to hold fast the whole truth of God, both in principle and in practice.

This indeed will be interpreted as unkindness. Your former acquaintance will look upon this,—that you will not sin or trifle with them,—as a plain proof of your coldness toward them; and this burden you must be content to bear: but labour to avoid all real unkindness, all disobliging words, or harshness of speech, all shyness, or strangeness of behaviour. Speak to them with all the tenderness and love, and behave with all the sweetness and courtesy you can; taking care not to give any needless offence to neighbour or stranger, friend or enemy.

Perhaps on this very account I might advise you, Fifthly, “not to talk much of what you suffer; of the persecution you endured at such a time, and the wickedness of your persecutors.” Nothing more tends to exasperate them than this; and therefore (although there is a time when these things must be mentioned, yet) it might be a general rule, to do it as seldom as you can with a safe conscience. For, besides its tendency to inflame them, it has the appearance of evil, of ostentation, of magnifying yourselves. It also tends to puff you up with pride, and to make you think yourselves some great ones, as it certainly does to excite or increase in your heart ill will, anger, and all unkind tempers. It is, at best, loss of time; for, instead of the wickedness of men, you

might be talking of the goodness of God. Nay, it is, in truth, an open, wilful sin: it is tale bearing, backbiting, evil speaking,—a sin you can never be sufficiently watchful against, seeing it steals upon you in a thousand shapes. Would it not be far more profitable for your souls, instead of speaking against them, to pray for them? to confirm your love toward those unhappy men, whom you believe to be fighting against God, by crying mightily to him in their behalf, that he may open their eyes and change their hearts?

I have now only to commend you to the care of Him who hath all power in heaven and in earth; beseeching Him, that, in every circumstance of life, you may stand “firm as the beaten anvil to the stroke;” desiring nothing on earth; accounting all things but dung and dross, that you may win Christ; and always remembering, “It is the part of a good champion, to be flayed alive, and to conquer!”

October 10, 1745.

THE PRINCIPLES OF A METHODIST.

WRITTEN IN 1740.

Occasioned by a late Pamphlet, entitled, “A Brief History of the Principles of Methodism.”

TO THE READER.

1. I have often wrote on controverted points before; but not with an eye to any particular person. So that this is the first time I have appeared in controversy, properly so called. Indeed I have not wanted occasion to do it before; particularly when, after many stabs in the dark, I was publicly attacked, not by an open enemy, but by my own familiar friend. But I could not answer him. I could only cover my face and say, *Και συ εις εκεινων; Και συ, τεκνον;* “Art thou also among them? Art thou, my son?”

2. I now tread an untried path “with fear and trembling;” fear, not of my adversary, but of myself. I fear my own spirit, lest I “fall where many mightier have been slain.” I never knew one man (or but one) write controversy, with what I thought a right spirit. Every disputant seems to think (as every soldier) that he may hurt his opponent as much as he can; nay, that he ought to do his worst to him, or he cannot make the best of his own cause; that, so he do not belie or wilfully misrepresent him, he must expose him as far as he is able. It is enough, we suppose, if we do not show heat or passion against our adversary. But, not to despise him, or endeavour to make others do so, is quite a work of supererogation.

3. But ought these things to be so? (I speak on the Christian scheme.) Ought we not to love our neighbour as ourselves? And does a man cease to be our neighbour, because he is of a different opinion; nay, and declares himself so to be? Ought we not, for all this, to do to him as we would he should do to us? But do we ourselves love to be exposed, or set in the worst light? Would we willingly be treated with contempt? If not, why do we treat others thus? And yet who scruples it? Who does not hit every blow he can, however foreign to the merits

of the cause? Who, in controversy, casts the mantle of love over the nakedness of his brother? Who keeps steadily and uniformly to the question, without ever striking at the person? Who shows, in every sentence, that he loves his brother only less than the truth?

4. I have made a little faint essay toward this. I have a brother who is as my own soul. My desire is, in every word I say, to look upon Mr. Tucker as in his place; and to speak no tittle concerning the one in any other spirit than I would speak concerning the other. But whether I have attained this or no, I know not; for my heart is "deceitful and desperately wicked." If I have spoken any thing in another spirit, I pray God it may not be laid to my charge; and that it may not condemn me in that day when the secrets of all hearts shall be made manifest! Meanwhile my heart's desire and prayer to God is, that both I, and all who think it their duty to oppose me, may "put on bowels of mercies, kindness, humbleness of mind, meekness, long suffering; forbearing one another, and forgiving one another, even as God for Christ's sake hath forgiven us."

THE PRINCIPLES OF A METHODIST.

1. THERE has lately appeared in the world a tract, entitled, "A Brief History of the Principles of Methodism." I doubt not but the writer's design was good, and believe he has a real desire to know the truth. And the manner wherein he pursues that design is generally calm and dispassionate. He is, indeed, in several mistakes; but as many of these are either of small consequence in themselves, or do not immediately relate to me, it is not my concern to mention them. All of any consequence which relates to me, I think, falls under three heads:—

First. That I believe justification by faith alone.

Secondly. That I believe sinless perfection. And,

Thirdly. That I believe inconsistencies.

Of each of these I will speak as plainly as I can.

2. First. That I believe justification by faith alone. This I allow. For I am firmly persuaded, that every man of the offspring of Adam is very far gone from original righteousness, and is of his own nature inclined to evil; that this corruption of our nature, in every person born into the world, deserves God's wrath and damnation; that therefore, if ever we receive the remission of our sins, and are accounted righteous before God, it must be only for the merit of Christ, by faith, and not for our own works or deservings of any kind. Nay, I am persuaded, that all works done before justification, have in them the nature of sin; and that, consequently, till he is justified, a man has no power to do any work which is pleasing and acceptable to God.

3. To express my meaning a little more at large: I believe, three things must go together in our justification: upon God's part, his great mercy and grace; upon Christ's part, the satisfaction of God's justice, by the offering his body, and shedding his blood; and upon our part, true and living faith in the merits of Jesus Christ. So that in our justification there is not only God's mercy and grace, but his justice also. And so the grace of God does not shut out the righteousness of God in our

justification; but only shuts out the righteousness of man, that is, the righteousness of our works.

4. And therefore St. Paul requires nothing on the part of man, but only a true and living faith. Yet this faith does not shut out repentance, hope, and love, which are joined with faith in every man that is justified. But it shuts them out from the office of justifying. So that although they are all present together in him that is justified, yet they justify not all together.

5. Neither does faith shut out good works, necessarily to be done afterward. But we may not do them to this intent,—to be justified by doing them. Our justification comes freely, of the mere mercy of God; for whereas all the world was not able to pay any part toward their ransom, it pleased him, without any of our deserving, to prepare for us Christ's body and blood, whereby our ransom might be paid, and his justice satisfied. Christ, therefore, is now the righteousness of all them that truly believe in him.

6. But let it be observed, the true sense of those words, "We are justified by faith in Christ only," is not, that this our own act, "to believe in Christ," or this our faith which is within us, justifies us; for that were to account ourselves to be justified by some act or virtue that is within us; but that although we have faith, hope, and love within us, and do never so many good works, yet we must renounce the merit of all, of faith, hope, love, and all other virtues and good works, which we either have done, shall do, or can do, as far too weak to deserve our justification; for which, therefore, we must trust only in God's mercy, and the merits of Christ. For it is he alone that taketh away our sins. To him alone are we to go for this; forsaking all our virtues, good words, thoughts, and works, and putting our trust in Christ only.

7. In strictness, therefore, neither our faith nor our works justify us, that is, deserve the remission of our sins. But God himself justifies us, of his own mercy, through the merits of his Son only. Nevertheless, because by faith we embrace the promise of God's mercy and of the remission of our sins, therefore the Scripture says, that faith does justify, yea, faith without works. And it is all one to say, "Faith without works," and "Faith alone, justifies us." Therefore the ancient Fathers from time to time speak thus: "Faith alone justifies us." And because we receive faith, through the only merits of Christ, and not through the merit and virtue we have, or work we do; therefore in that respect we renounce, as it were, again, faith, works, and all other virtues. For our corruption through original sin is so great, that all our faith, charity, words, and works, cannot merit or deserve any part of our justification for us. And therefore we thus speak, humbling ourselves before God, and giving Christ all the glory of our justification.

8. But it should also be observed, what that faith is whereby we are justified. Now, that faith which brings not forth good works, is not a living faith, but a dead and devilish one. For even the devils believe that Christ was born of a virgin; that he wrought all kind of miracles, declaring himself to be very God; that for our sakes he died and rose again, and ascended into heaven; and at the end of the world shall come again, to judge the quick and the dead. This the devils believe; and so they believe all that is written in the Old and New Testament: And

yet still, for all this faith, they are but devils; they remain still in their damnable estate, lacking the true Christian faith.

9. The true Christian faith is, not only to believe the Holy Scriptures and the articles of our faith are true; but also, to have "a sure trust and confidence to be saved from everlasting damnation by Christ," whereof doth follow a loving heart, to obey his commandments. And this faith neither any devil hath, nor any wicked man. No ungodly man hath or can have this "sure trust and confidence in God, that by the merits of Christ his sins are forgiven, and he reconciled to the favour of God."

10. This is what I believe (and have believed for some years) concerning justification by faith alone. I have chose to express it in the words of a little treatise, published several years ago; as being the most authentic proof, both of my past and present sentiments. If I err herein, let those who are better informed calmly point out my error to me; and I trust, I shall not shut my eyes against the light, from whatsoever side it comes.

11. The second thing laid to my charge is, that I believe sinless perfection. I will simply declare what I do believe concerning this also, and leave unprejudiced men to judge.

12. My last and most deliberate thoughts on this head were published but a few months since, in these words:—

(1.) "Perhaps the general prejudice against Christian perfection may chiefly arise from a misapprehension of the nature of it. We willingly allow, and continually declare, there is no such perfection in this life, as implies either a dispensation from doing good and attending all the ordinances of God; or a freedom from ignorance, mistake, temptation, and a thousand infirmities necessarily connected with flesh and blood.

(2.) "First. We not only allow, but earnestly contend, that there is no perfection in this life, which implies any dispensation from attending all the ordinances of God, or from 'doing good unto all men, while we have time,' though 'specially unto the household of faith.' We believe, that not only the babes in Christ, who have newly found redemption in his blood, but those also who are 'grown up into perfect men,' are indispensably obliged, as often as they have opportunity, 'to eat bread and drink wine in remembrance of him,' and to 'search the Scriptures;' by fasting, as well as temperance, to 'keep their bodies under, and bring them into subjection;' and, above all, to pour out their souls in prayer, both secretly and in the great congregation.

(3.) "We, Secondly, believe, that there is no such perfection in this life as implies an entire deliverance, either from ignorance or mistake, in things not essential to salvation, or from manifold temptations, or from numberless infirmities wherewith the corruptible body more or less presses down the soul. We cannot find any ground in Scripture to suppose, that any inhabitant of a house of clay is wholly exempt, either from bodily infirmities, or from ignorance of many things; or to imagine any is incapable of mistake, or falling into divers temptations.

(4.) "'But whom then do you mean by *one that is perfect*?' We mean one in whom 'is the mind which was in Christ,' and who so 'walketh as Christ walked;' a 'man that hath clean hands and a pure heart,' or that is 'cleansed from all filthiness of flesh and spirit;' one in whom 'is no occasion of stumbling,' and who accordingly 'doth not commit sin.' To declare this a little more particularly: We understand by that scriptural expression, 'a perfect man,' one in whom God hath fulfilled his faithful word, 'From all your filthiness and from all your idols will I cleanse you: I will also save you from all your uncleannesses.' We understand hereby one

whom God hath 'sanctified throughout, in body, soul, and spirit;' one who 'walketh in the light as he is in the light, in whom is no darkness at all; the blood of Jesus Christ his Son having cleansed him from all sin.'

(5.) "This man can now testify to all mankind, 'I am crucified with Christ: Nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me.' He is 'holy, as God who called him is holy,' both in heart and 'in all manner of conversation.' He 'loveth the Lord his God with all his heart,' and serveth him 'with all his strength.' He 'loveth his neighbour,' every man, 'as himself;' yea, 'as Christ loveth us;' them, in particular, that 'despitefully use him and persecute him, because they know not the Son, neither the Father.' Indeed his soul is all love, filled with 'bowels of mercies, kindness, meekness, gentleness, long suffering.' And his life agreeth thereto, full of 'the work of faith, the patience of hope, the labour of love. And whatsoever he doeth either in word or deed, he doeth it all in the name,' in the love and power, 'of the Lord Jesus.' In a word, he doeth 'the will of God on earth, as it is done in heaven.'

(6.) "This it is to be 'a perfect man,' to be sanctified throughout: Even 'to have a heart so all-flaming with the love of God,' to use Archbishop Usher's words, 'as continually to offer up every thought, word, and work, as a spiritual sacrifice, acceptable to God through Christ.' In every thought of our hearts, in every word of our tongues, in every work of our hands, to 'show forth his praise, who hath called us out of darkness into his marvellous light.' O that both we, and all who seek the Lord Jesus in sincerity, may thus 'be made perfect in one!'"

13. If there be any thing unscriptural in these words, any thing wild or extravagant, any thing contrary to the analogy of faith, or the experience of adult Christians, let them "smite me friendly and reprove me;" let them impart to me of the clearer light God has given them. How knowest thou, O man, "but thou mayest gain thy brother;" but he may at length come to the knowledge of the truth; and thy labour of love, shown forth with meekness of wisdom, may not be in vain?

14. There remains yet another charge against me, that I believe inconsistencies; that my tenets, particularly concerning justification, are contradictory to themselves: that Mr. Wesley, "since his return from Germany, has improved in the spirit of inconsistency." "For then he published two treatises of Dr. Barnes, the Calvinist, or Dominican rather, who suffered in 1541; (let us spare the ashes of the dead. Were I such a Dominican as he was, I should rejoice too to die in the flames;) "the first on 'justification by faith only;' the other on 'the sinfulness of man's natural will, and his utter inability to do works acceptable to God, until he be justified.' Which principles, if added to his former tenets," (nay, they need not be *added* to them, for they are the very same,) "will give the whole a new vein of inconsistency, and make the contradictions more gross and glaring than before."

15. It will be necessary to speak more largely on this head, than on either of the preceding. And in order to speak as distinctly as I can, I propose taking the paragraphs one by one, as they lie before me.

16. (1.) It is "asserted that Mr. Law's system was the creed of the Methodists." But it is not proved. I had been eight years at Oxford before I read any of Mr. Law's writings; and when I did, I was so far from making them my creed, that I had objections to almost every page. But all this time my manner was, to spend several hours a day in reading the Scripture in the original tongues. And hence, my system, so termed, was wholly drawn, according to the light I then had.

17. It was in my passage to Georgia, I met with those teachers who would have taught me the way of God more perfectly. But I understood them not. Neither, on my arrival there, did they infuse any particularities into me, either about justification or any thing else. For I came back with the same notions I went. And this I have explicitly acknowledged in my second Journal, where some of my words are these: "When Peter Böhler, as soon as I came to London, affirmed of true faith in Christ, (which is but one,) that it had these two fruits inseparably attending it, 'Dominion over sin, and constant peace from a sense of forgiveness,' I was quite amazed, and looked upon it as a new gospel. If this was so, it was clear I had no faith. But I was not willing to be convinced of this. Therefore I disputed with all my might, and laboured to prove that faith might be where these were not; especially, where that sense of forgiveness was not; for, all the Scriptures relating to this I had been long since taught to construe away, and to call all Presbyterians who spoke otherwise. Besides, I well saw, no one could (in the nature of things) have such a sense of forgiveness, and not feel it. But I felt it not. If then there was no faith without this, all my pretensions to faith dropped at once." (Vol. iii, p. 73.)

18. (2.) Yet it was not Peter Böhler who convinced me that conversion (I mean justification) was an instantaneous work. On the contrary, when I was convinced of the nature and fruits of justifying faith, still "I could not comprehend what he spoke of an instantaneous work. I could not understand how this faith should be given in a moment; how a man could at once be thus turned from darkness to light, from sin and misery to righteousness and joy in the Holy Ghost. I searched the Scriptures again, touching this very thing, particularly the Acts of the Apostles. But, to my utter astonishment, I found scarce any instances there of other than instantaneous conversion; scarce any others so slow as that of St. Paul, who was three days in the pangs of the new birth. I had but one retreat left, viz. 'Thus, I grant, God wrought in the first ages of Christianity; but the times are changed. What reason have I to believe he works in the same manner now?'

"But on Sunday, 22, I was beat out of this retreat too, by the concurring evidence of several living witnesses, who testified God had thus wrought in themselves; giving them, *in a moment*, such a faith in the blood of his Son, as translated them out of darkness into light, out of sin and fear into holiness and happiness. Here ended my disputing. I could now only cry out, 'Lord, help thou my unbelief!'" (Vol. iii, p. 66.) The remaining part of this section, with the third and fourth, contain my own words, to which I still subscribe.

And if there is a mistake in the fifth, it is not material.

20. (3.) It is true, that, "on Wednesday, July 12, the Count spoke to this effect:—

- (1.) "Justification is the forgiveness of sins.
- (2.) "The moment a man flies to Christ, he is justified.
- (3.) "And has peace with God, but not always joy.
- (4.) "Nor perhaps may he know he is justified till long after.
- (5.) "For the assurance of it is distinct from justification itself.
- (6.) "But others may know he is justified, by his power over sin, by his seriousness, his love of the brethren, and his hunger and thirst after righteousness; which alone proves the spiritual life to be begun.

(7.) "To be justified is the same thing as to be born of God: when a man is awakened, he is begotten of God, and his fear, and sorrow, and sense of the wrath of God, are the pangs of the new birth."

It is true also, that I then recollected what P. Böhler had often said on this head, which was to this effect:—

- (1.) "When a man has living faith in Christ, then he is justified.
- (2.) "This is always given in a moment.
- (3.) "And in that moment he has peace with God.
- (4.) "Which he cannot have without knowing that he has it.
- (5.) "And 'being born of God' he sinneth not.
- (6.) "Which deliverance from sin he cannot have without knowing that he has it."

21. I did not apprehend it possible for any man living to have imagined that I believed both these accounts; the words whereof I had purposely so ranged, and divided into short sentences, that the gross, irreconcilable difference between them might be plain to the meanest reader. I cannot therefore but be a little surprised at the strength of that prejudice which could prevent any one's seeing, that, in opposition to the Count's opinion, (which in many respects I wholly disapproved of,) I quoted the words of one of his own Church, which, if true, overturn it altogether.

22. I have nothing to object to the quotations made in the seventh, eighth, and ninth sections. In the tenth are these words: "Now, since Mr. Wesley went so far to gather such materials together, let us see what was the system (or rather the medley) of principles he had to return with to England."

"OF THE ASSURANCE OF JUSTIFICATION.

"I believe that conversion is an instantaneous work; and that the moment a man is converted, or has living faith in Christ, he is justified: which faith a man cannot have without knowing that he hath it.

"Yet I believe he may not know that he is justified (that is, that he has living faith) till a long time after.

"I believe, also, that the moment a man is justified he has peace with God.

"Which he cannot have without knowing that he has it.

"Yet I believe he may not know that he is justified (that is, that he has peace with God) till a long time after.

"I believe when a man is justified he is born of God.

"And being born of God, he sinneth not.

"Which deliverance from sin he cannot have without knowing it.

"Yet I believe he may not know that he is justified (that is, delivered from sin) till a long time after.

"Though I believe that others may know that he is justified, by his power over sin, his seriousness, and love of the brethren."

23. "OF THE CONDITIONS OF JUSTIFICATION.

"I believe that Christ 'formed in us,' subordinately to Christ 'given for us,' (that is, our own inherent righteousness subordinate to Christ's merits,) ought to be insisted upon, as necessary to our justification.

"And it is just and right that a man should be humble and penitent, and have a broken and contrite heart, (that is, should have Christ formed in him,) before he can expect to be justified.

"And that this penitence and contrition is the work of the Holy Ghost.

"Yet I believe that all this is nothing toward, and has no influence on, our justification.

“Again, I believe that, in order to justification, I must go straight to Christ, with all my ungodliness, and plead nothing else.

“Yet I believe that we should not insist upon any thing we do or feel, as if it were necessary *previous* to justification.”

24. “OF THE EFFECTS OF JUSTIFICATION.

“I believe that justification is the same thing as to be born of God. Yet a man may have a strong assurance that he is justified, and not be able to affirm that he is born of God.

“A man may be fully assured that his sins are forgiven, yet may not be able to tell the hour or day when he received this full assurance, because it may grow up in him by degrees.—Though he can remember that, from the time this full assurance was confirmed in him, he never lost it, no, not for a moment.

“A man may have a weak faith at the same time that he hath peace with God, not one uneasy thought, and freedom from sin, not one unholy desire.

“A man may be justified, that is, born of God, who has not a clean heart, that is, is not sanctified.

“He may be justified, that is, born of God, and not have the indwelling of the Spirit.”

25. I entirely agree, “that the foregoing creed is a very extraordinary and odd composition.” But it is not mine: I neither composed it nor believe it; as, I doubt not, every impartial reader will be fully convinced, when we shall have gone over it, once more, step by step.

The parts of it which I do believe I shall barely repeat: on the others it will be needful to add a few words.

“OF THE ASSURANCE OF JUSTIFICATION.

“I believe that conversion,” meaning thereby justification, “is an instantaneous work; and that the moment a man has living faith in Christ, he is converted or justified.” (So the proposition must be expressed to make it sense.) “Which faith he cannot have, without knowing that he has it.”

“Yet I believe he may not know that he has it till long after.” This I deny: I believe no such thing.

“I believe the moment a man is justified he has peace with God:

“Which he cannot have without knowing that he has it.”

“Yet I believe he may not know he has it till long after.” This again I deny. I believe it not; nor Michael Linner neither; to clear whom entirely, one need only read his own words:—

“About fourteen years ago, I was more than ever convinced that I was wholly different from what God required me to be. I consulted his word again and again; but it spoke nothing but condemnation; till at last I could not read, nor indeed do any thing else, having no hope and no spirit left in me. I had been in this state for several days, when, being musing by myself, those words came strongly into my mind, ‘God so loved the world that he gave his only-begotten Son, to the end that all who believe in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.’ I thought, ‘*All! Then I am one. Then He is given for me. But I am a sinner: and he came to save sinners.*’ Immediately my burden dropped off, and my heart was at rest.

“But the full assurance of faith I had not yet, nor for the two years I continued in Moravia. When I was driven out thence by the Jesuits, I retired hither, and was soon after received into the Church. And here,

after some time, it pleased our Lord to manifest himself more clearly to my soul ; and give me that full sense of acceptance in him, which excludes all doubt and fear.

“ Indeed the leading of the Spirit is different in different souls. His more usual method, I believe, is, to give, in one and the same moment, forgiveness of sins, and a full assurance of that forgiveness. Yet in many he works as he did in me ; giving first the remission of sins, and after some weeks, or months, or years, the full assurance of it.” (Vol. iii, p. 91.)

All I need observe is, that the first sense of forgiveness is often mixed with doubt or fear. But the full assurance of faith excludes all doubt and fear, as the very term implies.

Therefore, instead of, “ He may not know that he has peace with God till long after,” it should be, (to agree with Michael Linner’s words,) “ He may not have, till long after, the full assurance of faith, which excludes all doubt and fear.”

“ I believe a man is justified at the same time that he is born of God.

“ And he that is born of God sinneth not.

“ Which deliverance from sin he cannot have, without knowing that he has it.”

“ Yet I believe he may not know it till long after.” This also I utterly deny.

26. “ OF THE CONDITIONS OF JUSTIFICATION.

“ I believe, that Christ ‘ formed in us’ ought to be insisted on, as necessary to our justification.”

I no more believe this than Christian David does, whose words concerning it are these :—

“ It pleased God to show me, that Christ in us, and Christ for us, ought to be both insisted on.

“ But I clearly saw we ought not to insist on any thing we feel, any more than any thing we do, as if it were necessary previous to our justification.

“ And before a man can expect to be justified, he should be humble and penitent, and have a broken and contrite heart, that is, should have Christ formed in him.” No ; that is quite another thing. I believe every man is penitent before he is justified ; he repents before he believes the Gospel. But it is never before he is justified, that Christ is formed in him.

“ And that this penitence and contrition is the work of the Holy Ghost.

“ Yet I believe that all this is nothing toward, and has no influence on, our justification.”

Christian David’s words are : “ Observe, this is not the foundation. It is not this by which (for the sake of which) you are justified. This is not the righteousness, this is no part of the righteousness, by which you are reconciled to God. You grieve for your sins ; you are deeply humbled ; your heart is broken. Well ; but all this is nothing to your justification.” The words immediately following fix the sense of this otherwise exceptionable sentence. “ The remission of your sins is not owing to this cause, either in whole or in part. Your humiliation has no influence on that.” Not as a cause ; so the very last words explain it.

“Again, I believe that in order to obtain justification, I must go straight to Christ, with all my ungodliness, and plead nothing else.”

“Yet I believe we should not insist on any thing we do or feel, as if it were necessarily previous to justification.” No, nor on any thing else. So the whole tenor of Christian David’s words implies.

“OF THE EFFECTS OF JUSTIFICATION.

27. “I believe a man may have a strong assurance he is justified, and not be able to affirm he is a child of God.”

Feder’s words are these: “I found my heart at rest, in good hope that my sins were forgiven; of which I had a stronger assurance six weeks after.” (True, comparatively stronger, though still mixed with doubt and fear.) “But I dare not affirm, I am a child of God.” I see no inconsistency in all this. Many such instances I know at this day. I myself was one for some time.

“A man may be fully assured that his sins are forgiven, yet may not be able to tell the day when he received this full assurance; because it grew up in him by degrees.” (Of this also I know a few other instances.) “But from the time this full assurance was confirmed in him, he never lost it.” Very true, and, I think, consistent.

Neuser’s own words are, “In him I found true rest to my soul, being fully assured that all my sins were forgiven. Yet I cannot tell the hour or day when I first received that full assurance. For it was not given me at first, neither at once;” (not in its fulness;) “but grew up in me by degrees. And from the time it was confirmed in me, I have never lost it, having never since doubted, no, not for a moment.”

“A man may have a weak faith, at the same time that he has peace with God, and no unholy desires.”

A man may be justified who has not a clean heart.

28. (11.) Not in the full sense of the word. This I do verily believe is sound divinity, agreeable both to Scripture and experience. And I believe it is consistent with itself. As to the “hundred other absurdities which might be fully and fairly made out,” it will be time enough to consider them when they are produced.

29. (12, 13.) But whether I have succeeded in attempting to reconcile these things or no, I verily think Mr. Tucker has. I desire not a more consistent account of my principles, than he has himself given in the following words:—

“Our spiritual state should be considered distinctly under each of these views:—

“1. Before justification; in which state we may be said to be unable to do any thing acceptable to God; because then we can do nothing but come to Christ; which ought not to be considered as doing any thing, but as supplicating (or waiting) to receive a power of doing for the time to come.

“For the preventing grace of God, which is common to all is sufficient to bring us to Christ, though it is not sufficient to carry us any farther till we are justified.

“2. After justification. The moment a man comes to Christ (by faith) he is justified, and born again; that is, he is born again in the imperfect sense, (for there are two [if not more] degrees of regeneration,) and he has power over all the stirrings and motions of sin, but not a total freedom from them. Therefore he hath not yet, in the full and proper sense,

a new and clean heart. But being exposed to various temptations, he may and will fall again from this condition, if he doth not attain to a more excellent gift.^{55*}

3. Sanctification, the last and highest state of perfection in this life. For then are the faithful born again in the full and perfect sense. Then is there given unto them a new and clean heart; and the struggle between the old and new man is over.†

30. (14.) That I may say many things which have been said before, and perhaps by Calvin or Arminius, by Montanus or Barclay, or the Archbishop of Cambray, is highly probable. But it cannot thence be inferred that I hold a "medley of all their principles;—Calvinism, Arminianism, Montanism, Quakerism, Quietism, all thrown together." There might as well have been added, Judaism, Mohammedanism, Paganism. It would have made the period rounder, and been full as easily proved, I mean asserted. For no other proof is yet produced.

31. I pass over the smaller mistakes which occur in the fifteenth and sixteenth paragraphs, together with the prophecy or prognostication concerning the approaching divisions and downfall of the Methodists. What follows to the end, concerning the ground of our hope, is indeed of greater importance. But we have not as yet the strength of the cause; the dissertation promised, is still behind. Therefore, as my work is great, and my time short, I waive that dispute for the present. And perhaps, when I shall have received farther light, I may be convinced, that "Gospel holiness," as Mr. Tucker believes, "is a necessary qualification, antecedent to justification." This appears to me now to be directly opposite to the Gospel of Christ. But I will endeavour impartially to consider what shall be advanced in defence of it. And may He who knoweth my simplicity, teach me his way, and give me a right judgment in all things!

* "Mr. Charles Wesley," the note says, "was not persuaded of the truth of the Moravian faith, till some time after his brother's return from Germany." There is a great mistake in this. I returned not from Germany till Saturday, September 16. Whereas my brother was fully persuaded of the truth of the Moravian faith (so called) on Wednesday, May 3, preceding. The note adds, "This," that is, justifying faith, "he received but very lately." This also is a mistake. What he believed to be justifying faith, he received May 21, 1738. (Vol. iii, 67, 69.)

† The next note runs thus: "Mr. Wesley has such a peculiar turn and tendency toward inconsistencies in his principles, that in his Preface to Haliburton's Life, (wrote February 9, 1738–9, just after his return from Germany,) he contradicts all that he has said elsewhere for this sinless perfection, viz. 'But it may be said, the Gospel covenant does not promise entire freedom from sin.' What do you mean by the word sin? the infection of nature, or those numberless weaknesses and follies, sometimes (improperly) termed sins of infirmity? If you mean only this, you say most true. We shall not put off these but with our bodies. But if you mean, it does not promise entire freedom from sin, in its proper sense, or from committing sin; this is by no means true, unless the Scriptures be false. For thus it is written, *Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin*, unless he lose the Spirit of adoption, if not finally, yet for a while, as did this child of God: *For his seed remaineth in him, and he cannot sin, because he is born of God*. He cannot sin, so long as he keepeth himself, for then the wicked one toucheth him not."

The question is not, whether this be right or wrong; but whether it contradict any thing I have said elsewhere. Thrice I have spoken expressly on this subject,—in a sermon, and in two prefaces. If in any of these I have contradicted what I said before, I will own the former assertion as a mistake.

AN ANSWER

TO

THE REV. MR. CHURCH'S REMARKS ON THE REV. MR. JOHN WESLEY'S LAST JOURNAL.

IN A LETTER TO THAT GENTLEMAN.

Let not him that girdeth on his harness boast himself as he that putteth it off; 1 KINGS xx, 11.

REVEREND SIR,—1. My first desire and prayer to God is, that I may live peaceably with all men: my next, that if I must dispute at all, it may be with a man of understanding. Thus far, therefore, I rejoice on the present occasion. I rejoice also in that I have confidence of your sincerity, of your real desire to promote the glory of God, by peace and good will among men. I am likewise thankful to God for your calm manner of writing; (a few paragraphs excepted;) and yet more for this,—that such an opponent should, by writing in such a manner, give me an opportunity of explaining myself on those very heads whereon I wanted an occasion so to do.

2. I do not want, indeed, (though perhaps you think I do,) to widen the breach between us, or to represent the difference of the doctrines we severally teach, as greater than it really is. So far from it, that I earnestly wish there were none at all; or, if there must be some, that it may be as small as possible; being fully persuaded, that, could we once agree in doctrines, other differences would soon fall to the ground.

3. In order to contribute, as I am able, to this, it will be my endeavour to acknowledge what I think you have spoken right, and to answer what I cannot think right as yet, with what brevity and clearness I can. I desire to do this in as inoffensive a manner as the nature of the thing will bear, and consistently with that brotherly love which I cannot deny you without wronging my own soul.

4. You sum up your charge thus: "You have now, Sir, my sentiments.—It is impossible for you to put an entire stop to the enormities of the Moravians, while you still, I. Too much commend these men: II. Hold principles in common with them, from which these enormities naturally follow: And, III. Maintain other errors more than theirs, and are guilty of enthusiasm to the highest degree." (*Remarks*, pp. 73, 74.)

I. 1. You, first, charge me with too much commending the Moravians. That the case may be fully understood, I will transcribe the passages which you cite from the Journal concerning them, and then give a general answer:—

"She told me Mr. Molther had advised her, till she received faith, to be still, ceasing from outward works. In the evening, Mr. Bray also was highly commending the being still: he likewise spoke largely of the great danger that attended the doing of outward works, and of the folly of people that keep running about to church and sacrament." (Vol. iii, p. 167.)

"Sunday, November 4. Our society met, and continued silent till eight." (*Ibid.*)

"Sunday, June 22. I spoke thus: Eight or nine months ago, certain men arose, who affirmed that there is no such thing as any means of grace, and that we ought to leave off these works of the law." (*Ibid.* p. 186.)

“You, Mr. Molther, believe that the way to attain faith, is, not to go to church, not to communicate, not to fast, not to use so much private prayer, not to read the Scripture, not to do temporal good, or attempt to do spiritual good.” (*Ibid.* p. 174.)

“You undervalue good works, especially works of outward mercy, never publicly insisting on the necessity of them.” (*Ibid.* p. 225.)

“Some of our brethren asserted, (1.) That till they had true faith, they ought to be still; that is, (as they explained themselves,) to abstain from the means of grace, as they are called, the Lord’s Supper in particular. (2.) That the ordinances are not means of grace, there being no other means than Christ.” (*Ibid.* p. 167.)

“I could not agree, either that none has any faith, so long as he is liable to any doubt or fear; or that, till we have it, we ought to abstain from the ordinances of God.” (*Ibid.*)

“Mr. Br—n speaks so slightly of the means of grace, that many are much grieved to hear him; but others are greatly delighted with him. Ten or fourteen of them meet at our brother Clarke’s, with Mr. Molther, and make a mere jest of going to the church or to the sacrament.” (*Ibid.* p. 172.)

“You, Mr. Molther, believe it is impossible for a man to use these means without trusting in them.” (*Ibid.* p. 174.)

“‘Believers,’ said Mr. Simpson, ‘are not subject to ordinances, and unbelievers have nothing to do with them.’” (*Ibid.* p. 182.)

“‘Believers need not, and unbelievers may not, use them. These do not sin when they abstain from them; but those do sin when they do not abstain.’” (*Ibid.* p. 187.)

“‘For one who is not born of God to read the Scriptures, or to pray, or to communicate, or to do any outward work, is deadly poison. If he does any of these things, he destroys himself.’ Mr. Bell earnestly defended this.” (*Ibid.* p. 189.)

“At eight, the society at Nottingham met: I could not but observe that not one who came in used any prayer at all. I looked for one of our hymnbooks, but both that and the Bible were vanished away, and in the room thereof lay the Moravian Hymns and the Count’s Sermons.” (*Ibid.* p. 212.)

“One of our English brethren, joined with you, said in his public expounding, ‘As many go to hell by praying as by thieving.’ Another, ‘I knew one who, leaning over the back of a chair, received a great gift. But he must kneel down to give God thanks: so he lost it immediately; and I know not whether he will ever have it again.’ And yet another: ‘You have lost your first joy. Therefore, you pray: that is the devil. You read the Bible: that is the devil. You communicate: that is the devil.’” (*Ibid.* p. 224.)

“They affirmed that there is no commandment in the New Testament but to believe; that no other duty lies upon us; and that, when a man does believe, he is not bound or obliged to do any thing which is commanded there.” (*Ibid.* p. 186.)

“Mr. St— told me, ‘No one has any degree of faith till he is perfect as God is perfect.’” (*Ibid.* p. 182.)

“You believe there are no degrees in faith.” (*Ibid.*)

“I have heard Mr. Molther affirm, that there is no justifying faith where there is ever any doubt.” (*Ibid.* p. 223.)

“The moment a man is justified, he is sanctified wholly. Thenceforth, till death, he is neither more nor less holy.” (*Ibid.* p. 220.)

“We are to grow in grace, but not in holiness.” (*Ibid.* p. 220.)

2. I have frequently observed that I wholly disapprove of all these positions: “That there are no degrees in faith; that in order to attain

faith we must abstain from all the ordinances of God; that a believer does not grow in holiness; and that he is not obliged to keep the commandments of God." But I must also observe, (1.) That you ought not to charge the Moravian Church with the first of these; since in the very page from which you quote those words, "There is no justifying faith where there is ever any doubt," that note occurs: "In the preface to the Second Journal, the Moravian Church is cleared from this mistake." (2.) That with respect to the ordinances of God, their practice is better than their principle. They do use them themselves, I am a witness; and that with reverence and godly fear. Those expressions, however, of our own countrymen are utterly indefensible; as I think are Mr. Molther's also; who was quickly after recalled into Germany. The great fault of the Moravian Church seems to lie in not openly disclaiming all he had said; which in all probability they would have done, had they not leaned to the same opinion. I must, (3.) Observe that I never knew one of the Moravian Church, but that single person, affirm that a believer does not grow in holiness. And perhaps he would not affirm it on reflection. But I am still afraid their whole Church is tainted with Quietism, Universal Salvation, and Antinomianism: I speak, as I said elsewhere, of Antinomian opinions, abstracted from practice, good or bad.

3. But I should rejoice if there lay no other objection against them, than that of erroneous opinions. I know in some measure how to have compassion on the ignorant: I know the incredible force of prepossession. And God only knows, what ignorance or error (all things considered) is invincible; and what allowance his mercy will make, in such cases, to those who desire to be led into all truth. But how far what follows may be imputed to invincible ignorance or prepossession, I cannot tell.

Many of "you greatly, yea, above measure, exalt yourselves, (as a Church,) and despise others. I have scarce heard one Moravian brother own his Church to be wrong in any thing. Many of you I have heard speak of it, as if it were infallible. Some of you have set it up as the judge of all the earth, of all persons as well as doctrines. Some of you have said, that there is no true Church but yours; yea, that there are no true Christians out of it. And your own members you require to have implicit faith in her decisions, and to pay implicit obedience to her directions." (Vol. iii, p. 224.)

I can in no degree justify these things. And yet neither can I look upon them in the same light that you do, as "some of the very worst things which are objected to the Church of Rome." (*Remarks*, p. 7.) They are exceeding great mistakes: yet in as great mistakes have holy men both lived and died;—Thomas à Kempis, for instance, and Francis Sales. And yet I doubt not they are now in Abraham's bosom.

4. I am more concerned for their "despising and decrying self denial;" for their "extending Christian liberty beyond all warrant of holy writ;" for their "want of zeal for good works;" and, above all, for their supposing, that "we may, on some accounts, use guile;" in consequence of which they do "use guile or dissimulation in many cases." "Nay, in many of them I have found" (not in all, nor in most,) "much subtlety, much evasion and disguise; so 'becoming all things

to all men,' as to take the colour and shape of any that were near them." (*Ibid.* pp. 208, 174, 226, 223.)

I can neither defend nor excuse those among the Moravians whom I have found guilty of this. But neither can I condemn all for the sake of some. Every man shall give an account of himself to God.

But you say, "Your protesting against some of their opinions is not sufficient to discharge you. Have you not prepared the way for these Moravians, by countenancing and commending them; and by still speaking of them as if they were in the main the best Christians in the world, and only deluded or mistaken in a few points?" (*Remarks*, pp. 11, 12.)

I cannot speak of them otherwise than I think. And I still think, (1.) That God has some thousands in our own Church who have the faith and love which is among them, without those errors either of judgment or practice. (2.) That, next to these, the body of the Moravian Church, however mistaken some of them are, are in the main, of all whom I have seen, the best Christians in the world.

5. Because I am continually charged with inconsistency herein, even by the Moravians themselves, it may be "needful to give a short account of what has occurred between us from the beginning.

"My first acquaintance with the Moravian brethren began in my voyage to Georgia. Being then with many of them in the same ship, I narrowly observed their whole behaviour. And I greatly approved of all I saw." (The particulars are related in the First Journal.)

"From February 14, 1735, to December 2, 1737, being with them (except when I went to Frederica or Carolina) twice or thrice every day, I loved and esteemed them more and more. Yet a few things I could not approve of. These I mentioned to them from time to time, and then commended the cause to God.

"In February following I met with Peter Böhler. My heart clave to him as soon as he spoke. And the more we conversed, so much the more did I esteem both him and the Moravian Church. So that I had no rest in my spirit till I executed the design which I had formed long before; till, after a short stay in Holland, I hastened forward, first to Marienbourn, and then to Hernhuth."*

It may be observed, that I had before seen a few things in the Moravians which I could not approve of. In this journey I saw a few more, in the midst of many excellent things; in consequence whereof, "in September, 1738, soon after my return to England, I began the following letter to the Moravian Church. But being fearful of trusting my own judgment, I determined to wait yet a little longer, and so laid it by unfinished:—

"MY DEAR BRETHREN,—I cannot but rejoice in your steadfast faith, in your love to our blessed Redeemer, your deadness to the world, your meekness, temperance, chastity, and love of one another. I greatly approve of your conferences and bands,† of your methods of instructing children; and, in general, of your great care of the souls committed to your charge.

"But of some other things I stand in doubt, which I will mention in love and meekness. And I wish that, in order to remove those doubts,

* These are the words of the Fourth Journal, vol. iii, page 226, &c.

† The Band society in London began May 1, some time before I set out for Germany.

you would, on each of those heads, First, plainly answer whether the fact be as I suppose; and if so, Secondly, consider whether it be right.

“ Is not the Count all in all among you ?

“ Do you not magnify your own Church too much ?

“ Do you not use guile and dissimulation in many cases ?

“ Are you not of a close, dark, reserved temper and behaviour ?

“ It may easily be seen, that my objections then were nearly the same as now.” Only with this difference,—I was not then assured that the facts were as I supposed. “ Yet I cannot say my affection was lessened at all: (for I did not dare to determine any thing :) but from November 1, I could not but see more and more things which I could not reconcile with the Gospel.”

“ These I have set down with all simplicity. Yet do I this, because I love them not? God knoweth: yea, and in part, I esteem them still; because I verily believe they have a sincere desire to serve God; because many of them have tasted of his love, and some retain it in simplicity; because they love one another; because they have so much of the truth of the Gospel, and so far abstain from outward sin. And lastly, because their discipline is, in most respects, so truly excellent; notwithstanding that visible blemish, the paying too much regard to their great patron and benefactor, Count Zinzendorf.”

6. I believe if you coolly consider this account, you will not find, either that it is inconsistent with itself, or that it lays you under any necessity of speaking in the following manner: “ What charms there may be in a demure look and a sour behaviour, I know not. But sure they must be in your eye very extraordinary, as they can be sufficient to cover such a multitude of errors and crimes, and keep up the same regard and affection for the authors and abettors of them. I doubt your regard for them was not lessened, till they began to interfere with what you thought your province. You was influenced, not by a just resentment to see the honour of religion and virtue so injuriously and scandalously trampled upon, but by a fear of losing your own authority.” (*Remarks*, pp. 18, 19.)

I doubt, there is scarce one line of all these which is consistent either with truth or love. But I will transcribe a few more, before I answer: “ How could you so long and so intimately converse with, so much commend, and give such countenance to, such desperately wicked people as the Moravians, according to your own account, were known by you to be? And you still speak of them, as if they were, in the main, the best Christians in the world. In one place you say, ‘ A few things I could not approve of;’ but in God’s name, sir, is the contempt of almost the whole of our duty, of every Christian ordinance, to be so gently touched? Can detestation in such a case be too strongly expressed? Either they are some of the vilest wretches in the world, or you are the falsest accuser in the world. Christian charity has scarce an allowance to make for them as you have described them. If you have done this truly, they ought to be discouraged by all means that can be imagined.”

7. Let us now weigh these assertions. “ They” (that is, “ the charms of their *sour* behaviour”) “ must be in your eye very extraordinary.”—Do not you stumble at the threshold? The Moravians excel in sweetness of behaviour. “ As they can be sufficient to cover such a multitude of errors and crimes.” *Such a multitude of errors and*

crimes! I believe, as to errors, they hold universal salvation, and are partly Antinomians, (in opinion,) and partly Quietists; and for this cause I cannot join with them. But where is the multitude of errors? Whosoever knows two or three hundred more, let him please to mention them.

Such a multitude of crimes too! That some of them have used guile, and are of a close reserved behaviour, I know. And I excuse them not. But to this multitude of crimes I am an utter stranger. Let him prove this charge upon them who can. For me, I declare I cannot.

“To keep up the same regard and affection.”—Not so. I say, my affection was not lessened, till after September, 1739, till I had proof of what I had feared before. But I had not the same degree of regard for them when I saw the dark as well as the bright side of their character. “I doubt your regard for them was not lessened till they began to interfere with what you thought your province.” If this were only a doubt, it were not much amiss; but it presently shoots up into an assertion, equally groundless; for my regard for them lessened, even while I was in Georgia; but it increased again after my return from thence, especially while I was at Hernhuth; and it gradually lessened again for some years, as I saw more and more which I approved not. How then does it appear that “I was influenced herein, by a fear of losing my own authority; not by a just resentment to see the honour of religion and virtue so scandalously trampled upon?”—*Trampled upon!* By whom? Not by the Moravians: I never saw any such thing among them.

But what do you mean by “a just resentment?” I hope you do not mean what is commonly called *zeal*; a flame which often “sets on fire the whole course of nature, and is itself set on fire of hell!” “Rivers of water run from my eyes, because men keep not thy law.” This resentment on such an occasion I understand. From all other may God deliver me!

8. You go on: “How could you so long and so intimately converse with—such desperately wicked people as the Moravians, according to your own account, were known by you to be?” O sir, what another assertion is this! “The Moravians, according to your *own account*, were known by you to be desperately wicked people, while you intimately conversed with them!” Utterly false and injurious. I never gave any such account. I conversed intimately with them, both at Savannah and Hernhuth. But neither then, nor at any other time, did I know, or think, or say, they were “desperately wicked people.” I think and say, nay, you blame me for saying, just the reverse, viz. that though I soon “found among them a few things which I could not approve;” yet I believe they are “in the main some of the best Christians in the world.”

You surprise me yet more in going on thus: “In God’s name, sir, is the contempt of almost the whole of our duty, of every Christian ordinance, to be so very gently touched?” Sir, this is not the case. This charge no more belongs to the Moravians, than that of murder. Some of our countrymen spoke very wicked things. The Moravians did not sufficiently disavow them. These are the premises. By what art can you extort so dreadful a conclusion from them?

“Can detestation, in such a case, be too strongly expressed?” Indeed it can; even were the case as you suppose. “Either they are some

of the vilest wretches in the world, or you are the falsest accuser in the world." Neither one nor the other: though I prove what I allege, yet they may be, in the main, good men. "Charity has scarce an allowance to make for them, as you have described them." I have described them as of a mixed character, with much evil among them, but more good. Is it not a strange kind of charity, which cannot find an allowance to make in such a case? "If you have described them truly, they ought to be discouraged by all means that can be imagined." *By all means!* I hope not by fire and faggot; though the *house of mercy* imagines these to be, of all means, most effectual.

9. You proceed: "How can you justify the many good things you say of the Moravians, notwithstanding this character? You say they love God: but how can this be, when they even plead against keeping most of his commandments? You say, you believe they have a sincere desire to serve God. How, then, can they despise his service in so many instances? You declare some of them much holier than any people you had yet known. Strange! if they fail in so many prime points of Christian duty, and this not only habitually and presumptuously, but even to the denying their use and necessity. You praise them for trampling under foot 'the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eye, and the pride of life:' and yet you make them a close, reserved, insincere, deceitful people.

"How you will explain those things I know not," (*Remarks*, pp. 20, 21.) By nakedly declaring each thing as it is. They are, I believe, the most self-inconsistent people now under the sun: and I describe them just as I find them; neither better nor worse, but leaving the good and bad together. Upon this ground I can very easily justify the saying many good things of them, as well as bad. For instance: I am still persuaded that they (many of them) love God;—although many others of them ignorantly "plead against the keeping," not "most," but some "of his commandments." I believe "they have a sincere desire to serve God:" and yet, in several instances, some of them, I think, despise that manner of serving him which I know God hath ordained. I believe some of them are much holier than any people I had known in August, 1740: yet sure I am that others among them fail, not indeed in the "prime points of Christian duty," (for these are faith, and the love of God and man,) but in several points of no small importance. Not that they herein sin presumptuously, neither; for they are fully, though erroneously, persuaded in their own minds. From the same persuasion they act, when they, in some sense, deny the use or necessity of those ordinances. How far that persuasion will justify or excuse them, I leave to Him who knoweth their hearts. Lastly, I believe they trample under foot, in a good degree, "the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eye, and the pride of life:" and yet many of them use reserve, yea, guile. Therefore my soul mourns for them in secret places.

10. "But I must observe," you say, "that you fall not only into inconsistencies, but into direct contradictions. You commend them for 'loving one another in a manner the world knoweth not of;' and yet you charge them with being 'in the utmost confusion, biting and devouring one another.' You say, 'They caution us against natural love of one another; and had well nigh destroyed brotherly love from among us.'

"You praise them for 'using no diversions, but such as become saints;' and for 'not regarding outward adorning:' yet you say, they 'conform to the world in wearing gold and costly apparel; and by joining in worldly diversions, in order to do good.'

"You call their discipline, 'in most respects, truly excellent.' I wish you had more fully explained yourself. I am sure it is no sign of good discipline, to permit such abominations. And you tell them yourself, 'I can show you such a subordination as answers all Christian purposes, and yet is as distant from that among you as the heavens are from the earth.'

"You mention it as a good effect of their discipline, that 'every one knows and keeps his proper rank.' Soon after, as if it were with a design to confute yourself, you say, 'Our brethren have neither wisdom enough to guide, nor prudence enough to let it alone.'

"And now, sir, how can you reconcile these opposite descriptions?" (*Ibid.* pp. 21, 22.) Just as easily as those before, by simply declaring the thing as it is. "You commend them," (the Moravians,) "for loving one another; and yet charge them with biting and devouring one another." (Vol. iii, pp. 166, 173.) *Them!* Whom? Not the Moravians; but the English-brethren of Fetter-lane, before their union with the Moravians. Here, then, is no shadow of contradiction. For the two sentences do not relate to the same persons.

"You say, 'They had well nigh destroyed brotherly love from among us;' partly by 'cautions against natural love.'" (*Ibid.* p. 225.) It is a melancholy truth; so they had. But we had then no connection with them. Neither, therefore, does this contradict their "loving one another in a manner the world knoweth not of."

"You praise them for using no diversions but such as become saints;" (*Ibid.* p. 166;) "and yet say," (I recite the whole sentence,) "I have heard some of you affirm, that 'Christian salvation implies liberty to conform to the world, by joining in worldly diversions, in order to do good.'" (*Ibid.* p. 223.) And both these are true. The Moravians, in general, "use no diversions but such as become saints;" and yet I have heard some of them affirm, in contradiction to their own practice, that "one then mentioned did well, when he joined in playing at tennis in order to do good."

11. "You praise them for not 'regarding outward adorning.'" (*Ibid.* p. 166.) So I do, the bulk of the congregation. "And yet you say," (I again recite the whole sentence,) "I have heard some of you affirm, that 'Christian salvation implies liberty to conform to the world, by putting on of gold and costly apparel.'" (*Ibid.* p. 223.) I have so. And I blame them the more, because they are condemned by the general practice of their own Church.

"You call their discipline 'in most respects truly excellent.'" (*Ibid.* p. 166.) I could wish you had more fully explained yourself." I have, in the Second Journal, (*Ibid.* pp. 83-103.) "It is no sign of good discipline to permit such abominations;" that is, error in opinion, and guile in practice. True, it is not; nor is it any demonstration against it. For there may be good discipline even in a college of Jesuits. Another fault is, too great a deference to the Count. And yet, "in most respects, their discipline is truly excellent."

"You mention it as a good effect of their discipline, that 'every one

knows and keeps his proper rank.' (*Ibid.* p. 166.) Soon after, as it were with a design to confute yourself, you say, 'Our brethren have neither wisdom enough to guide, nor prudence enough to let it alone.'" (*Ibid.* p. 172.) Pardon me, sir, I have no design either to confute or to contradict myself in these words. The former sentence is spoken of the Moravian brethren; the latter, of the English brethren of Fetter-lane.

12. You need not therefore "imagine, that either the strong pretences or warm professions of the Moravians," or their "agreeing with me on some favourite topics," (for my love to them was antecedent to any such agreement,) "induce me to overlook their iniquity, and to forgive their other crimes." (*Remarks*, p. 23.) No. I love them upon quite different grounds; even because I believe, notwithstanding all their faults, they "love the Lord Jesus in sincerity," and have a measure of "the mind that was in him." And I am in great earnest when I declare once more, that I have a deep, abiding conviction, by how many degrees the good which is among them overbalances the evil; that I cannot speak of them but with tender affection, were it only for the benefits I have received from them; and that, at this hour, I desire union with them (were those stumbling blocks once put away, which have hitherto made that desire ineffectual) above all things under heaven.

II. 1. Your second charge is, "That I hold, in common with them, principles from which their errors naturally follow." You mean justification by faith alone. To set things in the clearest light I can, I will first observe what I hold, and what you object; and then inquire what the consequences have been.

First. As to what I hold. My latest thoughts upon justification are expressed in the following words:—

"Justification sometimes means our acquittal at the last day. But this is out of the present question; that justification whereof our Articles and Homilies speak, meaning present pardon and acceptance with God; who therein declares his righteousness and mercy, by or for the remission of the sins that are past.

"I believe, the condition of this is faith: I mean, not only, that without faith we cannot be justified; but also, that, as soon as any one has true faith, in that moment he is justified.

"Good works follow this faith, but cannot go before it. Much less can sanctification, which implies a continued course of good works, springing from holiness of heart. But—entire sanctification goes before our justification at the last day.

"It is allowed, that repentance, and 'fruits meet for repentance,' go before faith. Repentance absolutely must go before faith; fruits meet for it, if there be opportunity. By repentance I mean, conviction of sin, producing real desires and sincere resolutions of amendment; and by 'fruits meet for repentance,' forgiving our brother, ceasing from evil, doing good, using the ordiuanees of God, and, in general, obeying him according to the measure of grace which we have received. But these I cannot, as yet, term good works, because they do not spring from faith and the love of God." (*Farther Appeal to Men of Reason and Religion*, pp. 34, 35.)

2. "Faith, in general, is a divine, supernatural $\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\gamma\chi\omicron\varsigma$ (evidence or conviction) of things not seen, not discoverable by our bodily senses, as being either past, future, or spiritual. Justifying faith implies, not only a divine $\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\gamma\chi\omicron\varsigma$ [evidence or conviction] that God 'was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself,' but a sure trust and confidence that Christ

died for my sins, that he loved me, and gave himself for me. And the moment a penitent sinner thus believes, God pardons and absolves him." (*Ibid.* p. 35.)

Now, it being allowed, that both inward and outward holiness are the stated conditions of final justification, what more can you desire, who have hitherto opposed justification by faith alone merely upon a principle of conscience, because you was zealous for holiness and good works? Do I not effectually secure these from contempt, at the same time that I defend the doctrines of the Church? I not only allow, but vehemently contend, that none shall ever enter into glory, who is not holy on earth, as well in heart as "in all manner of conversation." I cry aloud, "Let all that have believed, be careful to maintain good works;" and, "Let every one that nameth the name of Christ, depart from all iniquity." I exhort even those who are conscious they do not believe, "Cease to do evil, learn to do well. The kingdom of heaven is at hand;" therefore, "repent, and bring forth fruits meet for repentance." Are not these directions the very same, in substance, which you yourself would give to persons so circumstanced?

3. "Many of those who are perhaps as zealous of good works as you, think I have allowed you too much. Nay, my brethren, but how can we help allowing it, if we allow the Scriptures to be from God? For is it not written, and do not you yourselves believe, 'Without holiness no man shall see the Lord?' And how then, without fighting about words, can we deny, that holiness is a condition of final acceptance? And as to the first acceptance or pardon, does not all experience as well as Scripture prove, that no man ever yet truly believed the Gospel who did not first repent. Repentance therefore we cannot deny to be necessarily previous to faith. Is it not equally undeniable, that the running back into wilful, known sin (suppose it were drunkenness or uncleanness) stifles that repentance or conviction? And can that repentance come to any good issue in his soul, who resolves not to forgive his brother? or who obstinately refrains from what God convinces him is right, whether it be prayer or hearing his word? Would you scruple yourself to tell one of these, 'Unto him that hath shall be given; but from him that hath not,' that is, uses it not, 'shall be taken even that which he hath?' Would you scruple to say this? But in saying this, you allow all which I have said, viz. that previous to justifying faith, there *must* be repentance, and, if opportunity permit, 'fruits meet for repentance.'

"And yet I allow you this, that although both repentance and the fruits thereof are in some sense necessary before justification, yet neither the one nor the other is necessary in the same sense, or in the same degree, with faith. Not in the same degree. For in whatever moment a man believes, (in the Christian sense of the word,) he is justified, his sins are blotted out, 'his faith is counted to him for righteousness.' But it is not so, at whatever moment he repents, or brings forth any or all the fruits of repentance. Faith alone therefore justifies; which repentance alone does not; much less any outward work. And consequently, none of these are necessary to justification, in the same degree with faith.

"Nor in the same sense. For none of these has so direct, immediate a relation to justification as faith. This is proximately necessary thereto; repentance remotely, as it is necessary to the increase or continuance of repentance.* And even in this sense, these are only necessary on supposition,—if there be time and opportunity for them; for in many instances

* See this glaring misprint of one of the earliest editions corrected by Mr. Wesley himself in a subsequent part of this volume, p. 302.—EDIT.

there is not; but God cuts short his work, and faith prevents the fruits of repentance: so that the general proposition is not overthrown, but clearly established, by these concessions; and we conclude still, that faith alone is the proximate condition of justification."

4. This is what I hold concerning justification. I am next, briefly to observe what you object. "If faith," say you, "is the sole condition of justification, then it is our sole duty." (*Remarks*, p. 25.) I deny the consequence. Faith may be, in the sense above described, the sole condition of justification; and yet not only repentance be our duty before, but all obedience after, we believe.

You go on: "If good works are not conditions of our justification, they are not conditions of our (final) salvation." (p. 25.) I deny the consequence again. Good works, properly so called, cannot be the conditions of justification; because it is impossible to do any good work before we are justified. And yet, notwithstanding, good works may be, and are conditions of final salvation. For who will say it is impossible to do any good work before we are finally saved?

You proceed: "Can we be saved in the contemptuous neglect of repentance, prayer," &c? (p. 26.) No, nor justified neither; but while they are previous to faith, these are not allowed to be good works.

You afterward argue from my own concessions, thus: "Your notion of true stillness is, 'a patient waiting upon God, by lowliness, meekness, and resignation, in all the ways of his holy law, and the works of his commandments.' But how is it possible to reconcile to this, the position, that these duties are not conditions of our justification? If we are justified without them, we may be saved without them. This consequence cannot be too often repeated." (p. 26.)

Let it be repeated ever so often, it is good for nothing. For, far other qualifications are required in order to our standing before God in glory, than were required in order to his giving us faith and pardon. In order to this, nothing is indispensably required, but repentance, or conviction of sin. But in order to the other it is indispensably required, that we be fully "cleansed from all sin;" that the "very God of peace sanctify us wholly," even *το ὅλον κληρον ἡμῶν*, "our entire body, soul, and spirit." It is not necessary, therefore, (nor indeed possible,) that we should, before justification, "patiently wait upon God, by lowliness, meekness, and resignation, in all the ways of his holy law." And yet it is necessary in the highest degree, that we should thus wait upon him after justification: otherwise, how shall we be "meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light?"

5. Soon after, you add: "In the passages last cited, you plead for the necessity of a good life: but in others, the force of your principles shows itself. An answer approved by you, is, 'My heart is desperately wicked; but I have no doubt or fear; I know my Saviour loves me, and I love him.' Both these particulars are impossible, if the Scripture be true." (p. 29.)

You amaze me! Is it possible you should be ignorant that your own heart is desperately wicked? Yet I dare not say, either that God does not love you, or that you do not love him.

"Again: you say, you described the state of those who have forgiveness of sins, but not a clean heart;" (p. 30;) not in the full, proper

sense. Very true ; but even then they had power over both inward and outward corruptions ; far from being, as you suppose, “ still wedded to their vices, and resolved to continue in them.”

“ In another place, after having observed that ‘ sin does remain in one that is justified, though it has not dominion over him,’ you go on : ‘ But fear not, though you have an evil heart ; yet a little while, and you shall be endued with power from on high, whereby ye may purify yourselves, even as he is pure.’ Sinners, if they believe this, may be quite secure, and imagine they have nothing to fear, though they continue in their iniquities. For God’s sake, sir, speak out. If they that have an evil heart have not, who has reason to fear ?” (p. 31.) All who have not dominion over sin ; all who continue in their iniquities. You, for one, if any sin has dominion over you. If so, I testify against you this day, (and you will not be quite secure, if you believe me,) “ The wrath of God abideth on you !”

“ What do you mean by, ‘ sin remains in one that is justified ?’ that he is guilty of any known, wilful, habitual sin ?” (p. 32.) Judge by what has gone before :—I mean the same as our Church means by, “ sin remains in the regenerate.”

6. You proceed to another passage, which in the Journal stands thus :—

“ After we had wandered many years in the new path of salvation by faith and works, about two years ago it pleased God to show us the old way of salvation by faith only. And many soon tasted of this salvation, being justified freely, having peace with God, ‘ rejoicing in hope of the glory of God,’ and having ‘ his love shed abroad in their hearts.’ ” (Vol. iii, p. 186.) ‘ Thus I define what I mean by this salvation, viz. “ righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost.”’

But you object, “ Here you deny the necessity of good works in order to salvation.” (*Remarks*, p. 33.) I deny the necessity, nay, possibility, of good works, as previous to this salvation ; as previous to faith or those fruits of faith, “ righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost.” This is my real sentiment, not a slip of my pen, neither any proof of my want of accuracy.

7. “ I shall now,” you say, “ consider the account you give, in this Journal, of the doctrine of justification.” (*Remarks*, p. 30.)

I will recite the whole, just as it stands, together with the occasion of it :—

“ In the afternoon I was informed how many who cannot, in terms, deny it,—explain justification by faith. They say, ‘ (1.) Justification is two-fold ; the first in this life, the second at the last day. (2.) Both these are by faith alone, that is, by objective faith, or by the merits of Christ, which are the object of our faith.’ And this, they say, is all that St. Paul and the Church mean by, ‘ we are justified by faith only.’ But they add, (3.) ‘ We are not justified by subjective faith alone, that is, by the faith which is in us. But good works also must be added to this faith, as a joint condition both of the first and second justification.’

“ In flat opposition to this, I cannot but maintain, (at least, till I have clearer light,) (1.) That the justification which is spoken of by St. Paul to the Romans, and in our Articles, is not two-fold. It is one, and no more. It is the present remission of our sins, or our first acceptance with God. (2.) It is true, that the merits of Christ are the sole cause of this

our justification. But it is not true, that this is all which St. Paul and our Church mean by our being justified by faith only; neither is it true, that either St. Paul or the Church mean, by faith, the merits of Christ. But, (3.) By our being justified by faith only, both St. Paul and the Church mean, that the condition of our justification is faith alone, and not good works; inasmuch as all works done before justification have in them the nature of sin. Lastly, That faith which is the sole condition of justification, is the faith which is wrought in us by the grace of God. It is a sure trust which a man hath, that Christ hath loved him and died for him." (Vol. iii, p. 172.)

8. To the first of these propositions you object, "that justification is not only two-fold, but manifold. For a man may possibly sin many times, and as many times be justified or forgiven." (*Remarks*, pp. 37-39.)

I grant it. I grant also, that justification sometimes means a state of acceptance with God. But all this does not in the least affect my assertion, that "that justification which is spoken of by St. Paul to the Romans, and by our Church in the eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth Articles, is not our acquittal at the last day, but the present remission of our sins."

You add, "You write in other places so variously about this matter, that I despair to find any consistency. Once you held 'a degree of justifying faith, short of the full assurance of faith, the abiding witness of the Spirit, or the clear perception that Christ abideth in him;' and yet you afterward 'warned all not to think they were justified before they had a clear assurance, that God had forgiven their sins.' What difference there is between this clear assurance, and the former full assurance and clear perception, I know not." (p. 40.)

Let us go on step by step, and you will know. "Once you held 'a degree of justifying faith, short of the full assurance of faith, the abiding witness of the Spirit, or the clear perception that Christ abideth in him.'" And so I hold still, and have done for some years. "And yet you afterward warned all not to think they were justified before they had a clear assurance that God had forgiven their sins." I did so. "What difference there is between this clear assurance, and that full assurance and clear perception, I know not." Sir, I will tell you. The one is an assurance that my sins are forgiven, clear at first, but soon clouded with doubt or fear. The other is such a plerophory or full assurance that I am forgiven, and so clear a perception that Christ abideth in me, as utterly excludes all doubt and fear, and leaves them no place, no, not for an hour. So that the difference between them is as great as the difference between the light of the morning and that of the mid-day sun.

9. On the second proposition you remark, (1.) That I "ought to have said, the merits of Christ are (not the *sole* cause, but) the *sole meritorious* cause of this our justification." (p. 41.) (2.) That "St. Paul and the Church, by justifying faith mean, faith in the Gospel and merits of Christ." The very thing; so I contend, in flat opposition to those who say they mean only the object of this faith.

Upon the third proposition, "By our being justified by faith only, both St. Paul and the Church mean, that the condition of our justification is faith alone, and not good works;" you say, "Neither of them mean any such thing. You greatly wrong them, in ascribing so mischievous a

sentiment to them." (*Ibid.*) Let me beg you, sir, to have patience, and calmly to consider, (1.) What I mean by this proposition. Why should you any longer run as uncertainly, and fight as one that beateth the air? (2.) What is advanced touching the sentiments of the Church, in the tract referred to above. Till you have done this, it would be mere loss of time to dispute with you on this head.

I waive, therefore, for the present, the consideration of some of your following pages. Only I cannot quite pass over that (I believe, new) assertion, "that the thirteenth Article, entitled, 'Of Works done before Justification,' does not speak of works done before justification, but of works before grace, which is a very different thing!" (p. 45.) I beseech you, sir, to consider the eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth Articles, just as they lie, in one view: and you cannot but see that it is as absolutely impossible to maintain that proposition, as it is to prove that the eleventh and twelfth Articles speak not of justification, but of some very different thing.

10. Against that part of the fourth proposition, "Faith is a sure trust which a man hath, that Christ loved him and died for him," you object, "This definition is absurd; as it supposes that such a sure trust can be in one who does not repent of his sins." (p. 48.) I suppose quite the contrary, as I have declared over and over; nor, therefore, is there any such danger as you apprehend.

But you say, "There is nothing distinguishing enough in this to point out the true justifying faith." (*Ibid.*) I grant it; supposing a man were to write a book, and say this of it, and no more. But did you ever see any treatise of mine, wherein I said this of faith, and no more? nothing whereby to distinguish true faith from false? Touching this Journal, your own quotations prove the contrary. Yea, and I every where insist, that we are to distinguish them by their fruits, by inward and outward righteousness, by the peace of God filling and ruling the heart, and by patient, active joy in the Holy Ghost.

You conclude this point: "I have now, sir, examined at large your account of justification; and, I hope, fully refuted the several articles in which you have comprised it." (p. 49.) We differ in our judgment. I do not apprehend you have refuted any one proposition of the four. You have, indeed, amended the second, by adding the word *meritorious*; for which I give you thanks.

11. You next give what you style, "the Christian scheme of justification;" (p. 50;) and afterward point out the consequences which you apprehend to have attended the preaching justification by faith; the Third point into which I was to inquire.

You open the cause thus: "The denying the necessity of good works, as the condition of justification, directly draws after it, or rather includes in it, all manner of impiety and vice. It has often perplexed and disturbed the minds of men, and in the last century occasioned great confusions in this nation. These are points which are ever liable to misconstructions, and have ever yet been more or less attended with them. And it appears from what you have lately published, that, since you have preached the doctrine, it has had its old consequences, or rather worse ones; it has been more misunderstood, more perverted and abused, than ever." (pp. 1, 2.)

“The denying the necessity of good works, as the condition of justification, draws after it, or rather includes in it, all manner of impiety and vice.” Here stands the proposition; but where is the proof? Till that appears, I simply say, It does not.

“It has often perplexed and disturbed the minds of men.” And so have many other points in St. Paul’s Epistles.

“But these are points which are ever liable to misconstructions; and have ever yet, more or less, been attended with them.” And what points of revealed religion are those which are not ever liable to misconstructions? Or of what material point can we say, that it has not ever yet, more or less, been attended with them?

“In the last century it occasioned great confusions in this nation.” *It occasioned!* No; in no wise. It is demonstrable, the occasions of those confusions were quite of another kind.

“And it appears, that since you have preached the doctrine, it has had its old consequences, or rather worse. It has been more misunderstood, more perverted and abused, than ever.” What! worse consequences than regicide, (which, you say, was the old one,) and making our whole land a field of blood? Or has it been more perverted and abused than when (in your account) it overturned the whole frame both of Church and State?

12. You go on: “The terms of the Gospel are, repentance toward God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ. But when we undervalue either of these terms, we involve the consciences of the weak in fatal perplexities; we give a handle to others to justify their impieties; we confirm the enemies of religion in their prejudices.” (*Remarks*, p. 2.)

All this I grant. But it affects not me. For I do not undervalue either faith or repentance.

“Was not irreligion and vice already prevailing enough in the nation, but we must—throw snares in people’s way, and root out the remains of piety and devotion, in the weak and well meaning? That this has been the case, your own confessions put beyond all doubt. And you even now hold and teach the principles from which these dangerous consequences do plainly and directly follow.” (p. 3.)

“Was not irreligion and vice already prevailing enough,” (whether I have increased them we will consider by and by,) “but we must throw snares in people’s way?” God forbid! My whole life is employed in taking those snares out of people’s way, which the world and the devil have thrown there. “And root out the remains of piety and devotion in the weak and well meaning?” Of whom speaketh the prophet this? of himself, or of some other man? “Your own confessions put this beyond all doubt.” What! that “I root out the remains of piety and devotion?” Not so. The sum of them all recited above amounts to this and no more: “That while my brother and I were absent from London, many weak men were tainted with wrong opinions, most of whom we recovered at our return; but even those who continued therein did, notwithstanding, continue to live a holier life than ever they did before they heard us preach.” “And you even now hold the principles from which these dangerous consequences do plainly and directly follow.” But I know not where to find these consequences, unless it be in your title page. There indeed I read of the very fatal tendency of

justification by faith only: "The divisions and perplexities of the Methodists, and the many errors relating both to faith and practice, which," as you conceive, "have already arisen among these deluded people."

However, "you charitably believe, I was not aware of these consequences at first." (*Remarks*, p. 4.) No, nor am I yet; though it is strange I should not, if they so naturally succeed that doctrine. I will go a step farther. I do not know, neither believe, that they ever did succeed that doctrine, unless perhaps accidentally, as they might have succeeded any doctrine whatsoever. And till the contrary is proved, those consequences cannot show that these principles are not true.

13. Another consequence which you charge on my preaching justification by faith, is, the introducing the errors of the Moravians. "Had the people," say you, "gone on in a quiet and regular practice of their duty, as most of them did before you deluded them, it would have been impossible for the Moravian tenets to have prevailed among them. But when they had been long and often used to hear good works undervalued, I cannot wonder that they should plunge into new errors, and wax worse and worse." (p. 12.)

This is one string of mistakes. "Had the people gone on in a quiet and regular practice of their duty, as most of them did before you deluded them." *Deluded them!* Into what? Into the love of God and all mankind, and a zealous care to keep his commandments. I would to God this delusion (if such it is accounted) may spread to the four corners of the earth! But how did most of them go on before they were thus deluded? Four in five, by a moderate computation, even as other baptized Heathens, in the works of the devil, in all the "wretchlessness of most unclean living." "In a quiet and regular practice of their duty!" What duty? the duty of cursing and swearing; the duty of gluttony and drunkenness; the duty of whoredom and adultery; or of beating one another, and any that came in their way? In this (not very "quiet or regular") practice did most of those go on before they heard us, who have now "put off the old man with his deeds," and are "holy in all manner of conversation."

Have these, think you, "been long and often used to hear good works undervalued?" Or, are they prepared for receiving the Moravian errors, by the knowledge and love of God? O sir, the Moravians know, if you do not, that there is no such barrier under heaven against their tenets as those very people whom you suppose just prepared for receiving them.

But "complaints," you say, "of their errors, come very ill from you, because you have occasioned them." Nay, if it were so, for that very cause they ought to come from me. If I had occasioned an evil, surely I am the very person who ought to remove it as far as I can; to recover, if possible, those who are hurt already, and to caution others against it.

14. On some of those complaints, as you term them, you remark as follows:—"Many of those who once knew in whom they had believed" (these are my words) "were thrown into idle reasonings, and thereby filled with doubts and fears." (p. 13.) "This," you add, "it is to be feared, has been too much the case of the Methodists in general.—"

Accordingly we find, in this Journal, several instances, not barely of doubts and fears, but of the most desperate despair. This is the consequence of resting so much on sensible impressions.—Bad men may be led into presumption thereby; an instance of which you give, vol. iii, p. 200.”

That instance will come in our way again: “Many of those who once knew in whom they had believed were thrown,” by the Antinomians, “into idle reasonings, and thereby filled with doubts and fears. This,” you fear, “has been the case with the Methodists in general.” You must mean, (to make it a parallel case,) that the generality of the people now termed Methodists were true believers till they heard us preach, but were thereby thrown into idle reasonings, and filled with needless doubts and fears. Exactly contrary to truth in every particular. For, (1.) They lived in open sins till they heard us preach, and, consequently, were no better believers than their father the devil. (2.) They were not then thrown into idle reasonings, but into serious thought how to flee from the wrath to come. Nor, (3.) Were they filled with needless doubts and fears, but with such as were needful in the highest degree, such as actually issued in repentance toward God and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ.

“Accordingly, we find in this Journal several instances of the most desperate despair. (*Ibid.* pp. 176, 184, 198.)”

Then I am greatly mistaken. But I will set down at length the several instances you refer to:—

“I was a little surprised in going out of the room, at one who caught hold of me, and said abruptly, ‘I must speak with you, and will. I have sinned against light and against love.’ (N. B. She was soon after, if not at that very time, a common prostitute.) ‘I have sinned beyond forgiveness. I have been cursing you in my heart, and blaspheming God, ever since I came here. I am damned: I know it: I feel it: I am in hell: I have hell in my heart.’ I desired two or three who had confidence in God, to join in crying to him on her behalf. Immediately that horrible dread was taken away, and she began to see some dawns of hope.” (*Ibid.* p. 176.)

“The attention of all was soon fixed on poor L—S—. One so violently and variously torn of the evil one did I never see before. Sometimes she laughed till almost strangled; and then broke out into cursing and blaspheming; then stamped and struggled with incredible strength, so that four or five could scarce hold her; then cried out, ‘O eternity, eternity! O that I had no soul! O that I had never been born!’ At last she faintly called on Christ to help her; and the violence of her pangs ceased.” (*Ibid.* p. 184.)

It should be remembered, that from that time to this, her conversation has been as becometh the Gospel.

“Thursday, December 25, I met with such a case as I do not remember either to have known or heard of before: L—S—, (the same person,) after many years’ mourning, (long before she heard of us,) was filled with peace and joy in believing. In the midst of this, without any discernible cause, such a cloud suddenly overwhelmed her, that she could not believe her sins were ever forgiven at all, nor that there was any such thing as forgiveness of sins. She could not believe that the Scriptures were true; that there was any heaven, or hell, or angel, or spirit, or any God. One more I have since found in the same state: but observe, neither of these

continued therein; nor did I ever know one that did. So sure it is that all faith is the gift of God, which the moment he withdraws, the evil heart of unbelief will poison the whole soul." (*Ibid.* p. 198.)

Which of these is an "instance of the most desperate despair?" Surely the most desperate of any, yea, the only one which is properly said to be desperate at all, is that which produces instant self murder; which causes a poor wretch, by a sin which he cannot repent of, to rush straight through death into hell. But that was not the case in any of these instances; in all which we have already seen the end of the Lord.

15. That I "raise separate societies against the Church," (*Remarks*, p. 14,) is a charge which I need not examine till the evidence is produced. You next cite a Moravian's words to me: (an Englishman joined with the Moravians:) "You have eyes full of adultery, and cannot cease from sin; you take upon you to guide unstable souls, and lead them in the way of damnation;" and remark, "This is only returning some of your own treatment upon yourself. Here also you set the pattern." At what time and place, when and where, were "such abuses as these thrown out by me against our universities, and against our regular clergy, not the highest or the worthiest excepted?" I am altogether clear in this matter, as often as it has been objected: neither do I desire to receive any other treatment from the clergy, than they have received from me to this day.

You have a note at the bottom of this page which runs thus: "See pages 71, 77, and 73, [vol. iii, pp. 203, 204, and 206, of this edition,] where some Methodists said they had heard both your brother and you many times preach Popery."

I am afraid you advance here a wilful untruth, purely *ad movendam invidiam*. [To excite hatred.] For you cannot but know, (1.) That there is not one word of preaching Popery, either in page 71 or 77. And, (2.) That when Mr. C. and two other predestinarians (as is related page 73) affirmed they had heard both my brother and me many times preach Popery, they meant neither more nor less thereby than the doctrine of universal redemption.

16. You proceed: "Kingswood you call *your own house*: and when one Mr. C. opposed you there, you reply to him, 'You should not have supplanted me in my own house, stealing the hearts of the people.' The parochial clergy may call their several districts their own houses, with much more propriety than you could call Kingswood yours. And yet how have you supplanted them therein, and laboured to steal the hearts of the people! You have suffered by the same ways you took to discharge your spleen and malice against your brethren.

"Your brother's words to Mr. C. are,—'Whether his doctrine is true or false, is not the question. But you ought first to have fairly told him, *I preach contrary to you. Are you willing, notwithstanding, that I should continue in your house, gainsaying you? Shall I stay here opposing you, or shall I depart?*' Think you hear this spoken to you by us. What can you justly reply?—Again, if Mr. C. had said thus to you, and you had refused him leave to stay; I ask you, whether in such a case he would have had reason to resent such a refusal? I think you cannot say he would. And yet how loudly have you objected our refusing our pulpits to you?" (*Remarks*, p. 15.)

So you judge these to be exactly parallel cases. It lies therefore

upon me to show that they are not parallel at all; that there is, in many respects, an essential difference between them.

(1.) "Kingswood you call your own house." So I do, that is, the school house there. For I bought the ground where it stands, and paid for the building it, partly from the contribution of my friends, (one of whom contributed fifty pounds,) partly from the income of my own fellowship. No clergyman therefore can call his parish his own house with more propriety than I can call this house mine.

(2.) "Mr. C. opposed you there." True; but who was Mr. C.? One I had sent for, to assist me there; a friend that was as my own soul; that, even while he opposed me, lay in my bosom. What resemblance then does Mr. C., thus opposing me, bear to me opposing (if I really did) a parochial minister?

3. "You said to Mr. C., 'You should not have supplanted me in my own house, stealing the hearts of the people.' Yet you have supplanted the clergy in their own houses." What, in the same manner as Mr. C. did me? Have I done to any of them as he has done to me? You may as justly say I have cut their throats! *Stealing the hearts of their people.* Nor are these their people in the same sense wherein those were mine, viz. servants of the devil brought, through my ministry, to be servants and children of God. "You have suffered by the same ways you took to discharge your spleen and malice against your brethren." *To discharge your spleen and malice!* Say, your muskets and blunderbusses: I have just as much to do with one as the other.

(4.) "Your brother said to Mr. C., 'You ought to have told my brother fairly, *I preach contrary to you. Are you willing I should continue in your house, gainsaying you? Shall I stay here opposing you, or shall I depart?*' Think you hear this spoken to you by us. What can you justly reply?" I can justly reply, sir, Mr. C.'s case totally differs from yours. Therefore it makes absolutely nothing to your purpose.

17. A farther consequence (you think) of my preaching this doctrine, is, "the introducing that of absolute predestination. And whenever these errors," say you, "gain ground, there can be no wonder, that confusion, presumption, and despair, many very shocking instances of all which you give us among your followers, should be the consequences." (*Remarks*, p. 52.) You should by all means have specified a few of those instances, or, at least, the pages where they occur. Till this is done, I can look upon this assertion as no other than a flourish of your pen.

To conclude this head: you roundly affirm, once for all, "The grossest corruptions have ever followed the spreading of this tenet. The greatest heats and animosities have been raised thereby. The wildest errors have been thus occasioned. And in proportion to its getting ground, it has never failed to perplex the weak, to harden the wicked, and to please the profane. Your Journal is a proof that these terrible consequences have of late prevailed, perhaps more than ever." (p. 51.) Suppose that Journal gives a true account of facts, (which you seem not to deny,) could you find there no other fruits of my preaching, than these terrible ones you here mention?

O who so blind, as he that will not see!

18. But that we may not still talk at large, let us bring this question into as narrow a compass as possible. Let us go no further, as to time, than seven years last past; as to place, than London and the parts adjoining; as to persons, than you and me, Thomas Church preaching one doctrine, John Wesley the other. Now then, let us consider, with meekness and fear, what have been the consequences of each doctrine.

You have preached justification by faith and works, at Battersea, and St. Ann's, Westminster; while I preached justification by faith alone, near Moorfields, and at Short's Gardens. I beseech you then to consider, in the secret of your heart, how many sinners have you converted to God? By their fruits we shall know them. This is a plain rule. By this test let them be tried. How many outwardly and habitually wicked men have you brought to uniform habits of outward holiness? It is an awful thought! Can you instance in a hundred? in fifty? in twenty? in ten? If not, take heed unto yourself and to your doctrine. It cannot be, that both are right before God.

Consider now (I would not speak, but I dare not refrain) what have been the consequences of even my preaching the other doctrine. By the fruits shall we know those of whom I speak; even the cloud of witnesses, who at this hour experience the Gospel I preach to be the power of God unto salvation. The habitual drunkard, that was, is now temperate in all things. The whoremonger now flees fornication. He that stole, steals no more, but works with his hands. He that cursed or swore, perhaps at every sentence, has now learned to serve the Lord with fear, and rejoice unto him with reverence. Those formerly enslaved to various habits of sin, are now brought to uniform habits of holiness. These are demonstrable facts. I can name the men, with their several places of abode. One of them was an avowed Atheist for many years; some were Jews; a considerable number Papists; the greatest part of them as much strangers to the form, as to the power, of godliness.

When you have weighed these things touching the consequences of my preaching, on the one hand, (somewhat different from those set down in your *Remarks*;) and of your preaching, on the other, I would earnestly recommend the following words to your deepest consideration:—"Beware of false prophets; ye shall know them by their fruits. Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles? Even so every good tree" (every true prophet or teacher) "bringeth forth good fruit. Every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down and cast into the fire," Matt. vi, 15, &c.

III. 1. Having spoken more largely than I designed on the principle I hold in common with the Moravians, I shall touch very briefly on those errors (so called) which you say I hold more than theirs. (*Remarks*, page 55.)

You name, as the first, my holding that "a man may have a degree of justifying faith before he has, in the full, proper sense, a new, a clean heart." (*Ibid.*)

I have so often explained this, that I cannot throw away time in adding any more now; only this,—that the moment a sinner is justified, his heart is cleansed in a low degree. But yet he has not a clean heart, in the full, proper sense, till he is made perfect in love.

2. Another error you mention is this doctrine of perfection. (p. 60.)

To save you from a continued *ignoratio elenchi*, [mistake of the question,] I waive disputing on this point also, till you are better acquainted with my real sentiments. I have declared them on that head again and again; particularly in the sermon on "Christian Perfection."

3. Into this fallacy you plunge from the beginning to the end of what you speak on my third error, (so you term it,) relating to the Lord's Supper; confuting, as mine, notions which I know not. (pp. 56, 57.) I cannot think any farther answer is needful here, than the bare recital of my own words:—

"Friday, June 27. I preached on, 'Do this in remembrance of me.'

"It has been diligently taught among us, that none but those who are converted, who 'have received the Holy Ghost,' who are believers in the full sense, ought to communicate.

"But experience shows the gross falsehood of that assertion, that the Lord's Supper is not a converting ordinance. Ye are witnesses: for many now present know, the very beginning of your conversion to God (perhaps in some the first deep conviction) was wrought at the Lord's Supper. Now, one single instance of this kind overthrows that whole assertion.

"The falsehood of the other assertion appears both from Scripture precept and example. Our Lord commanded those very men who were then unconverted, who had not yet 'received the Holy Ghost,' who, in the full sense of the word, were not believers, to do this in remembrance of him. Here the precept is clear. And to these he delivered the elements with his own hands. Here is example equally indisputable.

"Sat. 28.—I showed at large, (1.) 'That the Lord's Supper was ordained by God to be a means of conveying to men either preventing, or justifying, or sanctifying grace, according to their several necessities. (2.) That the persons for whom it was ordained, are all those who know and feel that they want the grace of God, either to restrain them from sin, or to show their sins forgiven, or to renew their souls in the image of God. (3.) That, inasmuch as we come to his table, not to give him any thing, but to receive whatsoever he sees best for us, there is no previous preparation indispensably necessary, but a desire to receive whatsoever he pleases to give. And, (4.) That no fitness is required at the time of communicating, but a sense of our state, of our utter sinfulness and helplessness; every one who knows he is fit for hell, being just fit to come to Christ, in this as well as all other ways of his appointment.'" (Vol. iii, p. 189.)

4. "A stoical insensibility," you add, "is the next error I have to charge you with. You say, 'The servants of God suffer nothing;' and suppose that we ought to be here so free as, in the strongest pain, not once to desire to have a moment's ease.

"At the end of one of your hymns, you seem to carry this notion to the very height of extravagancy and presumption. You say,—

"Doom, if thou canst, to endless pains,
And drive me from thy face." (Remarks, p. 58.)

"A stoical insensibility is the next error I have to charge you with." And how do you support the charge? Why thus: "You say, 'The servants of God suffer nothing.'" (Vol. iii, p. 196.) And can you possibly misunderstand these words, if you read those that immediately follow?—"His body was well-nigh torn asunder with pain: but God made all his bed in his sickness: so that he was continually giving thanks to God, and making his boast of his praise."

"You suppose we ought to be so free, as in the strongest pain not

once to desire to have a moment's ease." O sir, with what eyes did you read those words?—

"I dined with one who told me, in all simplicity, 'Sir, I thought last week, there could be no such rest as you describe; none in this world, wherein we should be so free as not to desire ease in pain. But God has taught me better; for on Friday and Saturday, when I was in the strongest pain, I never once had one moment's desire of ease, but only that the will of God might be done.'" (*Ibid.* p. 191.) Do I say here, that "we ought not in the strongest pain once to desire to have a moment's ease?" What a frightful distortion of my words is this! What I say is, "A serious person affirmed to me, that God kept her for two days in such a state." And why not? Where is the absurdity?

"At the end of one of your hymns, you seem to carry this notion to the very height of extravagancy and presumption. You say,—

'Doom, if thou canst, to endless pains,
And drive me from thy face.'

If thou canst; that is, if thou canst deny thyself, if thou canst forget to be gracious, if thou canst cease to be truth and love. So the lines both preceding and following fix the sense. I see nothing of stoical insensibility, neither of extravagancy or presumption, in this.

5. Your last charge is, that I am guilty of enthusiasm to the highest degree. "Enthusiasm," you say, "is a false persuasion of an extraordinary divine assistance, which leads men on to such conduct as is only to be justified by the supposition of such assistance. An enthusiast is, then, sincere, but mistaken. His intentions are good, but his actions most abominable. Instead of making the word of God the rule of his actions, he follows only that secret impulse which is owing to a warm imagination. Instead of judging of his spiritual estate by the improvement of his heart, he rests only on ecstasies, &c. He is very liable to err, as not considering things coolly and carefully. He is very difficult to be convinced by reason and argument, as he acts upon a supposed principle superior to it, the directions of God's Spirit. Whoever opposes him is charged with resisting the Spirit. His own dreams must be regarded as oracles. Whatever he does is to be accounted the work of God. Hence he talks in the style of inspired persons; and applies Scripture phrases to himself, without attending to their original meaning, or once considering the difference of times and circumstances." (*Remarks*, pp. 60, 61.)

You have drawn, sir, (in the main,) a true picture of an enthusiast. But it is no more like me, than I am like a centaur. Yet you say, "They are these very things which have been charged upon you, and which you could never yet disprove." I will try for once; and, to that end, will go over these articles, one by one.

"Enthusiasm is a false persuasion of an extraordinary divine assistance, which leads men on to such conduct as is only to be justified by the supposition of such assistance." Before this touches me, you are to prove, (which, I conceive, you have not done yet,) that my conduct is such as is only to be justified by the supposition of an extraordinary divine assistance. "An enthusiast is, then, sincere, but mistaken." That I am mistaken, remains also to be proved. "His intentions are good; but his actions most abominable." Sometimes they are; yet not always. For there may be innocent madmen. But, what actions of mine are most abominable? I wait to learn. "Instead of making the word of God the rule of his actions, he follows only his secret im-

pulse." In the whole compass of language, there is not a proposition which less belongs to me than this. I have declared again and again, that I make the word of God the rule of all my actions; and that I no more follow any secret impulse instead thereof, than I follow Mohammed or Confucius.

Not even a word or look,
Do I approve or own,
But by the model of thy book,
Thy sacred book alone.

"Instead of judging of his spiritual estate by the improvement of his heart, he rests only on ecstasies." Neither is this my case. I rest not on them at all. Nor did I ever experience any. I do judge of my spiritual estate by the improvement of my heart and the tenor of my life conjointly. "He is very liable to err." So indeed I am. I find it every day more and more. But I do not yet find, that this is owing to my want of "considering things coolly and carefully." Perhaps you do not know many persons (excuse my simplicity in speaking it) who more carefully consider every step they take. Yet I know I am not cool or careful enough. May God supply this and all my wants! "He is very difficult to be convinced by reason and argument, as he acts upon a supposed principle superior to it, the direction of God's Spirit." I am very difficult to be convinced by dry blows or hard names, (both of which I have not wanted,) but not by reason and argument. At least, that difficulty cannot spring from the cause you mention; for I claim no other direction of God's Spirit, than is common to all believers. "Whoever opposes him is charged with resisting or rejecting the Spirit." What! whoever opposes me, John Wesley? Do I charge every such person with rejecting the Spirit? No more than I charge him with robbing on the highway. I cite you yourself, to confute your own words. For, do I charge you with rejecting the Spirit? "His own dreams must be regarded as oracles." Whose? I desire neither my dreams nor my waking thoughts may be regarded at all, unless just so far as they agree with the oracles of God. "Whatever he does, is to be accounted the work of God." You strike quite wide of me still. I never said so of what I do. I never thought so. Yet I trust what I do is pleasing to God. "Hence he talks in the style of inspired persons." No otherwise inspired than you are, if you love God. "And applies Scripture phrases to himself, without attending to their original meaning, or once considering the difference of times and circumstances." I am not conscious of any thing like this. I apply no Scripture phrase either to myself or any other, without carefully considering both the original meaning and the secondary sense, wherein (allowing for different times and circumstances) it may be applied to ordinary Christians.

6. So much for the bulk of your charge. But it concerns me likewise, to gather up the fragments of it. You say, "We desire no more than to try your sentiments and proceedings by the written word." (p. 63.) Agreed. Begin when and where you please. "We find there good works as strongly insisted on as faith." I do as strongly insist on them as on faith. But each in its own order. "We find all railing, &c, condemned therein." True; and so you may in all I write or preach. "We are assured, that the doing what God commands is the sure way of knowing that we have received his Spirit." We have

doubtless received it, if we love God (as he commands) with all our heart, mind, soul, and strength. "And not by any sensible impulses or feelings whatsoever." *Any sensible impulses whatsoever!* Do you then exclude all sensible impulses? Do you reject inward feelings *toto genere?* [of every sort?] Then you reject both the love of God and of our neighbour. For, if these cannot be inwardly felt, nothing can. You reject all joy in the Holy Ghost; for, if we cannot be sensible of this, it is no joy at all. You reject the peace of God, which, if it be not felt in the inmost soul, is a dream, a notion, an empty name. You therefore reject the whole inward kingdom of God; that is, in effect, the whole Gospel of Jesus Christ.

You have therefore yourself abundantly shown (what I do not insinuate, but proclaim on the house top) that I am charged with enthusiasm for asserting the power as well as the form of godliness.

7. You go on: "The character of the enthusiast above drawn will fit, I believe, all such of the Methodists as can be thought sincere." (p. 63.) I believe not. I have tried it on one, and it fitted him just as Saul's armour did David. However, a few instances of enthusiasm you undertake to show in this very Journal.

And first, "You give us one" (these are your words) "of a private revelation, which you seem to pay great credit to." You partly relate this, and then remark, "What enthusiasm is here! To represent the conjectures of a woman, whose brain appears to have been too much heated, as if they had been owing to a particular and miraculous spirit of prophecy!" Descant, sir, as you please on this enthusiasm; on the credit I paid to this private revelation; and my representing the conjectures of this brain-sick woman as owing to the miraculous power of the Spirit of God: and when you have done, I will desire you to read that passage once more, where you will find my express words are, introducing this account: "Sunday 11. I met with a surprising instance of the power of the devil." (Vol. iii, p. 200.) Such was the credit I paid to this revelation! All which I ascribe to the Spirit of God is, the enabling her to strive against the power of the devil, and at length restoring peace to her soul.

8. As a second instance of enthusiasm, you cite those words: "I expounded out of the fulness which was given me." (*Ibid.* p. 199.) The whole sentence is, "Out of the fulness that was given me, I expounded those words of St. Paul, (indeed of every true believer,) 'To me to live is Christ, and to die is gain.'" I mean, I had then a fuller, deeper sense of that great truth, than I ordinarily have. And I still think it right to ascribe this, not to myself, but to the "Giver of every good and perfect gift."

You relate what follows as a third "very extraordinary instance of enthusiasm:" (*Remarks*, p. 65.) "Tuesday, Feb. 17. I left London. In the afternoon I reached Oxford; and, leaving my horse there, (for he was tired, and the horse road exceeding bad, and my business admitted of no delay,) set out on foot for Stanton Harcourt. The night overtook me in about an hour, accompanied with heavy rain. Being wet and weary, and not well knowing my way, I could not help saying in my heart, (though ashamed of my want of resignation to God's will,) 'O that thou wouldest stay the bottles of heaven! or at least give me light,

or an honest guide, or some help in the manner thou knowest.' Presently the rain ceased, the moon broke out, and a friendly man overtook me, who set me on his own horse, and walked by my side, till we came to Mr. Gambold's door." (*Ibid.* p. 202.)

Here you remark, "If you would not have us look on this as miraculous, there is nothing in it worthy of being related." It may be so; let it pass then as a trifle not worth relating: but still it is no proof of enthusiasm. For I would not have you look on it as miraculous. I do not myself look upon it as such; but as a signal instance of God's particular providence over all those who call upon him.

9. "In the same spirit of enthusiasm," (you go on, citing this as a fourth instance,) "you describe Heaven as executing judgments, immediate punishments, on those who oppose you. You say, 'Mr. Molther was taken ill this day. I believe it was the hand of God that was upon him.'" (*Remarks*, p. 66.) I do; but I do not say as a judgment from God for opposing me: that you say for me. "Again, you tell us of 'one who was exceeding angry at those who pretended to be in fits; and was just going to kick one of them out of the way, when she dropped down herself, and was in violent agonies for an hour.' And you say you 'left her under a deep sense of the just judgment of God.'" So she termed it; and so I believe it was. But observe, not for opposing me. "Again, you mention, 'as an awful providence, the case of a poor wretch, who was last week cursing and blaspheming, and had boasted to many that he would come again on Sunday, and no man should stop his mouth then.'" His mouth was stopped before, in the midst of the most horrid blasphemies, by asking him, *if he was stronger than God*. "But on Friday, God laid his hand upon him, and on Sunday he was buried." I do look on this as a manifest judgment of God on a hardened sinner, for his complicated wickedness. "Again, 'one being just going to beat his wife, (which he frequently did,) God smote him in a moment; so that his hand dropped, and he fell down upon the ground, having no more strength than a new-born child.'" (p. 67.) And can you, sir, consider this, as one of the common dispensations of providence? Have you known a parallel one in your life? But it was never cited by me, as it is by you, as an immediate punishment on a man for opposing me. You have no authority, from any sentence or word of mine, for putting such a construction upon it; no more than you have for that strange intimation, (how remote both from justice and charity!) that "I paralleled these cases with those of Ananias and Sapphira, or of Elymas the sorcerer!"

10. You proceed to what you account a fifth instance of enthusiasm: "With regard to people's falling in fits, it is plain, you look upon both the disorders and removals of them to be supernatural." (*Remarks*, pp. 68, 69.) It is not quite plain. I look upon some of these cases as wholly natural; on the rest as mixed, both the disorder and the removal being partly natural and partly not. Six of these you pick out from, it may be, two hundred; and add, "From all which, you leave no room to doubt, that you would have these cases considered as those of the demoniacs in the New Testament; in order, I suppose, to parallel your supposed cures of them with the highest miracles of Christ and his disciples." I should once have wondered at your making such a supposi-

tion; but I now wonder at nothing of this kind. Only be pleased to remember, till this supposition is made good, it is no confirmation at all of my enthusiasm.

You then attempt to account for those fits by "obstructions or irregularities of the blood and spirits, hysterical disorder, watchings, fastings, closeness of rooms, great crowds, violent heat." And, lastly, by "terrors, perplexities, and doubts, in weak and well meaning men;" which, you think, in many of the cases before us, have "quite upset their understandings."

As to each of the rest, let it go as far as it can go. But I require proof of the last way whereby you would account for these disorders. Why, "The instances," you say, "of religious madness have much increased since you began to disturb the world." (*Remarks*, pp. 68, 69.) I doubt the fact. Although if these instances had increased lately, it is easy to account for them another way. "Most have heard of, or known, several of the Methodists thus driven to distraction." You may have heard of five hundred; but how many have you known? Be pleased to name eight or ten of them. I cannot find them, no, not one of them to this day, either man, woman, or child. I find some indeed, whom you told, they would be distracted if they "continued to follow these men," and whom, at that time, you threw into much doubt, and terror, and perplexity. But though they did continue to hear them ever since, they are not distracted yet.

As for "the abilities, learning, and experience" of Dr. M——, (p. 70,) if you are personally acquainted with him, you do well to testify them. But if not, permit me to remind you of the old advice:—

*Qualem commendas, etiam atque etiam aspice, ne mox
Incutiant aliena tibi peccata pudorem.*

(Beware whom you commend, lest you should be blamed for the faults of another man.)

In endeavouring to account for the people's recovery from those disorders, you say, "I shall not dispute how far prayer may have naturally a good effect." Nay, I am persuaded you will not dispute but it may have supernatural good effects also. "However, there is no need of supposing these recoveries miraculous," (p. 71.) Who affirms there is? I have set down the facts just as they were, passing no judgment upon them myself; (consequently, here is no foundation for the charge of enthusiasm;) and leaving every man else to judge as he pleases.

11. The next passage you quote as a proof of my enthusiasm, taking the whole together, runs thus: "After communicating at St. James's, our parish church, I visited several of the sick. Most of them were ill of the spotted fever, which, they informed me, had been extremely mortal, few persons recovering from it. But God had said, 'Hitherto shalt thou come.' I believe there was not one with whom we were, but recovered." (Vol. iii, p. 197.) On which you comment thus: "Here is indeed no intimation of any thing miraculous." No! not so much as an intimation! Then, why is this cited as an instance of my enthusiasm? Why, "You seem to desire to have it believed, that an extraordinary blessing attended your prayers; whereas, I believe they would not have failed of an equal blessing and success, had they had the prayers of their own parish ministers." I believe this argument will have extraordinary success, if it convince any one that I am an enthusiast.

12. You add, "I shall give but one account more, and this is what you give of yourself." (*Remarks*, p. 72.) The sum whereof is, "At two several times, being ill and in violent pain, I prayed to God, and found immediate ease." I did so. I assert the fact still. "Now, if these," you say, "are not miraculous cures, all this is rank enthusiasm."

I will put your argument in form:—

He that believes those are miraculous cures which are not so is a rank enthusiast:

But you believe those to be miraculous cures which are not so:

Therefore, you are a rank enthusiast.

Before I answer, I must know what you mean by miraculous. If you term every thing so, which is not strictly accountable for by the ordinary course of natural causes, then I deny the latter part of the minor proposition. And unless you can make this good, unless you can prove the effects in question are strictly accountable for by the ordinary course of natural causes, your argument is nothing worth.

You conclude this head with, "Can you work miracles? All your present pretences to the Spirit, till they are proved by miracles, cannot be excused, or acquitted from enthusiasm." (p. 73.)

My short answer is this: I pretend to the Spirit just so far as is essential to a state of salvation. And cannot I be acquitted from enthusiasm till I prove by miracles that I am in a state of salvation?

13. We now draw to a period: "The consequences of Methodism," you say, that is, of our preaching this doctrine, "which have hitherto appeared, are bad enough to induce you to leave it. It has, in fact, introduced many disorders; enthusiasm, Antinomianism, Calvinism, a neglect and contempt of God's ordinances, and almost all other duties." (p. 75.)

That, whenever God revives his work upon earth, many tares will spring up with the wheat, both the word of God gives us ground to expect, and the experience of all ages. But where, sir, have you been, that you have heard of the tares only; and that you rank among the consequences of my preaching, "a neglect and contempt of God's ordinances, and almost of all duties?" Does not the very reverse appear at London, at Bristol, at Kingswood, at Newcastle? In every one of which places, multitudes of those (I am able to name the persons) who before lived in a thorough neglect and contempt of God's ordinances and all duties, do now zealously discharge their duties to God and man, and walk in all his ordinances blameless.

And as to those drunkards, whoremongers, and other servants of the devil, as they were before, who heard us a while, and then fell to the Calvinists or Moravians, are they not even now in a far better state than they were before they heard us? Admit they are in error, yea, and die therein, yet, who dares affirm they will perish everlastingly? But had they died in those sins, we are sure they had fallen into "the fire that never shall be quenched."

I hope, sir, you will rejoice in considering this, how much their gain still outweighs their loss; as well as in finding the sentiments you could not reconcile together clearly and consistently explained. I am very willing to consider whatever farther you have to offer. May God give us both a right judgment in all things! I am persuaded you will readily join in this prayer with, reverend sir, your servant for Christ's sake,

BRISTOL, February 2, 1741-5.

JOHN WESLEY.

THE
PRINCIPLES OF A METHODIST
FARTHER EXPLAINED:

OCCASIONED BY

THE REV. MR. CHURCH'S SECOND LETTER TO MR. WESLEY.

IN A SECOND LETTER TO THAT GENTLEMAN.

REVEREND SIR,—1. At the time that I was reading your former letter, I expected to hear from you again. And I was not displeased with the expectation; believing it would give me a fresh opportunity of weighing the sentiments I might have too lightly espoused, and the actions which perhaps I had not enough considered. Viewing things in this light, I cannot but esteem you, not an enemy, but a friend; and one, in some respects, better qualified to do me real service than those whom the world accounts so; who may be hindered by their prejudice in my favour, either from observing what is reprobable, or from using that freedom and plainness of speech which are requisite to convince me of it.

2. It is, at least, as much with a view to learn myself, as to show others (what I think) the truth, that I intend to set down a few reflections on some parts of the tract you have lately published. I say *some* parts; for it is not my design to answer every sentence in this, any more than in the former. Many things I pass over, because I think them true; many more, because I think them not material; and some, because I am determined not to engage in a useless, if not hurtful, controversy.

3. Fear, indeed, is one cause of my declining this; fear, as I said elsewhere, (in the preface to the answer to Mr. Tucker,) not of my adversary, but of myself. I fear my own spirit, lest “I fall where many mightier have been slain.” I never knew one (or but one) man write controversy with what I thought a right spirit. Every disputant seems to think, as every soldier, that he may hurt his opponent as much as he can; nay, that he ought to do his worst to him, or he cannot make the best of his own cause; that so he do not belie, or wilfully misrepresent, him, he must expose him as much as he is able. It is enough, we suppose, if we do not show heat or passion against our adversary. But not to despise him, or endeavour to make others do so, is quite a work of supererogation.

4. But ought these things to be so? (I speak on the Christian scheme.) Ought we not to love our neighbour as ourselves? And does a man cease to be our neighbour, because he is of a different opinion? nay, and declares himself so to be? Ought we not, for all this, to do to him as we would he should do to us? But do we ourselves love to be exposed, or set in the worst light? Would we willingly be treated with contempt? If not, why do we treat others thus? And yet, who scruples it? Who does not hit every blot he can, however foreign to the merits of the cause? Who, in controversy, casts the

mantle of love over the nakedness of his brother? Who keeps steadily and uniformly to the question, without ever striking at the person? Who shows in every sentence that he loves his brother only less than the truth?

5. I fear neither you nor I have attained to this. I believe brotherly love might have found a better construction than that of unfairness, art, or disingenuity, to have put either on my not answering every part of your book, (a thing which never once entered my thoughts,) or on my not reciting all the words of those parts which I did answer. I cannot yet perceive any blame herein. I still account it fair and ingenuous to pass over both what I believe is right, and what I believe is not dangerously wrong. Neither can I see any disingenuity at all in quoting only that part of any sentence, against which I conceive the objection lies; nor in abridging any part of any treatise to which I reply, whether in the author's or in my own words.

6. If, indeed, it were so abridged as to alter the sense, this would be unfair. And if this were designedly done, it would be artful and disingenuous. But I am not conscious of having done this at all; although you speak as if I had done it a thousand times. And yet I cannot undertake now either to transcribe your whole book, or every page or paragraph which I answer. But I must generally abridge before I reply; and that not only to save time, (of which I have none to spare,) but often to make the argument clearer, which is best understood when couched in few words.

7. You complain also of my mentioning all at once sentences which you placed at a distance from each other. I do so; and I think it quite fair and ingenuous to lay together what was before scattered abroad. For instance: you now speak of the conditions of justification, in the eighteenth and following pages; again, from the eighty-ninth to the hundred and second; and yet again, in the hundred and twenty-seventh page. Now, I have not leisure to follow you to and fro. Therefore, what I say on one head, I set in one place.

I. 1. This premised, I come to the letter itself. I begin, as before, with the case of the Moravians; of whom you say, "I collected together the character which you had given of these men; the errors and vices which you had charged upon them, and the mischiefs—they had done among your followers. And I proved that, in several respects, you had been the occasion of this mischief; and are therefore, in some measure, accountable for it. Let us see what answer you give to all this.

"With regard to the denying degrees in faith, you mentioned, that the Moravian Church was cleared from this mistake.' But did you not mention this as one of the tenets of the Moravians? Do you not say, that you 'could not agree with Mr. Spangenberg, that none has any faith so long as he is liable to any doubt or fear?' Do you not represent Mr. Molther, and other Moravians in England, as teaching the same? In short, I have not charged the Moravian Church with any thing; but only repeat after you. And if you have accused them when you knew them to be guiltless, you must bear the blame.

"They do use the ordinances of God with reverence and godly fear.' You have charged Mr. Spangenberg and Mr. Molther with teaching that we ought to abstain from them. And the same you say in general of the

Moravian brethren, in your letter to them. ‘But Mr. Molther was quickly after recalled into Germany.’ This might be on other accounts. You do not say it was out of any dislike of his doctrines or proceedings. Nor indeed can you, consistently with your next words: ‘The great fault of the Moravian Church seems to lie, in not openly disclaiming all he had said; which, in all probability, they would have done, had they not leaned to the same opinion.’

“You ‘never knew but one of the Moravian Church affirm, that a believer does not grow in holiness.’ But who was this? No less a person than Count Zinzendorf, their great bishop and patron, whose authority is very high, all in all with them, and to whom you think they pay too much regard.” (*Second Letter*, p. 79.)

2. This is the whole of your reply to this part of my answer. I will now consider it, part by part.

First. “With regard to the denying degrees in faith, you mentioned, ‘that the Moravian Church was cleared from this mistake.’ But did you not mention this as one of the tenets of the Moravians?” No; not of the Moravians in general. “Do you not say, that you ‘could not agree with Mr. Spangenberg, that none has any faith, so long as he is liable to any doubt or fear?’” I do say so still. But Spangenberg is not the Moravian Church. “Do you not represent Mr. Molther, and other Moravians in England, as teaching the same?” I do; three or four in all. But neither are these the Moravian Church. “In short, I have not charged the Moravian Church with any thing; but only repeat after you.” Indeed you have, in the very case before us. You charge them with denying degrees in faith. I do not charge them herewith. I openly cleared them from any such charge near six years ago. “If, therefore, you have accused them when you knew them to be guiltless, you must bear the blame.” In this case I must entreat you to bear it in my stead: for I have not accused them,—the Moravian Church. It is you that have accused them. I have again and again declared they are not guilty.

Secondly. “‘They do use the ordinances of God with reverence and godly fear.’ You have charged Mr. Spangenberg and Mr. Molther with teaching, that we ought to abstain from them.” That *we*? No. That unbelievers ought. The assertion relates to them only. “And the same you say in general of the Moravian brethren, in your letter.” I say, they hold that unbelievers ought to abstain from them. But yet I know and bear witness, they use them themselves, and that “with reverence and godly fear.” “‘Mr. Molther was quickly after recalled to Germany.’ This might be on other accounts. You do not say it was out of any dislike of his doctrines or proceedings.” I do not say so; because I am not sure; but I believe it was out of a dislike to some of his proceedings, if not of his doctrines too. “Nor indeed can you, consistently with your next words: ‘The great fault of the Moravian Church seems to lie, in not openly disclaiming all he had said’” relating to this head. They did privately disclaim what he had said of degrees in faith. But I think that was not enough. And I still believe they would have done more, “had they not leaned themselves to the same opinion,” touching the ordinances.

Thirdly. “You ‘never knew but one of the Moravian Church affirm, that a believer does not grow in holiness.’ But who was this? No less

a person than Count Zinzendorf, their great bishop and patron, whose authority is very high, all in all with them, and to whom you think they pay 'too much regard.'" Do you apprehend where the stress of the argument lies? I never heard one Moravian affirm this, but the Count alone; and him only once; and that once was in the heat of dispute. And hence I inferred, it is not a doctrine of the Moravian Church; nay, I doubt whether it be the Count's own settled judgment.

3. But I may not dismiss this passage yet. It is now my turn to complain of unfair usage; of the exceeding lame, broken, imperfect manner wherein you cite my words. For instance, your citation runs thus: you "never knew but one of the Moravian Church affirm, that a believer does not grow in holiness." Whereas my words are these: "I never knew one of the Moravian Church, but that single person, affirm, that a believer does not grow in holiness; and perhaps he would not affirm it on reflection." Now, why was the former part of the sentence changed, and the latter quite left out? Had the whole stood in your tract just as it does in mine, it must have appeared I do not here charge the Moravian Church.

I complain also of your manner of replying to the first article of this very paragraph. For you do not cite so much as one line of that answer to which you profess to reply. My words are, "You ought not to charge the Moravian Church with the first of these" errors, "since in the very page from which you quote those words, 'There is no justifying faith where there ever is any doubt,' that note occurs, (viz. vol. iii, p. 223,) 'In the preface to the Second Journal, the Moravian Church is cleared from this mistake.'" If you had cited these words, could you possibly have subjoined, "I have not charged the Moravian Church with any thing; but only repeat after you?"

4. I have now considered one page of your reply, in the manner you seem to require. But sure you cannot expect I should follow you thus, step by step, through a hundred and forty pages! If you should then think it worth while to make a second reply, and to follow me in the same manner, we might write indeed, but who would read? I return therefore to what I proposed at first, viz. to touch only on what seems of the most importance, and leave the rest just as it lies.

5. You say, "With regard to subtlety, evasion, and disguise, you now would have it thought, that you only found this 'in many of them; not in all, nor in most.'" (p. 80.) "You now would have it thought!" Yes, and always, as well as now. For my original charge was, "I have found this in many of you; that is, much subtlety, much evasion and disguise." (Vol. iii, p. 223.) But you add, "Let the reader judge from the following passages, whether you did not charge the Moravians in general with these crimes: 'I had a long conference with those whom I esteem very highly in love; but I could not yet understand them in one point, Christian openness and plainness of speech. They pleaded for such a reservedness and closeness of conversation. Yet I scarce know what to think, considering they had the practice of the whole Moravian Church on their side.'" True, in pleading for such a reservedness of conversation as I could not in anywise approve of; but not in using much subtlety, much evasion and disguise: this I dare not charge on the whole Moravian Church. Those words also, "There is darkness and close-

ness in all their behaviour, and guile in almost all their words," I spoke, not of all the Moravians, nor of most; but of those who were then in England. I could not speak it of them all; for I never found any guile in Christian David, Michael Linner, and many others.

6. "We are next to see how you get over the objection I made good, in three several particulars, that you have prepared the way for spreading of these tenets. The first you say nothing to here; the second you quote very partially thus: 'By countenancing and commending them.' And why would you not add, 'And being the occasion of so many of them coming over among us?'" Because I was not the occasion. I was indeed the first Englishman that ever was at Hernhuth. But before I was at Hernhuth, (I find on later inquiry,) the Count himself had been in England.

"You 'still think, that next to some thousands in our own Church, the body of the Moravian Church, however mistaken some of them are, are, in the main, the best Christians in the world.'" (p. 81.) I do, "of all whom I have seen;"—you should not omit these words. "Those dreadful errors and crimes are here softened into mistakes." I term them "errors of judgment and practice." "I have proved, that you have charged the body with such." At present, the proof does not amount to demonstration. There needs a little further proof, that I charge any "dreadful crimes" on the body of the Moravians.

I see no manner of inconsistency still, in those accounts of my intercourse with the Moravians, which you suppose irreconcilable with each other. Let any one read them in the Journal, and judge.

7. "You had said, your 'objections then were nearly the same as now.' You now add, 'only with this difference; I was not then assured that the facts were as I supposed; I did not dare to determine any thing.' No! Not when by conversing among them you saw these things? As indeed the facts are of such a nature, that you could not but be assured of them, if they were true. Nor do the questions in your Letter really imply any doubt of their truth; but are so many appeals to their consciences, and equivalent to strong assertions. And if you had not been assured, if you did not dare to determine any thing concerning what you saw, your writing bare suspicions to a body of men in such a manner was inexcusable. This excuse, therefore, will not serve you." (p. 83.)

I apprehend it will. "I was not then," in September, 1738, "assured that the facts were as I supposed." Therefore, "I did not" then "dare to determine any thing." Be pleased to add the immediately following words: "But from November 1," 1739, "I saw more and more things which I could not reconcile with the Gospel."

If you had not omitted these words, you could have had no colour to remark, on my saying, "I did not dare to determine any thing:" "No! Not when by conversing among them you saw these things?" No, I did not "dare to determine," in September, 1738, from what I saw in November, 1739. "But the facts are of such a nature, that you could not but be assured of them, if they were true." I cannot think so. "Is not the Count all in all among you? Do not you magnify your own Church too much? Do you not use guile and dissimulation in many cases?" These facts are by no means of such a nature, as that whoever converses (even intimately) among the Moravians cannot but be assured of them. "Nor do the questions in your Letter really imply any doubt

of their truth." No! Are not my very words prefixed to those questions? —“Of some other things I stand in doubt. And I wish that, in order to remove those doubts, you would plainly answer, whether the fact be as I suppose.” “But” these questions “are so many appeals to their consciences.” True. “And equivalent to strong assertions.” Utterly false. “If you had not been assured, if you did not dare to determine any thing concerning what you saw,” (fifteen months after,) “your writing bare suspicious to a body of men, in such a manner, was inexcusable.” They were strong presumptions then; which yet I did not write to a body of men, whom I so highly esteemed; no, not even in the tenderest manner, till I was assured they were not groundless.

7. “In a note at the bottom of page 8, you observe, ‘The Band society in London began May 1, some time before I set out for Germany.’ Would you insinuate here, that you did not set it up in imitation of the Moravians?” Sir, I will tell you the naked truth. You had remarked thus: “You took the trouble of a journey to Germany to them; and were so much in love with their methods, that, at your return hither, you set up their bands among your disciples.” (p. 17.) This was an entire mistake; for that society was set up, not only before I returned, but before I set out. And I designed that note to insinuate this to you, without telling your mistake to all the world.

“I imagined, that, supposing your account of the Moravians true, it would be impossible for any serious Christian to doubt of their being very wicked people.” I know many serious Christians who suppose it true, and yet believe they are, in the main, good men. “A much worse character, take the whole body together, cannot be given of a body of men.” Let us try: “Here is a body of men who have not one spark either of justice, mercy, or truth among them; who are lost to all sense of right and wrong; who have neither sobriety, temperance, nor chastity; who are, in general, liars, drunkards, gluttons, thieves, adulterers, murderers.” I cannot but think, that this is a much worse character than that of the Moravians, take it how you will. “Let the reader judge how far you are now able to defend them.” Just as far as I did at first. Still I dare not condemn what is good among them; and I will not excuse what is evil.

9. “‘The Moravians excel in sweetness of behaviour.’ What, though they use guile and dissimulation?” Yes. “‘Where is their multitude of errors?’ In your own Journal. I have taken the pains to place them in one view in my *Remarks*; the justness of which, with all your art, you cannot disprove.” You have taken the pains to transcribe many words; all which together amount to this, that they, generally, hold universal salvation, and are partly Antinomians, (in opinion,) partly Quietists. The justness of some of your remarks, if I mistake not, has been pretty fully disproved. As to what you speak of my art, subtlety, and so on, in this and many other places, I look upon it as neither better nor worse than a civil way of calling names.

“‘To this multitude of crimes I am also an utter stranger.’ Then you have charged them wrongfully. What do you account guile?” &c. (*Second Letter*, p. 84.) I account guile, despising self denial even in the smallest points, and teaching that those who have not the assurance of faith may not use the ordinances of God, the Lord’s Supper in par-

ticular, (this is the real, unaggravated charge,) to be faults which cannot be excused. But I do not account them all together “a multitude of crimes.” I conceive this is a vehement hyperbole.

“The honour of religion,” said you, “and virtue trampled upon:” I answered, “By whom? Not by the Moravians.” You reply, “And yet you have accused some of these as decriing all the means of grace.” No. What I accused them of, was, teaching that an unbeliever (in their sense) ought to abstain from them. “Neither did I know, or think, or say, they were desperately wicked people.” Your Journal is before the world; to whom I appeal whether this has not so represented them.” But how do you here represent your remark, and my answer? My paragraph runs thus:—

“You go on, ‘How could you so long, and so intimately, converse with such desperately wicked people as the Moravians, according to your own account, were known by you to be?’ O sir, what another assertion is this! ‘The Moravians, according to your own account, were known by you to be desperately wicked people, while you intimately conversed with them!’ Utterly false and injurious! I never gave any such account. I conversed with them intimately both at Savannah and Hernhuth. But neither then, nor at any other time, did I know, or think, or say they were desperately wicked people: I think and say just the reverse; viz. that though I soon ‘found among them a few things which I could not approve, yet I believe they are, in the main, some of the best Christians in the world.’ After this, are you the person who complains of me for imperfect and partial quotations?” (p. 10.)

I added, “You surprise me yet more in going on thus: ‘In God’s name, sir, is the contempt of almost the whole of our duty, of every Christian ordinance, to be so very gently touched?’ Sir, this is not the case. This charge no more belongs to the Moravians than that of murder.” (p. 11.)

You reply, “Mr. Sp— and Mr. Molther are accused by name. If falsely, I am sorry both for them and you.” *Accused?* True. But of what? of the contempt of every Christian ordinance, of almost the whole of our duty? By no means. The plain case is, I accuse them of one thing, viz. teaching that an unbeliever should abstain from the ordinances. You accuse them of another,—contemning every Christian ordinance, and almost the whole of our duty. And this you would father upon me. I desire to be excused.

9. As to what I said in my letter to the Moravian Church, “You can hinder this if you will; therefore, if you do not prevent their speaking thus, you do, in effect, speak thus yourselves,”—it may be observed, (1.) That this letter is dated August 8, 1741. (2.) That from that time the Moravian Church did in great measure prevent any of their members speaking thus.

You proceed: “You distinguish between the English brethren and the Moravians. These English brethren, I presume, were your followers. Afterward you represent them as perverted by the Moravians: ‘Before they had spoke these wicked things,’ you say, ‘they had joined these men, and acted under their direction.’ If they did not learn them from these new teachers, from whom did they learn them? Not, sure, from yourself, or any other Methodists. You cannot, therefore, bring

off the Moravians without condemning your own people. Here, therefore, you have certainly overshot yourself." (p. 85.) Perhaps not. "These English brethren were, I presume, your followers." No; this is your first mistake. I was but a single, private member of that society. "Afterward you represent them as perverted by the Moravians." I do; but not yet connected with them. "Before they spoke these wicked things, they had joined these men, and acted under their direction." This is another mistake. They did not join these men, nor act by their direction, till long after. "If they did not learn them from these new teachers, from whom did they learn them? You cannot bring off the Moravians without condemning your own people." They learned them from Mr. Molther chiefly; whom I am not at all concerned to bring off. Now let all men judge which of us two has overshot himself.

10. "In answer to my objections against the inconsistent accounts you have given of the Moravians, you say, 'They are, I believe, the most self-inconsistent people under the sun.' Would not one imagine, that you here speak of the same persons, or of the whole body of them in general?" I do, thus far: I ascribe the good to the body of them in general; the evil to part only of that body, to some of those same persons.

"Your method of getting over the contradictions I had charged upon you is much the same,—to distinguish either between the Moravians and the English brethren, though these had been their disciples,"—this has been abundantly answered,—“or between some of the Moravians and others.” (p. 86.) I think a very good method; for propositions are not contradictory unless they both speak of the same persons.

However, since you persist to affirm that I am guilty of the contradictions you charged upon me, (p. 87,) I think there cannot be a sufficient reply without reciting the several instances.

11. First. "You commend them (the Moravians) for loving one another; and yet charge them with biting and devouring one another." I answered, "*Them!* Whom? Not the Moravians, but the English brethren of Fetter-lane, before their union with the Moravians. Herein, then, is no shadow of contradiction; for the two sentences do not relate to the same persons."

You reply, "Would you then have us to think that so much anger and contradiction reigned among your Methodists?" I "would have you think" this is nothing to the purpose. Prove the contradiction, and you speak to the point. "It is plain they had before this been perverted by the Moravians; and that they were unwilling to be taught by any others." *They*; that is, nearly half of the society. But here is no proof of the contradiction still.

2. "You say, 'They had well nigh destroyed brotherly love from among us, partly by cautions against natural love, partly by occasioning almost continual disputes.'" So they had; but we had then no connection with them. Neither, therefore, does this contradict their loving one another. You reply, "As if they can truly love each other, who teach you not to do it, and stir up divisions and disturbances among you." You should say, if you would repeat after me, "Who caution you against natural love, and occasion many disputes among you."

Well; allowing they do this, (which is utterly wrong,) yet where is the contradiction? Yet they may love one another.

3. "You praise them for using no diversions, but such as become saints; and yet say," (I recite the whole sentence,) "'I have heard some of you affirm that Christian salvation implies liberty to conform to the world, by joining in worldly diversions in order to do good.'" And both these are true. The Moravians, in general, use no diversions but such as become saints. And yet I have heard some of them affirm, in contradiction to their own practice, that "one then mentioned did well when he joined in playing at tennis in order to do good." To this you make no reply. Silence then consents, that there is no contradiction here.

4. "You 'praise them for not regarding outward adorning.'" So I do, the bulk of the congregation. "And yet you say," (I again recite the whole sentence,) "'I have heard some of you affirm that Christian salvation implies liberty to conform to the world, by putting on gold and costly apparel.'" I have so; and I blame them the more, because "they are condemned by the general practice of their own Church." To this also you reply not. So I must count this the fourth contradiction which you have charged upon me, but have not proved.

5. "You call their discipline, in most respects, truly excellent. I could wish you had more fully explained yourself. 'I have, in the *Second Journal*, vol. iii, pp. 83-103. It is no sign of good discipline to permit such abominations; that is, error in opinion, and guile in practice. 'True; it is not; nor is it any demonstration against it: for there may be good discipline even in a college of Jesuits. Another fault is, too great a deference to the Count. And yet, in most respects, their discipline is truly excellent.'" "

You reply, "Such excellent discipline, for all that I know, they may have;" (that is, as the Jesuits;) "but I cannot agree that this is scarce inferior to that of the apostolical age." It may be, for any thing you advance to the contrary. "Here I cited some words of yours, condemning their subordination, (p. 88,) which you prudently take no notice of." Yes; I had just before taken notice of their too great deference to the Count. But, the contradiction! Where is the contradiction?

6. "You mention it as a good effect of their discipline, that 'every one knows and keeps his proper rank.' Soon after, as it were with a design to confute yourself, you say, 'Our brethren have neither wisdom enough to guide, nor prudence enough to let it alone.'" I answered, "Pardon me, sir, I have no design either to confute or contradict myself in these words. The former sentence is spoken of the Moravian brethren; the latter of the English brethren of Fetter-lane, not then united with the Moravians, neither acting by their direction." To this likewise you do not reply. Here is then a sixth contradiction, alleged against me, but not proved.

12. However, you add, "Had you shown me mistaken in any point you have attempted to reply to, still you confess errors and wickedness enough among the Moravians, to render your account of them very inconsistent. But you have not succeeded in any one answer. You have not shown that I have, in any one instance, misquoted you, or mis-

understood the character you had given of them, or argued falsely from what you had said of them. And truly, sir, all you have done has been cavilling at a few particulars. But the argument I was urging all this while you quite forgot."

Sir, if it be so, you do me too much honour, in setting pen to paper again. But is it so? Have I all this while quite forgot the argument you was urging? I hope not. I seem to remember you was urging some argument to prove, that I "fall not only into inconsistencies, but direct contradictions;" (*Remarks*, p. 21;) and that I showed you mistaken, not only in *one*, but in *every* point which you advanced as such; that I did not confess any such errors or wickedness of the Moravians, as rendered my account of them self-inconsistent; that I "succeeded" in more than "one answer" to the objections you had urged against it; and that I showed, you had "misquoted or misunderstood the character I had given of them," or "argued falsely from it," not properly "in one instance," but from the beginning to the end.

Yet this I think it incumbent upon me to say, that whereinsoever I have contributed, directly or indirectly, to the spreading of any thing evil, which is or has been among the Moravians, I am sorry for it, and hereby ask pardon both of God and all the world.

II. 1. I think it appears, by what you have yourself observed, that, on the second head, justification by faith, I allow, in the beginning of the "Farther Appeal," almost as much as you contend for.

I desire leave to cite part of that passage again, that we may come as near each other as possible. I would just subjoin a few words on each head, which I hope may remove more difficulties out of the way:—

"That justification, whereof our Articles and Homilies speak, means present pardon, and acceptance with God; who therein 'declares his righteousness,' or mercy, 'by,' or 'for the remission of sins that are past.'"

I say, *past*: for I cannot find any thing in the Bible of the remission of sins past, present, and to come.

"I believe the condition of this is faith; I mean, not only that without faith we cannot be justified, but also, that, as soon as any one has true faith, in that moment he is justified."

You take the word *condition* in the former sense only, as that without which we cannot be justified. In this sense of the word, I think we may allow, that there are several conditions of justification.

"Good works follow this faith, but cannot go before it. Much less can sanctification; which implies a continued course of good works, springing from holiness of heart."

Yet such a course is, without doubt, absolutely necessary to our continuance in a state of justification.

"It is allowed, that repentance and 'fruits meet for repentance' go before faith. Repentance absolutely must go before faith; fruits meet for it, if there be opportunity. By repentance I mean conviction of sin, producing real desires and sincere resolutions of amendment; and by 'fruits meet for repentance,' forgiving our brother, ceasing from evil, doing good, using the ordinances of God, and, in general, obeying him according to the measure of grace which we have received. But these I cannot as yet term good works, because they do not spring from faith and the love of

God." Although the same works are then good, when they are performed by "those who have believed."

"Faith, in general, is a divine supernatural $\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\gamma\chi\omicron\varsigma$ (evidence or conviction) of things not seen, not discoverable by our bodily senses, as being either past, future, or spiritual. Justifying faith implies, not only a divine $\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\gamma\chi\omicron\varsigma$, that God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, but a sure trust and confidence that Christ died for my sins, that he loved me, and gave himself for me. And the moment a penitent sinner thus believes, God pardons and absolves him."

I say a *penitent sinner*; because justifying faith cannot exist without previous repentance.

"Yet, although both repentance, and the fruits thereof, are in some sense necessary before justification, neither the one nor the other is necessary in the same sense, or in the same degree, with faith. Not in the same degree. For in whatever moment a man believes, (in the Christian sense of the word,) he is justified. But it is not so at whatever moment he repents, or brings forth any, or all, the fruits of repentance. Consequently, none of these are necessary to justification, in the same degree with faith.

"Nor in the same sense. For none of these has so direct, immediate a relation to justification as faith. This is proximately necessary thereto; repentance remotely, as it is necessary to faith." (So the error of the press is to be corrected.) "And the fruits of repentance still more remotely, as they are necessary to the increase or continuance of repentance. And even in this sense, they are only necessary on supposition,—if there be time and opportunity for them. For in many instances there is not; but God cuts short his work, and faith prevents the fruits of repentance."

2. Thus far I believe we are nearly agreed. But on those words, "Far other qualifications are required, in order to our standing before God in glory, than were required, in order to his giving us faith and pardon; in order to this, nothing is indispensably required, but repentance, or conviction of sin; but in order to the other, it is indispensably required, that we be fully cleansed from all sin;" you remark, "Here, I apprehend, are two great mistakes: (1.) You make too little necessary before pardon. (2.) Too much afterward. You confine repentance within too narrow limits, and extend holiness beyond its just bounds.

"First. By repentance you mean only conviction of sin. But this is a very partial account of it. Every child that has learned his catechism can tell, that forsaking of sin is included in it; living in obedience to God's will, when there is opportunity; and, even when there is not, a sincere desire and purpose to do so, and a faith in God's mercies through Christ Jesus." (p. 92.)

I had said, "In order to God's giving us faith and pardon, nothing is indispensably required but repentance," that is, "conviction of sin, producing real desires and sincere resolutions of amendment." But you "apprehend that I am here in a great mistake;" that I give a "very partial account of repentance;" that I ought to "include therein a sincere desire and purpose" to obey God. I do: I have said so expressly; and "living in obedience to God's will, when there is opportunity." Very well; but I here speak of what is indispensably required, that is, whether there is opportunity of actual obedience or no; "and a faith in God's mercies through Christ Jesus." A very great mistake indeed!—my not including faith in that repentance which I say is indispensably required in order to faith!

“Secondly. You make sinless perfection necessary after justification, in order to make us meet for glory.” And who does not? Indeed men do not agree in the time. Some believe it is attained before death; some, in the article of death; some, in an after-state, in the Mystic or the Popish purgatory. But all writers, whom I have ever seen till now, (the Romish themselves not excepted,) agree, that we must be “fully cleansed from all sin” before we can enter into glory.

3. After what has already been allowed, I cannot think it needful to dispute farther, on the head of justification. Rather suffer me to close this part of our debate, by transcribing what I assent to, from that clear recapitulation of your sentiments which you have given in pages 45 and 46:—

“(1.) Justification is the act of God, pardoning our sins, and receiving us again to his favour. This was free in him, because undeserved by us; undeserved, because we had transgressed his law, and could not, nor even can now, perfectly fulfil it.

“(2.) We cannot, therefore, be justified by our works; because this would be, to be justified by some merit of our own. Much less can we be justified by an external show of religion, or by any superstitious observances.”

“(3.) The life and death of our Lord is the sole meritorious cause of this mercy, which must be firmly believed and trusted in by us. Our faith therefore in him, though not more meritorious than any of our actions, yet has a nearer relation to the promises of pardon through him, and is the mean and instrument whereby we embrace and receive them.

“(4.) True faith must be lively and productive of good works, which are its proper fruits, the marks whereby it is known.

“(5.) Works really good are such as are commanded by God, (springing from faith,) done by the aid of his Holy Spirit, with good designs, and to good ends. These may be considered as internal or external.

“(6.) The inward ones, such as hope, trust, fear, and love of God and our neighbour, (which may be more properly termed *good dispositions*, and [are branches of] sanctification,) must always be joined with faith, and consequently be conditions present in justification, though they are not the means or instruments of receiving it.

“(7.) The outward,” (which are more properly termed good works,) “though there be no immediate opportunity of practising them, and therefore a sincere desire and resolution to perform them be sufficient for the present; yet must follow after as soon as occasion offers, and will then be necessary conditions of preserving our justification.

“(8.) There is a justification conveyed to us in our baptism, or, properly, this state is then begun. But, should we fall into sins, we cannot regain it without true faith and repentance, which implies (as its fruits) a forsaking of our sins, and amendment of our whole life.”

I have only one circumstance farther to add, namely, that I am not newly convinced of these things. For this is the doctrine which I have continually taught for eight or nine years last past; only, I abstained from the word *condition*, perhaps more scrupulously than was needful.

4. With regard to the consequences of my teaching this doctrine, I desire any who will not account it lost labour, to consult with his own eyes, seriously and in the fear of God, the Third and Fourth Journals. And if he pleases, he may farther read over and compare, from the 279th to the 281st page of my answer; with your reply, from the one hundred and first inclusive, to the one hundred and fourth page.

Among the consequences you reckoned, (in your *Remarks*,) besides, "introducing predestination, confusion, presumption, and despair, many very shocking instances of all which" (your words are) "you give us among your followers." (pp. 52, 55.) I answered, "You should have specified a few of those instances, at least the pages where they occur. (Suppose, only three of each sort, out of any or all the *Four Journals*.) Till this is done, I can look upon this assertion as no other than a flourish of your pen."

Upon this you exclaim: (p. 111:) "I must beg the reader to observe your method of citing my words. Many instances of omissions he has had already. But here is such a one, as I believe few controversies can parallel. Would not any one imagine from the view of these words, [predestination, confusion, presumption, and despair,] that they occurred all together in page fifty-two, of my *Remarks*, and that I observed nothing farther concerning this point? Could it be thought that any thing intervened between the page referred to, and the last sentence? And yet so it is, that near three pages intervene! Ha! do *near three pages intervene!* Prodigious indeed! "And this is called an answer!" So it is, for want of a better.

"Your business was to show, that the Calvinistical notions have not prevailed among the Methodists, or that they were no consequences of unconditional justification." No, sir, it was not my business to show this. It was not my business to prove the negative; but yours, to prove the affirmative. Mr. Whitefield is himself a Calvinist. Such therefore doubtless are many of his followers. But Calvinism has not prevailed at all among any other of the Methodists, (so called,) nor is it to this day any consequence of unconditional justification, in the manner wherein I preach it.

5. You next "take the pains to lay before the reader an instance or two of confusion," &c. The first I read thus:—

"While we were at the room, Mrs. J., sitting at home, took the Bible to read; but on a sudden threw it away, saying, 'I am good enough. I will never read or pray more.' She was in the same mind when I came; often repeating, 'I used to think I was full of sin, and that I sinned in every thing I did. But now I know better; I am a good Christian; I never did any harm in my life; I do not desire to be any better than I am.' She spake many things to the same effect, plainly showing that the spirit of pride and of lies had the full dominion over her. I asked, 'Do you desire to be healed?' She said, 'I am whole.' 'But do you desire to be saved?' She replied, 'I am saved, I ail nothing, I am happy.'

"This is one of the fruits of the present salvation and sinless perfection taught by you among the weak and ignorant." (p. 11.)

I should wonder if the scarecrow of sinless perfection was not brought in some way or other. But to the point: You here repeat a relation as from me, and that "in confirmation," you say, "of your own veracity," and yet leave out both the beginning of that relation, part of the middle, and the end of it.

I begin thus: "Sun. 11.—I met with a surprising instance of the power of the devil." (Vol. iii, p. 200.) These words, of all others, should not have been left out, being a key to all that follows. In the middle of the relation, immediately after the words, "I am happy," I add, "Yet it was easy to discern she was in the most violent agony both of

body and mind; sweating exceedingly, notwithstanding the severe frost, and not continuing in the same posture a moment:”—a plain proof that this was no instance of presumption, nor a natural fruit of any teaching whatever.

It ends thus: “About a quarter before six the next morning, after lying quiet a while, she broke out, ‘Peace be unto thee;’ (her husband;) ‘peace be unto this house; the peace of God is come to my soul; *I know that my Redeemer liveth.*’ And for several days her mouth was filled with his praise, and her talk was wholly of his wondrous works.” Had not these words been left out, neither could this have passed for an instance of despair. Though still I do not know but it might have stood for an instance of confusion, &c.

I must not forget that this was cited at first as a proof of my enthusiasm; as an instance of a private revelation, “which,” you say, “I seem to pay great credit to,—representing the conjectures of a woman, whose brain appears to have been too much heated, as if they had been owing to a particular and miraculous spirit of prophecy.” (*Remarks*, p. 64.) I answered, “Descant, sir, as you please on this enthusiasm; on the credit I paid to this private revelation; and my representing the conjectures of this brain-sick woman as owing to a miraculous power of the Spirit of prophecy: and when you have done, I will desire you to read the passage once more; where you will find my express words are, introducing this account: ‘Sun. 11. I met with a surprising instance of the power of the devil.’ Such was the credit I paid to this revelation! All which I ascribe to the Spirit of God is, the enabling her to strive against the power of the devil, and at length restoring peace to her soul.” (*Answer*, p. 288.)

I was in hopes you had done with this instance. But I am disappointed: for in your Second Letter I read thus:—

“The instances of enthusiasm and presumption which your last Journal had furnished me with remain now to be reviewed. The first was of a private revelation, which you appeared to pay great credit to. You had represented every thing the woman had spoke in her agony as coming to pass.” (p. 130.) But I had not represented any thing she spoke then, whether it came to pass or no, as coming from the Spirit of God, but from the devil.

You say, “When I read this first, I was amazed, and impatient to look again into your Journal. But I had no sooner done this, but I was still more astonished. For you have very grievously misrepresented the case.” If I have, then I will bear the blame; but if not, it will light on your head.

“It is not *this* account which you had thus introduced; but another, and a very different one, of what happened a day or two before. Sunday, you mention her as being guilty of gross presumption, which you attribute to the power of the devil. But on Monday and Tuesday the opposite revelations happened, which you relate without the least mark of diffidence or blame.” (*Ibid.* p. 131.)

I am grieved that you constrain me to say any more. In the sixty-sixth and sixty-seventh pages of the last Journal, [Vol. iii, p. 200, of this edition,] I gave an account of Mrs. Jones, which I term “a surprising instance of the power of the devil.” It includes the occurrences

of three days. This you brought as a proof of my enthusiasm. I answer, "The very words that introduce this account," prove it is no instance of enthusiasm; meaning by *this account*, (as I suppose is plain to every reader,) the following account of Mrs. Jones. You reply, "It is not this account, which you had thus introduced, but another, and a very different one, of what happened a day or two before." Sir, it is the whole account of Mrs. Jones which I thus introduce; and not another, not a very different one. And I attribute the agony which she (Mrs. Jones) was in, and most of the words which she spoke, both on Sunday, Monday, and Tuesday, not to the Spirit of God, but to the power of the devil.

6. The next instance which you relate as an instance of despair, is that of a young woman of Kingswood; which you break off with, "Take me away, &c." (p. 112.) But why did you not decypher that &c? Why did you not add the rest of the paragraph? Because it would have spoiled your whole argument. It would have shown what the end of the Lord was, in permitting that severe visitation. The words are, "We interrupted her by calling again upon God, on which she sunk down as before, (as one asleep,) and another young woman began to roar as loud as she had done. My brother now came in, it being about nine o'clock. We continued in prayer till past eleven; when God in a moment spoke peace into the soul, first, of the first tormented, and then of the other. And they both joined in singing praises to Him who had stilled the enemy and the avenger." (Vol. iii, p. 161.)

7. I am sorry to find you still affirm, that, with regard to the Lord's Supper also, I "advance many injudicious, false, and dangerous things. Such as, (1.) That 'a man ought to communicate, without a sure trust in God's mercy through Christ.'" (p. 117.) You mark these as my words; but I know them not. (2.) "That there is no previous preparation indispensably necessary, but a desire to receive whatsoever God pleases to give." But I include abundantly more in that desire than you seem to apprehend; even a willingness to know and do the whole will of God. (3.) "That no fitness is required at the time of communicating," (I recite the whole sentence,) "but a sense of our state, of our utter sinfulness and helplessness! Every one who knows he is fit for hell, being just fit to come to Christ, in this, as well as in all other ways of his appointment." But neither can this sense of our utter sinfulness and helplessness subsist, without earnest desires of universal holiness. "There was another passage," you say, "which you chose to omit." (p. 118.) Which this was I do not understand. Nor do I perceive any one of these dreadful positions (as you style them) to be contrary to the word of God.

8. You will likewise, at all hazards, stand your ground, as to the charge of stoical insensibility. I answered before, "How do you support the charge? Why thus: 'You say, *The servants of God suffer nothing.*' And can you possibly misunderstand these words, if you read those that immediately follow?—'His body was well-nigh torn asunder with pain. But God made all his bed in his sickness. So that he was continually giving thanks to God, and making his boast of his praise.'" (p. 285.)

You reply, "If you meant no more than that a man under the sharpest

pains may be thankful to God, why did you call this a strange truth?" (p. 118.) Because I think it is so. I think it exceeding strange, that one in such a degree of pain should be continually giving thanks to God. Not that I suppose him "insensible of his torments." "His body," I say, "was well-nigh torn asunder with pain." But the love of God so abundantly overbalanced all pain, that it was as nothing to him.

"The next instance is as follows: One told you, 'Sir, I thought last week there could be no such rest as you describe; none in this world wherein we should be so free as not to desire ease in pain. But God has taught me better. For on Friday and Saturday, when I was in the strongest pain, I never once had one moment's desire of ease.' Add, 'But only that the will of God might be done.'"

Neither has this any resemblance of "stoical insensibility." I never supposed that this person did not feel pain; (nor indeed that there is any state on earth wherein we shall not feel it;) but that her soul was filled with the love of God, and thankfully resigned to his will.

"Another instance is taken from one of your hymns, where are these lines:—(p. 119.)

'Doom, if thou canst, to endless pains,
And drive me from thy face:'

(Add,

"But if thy stronger love constrains,
Let me saved by grace.")

"This I thought the height of insensibility, extravagance, and presumption. You see nothing of these in it. And yet you explain yourself thus: 'If thou canst deny thyself, if thou canst forget to be gracious, if thou canst cease to be truth and love?' all which, in my opinion, is fixing the charge most strongly upon you. For the supposition that Christ *can* do these things."—Are you in earnest, sir? Are you really ignorant, that expressions of this kind do not suppose he *can*, but quite the reverse? that they are one of the strongest forms of obtestation, of adjuring God to show mercy, by all his grace, and truth, and love? So far is this also from proving the charge of "stoical insensibility."

III. 1. I come now to consider the point of Church communion, of which you have spoke in the beginning of your treatise. In the entrance, you say, "We teach no other doctrine than has always been taught in our Church. Our sentiments concerning justification are reconcilable to our Articles, Homilies, and Service. This I apprehend several of the Methodists have been convinced of, and have therefore left our communion entirely. You give us more instances than one of this in your last Journal." (p. 2.) No, not one. Nor did I ever yet know one man who "therefore left the communion of the Church," because he was convinced that either her Articles, Homilies, or Liturgy, opposed his sentiments concerning justification. Poor Mr. St— and Mr. Simpson were induced to leave it by reasons of quite another kind.

You add, "We cannot wonder that some Methodists have withdrawn from her, while they have been used to hear doctrines which they must have been sensible have no place in her Articles and Service." So far from it, that all I know of them are deeply sensible, the "doctrines they

have been used to hear" daily, are no other than the genuine doctrines of the Church, as expressed both in her Articles and Service.

2. But our present question turns not on doctrine but discipline. "My first business," you say, "is to consider some very lax notions of Church communion which I find in your last Journal. Vol. iii, p. 177, you say, 'Our Twentieth Article defines a true Church, a congregation of faithful people, wherein the true word of God is preached, and the sacraments duly administered.'" (p. 3.) The use I would willingly make of this definition, (which, observe, is not mine, be it good or bad,) is to stop the boasting of ungodly men, by cutting off their pretence to call themselves of the Church. But you think they may call themselves so still. Then let them. I will not contend about it.

But you cannot infer from hence, that my notions of Church communion are either lax or otherwise. The definition which I occasionally cite shows nothing of my sentiments on that head. And for any thing which occurs in this page, they may be strict or loose, right or wrong.

You add, "It will be requisite, in order to approve yourself a minister of our Church, that you follow her rules and orders; that you constantly conform to the method of worship she has prescribed, and study to promote her peace." (p. 5.) All this is good and fit to be done. But it properly belongs to the following question:—

"What led you into such very loose notions of Church communion, I imagine, might be, your being conscious to yourself, that, according to the strict, just account of the Church of England, you could not, with any grace, maintain your pretensions to belong still to her." Sir, I have never told you yet what my notions of Church communion are. They may be wrong, or they may be right, for all you know. Therefore, when you are first supposing that I have told you my notions, and then assigning the reasons of them, what can be said, but that you imagine the whole matter?

3. How far I have acted agreeably to the rules and orders of our Church, is a farther question. You think I have acted contrary thereto, First, by using extemporary prayer in public. "The Church," you say, "has strongly declared her mind on this point, by appointing her excellent Liturgy, which you have solemnly promised to use, and no other." I know not when or where. "And whoever does not worship God in the manner she prescribes must be supposed to slight and contemn her offices and rules; and therefore can be no more worthy to be called her minister." (*Ibid.* p. 7.)

I do not "slight or contemn the offices" of the Church: I esteem them very highly. And yet I do not, at all times, worship God, even in public, in the very terms of those offices. Nor yet do I knowingly "slight or contemn her rules:" for it is not clear to my apprehension, that she has any rule which forbids using extemporary prayer, suppose between the morning and evening service. And if I am "not worthy to be called her minister," (which I dare by no means affirm myself to be,) yet her minister I am, and must always be, unless I should be judicially deposed from my ministry.

Your second argument is this: "If you suppose the Scripture enjoins you to use extemporary prayer, then you must suppose our Liturgy to be inconsistent with Scripture; and, consequently, unlawful to be used."

That does not follow ; unless I supposed the Scripture to enjoin to use extemporary prayer and no other. Then it would follow, that a form of prayer was inconsistent with Scripture. But this I never did suppose.

Your third argument is to this effect : “ You act contrary to the rule of the Church. Allow she is in the wrong ; yet, while you break her rule, how do you act as her minister ? ” It ought to be expressed, “ How are you her minister ? ” for the conclusion to be proved is, that I am not her minister.

I answer, (1.) I am not convinced, as I observed before, that I do hereby break her rule. (2.) If I did, yet should I not cease to be her minister, unless I were formally deprived. (3.) I now actually do continue in her communion, and hope that I always shall.

4. You object farther, that I “ disobey the governors of the Church. ” I answer, I both do, and will, obey them in all things, where I do not apprehend there is some particular law of God to the contrary. “ Here, ” you say, “ you confess that in some things you do not, and cannot, obey your governors. ” (p. 8.) Did I *confess this* ? Then I spoke rashly and foolishly ; for I granted more than I can make good. I do certainly apprehend that the law of God requires me, both to preach, and, sometimes, to pray extempore. Yet I do not know that I disobey the governors of the Church herein : for I do not know that they have forbidden me to do either.

But your “ behaviour and method of teaching is irregular. Have you any warrant from Scripture for preaching ” up and down thus ? I think I have ; I think God hath called me to this work “ by the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery, ” which directs me how to obey that general command, “ While we have time, let us do good unto all men. ”

“ But we ought to do this agreeably to our respective situations, and not break in upon each other’s provinces. Every private man may take upon himself the office of a magistrate, and quote this text as justly as you have done. ” (p. 9.) No ; the private man is not called to the office of a magistrate ; but I am to the office of a preacher. “ You was, indeed, authorized to preach the Gospel ; but it was in the congregation to which you should be lawfully appointed. Whereas you have many years preached in places whereunto you was not lawfully appointed ; nay, which were entrusted to others, who neither wanted nor desired your assistance. ”

Many of them wanted it enough, whether they desired it or no. But I shall not now debate that point. I rather follow you to the First Part of the “ Farther Appeal, ” where this objection is considered.

5. “ Our Church, ” it was said, “ has provided against this preaching up and down, in the ordination of a priest, by expressly limiting the exercise of the powers then conferred upon him to the congregation where he shall be lawfully appointed thereunto. ”

I answered, (1.) “ Your argument proves too much. If it be allowed just as you propose it, it proves that no priest has authority either to preach or administer the sacrament in any other than his own congregation. ” (*Farther Appeal*, p. 84.)

You reply, “ Is there no difference between a thing’s being done occasionally, and its being done for years together ? ” Yes, a great one ; and more inconveniences may arise from the latter than from the former.

But this is all wide : it does not touch the point. Still, if our Church does expressly limit the exercise of the sacerdotal powers to that congregation whereunto each priest shall be appointed, this precludes him from exercising those powers at all, in any other than that congregation.

I answered, (2.) "Had the powers conferred been so limited when I was ordained priest, my ordination would have signified just nothing. For I was not appointed to any congregation at all ; but was ordained as a member of that 'college of divines,' (so our statutes express it,) 'founded to overturn all heresies, and defend the catholic faith.'"

You reply, "I presume it was expected you should either continue at your college, or enter upon some regular cure." Perhaps so ; but I must still insist, that if my sacerdotal powers had been then expressly limited to that congregation whereunto I should be appointed, my ordination would have signified nothing. I mean, I could never, in virtue of that ordination, have exercised those powers at all ; seeing I never was appointed to any single congregation, at least not till I went to Georgia.

I answered, (3.) "For many years after I was ordained priest, this limitation was never heard of. I heard not one syllable of it, by way of objection to my preaching up and down in Oxford or London, or the parts adjacent ; in Gloucestershire or Worcestershire ; in Lancashire, Yorkshire, or Lincolnshire. Nor did the strictest disciplinarian scruple suffering me to exercise those powers wherever I came."

You reply, "There is great difference between preaching occasionally, with the leave of the incumbents, and doing it constantly without their leave." I grant there is ; and there are objections to the latter, which do not reach the former case. But they do not belong to this head. They do not in the least affect this consequence,—“If every priest, when ordained, is expressly limited, touching the exercise of the power then received, to that congregation to which he shall be appointed ; then is he precluded by this express limitation from preaching, with or without the incumbent's leave, in any other congregation whatever.”

I answered, (4.) "Is it not, in fact, universally allowed, that every priest, as such, has a power, in virtue of his ordination, to preach in any congregation, where the curate desires his assistance?"

You reply to this by what you judge a parallel case. But it does not touch the restriction in question. Either this does, or does not, expressly limit the exercise of the powers conferred upon a priest in his ordination to that congregation whereunto he shall be appointed. If it does not, I am not condemned by this, however faulty I may be on a thousand other accounts. If it does, then is every priest condemned whoever preaches out of the congregation to which he is appointed.

Your parallel case is this : "Because a man does not offend against the law of the land, when I prevail upon him to teach my children ;" therefore "he is impowered to seize" (read, he does not offend against the law of the land in seizing,) "an apartment in my house, and against my will and approbation to continue therein, and to direct and dictate to my family!" (p. 11.)

An exact parallel indeed ! When, therefore, I came to live in St. Luke's parish, was it just the same thing as if I had seized an apartment in Dr. Buckley's house ? And was the continuing therein against his

will and approbation (supposing it were so) precisely the same, as if I had continued in his house, whether he would or no? Is the one exactly the same offence against the law of the land as the other? Once more. Is the warning sinners in Moorfields to flee from the wrath to come, the very same with directing the Doctor's family under his own roof? I should not have answered this, but that I was afraid you would conclude it was unanswerable.

I answered the former objector, (5.) "Before those words which you suppose to imply such a restraint, were those words spoken without any restraint or limitation at all, which I apprehend to convey an indelible character, 'Receive the Holy Ghost, for the office and work of a priest in the church of God, now committed unto thee, by the imposition of our hands.'" You reply, "The question is not, whether you are in orders or not." (*Ibid.* p. 12.) I am glad to hear it. I really thought it was. "But whether you have acted suitably to the directions or rules of the Church of England." Not suitably to that rule, if it were strictly to be interpreted, of preaching only in a single congregation. But I have given my reasons why I think it cannot be so interpreted. And those reasons I do not see that you have invalidated.

I would only add, If I am in orders, if I am a minister still, and yet not a minister of the Church of England, of what church am I a minister? Whoever is a minister at all, is a minister of some particular church. Neither can he cease to be a minister of that church, till he is cast out of it by a judicial sentence. Till, therefore, I am so cast out, (which I trust will never be,) I must style myself a minister of the Church of England.

6. Your next objection is, "You not only erect bands, which after the Moravians, you call the *United Society*, but also give out tickets to those that continue therein." These bands, you think, "have had very bad consequences, as was to be expected, when weak people are made leaders of their brethren, and are set upon expounding Scripture." (*Ibid.*)

You are in some mistakes here. For, (1.) The bands are not called the *United Society*. (2.) The *United Society* was originally so called, not after the Moravians, but because it consisted of several smaller societies united together. (3.) Neither the bands nor the leaders of them, as such, are "set upon expounding Scripture." (4.) The good consequences of their meeting together in bands, I know; but the very bad consequences, I know not.

When any members of these, or of the *United Society*, are proved to live in known sin, we then mark and avoid them; we separate ourselves from every one that walks disorderly. Sometimes, if the case be judged infectious, (though rarely,) this is openly declared. And this you style "excommunication;" and say, "Does not every one see a separate ecclesiastical society or communion?" (p. 13.) No. This society does not separate from the communion of the rest of the Church of England. They continue steadfastly with them, both "in the apostolical doctrine, and in the breaking of bread, and in prayers." (Which neither Mr. St— nor Mr. Simpson does, nor the gentleman who writes to you in favour of the Moravians, who also writes pressingly to me to separate myself from the Church.) A society "over which you had appointed yourself a governor." No: so far as I governed them, it was

at their own entreaty. "And took upon you all the spiritual authority which the very highest church governor could claim." What! at Kingswood, in *February* 1740-1? Not so. I took upon me no other authority (then and there at least) than any steward of a society exerts by the consent of the other members. I did neither more nor less than declare, that they who had broken our rules were no longer of our society.

"Can you pretend that you received this authority from our Church?" Not by ordination; for I did not exert it as a priest; but as one whom that society had voluntarily chosen to be at the head of them. "Or that you exercised it in subjection or subordination to her lawful governors?" I think so; I am sure I did not exercise it in any designed opposition to them. "Did you ever think proper to consult or advise with them, about fixing the terms of your communion?" If you mean, about fixing the rules of admitting or excluding from our society, I never did think it either needful or proper. Nor do I at this day.

"How then will you vindicate all these powers?" All these are, "declaring those are no longer of our society." "Here is a manifest congregation. Either it belonged to the Church of England, or not. If it did not, you set up a separate communion against her. And how then are you injured, in being thought to have withdrawn from her?" I have nothing to do with this. The antecedent is false: therefore the consequent falls of course. "If it did belong to the Church, show where the Church gave you such authority of controlling and regulating it?" Authority of putting disorderly members out of that society? The society itself gave me that authority. "What private clergyman can plead her commission to be thus a judge and ordinary, even in his own parish?" Any clergyman or layman, without pleading her commission, may be thus a judge and ordinary. "Are not these powers inherent in her governors, and committed to the higher order of her clergy?" No; not the power of excluding members from a private society,—unless on supposition of some such rule as ours is, viz. "That if any man separate from the Church, he is no longer a member of our society."

7. But you have more proof yet: "The grand jury in Georgia found, that you had called yourself ordinary of Savannah. Nor was this fact contradicted even by those of the jury who, you say, wrote in your favour: so that it appears, you have long had an inclination to be independent and uncontrolled." This argument ought to be good; for it is far fetched. The plain case was this: that grand jury did assert, that, in Mr. Causton's hearing, I had called myself ordinary of Savannah. The minority of the jury, in their letter to the trustees, refuted the other allegations particularly; but thought this so idle a one, that they did not deign to give it any farther reply, than,

"As to the eighth bill we are in doubt, as not well knowing the meaning of the word *ordinary*." See vol. iii, p. 44.

You add, "I appeal to any reasonable man, whether you have not acted as an ordinary, nay, a bishop, in Kingswood." If you mean, in "declaring those disorderly members were no longer of that society;" I admit your appeal, whether I therein acted as a bishop, or as any steward of a society may. "Nay, you have gone far beyond the generality of the Dissenters themselves; who do not commit the power of excommunication, and appointing to preach," (that is another question,)

“to the hands of any private minister.” *The powers of excommunication.* True; but this was not excommunication, but a quite different thing.

How far, in what circumstances, and in what sense, I have “appointed men to preach,” I have explained at large in the third part of the “Farther Appeal.” But I wait for farther light; and am ready to consider, as I am able, whatever shall be replied to what is there advanced.

8. Your general conclusion is, “Whatever your pretences or professions may be, you can be looked upon by serious and impartial persons, not as a member, much less a minister, of the Church of England, but as no other than an enemy to her constitution, worship, and doctrine, raising divisions and disturbances in her communion.” (*Ibid.* p. 76.) “And yet you say, ‘I cannot have greater regard to her rules.’ ‘I dare not renounce communion with her.’” (*Ibid.* p. 15.)

I do say so still. I cannot have a greater regard to any human rules, than to follow them in all things, unless where I apprehend there is a divine rule to the contrary. I dare not renounce communion with the Church of England. As a minister, I teach her doctrines; I use her offices; I conform to her rubrics; I suffer reproach for my attachment to her. As a private member, I hold her doctrines; I join in her offices, in prayer, in hearing, in communicating. I expect every reasonable man, touching these facts, to believe his own eyes and ears. But if these facts are so, how dare any man of common sense charge me with renouncing the Church of England?

9. Use ever so many exaggerations, still the whole of this matter is, (1.) I often use extemporary prayer. (2.) Wherever I can, I preach the Gospel. (3.) Those who desire to live the Gospel, I advise how to watch over each other, and to put from them such as walk disorderly. Now, whether these things are, on other considerations, right or wrong, this single point I must still insist on: “All this does not prove, either that I am no member, or that I am no minister, of the Church of England.” Nay, nothing can prove, I am no member of the Church, till I either am excommunicated, or renounce her communion, and no longer join in her doctrine, and in the breaking of bread, and in prayer. Nor can any thing prove, I am no minister of the Church, till I either am deposed from my ministry, or voluntarily renounce her, and wholly cease to teach her doctrines, use her offices, and obey her rubrics for conscience’ sake.

However, I grant, that whatsoever is “urged on this head deserves my most serious consideration.” And whensoever I am convinced, that by taking any methods, more or less different from those I now take, I may better “consult the honour of religion, and be able to do more good in the world,” by the grace of God I shall not persist in these one hour, but instantly choose the more excellent way.

IV. 1. What you urge on the head of enthusiasm also, I think, “deserves my most serious consideration.” You may add, “and presumption.” I let it drop once more; because I do not love tautology; and because I look upon presumption to be essential to enthusiasm, and, consequently, contained therein. I will therefore weigh what you advance concerning it, and explain myself something more at large.

“I am to examine,” you say, “how far you have cleared yourself of

enthusiasm. My account of this you set down, making as many alterations and omissions as there are lines." (p. 120.) Perhaps more; for I never designed to recite the whole, but only the material part of it. "If you did not wholly approve of it, why would you not let me know what you disliked in it?" Because I do not love many words. Therefore, when the argument stood thus, "He that does this is an enthusiast; but you do this;" I was generally content with answering the second proposition, and leaving the first as I found it.

"I laid this charge against you and the Methodists in general; between you every part of the character has been verified." I answer for one; let the rest answer for themselves, if they have not better employment.

That the question between us may be the more fully understood, I shall briefly compare together, (1.) Your remarks. (2.) My answer. (3.) Your reply; though still I cannot promise to repeat your words at length.

2. You remark, "Though you would be thought an enemy to enthusiasm and presumption, yet in both you are far from being inferior to the Moravians, or indeed to any others." (p. 60.) Strong assertions! *Not inferior to any others?* not to the French prophets, or John of Leyden! "(1.) Enthusiasm is a false persuasion of an extraordinary divine assistance, which leads men to such conduct as is only to be justified by the supposition of such assistance." I answer, "Before this touches me, you are to prove (which I conceive you have not done yet) that my conduct is such as is only to be justified by the supposition of such assistance." (p. 286.) You reply, "This, I think, is proved in the preceding tract." (p. 120.) I think not. Let men of candour judge. Yet I am persuaded, there was such an assistance at some times. You have also to prove, that this was a false persuasion.

You remark, (2.) "An enthusiast is, then, sincere, but mistaken." (p. 61.) I answered, "That I am mistaken remains to be proved." You reply, "The world must judge." Agreed, if by *the world* you mean men of reason and religion.

You remark, (3.) "His intentions must be good; but his actions will be most abominable." I answered, "What actions of mine are most abominable?" You reply, "The world must be judge, whether your public actions have not been, in *many* respects, abominable." I am glad the charge softens. I hope by and by you will think they are only abominable in *some* respects.

You remark, (4.) "Instead of making the word of God the rule of his actions, he follows only secret persuasion or impulse." I answered: "I have declared again and again, that I make the word of God the rule of all my actions; and that I no more follow any secret impulse instead thereof, than I follow Mohammed or Confucius." You reply: "You fall again into your strain of boasting, as if declarations could have any weight against facts; assert, that 'you make the word of God the rule of all your actions,' and that I 'perhaps do not know many persons.'" (p. 121.) Stop, sir: you are stepping over one or two points which I have not done with.

You remark, (5.) "Instead of judging of his spiritual estate by the improvement of his heart, he rests only on ecstasies," &c. I answered;

“Neither is this my case. I rest not on them at all. I judge of my spiritual estate by the improvement of my heart and the tenor of my life conjointly.” To this I do not perceive you reply one word. Herein, then, I am not an enthusiast.

You remark, (6.) “He is very liable to err, not considering things coolly and carefully.” I answered: “So indeed I am; I find it every day more and more. But I do not yet find that this is owing to my want of ‘considering things coolly and carefully.’ Perhaps you do not know many persons (excuse my simplicity in speaking it) who more carefully consider every step they take. Yet I know I am not cool or careful enough. May God supply this and all my wants!” (p. 287.) You reply, “Your private life I have nothing to do with;” and then enlarge on my “method of consulting Scripture,” and of using lots;—of both which by and by. But, meantime, observe, this does not affect the question: for I neither cast lots, nor use that method at all, till I have considered things with all the care I can. So that, be this right or wrong, it is no manner of proof that I do not “carefully consider every step I take.”

But how little did I profit by begging your excuse, suppose I had spoken a word unguardedly! O sir, you put me in mind of him who said, “I know not how to show mercy!” You have need never to fight but when you are sure to conquer; seeing you are resolved neither to give nor take quarter.

You remark, (7.) “He is very difficult to be convinced by reason and argument, as he acts upon a supposed principle superior to it,—the direction of God’s Spirit.” I answered, “I am very difficult to be convinced by dry blows or hard names, but not by reason or argument. At least that difficulty cannot spring from the cause you mention: for I claim no other direction of God’s Spirit than is common to all believers.”

You reply, (1.) “I fear this will not be easily reconcilable to your past pretenses and behaviour.” (p. 124.) I believe it will; in particular, to what I speak of the light I received from God in that important affair. (Vol. iii, p. 234.) But as to the directions in general, of the Spirit of God, we very probably differ in this: you apprehend those directions to be extraordinary, which I suppose to be common to all believers.

You remark, (8.) “Whoever opposes him will be charged with resisting or rejecting the Spirit.” I answered, “What! whoever opposes me, John Wesley? Do I charge every such person with ‘rejecting the Spirit?’ No more than I charge him with robbing on the highway. Do I charge you with rejecting the Spirit?” You reply, “You deny that you charge the opposers with rejecting the Spirit, and affirm, that you never said or thought that what you do is to be accounted the work of God.” Here you blend different sentences together, which I must consider apart, as they were written. And, first, where do I charge you with rejecting the Spirit? If I charge whoever opposes me with this, undoubtedly I charge you. If I do not charge you, that proposition is false; I do not so charge whoever opposes me. Your next words are, “You affirm that you never said or thought that what you do is to be accounted the work of God. If it be the work of God, you need not

deny the other point." Yes, sir; whether it be or no, I must still deny that I ever charged you with rejecting the Spirit in opposing me.

You remark, (9.) "His own dreams must be regarded as oracles." I answered, "Whose? I desire neither my dreams nor my waking thoughts may be regarded at all, unless just so far as they agree with the oracles of God." To this also you make no reply.

You remark, (10.) "However wild his behaviour may be, whatever he does is to be accounted the work of God." It was to this I answered, "I never said so of what I do; I never thought so." This answer was ill expressed. And I might have foreseen you would hardly fail to make your advantage of it. I must therefore explain myself upon it a little farther. You said, "An enthusiast accounts whatever he does to be the work of God." I should have said, "But I do not account whatever I do to be the work of God." What that is which I do account his work will be considered by and by.

You remark, (11.) "He talks in the style of inspired persons." I answered, "No otherwise inspired than you are, if you love God." You reply, "The point was not, whether you are actually inspired, but whether you have talked in the style of those who were so." (p. 126.) That was so much the point, that, if it were allowed, it would overturn your whole argument. For if I was inspired, (in your sense,) you could not term that inspiration enthusiasm without blasphemy; but you again mistake my words. The plain meaning of them is, that I talk in the style of those persons who are "no otherwise inspired than you are, if you love God."

You remark, (12.) "He applies Scripture phrases to himself, without attending to their original meaning, or once considering the difference of times and circumstances." (p. 62.) I answered, "I am not conscious of any thing like this. I apply no Scripture phrase either to myself or any other, without carefully considering both the original meaning, and the secondary sense, wherein, allowing for different times and circumstances, it may be applied to ordinary Christians." (p. 287.) You reply, "This also you deny to have done; holding, however, some secondary sense, (what it is, you have not told us,) in which Scripture phrases may be applied to ordinary Christians." I have largely told you what I mean by a secondary sense, in the First Part of the "Farther Appeal." You add: "Many things which were truly written of the preaching of Christianity at first, you have vainly applied to yourselves." Sir, I am to answer only for myself; as I will for that expression, "Behold, the day of the Lord is come; he is again visiting and redeeming his people!"

3. I come now to what you expatiate upon at large, as the two grand instances of my enthusiasm. The first is plainly this: at some rare times, when I have been in great distress of soul, or in utter uncertainty how to act in an important case which required a speedy determination, after using all other means that occurred, I have cast lots, or opened the Bible. And by this means I have been relieved from that distress, or directed in that uncertainty.

Instances of this kind occur in pages 12, 14, 15, 28, and 88 of the third Journal; as also in pages 27, 28, and 80 of the last Journal. [Vol. iii, pp. 112, 113, 121, 158, 178, 208, of this edition.] I desire any who

would understand this matter throughly, to read those passages as they stand at length.

As to the particular instances, I would observe, (1.) That with regard to my first journey to Bristol, you should, in any wise, have set down those words that preface the scriptures there recited: "I was entreated, in the most pressing manner, to come to Bristol without delay. This I was not at all forward to do; and perhaps a little the less inclined to it, because of the remarkable scriptures which offered, as often as we inquired, touching the consequence of this removal; though whether this was permitted only for the trial of our faith, God knoweth, and the event will show." From the scriptures afterward recited, some inferred that the event they apprehended was yet afar off. I infer nothing at all. I still know not how to judge; but leave the whole to God. This only I know, that the continual expectation of death was then an unspeakable blessing to me; that I did not dare, knowingly, to waste a moment, neither to throw away one desire on earthly things; those words being ever uppermost in my thoughts, and indeed frequently on my tongue:—

Ere long, when sovereign wisdom wills,
My soul an unknown path shall tread,
Shall strangely leave, who strangely fills
This frame, and waft me to the dead.
O, what is death? 'Tis life's last shore,
Where vanities are vain no more;
Where all pursuits their goal obtain,
And life is all retouch'd again.

I observe, (2.) That in two other of those instances, (vol. iii, pp. 112, 113,) it is particularly mentioned, that "I was troubled;" and that, by the seasonable application of those scriptures, that trouble was entirely removed. The same blessing I received (so I must term it still) from the words set down in page 158; and in a yet higher degree, from that exceeding apposite scripture mentioned in vol. iii, p. 208.

I observe, (3.) That at the times to which your other citations refer, I was utterly uncertain how to act in points of great importance, and such as required a speedy determination; and that, by this means, my uncertainty was removed, and I went on my way rejoicing. (Vol. iii, pp. 112, 113, 178.)

My own experience, therefore, which you think should discourage me for the future from any thing of this kind, does, on the contrary, greatly encourage me herein; since I have found much benefit, and no inconvenience; unless, perhaps, this be one, that you "cannot acquit me of enthusiasm;" add, if you please, and presumption.

But you ask, "Has God ever commanded us to do thus?" I believe he has neither commanded nor forbidden it in Scripture. But then remember, "that Scripture" (to use the words which you cite from "our learned and judicious Hooker") "is not the only rule of all things, which, in this life, may be done by men." All I affirm concerning this is, that it may be done; and that I have, in fact, received assistance and direction thereby.

4. I give the same answer to your assertion, that we are not ordered in Scripture to decide any points in question by lots. (*Remarks*, p. 123.) You allow, indeed, there are instances of this in Scripture; but affirm, "These were miraculous; nor can we, without presumption," (a spe-

cies of enthusiasm,) "apply this method." I want proof of this: bring one plain text of Scripture, and I am satisfied. "This, I apprehend, you learned from the Moravians." I did; though, it is true, Mr. Whitefield thought I went too far therein. "Instances of the same occur in your Journals. I will mention only one. It being debated, when you should go to Bristol, you say, 'We at length all agreed to decide it by lot. And by this it was determined I should go.' (Vol. iii, p. 121.) Is this your way of carefully considering every step you take? Can there be greater rashness and extravagance? Reason is thus, in a manner, rendered useless, prudence is set aside, and affairs of moment left to be determined by chance!" (*Remarks*, p. 124.)

So this you give as a genuine instance of my proceedings; and, I suppose, of your own fairness and candour! "We agreed, at length, to decide it by lot." True, *at length*; after a debate of some hours; after carefully hearing and weighing coolly all the reasons which could be alleged on either side; our brethren still continuing the dispute, without any probability of their coming to one conclusion, we, at length, (the night being now far spent,) all agreed to this. "Can there be greater rashness and extravagance?" I cannot but think there can. "Reason is thus, in a manner, rendered useless." No; we had used it as far as it could go; from Saturday, March 17, (when I received the first letter,) to Wednesday, 28, when the case was laid before the society. "Prudence is set aside." Not so: but the arguments here were so equal, that she saw not how to determine. "And affairs of moment left to be determined by chance!" *By chance!* What a blunder, then, is that, "The lot is cast into the lap; but the whole disposal thereof is of the Lord!"

This, I firmly believe, is truth and reason, and will be to the end of the world. And I therefore still subscribe to that declaration of the Moravian Church, laid before the whole body of divines in the University of Wirtemberg, and not by them accounted enthusiasm: "We have a peculiar esteem for lots, and accordingly use them, both in public and private, to decide points of importance, when the reasons brought on each side appear to be of equal weight. And we believe this to be then the only way of wholly setting aside our own will, of acquitting ourselves of all blame, and clearly knowing what is the will of God."—(Vol. iii, p. 102.)

5. You next remarked several instances of my enthusiasm. The first was that of Mrs. Jones. The next ran thus: "Again, you say, 'I expounded out of the fulness that was given me.'" (*Remarks*, p. 64.) I answered, "I mean, I had then a fuller, deeper sense of what I spoke than I ordinarily have." (p. 288.) But if you still think, "it would have been more decent to have said, 'According to the best of my power and ability, with God's assistance, I expounded;'" I will say so another time.

With regard to the third instance of enthusiasm, you remarked, "If you would not have us look on this as miraculous, there is nothing in it worthy of being related." (*Remarks*, p. 64.) I answered, "It may be so. Let it pass, then, as a trifle not worth relating; but still it is no proof of enthusiasm. For I would not have you look upon it as miraculous, but as a signal instance of God's particular providence." (p. 289.)

How friendly and generous is your reply!—"You seem ashamed of it. I am glad you give this fooling up, and hope for the future you will treat your readers better." (*Second Letter*, p. 131.) Sir, I am not ashamed of it; nor shall I ever give this fooling up, till I give up the Bible. I still look upon this "as a signal instance of God's particular providence." But "how is this consistent with yielding it to be a trifle?" (*Ibid.* p. 132.) My words do not imply, that I yield it so to be. Being urged with the dilemma, "Either this is related as miraculous," (and then it is enthusiasm,) "or it is not worth relating;" I answered, (to avoid drawing the saw of controversy,) "Let it pass, then, as a trifle not worth relating. But still" (if it be a trifle, which I suppose, not grant) "it is no proof of enthusiasm. For I would not have you look upon it as miraculous."

And yet I believe I yielded too much, and what might too much favour your assertion, that "there is a great difference between particular providences and such extraordinary interpositions." Pray, sir, show me what this difference is. It is a subject that deserves your coolest thoughts. "I know no ground to hope or pray for such immediate reliefs. These things must be represented either as common accidents or as miracles." I do not thoroughly understand your terms. What is a common accident? that a sparrow falls to the ground, or something more inconsiderable than the hairs of your head? Is there no medium between accident and miracle? If there be, what is that medium? When we are agreed with regard to these few points, I shall be glad to resume the subject.

6. The fourth instance of my enthusiasm was this, that I "related judgments inflicted on my opposers." As to Mr. Molther, I must observe once more, that I do believe there was a particular providence in his sickness. But I do not believe, (nor did I design to insinuate,) that it was a judgment for opposing me.

You go on: "Again you mention, 'as an awful providence, the case of a poor wretch who was last week cursing and blaspheming, and had boasted to many that he would come again on Sunday, and no man should stop his mouth then. But on Friday God laid his hand upon him, and on Sunday he was buried.'" (*Remarks*, p. 66.) I answered, "I look on this as a manifest judgment of God on a hardened sinner, for his complicated wickedness." (p. 289.) You reply, "Add, if you please, 'His labouring with all his might to hinder the word of God.' Here therefore is a confessed judgment for his opposition to you." (*Second Letter*, p. 133.) There is, for his thus opposing with curses and blasphemy. This was part of his complicated wickedness. Here then you "think I plead guilty." Not of enthusiasm, till you prove this was not "an awful providence."

"Again: 'One was just going to beat his wife, (which he frequently did,) when God smote him in a moment, so that his hand dropped, and he fell down upon the ground, having no more strength than a new-born child.' Have we any warrant either from Scripture, or the common dispensations of providence, to interpret misfortunes of this nature as judgments?" (*Remarks*, p. 67.) I answered, "Can you, sir, consider this as one of the common dispensations of providence? Have you known a parallel one in your life? But it was never cited by me, (as it is by

you,) as an immediate punishment on a man for *opposing me.*" (p. 289.) You reply, "As if what is not common, or what I have not known, must be a miraculous judgment." I believe it was, whether miraculous or no, a judgment mixed with mercy.

You now add to the rest the following instance: "One John Haydon, a man of a regular life and conversation, being informed that people fell into strange fits at the societies, came to see and judge for himself. But he was still less satisfied than before; insomuch that he went about to his acquaintance one after another, and laboured above measure to convince them it was a delusion of the devil. We were going home, when one met us in the street, and informed us that J. H. was fallen raving mad. It seems he had sat down to dinner, but had a mind first to end the sermon on 'Salvation by Faith.' In reading the last page, he changed colour, fell off his chair, and began screaming terribly, and beating himself against the ground. The neighbours were alarmed, and flocked into the house. I came in and found him upon the floor, the room being full of people, whom his wife would have kept without, but he cried aloud, 'No; let them all come; let all the world see the just judgment of God.' Two or three men were holding him as well as they could. He immediately fixed his eyes upon me, and cried, 'Ay, this is he, who I said was a deceiver of the people. But God has overtaken me. I said it was all a delusion. But this is no delusion.' He then roared out, 'O thou devil! Thou cursed devil! Yea, thou legion of devils! Thou canst not stay! Christ will cast thee out. I know his work is begun. Tear me to pieces if thou wilt, but thou canst not hurt me.' He then beat himself against the ground again, his breast heaving at the same time, as in the pangs of death, and great drops of sweat trickling down his face. We all betook ourselves to prayer. His pangs ceased, and both his body and soul were set at liberty." (Vol. iii, 130.)

If you had pleased, you might have added from the next paragraph, "Returning to J. H., we found his voice was lost, and his body weak as that of an infant. But his soul was in peace, full of love, and rejoicing in hope of the glory of God."

You subjoin, "This you may desire, for aught I know, to pass as a trifle too." (*Remarks*, p. 134.) No; it is so terrible an instance of the judgment of God, (though at length "mercy rejoiced over judgment,") as ought never to be forgotten by those who fear God, so long as the sun or moon endureth.

7. The account of people falling down in fits you cite as a fifth instance of my enthusiasm; it being "plain," you say, that I "look upon both the disorders, and the removals of them, to be supernatural." (*Remarks*, p. 67.) I answered, "It is not quite plain. I look upon some of these cases as wholly natural; on the rest, as mixed; both the disorders and the removals being partly natural, and partly not." (p. 289.) You reply, "It would have been kind to have let us know your rule, by which you distinguish these." I will. I distinguish them by the circumstances that precede, accompany, and follow. "However, some of these you here allow to be in part supernatural. Miracles, therefore, are not wholly ceased." Can you prove they are, by Scripture or reason? You then refer to two or three cases, related in vol. iii, p. 129. I believe there was a supernatural power on the minds of

the persons there mentioned, which occasioned their bodies to be so affected by the natural laws of the vital union. This point, therefore, you have to prove, or here is no enthusiasm; that there was no supernatural power in the case.

Hereon you remarked, "You leave no room to doubt that you would have these cases considered as those of the demoniacs in the New Testament, in order, I suppose, to parallel your supposed cures of them, with those highest miracles of Christ and his disciples, the casting out devils." (*Remarks*, p. 68.) I answered, "I should once have wondered at your making such a supposition. But I now wonder at nothing of the kind." You reply, "Why so? What have I done lately, to take off your surprise? Have I forfeited my character for ingenuous and fair dealing with you?" (*Second Letter*, p. 135.) Since you ask me the question, I will answer it; I hope, in love, and in the spirit of meekness. I scarce know, of all who have wrote against me, a less ingenuous dealer; or one who has shown a more steady, invariable disposition to put an ill construction on whatever I say.

"But why would you not particularly explain these cases?" I will explain myself upon them once for all. For more than three hundred years after Christ, you know, demoniacs were common in the Church; and I suppose you are not unapprized, that during this period, (if not much longer,) they were continually relieved by the prayers of the faithful. Nor can I doubt, but demoniacs will remain, so long as Satan is the "god of this world." I doubt not, but there are such at this day. And I believe John Haydon was one. But of whatever sort his disorder was, that it was removed by prayer is undeniable. Now, sir, you have only two points to prove, and then your argument will be conclusive: (1.) That to think or say, "There are demoniacs now, and they are now relieved by prayer," is enthusiasm. (2.) That to say, "Demoniacs were or are relieved, on prayer made by Cyprian, or their parish minister," is to parallel the actions of Cyprian or that minister with the highest miracles of Christ and his disciples.

8. You remarked, "It will be difficult to persuade any sober person, that there is any thing supernatural in these disorders." (*Remarks*, p. 69.) The remainder of that paragraph I abridged thus: You attempt to account for those fits, by "obstructions or irregularities of the blood and spirits; hysterical disorders; watchings, fastings, closeness of rooms, great crowds, violent heat;" and lastly by "terrors, perplexities, and doubts, in weak and well-meaning men; which," you think, "in many of the cases before us, have quite overset their understandings." (*Remarks*, p. 43.)

I answered, "As to each of the rest, let it go as far as it can go." (Let it be supposed to have some influence in some cases; perhaps fully to account for one in a thousand.) "But I require proof of the last way whereby you would account for these disorders." Why, "the instances," you say, "of religious madness have much increased since you began to disturb the world." I doubt the fact. You reply, "This no way disproves it." (*Second Letter*, p. 137.) Yes, it does, till you produce some proof. For a bare negation is the proper and sufficient answer to a bare affirmation. I add, "If these instances had increased daily, it is easy to account for them another way," as is done in the First Part of

the *Farther Appeal*, at the ninety-fourth and following pages. You say, "Most have heard of or known several of the Methodists thus driven to distraction." I answered, "You may have heard of five hundred. But how many have you known? Be pleased to name eight or ten of them. I cannot find them, no, not one of them to this day, either man, woman, or child." (p. 290.) You reply, "This" (the naming them) "would be very improper and unnecessary." (*Second Letter*, p. 138.) However, sir, it is extremely necessary that you should name them to me in private. I will then, if required, excuse you to the public; which till then I cannot do.

The person I mentioned, whom you threw into much doubt and perplexity, then lived in the parish of St. Ann, Westminster. I related the case just as she related it to me. But she is able and ready to answer for herself.

9. You go on: "It is the most charitable supposition we can make, that many of the cases you have mentioned in your Journals, and some of which have been represented above, are of this kind," that is, instances of madness. (*Second Letter*, p. 138.) O tender charity! But cannot your charity reach one hair's breadth farther than this? No: for "otherwise" (that is, if those persons were not mad,) "the presumption and despair are terrible indeed." But what, if you were to suppose John Haydon (to instance in one) was not mad, but under a temporary possession; and that others were deeply convinced of sin, and of the wrath of God abiding on them? I should think this supposition (be it true or false) was full as charitable as the other.

I said, "I cannot find one such instance to this day." You reply, "Yet once you could not but be under some concern with regard to one or two persons, who seemed to be indeed lunatic, as well as sore vexed." So they seemed; but it soon appeared they were not. The very next paragraph mentions, that one of these, within a few hours, was "filled with the spirit of love, and of a sound mind." (Vol. iii, p. 158.)

But you are resolved, come what will, to carry this point; and so add, "Toward the end of your *Farther Appeal*, (First Part, p. 94,) you say, you have seen one instance of real, lasting madness. This was one whom you took with you to Bristol, who was afterward prejudiced against you, and began a vehement invective both against your person and doctrines. In the midst of this he was struck raving mad." Add, "And so he continued till his friends put him into Bedlam; and probably laid his madness to my charge." If they did not, it is now done to their hands.

10. "As to the cure of these fits, I observed," (so you, p. 139, proceed,) "that you had frequently represented them as miraculous, as the instantaneous consequences of your prayers." My former answer to this was, "I have set down the facts just as they were, passing no judgment upon them myself, and leaving every man else to judge as he pleases."

I am glad you give me an occasion of reviewing this answer; for, upon reflection, I do not like it at all. It grants you more than I can in conscience do. As it can be proved by abundance of witnesses, that these cures were frequently (indeed almost always) the instantaneous consequences of prayer, your inference is just. I cannot, dare not affirm,

that they were purely natural. I believe they were not. I believe many of them were wrought by the supernatural power of God; that of John Haydon in particular; (I fix on this, and will join issue with you upon it when you please;) and yet this is not barefaced enthusiasm. Nor can you prove it any enthusiasm at all, unless you can prove, that this is falsely ascribed to a supernatural power.

“The next case,” you say, “relates to the spotted fever, which you represent as being extremely mortal; but you believe there was not one with whom you were but recovered. I allowed that here is no intimation of any thing miraculous.” (*Remarks*, p. 72.) “You ask, ‘Why then is this cited as an instance of my enthusiasm?’ (p. 290.) You sure cannot think, that false pretences to miracles are the whole of enthusiasm.” No; but I think they are that part of enthusiasm which you here undertook to prove upon me. You are here to prove, that I “boast of curing bodily distempers by prayer, without the use of other means.” (*Remarks*, p. 71.) But if there is no intimation in my account of any thing miraculous, or that proper remedies had not been applied; how is this a proof, that I boast of curing bodily distempers, without applying any remedies at all?

“But you seem to desire to have it believed, that an extraordinary blessing attended your prayers. Whereas, if the circumstances could be particularly inquired into, most probably it would appear, that either the fury of the distemper was abated, or the persons you visited were seized with it in a more favourable degree, or were, by reason of a good constitution, more capable of going through it. Neither do I believe that they would have failed of an equal blessing and success had they had the assistance and prayers of their own parish ministers.”

There, sir; now I have done as you require; I have quoted your whole remark. But does all this prove, that I “boast of curing bodily distempers by prayer, without the use of any other means?” If you say, Although it does not prove this, it proves that “you seem to desire to have it believed, that an extraordinary blessing attended your prayers;” and this is another sort of enthusiasm: it is very well: so it does not prove the conclusion you designed; but it proves another, which is as good!

11. The two last instances of my enthusiasm which you bring, (*Remarks*, pp. 72, 73,) I had summed up in two lines, thus: “At two several times, being ill and in violent pain, I prayed to God, and found immediate ease.” (*Answer*, p. 291.) But since you say, I “must not hope to escape so; these instances must once more be laid before me particularly;” (*Second Letter*, p. 140;) I must yield to necessity, and set them down from the beginning to the end:—

“Saturday, March 21.—I explained in the evening the thirty-third chapter of Ezekiel; in applying which, I was seized with such a pain in my side, I could not speak. I knew my remedy, and immediately knelt down. In a moment the pain was gone.” (Vol. iii, p. 206.)

“Friday, May 8.—I found myself much out of order: however, I made shift to preach in the evening. But on Saturday my bodily strength failed, so that for several hours I could scarce lift up my head. Sunday, 10.—I was obliged to lie down most part of the day, being easy only in that posture. In the evening, beside the pain in my back and head, and the fever which still continued upon me, just as I began to pray I was seized with such a cough that I could hardly speak. At the same time came

strongly into my mind: 'These signs shall follow them that believe.' I called on Jesus aloud, to 'increase my faith,' and to 'confirm the word of his grace.' While I was speaking, my pain vanished away, the fever left me, my bodily strength returned, and for many weeks I felt neither weakness nor pain. Unto thee, O Lord, do I give thanks." (*Ibid.* p. 209.)

When you first cited these as proofs of enthusiasm, I answered "I will put your argument into form:—

"He that believes those are miraculous cures which are not so, is a rank enthusiast; but

"You believe those are miraculous cures which are not so: therefore, you are a rank enthusiast.

"What do you mean by miraculous? If you term every thing so, which is 'not strictly accountable for by the ordinary course of natural causes,' then I deny the latter part of the minor proposition. And unless you can make this good, unless you can prove the effects in question are 'strictly accountable for by the ordinary course of natural causes,' your argument is nothing worth."

You reply, "Your answer to the objection is very evasive, though you pretend to put my argument in form. You mistake the major proposition, which should have been:

"He that represents those cures as the immediate effects of his own prayers, and as miraculous, which are not so, is a rank enthusiast, if sincere:

"But, this you have done: *Ergo*, &c."

To this clumsy syllogism I rejoin, (1.) That the words, "if sincere," are utterly impertinent: for if insincerity be supposed, enthusiasm will be out of the question. (2.) That those words, "as the effects of his own prayers," may likewise be pared off; for they are unnecessary and cumbersome, the argument being complete without them. (3.) That, with or without them, the proposition is false; unless so far as it coincides with that you reject. For it is the believing those to be miracles which are not, that constitutes an enthusiast; not the representing them one way or the other; unless so far as it implies such a belief.

12. Upon my answer to the syllogism first proposed, you observe, "Thus" (by denying the latter part of the minor) "you clear yourself from the charge of enthusiasm, by acknowledging the cures to be supernatural and miraculous. Why then would you not speak out, and directly say, that you can work real and undoubted miracles? This would put the controversy between you and your opposers on a short foot, and be an effectual proof of the truth of your pretences." (*Second Letter*, p. 142.)

V. 1. I have in some measure explained myself on the head of miracles, in the third part of the *Farther Appeal*. But since you repeat the demand, (though without taking any notice of the arguments there advanced,) I will endeavour once more to give you a distinct, full, and determinate answer.

And, (1.) I acknowledge that I have seen with my eyes, and heard with my ears, several things, which, to the best of my judgment, cannot be accounted for by the ordinary course of natural causes; and which I therefore believe ought to be "ascribed to the extraordinary interposition of God." If any man choose to style these *miracles*, I reclaim not. I have diligently inquired into the facts. I have weighed the preceding and following circumstances. I have strove to account for them in a natural way. I could not, without doing violence to my reason. Not

to go far back, I am clearly persuaded, that the sudden deliverance of John Haydon was one instance of this kind; and my own recovery, on May 10th, another. I cannot account for either of these in a natural way. Therefore I believe they were both supernatural.

I must (2.) Observe, that the truth of these facts is supported by the same kind of proof, as that of all other facts is wont to be, namely, the testimony of competent witnesses; and that the testimony here is in as high a degree as any reasonable man can desire. Those witnesses were many in number: they could not be deceived themselves; for the facts in question they saw with their own eyes, and heard with their own ears: nor is it credible, that so many of them would combine together with a view of deceiving others; the greater part being men that feared God; as appeared by the general tenor of their lives. Thus in the case of John Haydon, this thing was not contrived and executed in a corner, and in the presence of his own family only, or three or four persons prepared for the purpose: no, it was in an open street of the city of Bristol, at one or two in the afternoon; and, the doors being all open from the beginning, not only many of the neighbours from every side, but several others, (indeed whosoever desired it,) went in, till the house could contain no more. Nor yet does the account of my own illness and recovery depend, as you suppose, on my bare word. There were many witnesses both of my disorder on Friday and Saturday, and of my lying down most part of Sunday, a thing which they were well satisfied could not be the effect of a slight indisposition; and all who saw me that evening plainly discerned, (what I could not wholly conceal,) that I was in pain; about two hundred of whom were present when I was seized with that cough, which cut me short, so that I could speak no more; till I cried out aloud, "Lord, increase my faith! Lord, confirm the word of thy grace!" The same persons saw and heard, that at that instant I changed my posture, and broke out into thanksgiving; that quickly after I stood upright, (which I could not before,) and showed no more sign either of sickness or pain.

Yet I must desire you well to observe, Thirdly, that my will, or choice, or desire, had no place either in this, or any case of this kind, that has ever fallen under my notice. Five minutes before, I had no thought of this. I expected nothing less. I was willing to wait for a gradual recovery, in the ordinary use of outward means. I did not look for any other cure, till the moment before I found it. And it is my belief that the case was always the same with regard to the most "real and undoubted miracles." I believe God never interposed his miraculous power, but according to his own sovereign will; not according to the will of man; neither of him by whom he wrought, nor of any other man whatsoever. The wisdom as well as the power are his; nor can I find that ever, from the beginning of the world, he lodged this power in any mere man, to be used whenever that man saw good. Suppose, therefore, there was a man now on earth who did work "real and undoubted miracles;" I would ask, By whose power doth he work these? and at whose pleasure? his own, or God's? Not his own; but God's. But if so, then your demand is not made on man, but on God. I cannot say it is modest, thus to challenge God; or well suiting the relation of a creature to his Creator.

2. However, I cannot but think, there have been already so many plain interpositions of Divine power, as will shortly leave you without excuse, if you either deny or despise them. We desire no favour, but the justice that diligent inquiry may be made concerning them. We are ready to name the persons on whom that power was shown, which belongeth to none but God; (not one or two, or ten or twelve only;) to point out their places of abode; and we engage they shall answer every pertinent question, fairly and directly; and, if required, shall give all those answers upon oath, before any who are empowered so to receive them. It is our particular request that the circumstances which went before, which accompanied, and which followed after, the facts under consideration, may be thoroughly examined, and punctually noted down. Let but this be done, (and is it not highly needful it should? at least, by those who would form an exact judgment,) and we have no fear that any reasonable man should scruple to say, "This hath God wrought!"

As there have been already so many instances of this kind, far beyond what we had dared to ask or think, I cannot take upon me to say whether or no it will please God to add to their number. I have not herein "known the mind of the Lord," neither am I "his counsellor." He may, or he may not; I cannot affirm or deny. I have no light, and I have no desire either way. "It is the Lord: let him do what seemeth him good." I desire only to be as clay in his hand.

But what, if there were now to be wrought ever so many "real and undoubted miracles?" (I suppose you mean by *undoubted*, such as, being sufficiently attested, ought not to be doubted of.) Why, "This," you say, "would put the controversy on a short foot, and be an effectual proof of the truth of your pretences." By no means. As common as this assertion is, there is none upon earth more false. Suppose a teacher were now, on this very day, to work "real and undoubted miracles;" this would extremely little "shorten the controversy" between him and the greater part of his opposers: for all this would not force them to believe; but many would still stand just where they did before; seeing men may "harden their hearts" against miracles, as well as against arguments.

So men have done from the beginning of the world; even against such signal, glorious miracles, against such interpositions of the power of God, as may not be again till the consummation of all things. Permit me to remind you only of a few instances; and to observe, that the argument holds *a fortiori*: for who will ever be empowered of God again to work such miracles as these were? Did Pharaoh look on all that Moses and Aaron wrought as an "effectual proof of the truth of their pretences?" even when "the Lord made the sea dry land, and the waters were divided;" when "the children of Israel went into the midst of the sea, and the waters were a wall unto them on the right hand, and on the left?" Exod. xiv, 21, 22. Nay,

The wounded dragon raged in vain;
And, fierce the utmost plague to brave,
Madly he dared the parted main,
And sunk beneath the o'erwhelming wave.

Was all this "an effectual proof of the truth of their pretences," to the Israelites themselves? It was not. "They were" still "disobedient at

the sea; even at the Red Sea!" Was the giving them day by day "bread from heaven," "an effectual proof" to those "two hundred and fifty princes of the assembly, famous in the congregation, men of renown," who said, with Dathan and Abiram, "Wilt thou put out the eyes of these men? We will not come up?" Numbers xvi, 14; nay, "when the ground clave asunder that was under them; and the earth opened her mouth and swallowed them up?" verse 32. Neither was this an "effectual proof" to those who saw it with their eyes, and heard the cry of those that went down into the pit; but, the very next day, they "murmured against Moses and against Aaron, saying, Ye have killed the people of the Lord!" verse 41.

Was not the case generally the same with regard to the Prophets that followed? several of whom "stopped the mouths of lions, quenched the violence of fire," did many mighty works; yet their own people received them not. Yet "they were stoned, they were sawn asunder, they were slain with the sword;" they were "destitute, afflicted, tormented!" utterly contrary to the commonly received supposition, that the working real, undoubted miracles must bring all controversy to an end, and convince every gainsayer.

Let us come nearer yet. How stood the case between our Lord himself and his opposers? Did he not work "real and undoubted miracles?" And what was the effect? Still, when "he came to his own, his own received him not." Still "he was despised and rejected of men." Still it was a challenge not to be answered: "Have any of the rulers or of the Pharisees believed on him?" After this, how can you imagine, that whoever works miracles must convince "all men of the truth of his pretences?"

I would just remind you of only one instance more: "There sat a certain man at Lystra, impotent in his feet, being a cripple from his mother's womb, who never had walked. The same heard Paul speak; who steadfastly beholding him, and perceiving that he had faith to be healed, said with a loud voice, Stand upright on thy feet. And he leaped and walked." Here was so undoubted a miracle, that the people "lifted up their voices, saying, The gods are come down in the likeness of men." But how long were even these convinced of the truth of his pretences? Only till "there came thither certain Jews from Antioch and Iconium;" and then they stoned him (as they supposed) to death! Acts xiv, 1, &c. So certain it is, that no miracles whatever, which were ever yet wrought in the world, were effectual to prove the most glaring truth, to those that hardened their hearts against it.

4. And it will equally hold in every age and nation. "If they hear not Moses and the Prophets, neither will they be convinced" of what they desire not to believe, "though one rose from the dead." Without a miracle, without one rising from the dead, *εαν τις θεληη το θελημα αυτου ποιειν*, "if any man be willing to do his will, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God." But if he is not willing to do his will, he will never want an excuse, a plausible reason, for rejecting it. Yea, though ever so many miracles were wrought to confirm it. For let ever so much "light come into the world," it will have no effect (such is the wise and just will of God) on those who "love darkness rather than light." It will not convince those who do not simply desire to do the

will of their Father which is in heaven ; those who mind earthly things ; who (if they do not continue in any gross outward sin, yet) love pleasure or ease ; yet seek profit or power, preferment or reputation. Nothing will ever be an effectual proof to these of the holy and acceptable will of God, unless first their proud hearts be humbled, their stubborn wills bowed down, and their desires brought, at least in some degree, into obedience to the law of Christ.

Hence, although it should please God to work anew all the wonders that ever were wrought on the earth, still these men, however "wise and prudent" they may be in things relating to the present world, would fight against God and all his messengers, and that in spite of all these miracles. Meanwhile, God will reveal his truth unto babes, unto those who are meek and lowly, whose desires are in heaven, who want to "know nothing save Jesus Christ and him crucified." These need no outward miracle to show them his will ; they have a plain rule,—the written word. And "the anointing which they have received of him abideth in them, and teacheth them of all things," 1 John ii, 27. Through this they are enabled to bring all doctrines "to the law and to the testimony:" and whatsoever is agreeable to this they receive, without waiting to see it attested by miracles ; as, on the other hand, whatever is contrary to this they reject ; nor can any miracles move them to receive it.

5. Yet I do not know that God hath any way precluded himself from thus exerting his sovereign power, from working miracles in any kind or degree, in any age, to the end of the world. I do not recollect any scripture wherein we are taught, that miracles were to be confined within the limits either of the apostolic or the Cypriatic age ; or of any period of time, longer or shorter, even till the restitution of all things. I have not observed, either in the Old Testament or the New, any intimation at all of this kind. St. Paul says, indeed, once, concerning two of the miraculous gifts of the Spirit, (so, I think, that text is usually understood,) "Whether there be prophecies, they shall fail, whether there be tongues, they shall cease." But he does not say, either that these or any other miracles shall cease, till faith and hope shall cease also ; till they all be swallowed up in the vision of God, and love be all in all.

I presume you will allow there is one kind of miracles (loosely speaking) which are not ceased ; namely, *τερατα ψευδους*, "lying wonders," diabolical miracles, or works beyond the virtue of natural causes, wrought by the power of evil spirits. Nor can you easily conceive that these will cease, as long as the father of lies is the prince of this world. And why should you think that the God of truth is less active than him, or that he will not have his miracles also ? only, not as man wills, neither when he wills ; but according to his own excellent wisdom and greatness.

6. But even if it were supposed that God does now work beyond the operation of merely natural causes, yet what impression would this make upon you, in the disposition your mind is now in ? Suppose the trial were repeated, were made again to-morrow. One informs you the next day, "While a clergyman was preaching yesterday, where I was, a man came who had been long ill of an incurable distemper. Prayer was made for him, and he was restored to perfect health."

Suppose, now, that this were real fact : perhaps you would scarce

have patience to hear the account of it ; but would cut it short, in the midst, with, “Do you tell this as something supernatural? Then miracles are not ceased.” But if you should venture to ask, “Where was this, and who was the person that prayed?” and it was answered, “At the Foundery near Moorfields ; the person who prayed was Mr. Wesley ;” what a damp comes at once ! What a weight falls on your mind, at the very first setting out ! It is well if you have any heart or desire to move one step farther. Or if you should, what a strong additional propensity do you now feel to deny the fact ! And is there not a ready excuse for so doing ?—“O, they who tell the story are doubtless his own people ; most of whom, we may be sure, will say any thing for him, and the rest will believe any thing.” But if you at length allowed the fact, might you not find means to account for it by natural causes ? “Great crowds, violent heats, with obstructions and irregularities of the blood and spirits,” will do wonders. If you could not but allow it was more than natural, might not some plausible reason be found for ranking it among the lying wonders, for ascribing it to the devil rather than God ? And if, after all, you was convinced it was the finger of God, must you not still bring every doctrine advanced to the law and to the testimony, the only sure and infallible test of all ? What, then, is the use of this continual demand, “Show us a sign, and we will believe ?” What will you believe ? I hope, no more than is written in the book of God. And thus far you might venture to believe, even without a miracle.

7. Let us consider this point yet a little farther. “What is it you would have us prove by miracles ? the doctrines we preach ?” We prove these by Scripture and reason ; and, if need be, by antiquity. What else is it, then, that we are to prove by miracles ? At length we have a distinct reply : “Wise and sober men will not otherwise be convinced,” (that is, unless you prove this by miracles,) “that God is, by the means of such teachers, and such doctrines, working a great and extraordinary work in the earth.” (*Pref.* p. 6.)

So then the determinate point which you, in their name, call upon us to prove by miracles, is this, “that God is, by these teachers, working a great and extraordinary work in the earth.”

What I mean by “a great and extraordinary work,” is, the bringing multitudes of gross notorious sinners, in a short space, to the fear, and love, and service of God, to an entire change of heart and life.

Now, then, let us take a nearer view of the proposition, and see which part of it we are to prove by miracles.

“Is it, (1.) That A. B. was, for many years, without God in the world, a common swearer, a drunkard, a Sabbath breaker ?

“Or, (2.) That he is not so now ?

“Or, (3.) That he continued so till he heard these men preach ; and from that time was another man ?

“Not so. The proper way to prove these facts is, by the testimony of competent witnesses. And these witnesses are ready, whenever required, to give full evidence of them.

“Or would you have us prove by miracles, (4.) That this was not done by our own power or holiness ? that God only is able to raise the dead, to quicken those who are dead in trespasses and sins ?”

Surely No. Whosoever believes the Scriptures, will want no new proof of this.

Where then is the wisdom of those men who demand miracles in proof of such a proposition? one branch of which, "that such sinners were reformed by the means of these teachers," being a plain fact, can only be proved by testimony, as all other facts are; and the other, "That this is a work of God, and a great and more than ordinary work," needs no proof, as carrying its own evidence to every thinking man.

8. To sum up this: No truly wise or sober man can possibly desire or expect miracles to prove either, (1.) That these doctrines are true;—this must be decided by Scripture and reason; or, (2.) That these facts are true; this can only be proved by testimony; or, (3.) That to change sinners from darkness to light, is the work of God alone; only using what instruments he pleases;—this is glaringly self-evident; or, (4.) That such a change wrought in so many notorious sinners, within so short a time, is a great and extraordinary work of God; this also carries its own evidence. What then is it which remains to be proved by miracles? Perhaps you will say, It is this: "That God hath called or sent you to do this." Nay, this is implied in the third of the foregoing propositions. If God has actually used us therein, if his work hath in fact prospered in our hands, then he hath called or sent us to do this. I entreat reasonable men to weigh this thoroughly, whether the fact does not plainly prove the call; whether He who enables us thus to save souls alive, does not commission us so to do; whether, by giving us the power to pluck these brands out of the burning, He does not authorize us to exert it?

O that it were possible for you to consider calmly, whether the success of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, even as it is preached by us, the least of his servants, be not itself a miracle, never to be forgotten! one which cannot be denied, as being visible at this day, not in one, but a hundred places; one which cannot be accounted for by the ordinary course of any natural cause whatsoever; one which cannot be ascribed, with any colour of reason, to diabolical agency; and, lastly, one which will bear the infallible test,—the trial of the written word.

VI. 1. But here I am aware of abundance of objections. You object, That to speak any thing of myself, of what I have done, or am doing now, is mere boasting and vanity. This charge you frequently repeat. So, p. 102: "The following page is full of boasting." "You boast very much of the numbers you have converted;" (p. 113;) and again, "As to myself, I hope I shall never be led to imitate you in boasting." I think therefore it is needful, once for all, to examine this charge thoroughly; and to show distinctly what that good thing is which you disguise under this bad name.

(1.) From the year 1725 to 1729 I preached much, but saw no fruit of my labour. Indeed it could not be that I should; for I neither laid the foundation of repentance, nor of believing the Gospel; taking it for granted, that all to whom I preached were believers, and that many of them "needed no repentance." (2.) From the year 1729 to 1734, laying a deeper foundation of repentance, I saw a little fruit. But it was only a little; and no wonder: for I did not preach faith in the blood of the covenant. (3.) From 1734 to 1738, speaking more of faith in Christ, I saw more fruit of my preaching, and visiting from house to house, than ever I had done before; though I know not if any of those

who were outwardly reformed were inwardly and thoroughly converted to God. (4.) From 1738 to this time, speaking continually of Jesus Christ, laying him only for the foundation of the whole building, making him all in all, the first and the last; preaching only on this plan, "The kingdom of God is at hand; repent ye, and believe the Gospel;" the "word of God ran" as fire among the stubble; it "was glorified" more and more; multitudes crying out, "What must we do to be saved?" and afterward witnessing, "By grace we are saved through faith." (5.) I considered deeply with myself what I ought to do; whether to declare the things I had seen, or not. I consulted the most serious friends I had. They all agreed, I ought to declare them; that the work itself was of such a kind, as ought in no wise to be concealed; and indeed, that the unusual circumstances now attending it, made it impossible that it should. (6.) This very difficulty occurred: "Will not my speaking of this be boasting? at least, will it not be accounted so?" They replied, "If you speak of it as your own work, it will be vanity and boasting all over; but if you ascribe it wholly to God, if you give him all the praise, it will not. And if, after this, some will account it so still, you must be content, and bear the burden." (7.) I yielded, and transcribed my papers for the press; only labouring, as far as possible, to "render unto God the things which are God's;" to give him the praise of his own work.

2. But this very thing you improve into a fresh objection. If I ascribe any thing to God, it is *enthusiasm*. If I do not (or if I do) it is *vanity and boasting*, supposing me to mention it at all. What then can I do to escape your censure? "Why, be silent; say nothing at all." I cannot, I dare not. Were I thus to please men, I could not be the servant of Christ.

You do not appear to have the least idea or conception of what is in the heart of one whom it pleases Him that worketh all in all to employ in a work of this kind. He is in no wise forward to be at all employed therein; he starts back, again and again; not only because he readily foresees what shame, care, sorrow, reproach, what loss of friends, and of all that the world accounts dear, will inevitably follow; but much more, because he (in some measure) knows himself. This chiefly it is which constrains him to cry out, (and that many times, in the bitterness of his soul, when no human eye seeth him,) O Lord, send by whom thou wilt send, only send not me! What am I? A worm! A dead dog! A man unclean in heart and lips!" And when he dares no longer gainsay or resist, when he is at last "thrust out into the harvest," he looketh on the right hand and on the left, he takes every step with fear and trembling, and with the deepest sense (such as words cannot express) of "Who is sufficient for these things?" Every gift which he has received of God for the furtherance of his word, whether of nature or grace, heightens this fear, and increases his jealousy over himself; knowing that so much the stricter must the inquiry be, when he gives an account of his stewardship. He is most of all jealous over himself when the work of the Lord prospers in his hand. He is then amazed and confounded before God. Shame covers his face. Yet when he sees, that he ought "to praise the Lord for his goodness, and to declare the wonders which he doeth for the children of men," he is in a strait between

two; he knows not which way to turn; he cannot speak; he dares not be silent. It may be, for a time he "keeps his mouth with a bridle; he holds his peace even from good. But his heart is hot within him," and constrains him at length to declare what God hath wrought. And this he then doeth in all simplicity, with "great plainness of speech," desiring only to commend himself to Him who "searcheth the heart and trieth the reins;" and (whether his words are the savour of life or of death to others) to have that witness in himself, "As of sincerity, as of God, in the sight of God, speak we in Christ." If any man counts this boasting, he cannot help it. It is enough that a higher Judge standeth at the door.

3. But you may say, "Why do you talk of the success of the Gospel in England, which was a Christian country before you was born?" Was it indeed? Is it so at this day? I would explain myself a little on this head also.

And, (1.) None can deny, that the people of England, in general, are called Christians. They are called so, a few only excepted, by others, as well as by themselves. But I presume no man will say that the name makes the thing; that men are Christians, barely because they are called so. (2.) It must be allowed, that the people of England, generally speaking, have been christened or baptized. But neither can we infer, "These were once baptized; therefore they are Christians now." (3.) It is allowed, that many of those who were once baptized, and are called Christians to this day, hear the word of God, attend public prayers, and partake of the Lord's Supper. But neither does this prove that they are Christians. For, notwithstanding this, some of them live in open sin; and others (though not conscious to themselves of hypocrisy, yet) are utter strangers to the religion of the heart; are full of pride, vanity, covetousness, ambition; of hatred, anger, malice, or envy; and, consequently, are no more scriptural Christians, than the open drunkard or common swearer.

Now, these being removed, where are the Christians, from whom we may properly term England a Christian country? the men who have the mind which was in Christ, and who walk as he also walked; whose inmost soul is renewed after the image of God; and who are outwardly holy, as He who hath called them is holy? There are doubtless a few such to be found. To deny this would be want of candour. But how few! how thinly scattered up and down! And as for a Christian visible Church, or a body of Christians visibly united together, where is this to be seen?

Ye different sects, who all declare,
Lo! here is Christ, or, Christ is there!
Your stronger proofs divinely give,
And show me where the Christians live!

And what use is it of, what good end does it serve, to term England a Christian country? (Although it is true, most of the natives are called Christians, have been baptized, frequent the ordinances; and although a real Christian is here and there to be found, "as a light shining in a dark place.") Does it do any honour to our great Master, among those who are not called by his name? Does it recommend Christianity to the Jews, the Mohammedans, or the avowed Heathens? Surely no one can conceive it does. It only makes Christianity stink

in their nostrils. Does it answer any good end with regard to those on whom this worthy name is called? I fear not; but rather an exceeding bad one. For, does it not keep multitudes easy in their heathen practice? Does it not make or keep still greater numbers satisfied with their heathen tempers? Does it not directly tend to make both the one and the other imagine, that they are what indeed they are not; that they are Christians, while they are utterly without Christ, and without God in the world? To close this point: If men are not Christians till they are renewed after the image of Christ, and if the people of England in general are not thus renewed, why do we term them so? The god of this world hath long blinded their hearts. Let us do nothing to increase that blindness; but rather labour to recover them from that strong delusion, that they may no longer believe a lie.

4. Let us labour to convince all mankind, that to be a real Christian, is, to love the Lord our God with all our heart, and to serve him with all our strength; to love our neighbour as ourselves; and therefore do unto every man as we would he should do unto us. Nay, you say, "Had you confined yourselves to these great points, there would have been no objection against your doctrine. But the doctrines you have distinguished yourselves by, are not the love of God and man, but many false and pernicious errors." (p. 104.)

I have again and again, with all the plainness I could, declared what our constant doctrines are; whereby we are distinguished only from Heathens, or nominal Christians; not from any that worship God in spirit and in truth. Our main doctrines, which include all the rest, are three,—that of repentance, of faith, and of holiness. The first of these we account, as it were, the porch of religion; the next, the door; the third, religion itself.

That repentance or conviction of sin, which is always previous to faith, (either in a higher or lower degree, as it pleases God,) we describe in words to this effect:—

"When men feel in themselves the heavy burden of sin, see damnation to be the reward of it, behold with the eye of their mind the horror of hell; they tremble, they quake, and are inwardly touched with sorrowfulness of heart, and cannot but accuse themselves, and open their grief unto Almighty God, and call unto him for mercy. This being done seriously, their mind is so occupied, partly with sorrow and heaviness, partly with an earnest desire to be delivered from this danger of hell and damnation, that all desire of meat and drink is laid apart, and loathing of all worldly things and pleasure cometh in place. So that nothing then liketh them more, than to weep, to lament, to mourn; and both with words and behaviour of body to show themselves weary of life."

Now, permit me to ask, What, if, before you had observed that these were the very words of our own Church, one of your acquaintance or parishioners had come and told you, that ever since he heard a sermon at the Foundery, he "saw damnation" before him, "and beheld with the eye of his mind the horror of hell?" What, if he had "trembled and quaked," and been so taken up, "partly with sorrow and heaviness, partly with an earnest desire to be delivered from the danger of hell and damnation," as to "weep, to lament, to mourn, and both with words and behaviour to show himself weary of life?" Would you have scrupled to say, "Here is another 'deplorable instance' of the 'Methodists driving men to dis-

traction! See, 'into what excessive terrors, frights, doubts, and perplexities, they throw weak and well-meaning men! quite oversetting their understandings and judgments, and making them liable to all these miseries.'

I dare not refrain from adding one plain question, which I beseech you to answer, not to me, but to God: Have you ever experienced this repentance yourself? Did you ever "feel in yourself that heavy burden of sin?" of sin in general, more especially, inward sin; of pride, anger, lust, vanity? of (what is all sin in one) that carnal mind which is enmity, essential enmity, against God? Do you know by experience what it is, to "behold with the eye of the mind the horror of hell?" Was "your mind" ever so "taken up, partly with sorrow and heaviness, partly with an earnest desire to be delivered from this danger of hell and damnation, that even all desire of meat and drink" was taken away, and you "loathed all worldly things and pleasure?" Surely if you had known what it is to have the "arrows of the Almighty" thus "sticking fast in you," you could not so lightly have condemned those who now cry out, "The pains of hell come about me; the sorrows of death compass me, and the overflowings of ungodliness make me afraid."

5. Concerning the gate of religion,—(if it may be allowed so to speak,) the true, Christian, saving faith,—we believe it implies abundantly more than an assent to the truth of the Bible. "Even the devils believe that Christ was born of a virgin; that he wrought all kind of miracles; that for our sakes he suffered a most painful death to redeem us from death everlasting. These articles of our faith the very devils believe, and so they believe all that is written in the Old and New Testament. And yet, for all this faith, they be but devils. They remain still in their damnable estate, lacking the very true Christian faith.

"The right and true Christian faith is, not only to believe that the Holy Scriptures and the articles of our faith are true, but also to have a sure trust and confidence to be saved from everlasting damnation, through Christ." Perhaps it may be expressed more clearly thus: "A sure trust and confidence which a man hath in God, that by the merits of Christ his sins are forgiven, and he reconciled to the favour of God."

For giving this account of Christian faith, (as well as the preceding account of repentance, both which I have here also purposely described in the very terms of the Homilies,) I have been again and again, for near these eight years past, accused of enthusiasm; sometimes by those who spoke to my face, either in conversation, or from the pulpit; but more frequently by those who chose to speak in my absence; and not seldom from the press. I wait for those who judge this to be enthusiasm, to bring forth their strong reasons. Till then, I must continue to account all these the "words of truth and soberness."

6. Religion itself (I choose to use the very words wherein I described it long ago) we define, "The loving God with all our heart, and our neighbour as ourselves; and in that love abstaining from all evil, and doing all possible good to all men." The same meaning we have sometimes expressed a little more at large, thus: "Religion we conceive to be no other than love; the love of God and of all mankind; the loving God 'with all our heart, and soul, and strength,' as having 'first loved us,' as the fountain of all the good we have received, and of all

we ever hope to enjoy; and the loving every soul which God hath made, every man on earth, as our own soul.

“This love we believe to be the medicine of life, the never-failing remedy for all the evils of a disordered world, for all the miseries and vices of men. Wherever this is, there are virtue and happiness going hand in hand. There is humbleness of mind, gentleness, longsuffering, the whole image of God, and, at the same time, a peace that passeth all understanding, and joy unspeakable and full of glory.

“This religion we long to see established in the world, a religion of love, and joy, and peace; having its seat in the heart, in the inmost soul, but ever showing itself by its fruits; continually springing forth, not only in all innocence, (for love worketh no ill to his neighbour,) but likewise in every kind of beneficence, spreading virtue and happiness all around it.”

If this can be proved by Scripture or reason to be enthusiastic or erroneous doctrine, we will then plead guilty to the indictment of “teaching error and enthusiasm.” But if this be the genuine religion of Christ, then will all who advance this charge against us be found false witnesses before God, in the day when he shall judge the earth.

7. However, with regard to the fruits of our teaching, you say, “It is to be feared, the numbers of serious men who have been perplexed and deluded are much greater than the numbers of notorious sinners who have been brought to repentance and good life.” (p. 113.) “Indeed, if you could prove that the Methodists were, in general, very wicked people before they followed you, and that all you have been teaching them is, the love of God and their neighbour, and a care to keep his commandments, which accordingly they have done since, you would stop the mouths of all adversaries at once. But we have great reason to believe that the generality of the Methodists, before they became so, were serious, regular, and well-disposed people.” (p. 103.)

If the question were proposed, “Which are greater, the numbers of serious men who have been perplexed and deluded, or of notorious sinners who have been brought to repentance and good life,” by these preachers, throughout England, within seven years? it might be difficult for you to fix the conclusion. For England is a place of wide dimensions; nor is it easy to make a satisfactory computation, unless you confine yourself within a smaller compass. Suppose then we were to contract the question, in order to make it a little less unwieldy. We will bound our inquiry, for the present, within a square of three or four miles. It may be certainly known by candid men, both what has been and what is now done within this distance; and from hence they may judge of those fruits elsewhere, which they cannot be so particularly informed of.

Inquire then, “Which are greater, the numbers of serious men, perplexed and deluded by these teachers, or of notorious sinners brought to repentance and good life,” within the forest of Kingswood? Many indeed of the inhabitants are nearly as they were; are not much better or worse for their preaching; because the neighbouring clergy and gentry have successfully laboured to deter them from hearing it. But between three and four hundred of those who would not be deterred are now under the care of those preachers. Now, what number of these were serious Christians before? Were fifty? Were twenty? Were ten? Peradventure, there might five such be found. But it is a question

whether there could or no. The remainder were gross, open sinners, common swearers, drunkards, Sabbath breakers, whoremongers, plunderers, robbers, implacable, unmerciful, wolves and bears in the shape of men. Do you desire instances of more "notorious sinners" than these? I know not if Turkey or Japan can afford them. And what do you include in "repentance and good life?" Give the strictest definition thereof that you are able; and I will undertake, these once notorious sinners shall be weighed in that balance, and not found wanting.

8. Not that all the Methodists (so called) "were very wicked people before they followed us." There are those among them, and not a few, who are able to stop the boasting of those that despise them, and to say, "Whereinsoever any of you is bold, I am bold also:" only they "count all these things but loss, for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus." But these we found, as it were, when we sought them not. We went forth to "seek that which was lost;" (more eminently lost;) "to call" the most flagrant, hardened, desperate "sinners to repentance." To this end we preached in the Horsefair at Bristol, in Kingswood, in Newcastle; among the colliers in Staffordshire, and the tanners in Cornwall; in Southwark, Wapping, Moorfields, Drury-lane, at London. Did any man ever pick out such places as these, in order to find "serious, regular, well-disposed people?" How many such might then be in any of them I know not. But this I know, that four in five of those who are now with us were not of that number, but were wallowing in their blood, till God by us said unto them, "Live."

Sir, I willingly put the whole cause on this issue: what are the general consequences of this preaching? Are there more tares or wheat? more "good men destroyed," (that is the proper question,) or "wicked men saved?" The last place where we began constant preaching is a part of Wiltshire and Somersetshire, near Bath. Now, let any man inquire at Rhode, Bradford, Wrexall, or among the colliers at Coleford, (1.) What kind of people were those "before they followed these men?" (2.) What are the main doctrines they have been teaching for this twelve-month? (3.) What effect have these doctrines upon their followers? What manner of lives do they lead now? And if you do not find, (1.) That three in four of these were, two years ago, notoriously wicked men; (2.) That the main doctrines they have heard since, were, "Love God and your neighbour, and carefully keep his commandments;" and, (3.) That they have since exercised themselves herein, and continue so to do;—I say, if you, or any reasonable man, who will be at the pains to inquire, does not find this to be an unquestionable fact, I will openly acknowledge myself an enthusiast, or whatsoever else you shall please to style me.

Only one caution I would give to such an inquirer: let him not ask the colliers of Coleford, "Were not the generality of you, before you followed these men, serious, regular, well-disposed people?" Were you not "offended at the profaneness and debauchery of the age?" And "was it not this disposition which at first made you liable to receive these impressions?" (*Second Letter*, p. 103.) Because if he talk thus to some of those who do not yet "follow these men," perhaps he will not live to bring back their answer.

9. But will this, or a thousand such instances as this, "stop the

mouths of all adversaries at once?" O sir, would one expect such a thought as this in one that had read the Bible? What if you could convert as many sinners as St. Paul himself? Would that "stop the mouths of all your adversaries?" Yea, if you could convert three thousand at one sermon, still you would be so far from "stopping all their mouths at once," that the greater part of them would gnash upon you with their teeth, and cry, "Away with such a fellow from the earth!"

I never, therefore, expect "to persuade the world," the majority of mankind, that I "have been," for some years, "advancing nothing" but what has a clear, immediate connection with "the true knowledge and love of God;" that God hath been pleased to use me, a weak, vile worm, in reforming many of my fellow sinners, and making them, at this day, living witnesses of "inward and pure religion;" and that many of these, "from living in all sin, are quite changed, are become" so far "holy, that" though they are not "free from all sin," yet no sin hath dominion over them. And yet I do firmly believe, "it is nothing but downright prejudice, to deny or oppose any of these particulars." (*Pref.* p. 5.)

"Allow Mr. Wesley," you say, "but these few points, and he will defend his conduct beyond exception." That is most true. If I have indeed "been advancing nothing but the true knowledge and love of God; if God has made me an instrument in reforming many sinners, and bringing them to "inward and pure religion;" and if many of these continue holy to this day, and free from all wilful sin, then may I, even I, use those awful words, "He that despiseth me, despiseth Him that sent me." But I never expect the world to allow me one of these points. However, I must go on as God shall enable me. I must lay out whatsoever he intrusts me with, (whether others will believe I do it or no,) in advancing the true Christian knowledge of God, and the love and fear of God among men; in reforming (if so be it please him to use me still) those who are yet without God in the world; and in propagating inward and pure religion,—righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost.

10. But you believe, I only corrupt those who were good Christians before, teaching them to revile and censure their neighbours, and to abuse the clergy, notwithstanding all their meekness and gentleness, as I do myself. "I must declare," say you, "we have, in general, answered your pretence with all meekness and temper; the railing and reviling has been chiefly on the side of the Methodists." (*Sec. Let.* p. 16.)

Your first charge ran thus: "How have such abuses as these been thrown out by you against our regular clergy, not the highest or the worthiest excepted!" (*Remarks*, p. 15.) I answered, "I am altogether clear in this matter, as often as it has been objected: neither do I desire to receive any other treatment from the clergy, than they have received from me to this day." (p. 282.)

You reply, (1.) "One instance of your misrepresenting and injuring a preacher of our Church I mentioned." (*Second Letter*, p. 105.) *Mentioned!* Well, but did you *prove* it was an injury or misrepresentation? I know not that you once attempted it. (2.) You next quote part of a letter from the *Third Journal*; (vol. iii, p. 126;) wherein, according to your account, the "most considerable of our clergy are abused, and at once accused in a very gross manner." (*Second Letter*, p. 106.) Set down the whole paragraph, and I will prove that this also is naked truth,

and no abuse at all. You say, (3.) "You approved of Whitefield's railing against the clergy;" that is, I say, "Mr. Whitefield preached concerning the 'Holy Ghost, which all who believe are to receive;' not without a just, though severe, censure of those who preach as if there were no Holy Ghost." (Vol. iii, p. 144.) Nor is this railing, but melancholy truth. I have myself heard several preach in this manner. (4.) You cite my words: "Wo unto you, ye blind leaders of the blind! How long will you pervert the right ways of the Lord?" and add, "I appeal to yourself, whether you did not design this reflection against the clergy in general who differ from you." No more than I did against Moses and Aaron. I expressly specify whom I design: "Ye who tell the mourners in Zion, Much religion hath made you mad." You say, (5.) (with a N. B.,) "All the clergy who differ from you, you style so, p. 154; in which, and the foregoing page, you causelessly slander them as speaking of their own holiness as that for the sake of which, on account of which, we are justified before God."

Let any serious person read over those pages. I therein slander no man: I speak what I know; what I have both heard and read. The men are alive, and the books are extant. And the same conclusion I now defend, touching that part of the clergy who preach or write thus; viz. if they preach the truth as it is in Jesus, I am found a false witness before God. But if I preach the way of God in truth, then they are blind leaders of the blind. (6.) You quote those words, "Nor can I be said to intrude into the labours of those who do not labour at all, but suffer thousands of those for whom Christ died to perish for lack of knowledge." (Vol. iii, p. 146.) I wrote that letter near Kingswood. I would to God the observation were not terribly true! (7.) The first passage you cite from the "Earnest Appeal," (p. 21,) evidently relates to a few only among the clergy; and if the charge be true but of one in five hundred, it abundantly supports my reasoning. (8.) In the next, (*Ib.* p. 24,) I address all those, and those only, who affirm that I preach for gain.

You conclude: "The reader has now before him the manner in which you have been pleased to treat the clergy; and your late sermon is too fresh an instance of the like usage of the universities." (*Second Letter*, p. 107.) It is an instance of speaking the truth in love. So I desire all mankind may use me. Nor could I have said less either to the university or the clergy, without sinning against God and my own soul.

11. But I must explain myself a little on that practice which you so often term "abusing the clergy." I have many times great sorrow and heaviness in my heart on account of these my brethren. And this sometimes constrains me to speak to them, in the only way which is now in my power; and sometimes, though rarely, to speak of them; of a few, not all, in general. In either case, I take an especial care, (1.) To speak nothing but the truth. (2.) To speak this with all plainness. And, (3.) With love, and in the spirit of meekness. Now, if you will call this *abusing*, *railing*, or *reviling*, you must. But still I dare not refrain from it. I must thus rail, thus abuse sinners of all sorts and degrees, unless I will perish with them.

When I first read your declaration, that our brethren "in general had treated us with all meekness and temper," I had thoughts of spreading

before you a few of the flowers which they have strowed upon us with no sparing hand. But, on reflection, I judged it better to forbear. Let them die and be forgotten!

As to those of the people called *Methodists*, whom you suppose to "rail at and abuse the clergy," and to "revile and censure their neighbours," I can only say, Which are they? Show me the men. And if it appear, that any of those under my care habitually "censure" or "revile" others, whether clergy or laity, I will make them an example, for the benefit of all the rest.

Touching you, I believe I was afraid without cause. I do not think you advanced a wilful untruth. This was a rash word. I hereby openly retract it, and ask pardon of God and you.

To draw toward a conclusion: Whosoever they are that "despise me, and make no account of my labours," I know that they are "not in vain in the Lord;" and that I have not "fought as one that beateth the air." I still see (and I praise "the Father of Lights," from whom every good and perfect gift descendeth) a continual increase of pure religion and undefiled, of the love of God and man, of the "wisdom" which is "pure and peaceable, gentle, and easy to be entreated, full of mercy, and of good fruits." I see more and more of those "who before lived in a thorough contempt of God's ordinances, and of all duties, now zealously discharging their duties to God and man, and walking in all his ordinances blameless." A few indeed I have seen draw back to perdition, chiefly through a fear of being "righteous overmuch." And here and there one has fallen into Calvinism, or turned aside to the Moravians. But I doubt not, these "are in a better state than they were before they heard us." Admit they are in error, yea, and die therein, yet who dares affirm they will perish everlastingly? But had they died in gross sin, we are sure they had fallen into "the fire that never shall be quenched."

I have now considered, as far as my time would permit, (not every thing in your letter, whether of moment or no, but,) those points which I conceived to be of the greatest weight. That God may lead us both into all truth, and that we may not drop our love in the pursuit of it, is the continual prayer of, reverend sir, your friend and servant for Christ's sake,

JOHN WESLEY.

June 17, 1746.

A LETTER TO

THE RIGHT REV. THE LORD BISHOP OF LONDON;

OCCASIONED BY HIS LORDSHIP'S LATE CHARGE TO HIS CLERGY.

Let me not, I pray you, accept any man's person, neither let me give flattering titles unto man. For I know not to give flattering titles; in so doing, my Maker would soon take me away, JOB xxxii, 21, 22.

MY LORD,—1. When abundance of persons have for several years laid to my charge things that I knew not, I have generally thought it my duty to pass it over in silence, to be "as one that heard not." But the case is different when a person of your lordship's character calls me

forth to answer for myself. Silence now might be interpreted contempt. It might appear like a sullen disregard, a withholding honour from him to whom honour is due, were it only on account of his high office in the Church, more especially when I apprehend so eminent a person as this to be under considerable mistakes concerning me. Were I now to be silent, were I not to do what was in my power for the removal of those mistakes, I could not "have a conscience void of offence," either "toward God or toward man."

2. But I am sensible how difficult it is to speak in such a manner as I ought, and as I desire to do. When your lordship published those queries, under the title of "Observations," I did not lie under the same difficulty; because, as your name was not inscribed, I had "the liberty to stand, as it were, on even ground." But I must now always remember to whom I speak. And may the God "whom I serve in the Gospel of his Son," enable me to do it with deep seriousness of spirit, with modesty and humility; and, at the same time, with the utmost plainness of speech; seeing we must "both stand before the judgment seat of Christ."

3. In this, then, I entreat your lordship to bear with me; and in particular, when I speak of myself, (how tender a point!) just as freely as I would of another man. Let not this be termed boasting. Is there not a cause? Can I refrain from speaking, and be guiltless? And if I speak at all, ought I not to speak (what appears to me to be) the whole truth? Does not your lordship desire that I should do this? I will then, God being my helper. And you will bear with me in my folly, (if such it is,) with my speaking in the simplicity of my heart.

4. Your lordship begins, "There is another species of enemies, who give shameful disturbance to the parochial clergy, and use very unwarrantable methods to prejudice their people against them, and to seduce their flocks from them; the Methodist and Moravians, who agree in annoying the established ministry, and in drawing over to themselves the lowest and most ignorant of the people, by pretences to greater sanctity." (*Charge*, p. 4.)

But have no endeavours been used to show them their error? Yes; your lordship remarks, "Endeavours have not been wanting. But though these endeavours have caused some abatement in the pomp and grandeur with which these people for some time acted," (truly, one would not have expected it from them!) "yet they do not seem to have made any impression upon their leaders." (*Ibid.* p. 6.)

Your lordship adds, "Their innovations in points of discipline I do not intend to enter into at present. But to inquire what the doctrines are which they spread." (*Ibid.* p. 7.) "Doctrines big with pernicious influences upon practice." (*Ibid.* p. 8.)

Six of these your lordship mentions, after having premised, "It is not at all needful, to the end of guarding against them, to charge the particular tenets upon the particular persons among them." (*Ibid.* p. 7.) Indeed, my lord, it is needful in the highest degree. For if the minister who is to guard his people, either against Peter Böhler, Mr. Whitefield, or me, does not know what our particular tenets are, he must needs "run as uncertainly, and fight as one that beateth the air."

I will fairly own which of these belong to me. The indirect prac-

tices which your lordship charges upon me may then be considered; together with the consequences of these doctrines, and your lordship's instructions to the clergy.

5. "The First that I shall take notice of," says your lordship, "is the Antinomian doctrine." (*Ibid.* p. 8.) The Second, "that Christ has done all, and left nothing for us to do but to believe." (*Ibid.* p. 9.) These belong not to me. I am unconcerned therein. I have earnestly opposed, but did never teach or embrace, them.

"There is another notion," your lordship says, "which we find propagated throughout the writings of those people, and that is, the making inward, secret, and sudden impulses, the guides of their actions, resolutions, and designs." (*Ibid.* p. 14.) Mr. Church urged the same objection before: "Instead of making the word of God the rule of his actions, he follows only his secret impulse." I beg leave to return the same answer. "In the whole compass of language there is not a proposition which less belongs to me than this. I have declared again and again, that I make the word of God 'the rule' of all my actions; and that I no more follow any 'secret impulse' instead thereof, than I follow Mohammed or Confucius." (*Answer to Mr. Church*, p. 287.)

6. Before I proceed, suffer me to observe, here are three grievous errors charged on the Moravians, Mr. Whitefield, and me, conjointly, in none of which I am any more concerned than in the doctrine of the metempsychosis! But it was "not needful to charge particular tenets on particular persons." Just as needful, my lord, as it is not to put a stumbling block in the way of our brethren; not to lay them under an almost insuperable temptation of condemning the innocent with the guilty. I beseech your lordship to answer in your own conscience before God, whether you did not foresee how many of your hearers would charge these tenets upon me; nay, whether you did not design they should. If so, my lord, is this Christianity? Is it humanity? Let me speak plain. Is it honest Heathenism?

7. I am not one jot more concerned in instantaneous justification, as your lordship explains it, viz. "A sudden, instantaneous justification, by which the person receives from God a certain seal of his salvation, or an absolute assurance of being saved at last." (*Charge*, p. 11.) "Such an instantaneous working of the Holy Spirit as finishes the business of salvation once for all." (*Ibid.*) I neither teach nor believe it; and am therefore clear of all the consequences that may arise therefrom. I believe "a gradual improvement in grace and goodness," I mean, in the knowledge and love of God, is a good "testimony of our present sincerity toward God;" although I dare not say, It is "the only true ground of humble assurance," or the only foundation on which a Christian builds his "hopes of acceptance and salvation." For I think, "other foundation" of these "can no man lay, than that which is laid, even Jesus Christ."

8. To the charge of holding "sinless perfection," as your lordship states it, I might likewise plead, Not guilty; seeing one ingredient thereof, in your lordship's account, is "freedom from temptation." (*Ibid.* p. 17.) Whereas I believe "there is no such perfection in this life as implies an entire deliverance from manifold temptations." But I will not decline the charge. I will repeat once more my coolest thoughts

upon this head; and that in the very terms which I did several years ago, as I presume your lordship cannot be ignorant:—

“What, it may be asked, do you mean by ‘one that is perfect,’ or, ‘one that is as his Master?’ We mean one in whom is, ‘the mind which was in Christ,’ and who so ‘walketh as he walked;’ a man that ‘hath clean hands and a pure heart;’ or that is ‘cleansed from all filthiness of flesh and spirit;’ one ‘in whom there is no occasion of stumbling,’ and who, accordingly, ‘doth not commit sin.’ To declare this a little more particularly: We understand by that Scriptural expression, ‘a perfect man,’ one in whom God hath fulfilled his faithful word: ‘From all your filthiness, and from all your idols will I cleanse you. I will also save you from all your uncleanness.’ We understand hereby, one whom God hath sanctified throughout, even in ‘body, soul, and spirit;’ one who ‘walketh in the light, as He is in the light,’ in whom ‘is no darkness at all; the blood of Jesus Christ his Son’ having ‘cleansed him from all sin.’

“This man can now testify to all mankind, ‘I am crucified with Christ; nevertheless I live; yet I live not, but Christ liveth in me.’ He ‘is holy, as God who called him is holy,’ both in life, and ‘in all manner of conversation.’ He ‘loveth the Lord his God with all his heart, and serveth him with all his strength.’ He ‘loveth his neighbour’ (every man) ‘as himself;’ yea, ‘as Christ loved us;’ them in particular that ‘despitefully use him and persecute him,’ because ‘they know not the Son, neither the Father.’ Indeed, his soul is all love, filled with ‘bowels of mercies, kindness, meekness, gentleness, long suffering.’ And his life agreeth thereto, full of ‘the work of faith, the patience of hope, the labour of love.’ And ‘whatsoever he doeth, either in word or deed,’ he doeth ‘it all in the name,’ in the love and power, ‘of the Lord Jesus.’ In a word, he doeth the will of God ‘on earth, as it is done in heaven.’

“This is to be ‘a perfect man,’ to be ‘sanctified throughout, created anew in Jesus Christ;’ even ‘to have a heart so all-flaming with the love of God,’ (to use Archbishop Usher’s words,) ‘as continually to offer up every thought, word, and work, as a spiritual sacrifice, acceptable unto God through Christ.’ In every thought of our hearts, in every word of our tongues, in every work of our hands, ‘to show forth his praise who hath called us out of darkness into his marvellous light.’ O that both we, and all who seek the Lord Jesus in sincerity, may thus ‘be made perfect in one!’”

9. I conjure you, my lord, by the mercies of God, if these are not the words of truth and soberness, point me out wherein I have erred from the truth; show me clearly wherein I have spoken either beyond or contrary to the word of God. But might I not humbly entreat, that your lordship, in doing this, would abstain from such expressions as these: “If they will but put themselves under their direction and discipline,—after their course of discipline is once over,” (*ibid.* p. 15,) as not suitable either to the weight of the subject, or the dignity of your lordship’s character. And might I not expect something more than these loose assertions, that this is “a delusion altogether groundless; a notion contrary to the whole tenor both of the Old and New Testament;” that “the Scriptures forbid all thought of it, as vain, arrogant, and presumptuous;” that they “represent all mankind, without distinction, as subject to sin and corruption” (*subject to sin and corruption!* strong words!) “during their continuance in this world; and require no more than an honest desire and endeavour to find ourselves less and less in a state of imperfection.” (*Ibid.* pp. 15, 16.)

Is it not from your lordship’s entirely mistaking the question, not at

all apprehending what perfection I teach, that you go on to guard against the same imaginary consequences, as your lordship did in the "Observations?" Surely, my lord, you never gave yourself the trouble to read the answer given in the "Farther Appeal," to every objection which you now urge afresh; seeing you do not now appear to know any more of my sentiments than if you had never proposed one question, nor received one answer, upon the subject!

10. If your lordship designed to show my real sentiments concerning the last doctrine which you mention, as one would imagine by your adding, "These are his own words," (*ibid.* p. 18,) should you not have cited all my own words? at least all the words of that paragraph, and not have mangled it as Mr. Church did before?

It runs thus: "Saturday, 28. I showed at large, in order to answer those who taught that none but they who are full of faith and the Holy Ghost ought ever to communicate, (1.) That the Lord's Supper was ordained by God to be a means of conveying to men either preventing, or justifying, or sanctifying grace, according to their several necessities. (2.) That the persons for whom it was ordained are all those who know and feel that they want the grace of God, either to restrain them from sin, or to 'show their sins forgiven,' or to 'renew their souls' in the image of God. (3.) That inasmuch as we come to his table, not to give him any thing, but to receive whatsoever he sees best for us, there is no previous preparation indispensably necessary, but a desire to receive whatsoever he pleases to give. And, (4.) That no fitness is required at the time of communicating, but a sense of our state, of our utter sinfulness and helplessness; every one who knows he is fit for hell, being just fit to come to Christ, in this, as well as all other ways of his appointment." (Vol. iii, p. 189.)

In the Second Letter to Mr. Church, p. 306, I explain myself farther on this head: "I am sorry to find you still affirm, that, with regard to the Lord's Supper also, I 'advance many injudicious, false, and dangerous things. Such as, (1.) That a man ought to communicate without a sure trust in God's mercy through Christ.' (p. 117.) You mark these as my words; but I know them not. (2.) 'That there is no previous preparation indispensably necessary, but a desire to receive whatsoever God pleases to give.' But I include abundantly more in that desire, than you seem to apprehend, even a willingness to know and do the whole will of God. (3.) 'That no fitness is required at the time of communicating,' (I recite the whole sentence,) 'but a sense of our state, of our utter sinfulness and helplessness; every one who knows he is fit for hell, being just fit to come to Christ, in this, as well as in all other ways of his appointment.' But neither can this sense of our utter sinfulness and helplessness subsist without earnest desires of universal holiness."

And now, what can I say? Had your lordship never seen this? That is hardly to be imagined. But if you had, how was it possible your lordship should thus explicitly and solemnly charge me, in the presence of God and all my brethren, (only the person so charged was not present,) with "meaning by those words to set aside self-examination, and repentance for sins past, and resolutions of living better for the time to come, as things no way necessary to make a worthy communicant?" (*Charge*, p. 18.)

If an evidence at the bar should swerve from truth, an equitable judge may place the thing in a true light. But if the judge himself shall bear false witness, where then can we find a remedy?

Actual preparation was here entirely out of the question. It might be absolutely and indispensably necessary, for any thing I had either said or meant to the contrary: for it was not at all in my thoughts. And the habitual preparation which I had in terms declared to be indispensably necessary was, "a willingness to know and to do the whole will of God," and "earnest desires of universal holiness." Does your lordship think, this is "meant to set aside all repentance for sins past, and resolutions of living better for the time to come?"

11. Your lordship next falls with all your might upon *that strange assertion*, as you term it, "We come to his table, not to give him any thing, but to receive whatsoever he sees best for us." "Whereas," says your lordship, "in the exhortation at the time of receiving, the people are told that they must give most humble and hearty thanks,—and immediately after receiving, both minister and people join in offering and presenting themselves before God." (*Ibid.* pp. 20, 21.) O God! in what manner are the most sacred things here treated! the most venerable mysteries of our religion! What quibbling, what playing upon words, is here! *Not to give him any thing.* "Yes, to give him thanks." O my Lord, are these the words of a father of the Church!

12. Your lordship goes on: "To the foregoing account of these modern principles and doctrines, it may not be improper to subjoin a few observations upon the indirect practices of the same people in gaining proselytes." (*Ibid.* pp. 23, 24.)

"I. They persuade the people, that the established worship, with a regular attendance upon it, is not sufficient to answer the ends of devotion."

Your lordship mentioned this likewise in the *Observations*. In your fourth query it stood thus: "Whether a due and regular attendance on the public offices of religion, paid in a serious and composed way, does not answer the true ends of devotion." Suffer me to repeat part of the answer then given:—

"I suppose by 'devotion' you mean public worship; by the 'true ends' of it, the love of God and man; and by 'a due and regular attendance on the public offices of religion, paid in a serious and composed way,' the going as often as we can to our parish church, and to the sacrament there administered. If so, the question is, Whether this attendance on those offices does not produce the love of God and man. I answer, Sometimes it does, and sometimes it does not. I myself thus attended them for many years; and yet am conscious to myself, that, during that whole time, I had no more of the love of God than a stone. And I know many hundreds, perhaps thousands, of serious persons who are ready to testify the same thing."

I subjoined, (1.) "We continually exhort all who attend on our preaching, to attend the offices of the Church. And they do pay a more regular attendance there than ever they did before." (2.) Their attending the Church did not, in fact, answer those ends at all till they attended this preaching also. (3.) It is the preaching remission of sins through Jesus Christ which alone answers the true ends of devotion."

II. 13. "They censure the clergy," says your lordship, "as less zeal-

ous than themselves in the several branches of the ministerial function. For this they are undeservedly reproached by these noisy itinerant leaders." (*Charge*, pp. 24, 25.)

My lord, I am not conscious to myself of this. I do not willingly compare myself with any man; much less do I reproach my brethren of the clergy, whether they deserve it or not. But it is needless to add any more on this head than what was said above a year ago:—

"I must explain myself a little on that practice which you so often term 'abusing the clergy.' I have many times great sorrow and heaviness in my heart on account of these my brethren. And this sometimes constrains me to speak to them, in the only way which is now in my power; and sometimes (though rarely) to speak of them; of a few, not all in general. In either case, I take an especial care, (1.) To speak nothing but the truth. (2.) To speak this with all plainness; and, (3.) With love, and in the spirit of meekness. Now, if you will call this abusing, railing, or reviling, you must. But still, I dare not refrain from it. I must thus rail, thus abuse sinners of all sorts and degrees, unless I will perish with them." (*Second Letter to Mr. Church*, p. 338.)

III. 14. "They value themselves upon extraordinary strictnesses and severities in life, and such as are beyond what the rules of Christianity require. They captivate the people by such professions and appearances of uncommon sanctity. But that which can never fail of a general respect is, a quiet and exemplary life, free from the many follies and indiscretions which those restless and vagrant teachers are apt to fall into." (*Charge*, p. 25.)

By "extraordinary strictnesses and severities," I presume your lordship means, the abstaining from wine and animal food; which, it is sure, Christianity does not require. But if you do, I fear your lordship is not thoroughly informed of the matter of fact. I began to do this about twelve years ago, when I had no thought of "annoying parochial ministers," or of "captivating" any "people" thereby, unless it were the Chicasaw or Choctaw Indians. But I resumed the use of them both, about two years after, for the sake of some who thought I made it a point of conscience; telling them, "I *will* eat flesh while the world standeth," rather than "make my brother to offend." Dr. Cheyne advised me to leave them off again, assuring me, "Till you do, you will never be free from fevers." And since I have taken his advice, I have been free (blessed be God!) from all bodily disorders. (I continued this about two years.) Would to God I knew any method of being equally free from all "follies and indiscretions!" But this I never expect to attain till my spirit returns to God.

15. But in how strange a manner does your lordship represent this! What a construction do you put upon it! "Appearances of an uncommon sanctity, in order to captivate the people. Pretensions to more exalted degrees of strictness, to make their way into weak minds and fickle heads." (*Ibid.* p. 25.) "Pretences to greater sanctity, whereby they draw over to themselves the most ignorant of the people." (*Ibid.* p. 4.) If these are "appearances of uncommon sanctity," (which, indeed, might bear a dispute,) how does your lordship know that they are only appearances? that they do not spring from the heart? Suppose these were "exalted degrees of strictness," is your lordship absolutely assured that we practise them only "to make *our* way into weak minds and fickle heads?" Where is the proof, that these "pretences to greater

sanctity," (as your lordship is pleased to phrase them,) are mere pretences, and have nothing of reality or sincerity in them?

My lord, this is an accusation of the highest nature. If we are guilty, we are not so much as moral Heathens. We are monsters, not only unworthy of the Christian name, but unfit for human society. It tears up all pretences to the love of God and man; to justice, mercy, or truth. But how is it proved? Or does your lordship read the heart, and so pass sentence without any proof at all? O my lord, ought an accusation of the lowest kind to be thus received, even against the lowest of the people? How much less can this be reconciled with the apostolical advice to the bishop of Ephesus: "Against a Presbyter receive not an accusation, but before two or three witnesses;" and those face to face. When it is thus proved, "them that sin, rebuke before all." Your lordship doubtless remembers the words that follow: (How worthy to be written in your heart!) "I charge thee, before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, and the elect angels, that thou observe these things without preferring one before another, doing nothing by partiality," 1 Tim. v, 19-21.

IV. 16. "They mislead the people into an opinion of the high merit of punctual attendances on their performances, to the neglect of the business of their stations." (*Ibid.* p. 26.) My lord, this is not so. You yourself, in this very Charge, have cleared us from one part of this accusation. You have borne us witness, (*ibid.* p. 10,) that we disclaim all merit, even in (really) good works; how much more in such works as we continually declare are not good, but very evil! such as the attending sermons, or any public offices whatever, "to the neglect of the business of our station."

When your lordship urged this before, in the "Observations," I openly declared my belief, "that true religion cannot lead into a disregard or disesteem of the common duties and offices of life; that, on the contrary, it leads men to discharge all those duties with the strictest and closest attention; that Christianity requires this attention and diligence, in all stations, and in all conditions; that the performance of the lowest offices of life, as unto God, is truly a serving of Christ; and that this is the doctrine I preach continually;" (*Farther Appeal*, part i, p. 44;) a fact whereof any man may easily be informed. Now, if, after all this, your lordship will repeat the charge, as if I had not once opened my mouth concerning it, I cannot help it. I can say no more. I commend my cause to God.

17. Having considered what your lordship has advanced concerning dangerous doctrines and indirect practices, I now come to the instructions your lordship gives to the clergy of your diocess.

How awful a thing is this! The very occasion carries in it a solemnity not to be expressed. Here is an angel of the Church of Christ, one of the stars in God's right hand, calling together all the subordinate pastors, for whom he is to give an account to God; and directing them (in the name and by the authority of "the great Shepherd of the sheep, Jesus Christ, the First Begotten from the dead, the Prince of the kings of the earth") how to "make full proof of their ministry," that they may be "pure from the blood of all men;" how to "take heed unto themselves, and to all the flock over which the Holy Ghost hath made them

overseers;" how to "feed the flock of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood!" To this end they are all assembled together. And what is the substance of all his instructions?—"Reverend brethren, I charge you all, lift up your voice like a trumpet; and warn and arm and fortify all mankind against a people called *Methodists!*"

True it is, your lordship gives them several advices; but all in order to this end. You direct them to "inculcate the excellency of our Liturgy, as a wise, grave, and serious service;" to "show their people, that a diligent attendance on their business is a serving of God;" "punctually to perform both the public offices of the Church, and all other pastoral duties;" and to "engage the esteem of their parishioners by a constant regularity of life." But all these your lordship recommends *eo nomine*, [on that account,] as means to that great end, the arming and fortifying their people against the Moravians or Methodists, and their doctrines.

Is it possible! Could your lordship discern no other enemies of the Gospel of Christ? Are there no other heretics or schismatics on earth, or even within the four seas? Are there no Papists, no Deists in the land? Or are their errors of less importance? Or are their numbers in England less considerable, or less likely to increase? Does it appear, then, that they have lost their zeal for making proselytes? Or are all the people so guarded against them already, that their labour is in vain? Can your lordship answer these few plain questions, to the satisfaction of your own conscience?

Have the Methodists (so called) already monopolized all the sins, as well as errors, in the nation? Is Methodism the only sin, or the only fatal or spreading sin, to be found within the bills of mortality? Have two thousand (or more) "ambassadors of Christ and stewards of the mysteries of God" no other business than to guard, warn, arm, and fortify their people against this? O my lord, if this engrosses their time and strength, (as it must, if they follow your lordship's instructions,) they will not give an account with joy, either of themselves, or of their flock, in that day!

18. Your lordship seems in some measure sensible of this, when you very gently condemn their opinion, who think the Methodists "might better be disregarded and despised, than taken notice of and opposed, if it were not for the disturbance they give to the parochial ministers, and their unwarrantable endeavours to seduce the people from their lawful pastors." (*Charge*, p. 22.) The same complaint with which your lordship opened your Charge: "They give shameful disturbances to the parochial clergy; they annoy the established ministry, using very unwarrantable methods, first, to prejudice their people against them, and then to seduce their flocks from them." (*Ibid.* p. 4.)

Whether we seduce them or no, (which will be presently considered,) I am sorry your lordship should give any countenance to that low, senseless, and now generally exploded slander, that we do it for a maintenance. This your lordship insinuates, by applying to us those words of Bishop Sanderson: "And all this, to serve their own belly, to make a prey of the poor deluded proselytes; for by this means the people fall unto them, and thereout suck they no small advantage." (*Ibid.* p. 15.) Your lordship cannot but know, that my fellowship, and my brother's

studentship, afford us more than sufficient for life and godliness ; especially for that manner of life which we choose, whether out of ostentation or in sincerity.

19. But do we willingly “ annoy the established ministry,” or “ give disturbance to the parochial clergy ?” My lord, we do not. We trust, herein, to have a conscience void of offence. Nor do we designedly “ prejudice their people against them.” In this also our heart condemneth us not. But you “ seduce their flocks from them.” No, not even from those who feed themselves, not the flock. All who hear us, attend the service of the Church, at least as much as they did before. And for this very thing are we reproached as bigots to the Church by those of most other denominations.

Give me leave, my lord, to say, you have mistook and misrepresented this whole affair from the top to the bottom. And I am the more concerned to take notice of this, because so many have fallen into the same mistake. It is indeed, and has been from the beginning, the *πρωτον ψευδος*, “ the capital blunder,” of our bitterest adversaries ; though how they can advance it, I see not, without “ loving,” if not “ making, a lie.” It is not our care, endeavour, or desire, to proselyte any from one man to another ; or from one Church, (so called,) from one congregation or society to another ; (we would not move a finger to do this, to make ten thousand such proselytes ;) but from darkness to light, from Belial to Christ, from the power of Satan to God. Our one aim is, to proselyte sinners to repentance ; the servants of the devil, to serve the living and true God. If this be not done, in fact, we will stand condemned ; not as well-meaning fools, but as devils incarnate. But if it be, if the instances glare in the face of the sun, if they increase daily, maugre all the power of earth and hell ; then, my lord, neither you nor any man beside (let me use great plainness of speech) can “ oppose” and “ fortify people against us,” without being found even “ to fight against God.”

20. I would fain set this point in a clearer light. Here are, in and near Moorfields, ten thousand poor souls for whom Christ died, rushing headlong into hell. Is Dr. Bulkely, the parochial minister, both willing and able to stop them ? If so, let it be done, and I have no place in these parts. I go and call other sinners to repentance. But if, after all he has done, and all he can do, they are still in the broad way to destruction, let me see if God will put a word even in my mouth. True, I am a poor worm that of myself can do nothing. But if God sends by whomsoever he will send, his word shall not return empty. All the messenger of God asks, is, *Δος τις εω* ; (no help of man !) *και γην κινησω*. [Give me where to stand, and I will move the earth.] The arm of the Lord is revealed. The lion roars, having the prey plucked out of his teeth. And “ there is joy in the presence of the angels of God, over” more than “ one sinner that repenteth.”

21. Is this any annoyance to the parochial minister ? Then what manner of spirit is he of ? Does he look on this part of his flock as lost, because they are found of the great Shepherd ? My lord, great is my boldness toward you. You speak of the consequences of our doctrines. You seem well pleased with the success of your endeavours against them, because, you say, they “ have pernicious consequences, are big with pernicious influences upon practice, dangerous to religion

and the souls of men." (*Ibid.* pp. 8, 22.) In answer to all this, I appeal to plain fact. I say once more, "What have been the consequences (I would not speak, but I dare not refrain) of the doctrines I have preached for nine years last past? By the fruits shall ye know those of whom I speak; even the cloud of witnesses, who at this hour experience the Gospel which I preach to be the power of God unto salvation. The habitual drunkard that was is now temperate in all things; the whoremonger now flees fornication; he that stole, steals no more, but works with his hands; he that cursed or swore, perhaps at every sentence, has now learned to serve the Lord with fear, and rejoice unto him with reverence; those formerly enslaved to various habits of sin are now brought to uniform habits of holiness. These are demonstrable facts: I can name the men, with their places of abode. One of them was an avowed Atheist for many years; some were Jews; a considerable number Papists; the greatest part of them as much strangers to the form, as to the power, of godliness."

My lord, can you deny these facts? I will make whatever proof of them you shall require. But if the facts be allowed, who can deny the doctrines to be, in substance, the Gospel of Christ? "For is there any other name under heaven given to men, whereby they may thus be saved?" or is there any other word that thus "commendeth itself to every man's conscience in the sight of God?"

22. But I must draw to a conclusion. Your lordship has, without doubt, had some success in opposing this doctrine. Very many have, by your lordship's unwearied endeavours, been deterred from hearing at all; and have thereby probably escaped the being seduced into holiness, have lived and died in their sins. My lord, the time is short. I am past the noon of life, and my remaining years flee away as a shadow. Your lordship is old and full of days, having past the usual age of man. It cannot, therefore, be long before we shall both drop this house of earth, and stand naked before God: no, nor before we shall see the great white throne coming down from heaven, and Him that sitteth thereon. On his left hand shall be those who are shortly to dwell in everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels. In that number will be all who died in their sins; and, among the rest, those whom you *preserved* from repentance. Will you then rejoice in your success? The Lord God grant it may not be said in that hour, "These have perished in their iniquity; but their blood I require at thy hands!" I am, your lordship's dutiful son and servant,

JOHN WESLEY.

LONDON, June 11, 1747.

A LETTER TO A CLERGYMAN.

TULLAMORE, May 4, 1748.

REVEREND SIR,—I have at present neither leisure nor inclination to enter into a formal controversy; but you will give me leave just to offer a few loose hints relating to the subject of last night's conversation:—

1. Seeing life and health are things of so great importance, it is, without question, highly expedient that physicians should have all possible advantages of learning and education.

2. That trial should be made of them, by competent judges, before they practise publicly.

3. That after such trial, they be authorized to practise by those who are empowered to convey that authority.

4. And that, while they are preserving the lives of others, they should have what is sufficient to sustain their own.

5. But supposing a gentleman, bred at the university in Dublin, with all the advantages of education, after he has undergone all the usual trials, and then been regularly authorized to practise :

6. Suppose, I say, this physician settles at —, for some years, and yet makes no cures at all ; but, after trying his skill on five hundred persons, cannot show that he has healed one ; many of his patients dying under his hands, and the rest remaining just as they were before he came :

7. Will you condemn a man who, having some little skill in physic, and a tender compassion for those who are sick or dying all around him, cures many of those, without fee or reward, whom the doctor *could* not cure ?

8. At least *did* not, (which is the same thing as to the case in hand,) were it only for this reason, because he did not go to them, and they would not come to him ?

9. Will you condemn him because he has not learning, or has not had a university education ?

What then ? He cures those whom the man of learning and education cannot cure !

10. Will you object, that he is no physician, nor has any authority to practise ?

I cannot come into your opinion. I think, *Medicus est qui medetur*, " He is a physician who heals ;" and that every man has authority to save the life of a dying man.

But if you only mean, he has no authority to takes fees, I contend not ; for he takes none at all.

11. Nay, and I am afraid it will hold, on the other hand, *Medicus non est qui non medetur* ; I am afraid, if we use propriety of speech, " He is no physician who works no cure."

12. " O, but he has taken his degree of doctor of physic, and therefore has authority."

Authority to do what ? " Why, to heal all the sick that will employ him." But (to waive the case of those who will not employ him ; and would you have even their lives thrown away ?) he does not heal those that do employ him. He that was sick before, is sick still ; or else he is gone hence, and is no more seen.

Therefore, his authority is not worth a rush ; for it serves not the end for which it was given.

13. And surely he has no authority to kill them, by hindering another from saving their lives !

14. If he either attempts or desires to hinder him, if he condemns or dislikes him for it, it is plain to all thinking men, he regards his own fees more than the lives of his patients.

II. Now, to apply: 1. Seeing life everlasting, and holiness, or health of soul, are things of so great importance, it is highly expedient that

ministers, being physicians of the soul, should have all advantages of education and learning.

2. That full trial should be made of them in all respects, and that by the most competent judges, before they enter on the public exercise of their office, the saving souls from death.

3. That after such trial, they be authorized to exercise that office by those who are empowered to convey that authority. (I believe bishops are empowered to do this, and have been so from the apostolic age.)

4. And that those whose souls they save ought, meantime, to provide them what is needful for the body.

5. But suppose a gentleman bred at the university in Dublin, with all the advantages of education, after he has undergone the usual trials, and been regularly authorized to save souls from death :

6. Suppose, I say, this minister settles at —, for some years, and yet saves no soul at all, saves no sinners from their sins ; but after he has preached all this time to five or six hundred persons, cannot show that he has converted one from the error of his ways ; many of his parishioners dying as they lived, and the rest remaining just as they were before he came :

7. Will you condemn a man, who, having compassion on dying souls, and some knowledge of the Gospel of Christ, without any temporal reward, saves them from their sins whom the minister *could* not save ?

8. At least *did* not ; nor ever was likely to do it ; for he did not go to them, and they would not come to him.

9. Will you condemn such a preacher because he has not learning, or has not had a university education ?

What then ? He saves those sinners from their sins whom the man of learning and education cannot save.

A peasant being brought before the college of physicians, at Paris, a learned doctor accosted him, "What, friend, do you pretend to prescribe to people that have agues ? Dost thou know what an ague is ?"

He replied, "Yes, sir ; an ague is what I can cure, and you cannot."

Will you object, "But he is no minister, nor has any authority to save souls ?"

I must beg leave to dissent from you in this. I think he is a true, evangelical minister, *δίακονος*, "servant" of Christ and his church, who *οὕτω δίακονεῖ*, "so ministers," as to save souls from death, to reclaim sinners from their sins ; and that every Christian, if he is able to do it, has authority to save a dying soul.

But if you only mean, "He has no authority to take tithes," I grant it. He takes none : as he has freely received, so he freely gives.

11. But, to carry the matter a little farther : I am afraid it will hold, on the other hand, with regard to the soul as well as the body, *Medicus non est qui non medetur*. [He who cures none is no physician.] I am afraid, reasonable men will be much inclined to think, he that saves no souls is no minister of Christ.

12. "O, but he is ordained, and therefore has authority."

Authority to do what ? "To save all the souls that will put themselves under his care." True ; but (to waive the case of them that will not ; and would you desire that even those should perish ?) he does not, in fact, save them that are under his care : therefore, what end does his

authority serve? He that was a drunkard is a drunkard still. The same is true of the Sabbath breaker, the thief, the common swearer. This is the best of the case; for many have died in their iniquity, and their blood will God require at the watchman's hand.

13. For surely he has no authority to murder souls, either by his neglect, by his smooth, if not false, doctrine, or by hindering another from plucking them out of the fire, and bringing them to life everlasting.

14. If he either attempts or desires to hinder him, if he condemns or is displeased with him for it, how great reason is there to fear that he regards his own profit more than the salvation of souls! I am,

Reverend Sir, your affectionate brother,

JOHN WESLEY.

A LETTER TO THE REVEREND DR. FREE.

TULLAMORE, May 2, 1758.

REVEREND SIR,—1. A little tract appearing under your name was yesterday put into my hands. You therein call upon me to speak, if I have any exceptions to make to what is advanced; and promise to reply as fairly and candidly as I can expect, “provided those exceptions be drawn up, as you have set the example, in a short compass, and in the manner wherein all wise and good people would choose to manage a religious dispute.” (p. 22.)

2. “In a short compass,” sir, they will certainly be drawn up, for my own sake, as well as yours: for I know the value of time, and would gladly employ it all in what more immediately relates to eternity. But I do not promise to draw them up in that manner whereof you have set the example. I cannot, I dare not; for I fear God, and do really believe there is a judgment to come. Therefore, I dare not “return evil for evil,” neither “railing for railing.” Nor can I allow that your manner of treating this subject is that “wherein all wise and good people would choose to manage a religious dispute.” Far, very far, from it. I shall rejoice if a little more fairness and candour should appear in your future writings. But I cannot expect it; for the *nigre succus loliginis*, “wormwood and gall,” seem to have infected your very vitals.

3. The quotation from Bishop Gibson, which takes up five out of nineteen pages, I have answered already;* and in a manner wherewith I have good reason to believe his lordship was entirely satisfied. With his lordship, therefore, I have no present concern; my business now is with you only: and seeing you are “now ready,” as you express it, “to run a tilt,” I must make what defence I can. Only you must excuse me from meeting you on the same ground, or fighting you with the same weapons: my weapons are only truth and love. May the God of truth and love strengthen my weakness!

4. I waive what relates to Mr. V——’s personal character, which is too well known to need my defence of it; as likewise the occurrence (real or imaginary I cannot tell) which gave birth to your performance. All that I concern myself with is your five vehement assertions with

*In “A Letter to the Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of London.”

regard to the people called Methodists. These I shall consider in their order, and prove to be totally false and groundless.

5. The First is this: "Their whole ministry is an open and avowed opposition to one of the fundamental articles of our religion." (p. 4.) How so? Why "the Twentieth Article declares, we may not so expound one scripture, that it be repugnant to another. And yet it is notorious, that the Methodists do ever explain the word 'faith' as it stands in some of St. Paul's writings, so as to make his doctrine a direct and flat contradiction to that of St. James." (p. 5.)

This stale objection has been answered a hundred times, so that I really thought we should have heard no more of it. But since it is required, I repeat the answer once more: by *faith* we mean "the evidence of things not seen;" by *justifying faith*, a divine evidence or conviction, that "Christ loved me, and gave himself for me." St. Paul affirms, that a man is justified by this faith; which St. James never denies, but only asserts, that a man cannot be justified by a dead faith: and this St. Paul never affirms.

"But St. James declares, 'Faith without works is dead.' Therefore it is clearly St. James's meaning, that a faith which is without virtue and morality cannot produce salvation. Yet the Methodists so explain St. Paul, as to affirm that faith without virtue or morality will produce salvation." (p. 6.) Where? in which of their writings? This needs some proof: I absolutely deny the fact. So that all which follows is mere flourish, and falls to the ground at once; and all that you aver of their "open and scandalous opposition to the Twentieth Article" (*Ib.*) is no better than open and scandalous slander.

6. Your Second assertion is this: "The Methodist, for the perdition of the souls of his followers, openly gives our Saviour the lie, loads the Scripture with falsehood and contradiction;" (and pray what could a Mohammedan, or infidel, or the devil himself do more?) "yea, openly blasphemes the name of Christ, by saying that the works of men are of no consideration at all; that God makes no distinction between virtue and vice, that he does not hate vice or love virtue. What blasphemy then and impiety are those wretches guilty of who, in their diabolical frenzy, dare to contradict our Saviour's authority, and that in such an essential article of religion!" (pp. 7-9.) Here also the Methodists plead, Not Guilty, and require you to produce your evidence; to show in which of their writings they affirm that God "will not reward every man according to his works; that he makes no distinction between virtue and vice; that he does not hate vice or love virtue." These are positions which they never remember to have advanced. If you can, refresh their memory.

7. You assert, Thirdly, the Methodists, by these positions, "destroy the essential attributes of God, and ruin his character as Judge of the world." Very true; if they held these positions. But here lies the mistake. They hold no such positions. They never did. They detest and abhor them. In arguing, therefore, on this supposition, you are again "beating the air."

8. You assert, Fourthly, the Methodists "teach and propagate downright Atheism,—a capital crime; and Atheists in some countries have been put to death. Hereby they make room for all manner of vice and

villany; by which means the bands of society are dissolved. And therefore this attempt must be considered as a sort of treason by magistrates." (pp. 10, 11.)

Again we deny the whole charge, and call for proof; and, blessed be God, so do the magistrates in Great Britain. Bold, vehement asseverations will not pass upon them for legal evidence: nor indeed on any reasonable men. They can distinguish between *arguing* and *calling names*: the former becomes a gentleman and a Christian: but what is he who can be guilty of the latter?

9. You assert, Lastly, that any who choose a Methodist clergyman for their lecturer, "put into that office, which should be held by a minister of the Church of England, an enemy, who undermines not only the legal establishment of that Church, but also the foundation of all religion." (p. 13.)

Once more we must call upon you for the proof; the proof of these two particulars, First, that I, John Wesley, am "an enemy to the Church; and that I undermine not only the legal establishment of the Church of England, but also the very foundation of all religion." Secondly, That "Mr. V—— is an enemy to the Church, and is undermining all religion, as well as the establishment."

10. Another word, and I have done: Are there "certain qualifications required of all lecturers, before they are by law permitted to speak to the people?" (p. 14.) And is a subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles of religion one of these qualifications? And is a person who does not "conform to such subscription" disqualified to be a lecturer? or, who "has ever held or published any thing contrary to what the Church of England maintains?" Then certainly you, Dr. John Free, are not "permitted by law to speak to the people;" neither are you "qualified to be a lecturer" in any church in London or England, as by law established. For you flatly deny and openly oppose more than one or two of those Articles. You do not in anywise conform to the subscription you made before you was ordained either priest or deacon. You both hold and publish (if you are the author and publisher of the tract before me) what is grossly, palpably "contrary to what the Church of England maintains," in her Homilies as well as Articles; those Homilies to which you have also subscribed, in subscribing the Thirty-sixth Article. You have subscribed them, sir; but did you ever read them? Did you ever read so much as the three first Homilies? I beg of you, sir, to read these at least, before you write again about the doctrine of the Church of England. And would it not be prudent to read a few of the writings of the Methodists before you undertake a farther confutation of them? At present you know not the men, or their communication. You are as wholly unacquainted both with them and their doctrines, as if you had lived all your days in the islands of Japan, or the deserts of Arabia. You have given a furious assault to you know not whom; and you have done it, you know not why. You have not hurt me thereby; but you have hurt yourself, perhaps in your character, certainly in your conscience. For this is not doing to others "as you would they should do unto you." When you grow cool, I trust you will see this clearly; and will no more accuse, in a manner so remote from fairness and candour,

Rev. Sir, your servant for Christ's sake,

JOHN WESLEY.

A SECOND LETTER

TO THE REVEREND DR. FREE.

FOSMON CASTLE, August 24, 1758.

REVEREND SIR,—In the preface to your Sermon, lately printed, you mention your having received my former letter, and add, that “if the proofs you have now brought do not satisfy me as to the validity of your former assertions; if I am not yet convinced that such positions are held by people who pass under the denomination of Methodists, and will signify this by a private letter, I shall have a more particular answer.” I desire to live peaceably with all men; and should therefore wish for no more than a private answer to a private letter, did the affair lie between you and me. But this is not the case: you have already appealed to the archbishop, the university, the nation. Before these judges you have advanced a charge of the highest kind; not only against me, but a whole body of people.

Before these, therefore, I must either confess the charge, or give in my answer.

But you say, “I charge blasphemy, impiety, &c, upon the profession of Methodism in general. I use no personal reflections upon you, nor any invective against you, but in the character of a Methodist.” That is, you first say, “All Methodists are pickpockets, rebels, blasphemers, Atheists;” and then add, “I use no reflections upon you, but in the character of a Methodist;” but in the character of a pickpocket, blasphemer, Atheist. *None but!* What can you do more?

But this you say, is the practice of all honest men, and a part of the liberty wherewith Christ hath made you free. Nay, surely there are some honest men who scruple using their opponents in this manner. At least, I do: suppose you was an Atheist, I would not bring against you a railing accusation. I would still endeavour to “treat you with gentleness and meekness,” and thus to “show the sincerity” of my faith. I leave to you that exquisite “bitterness of spirit, and extreme virulence of language,” which, you say, is your duty, and term *zeal*. (*Preface*, p. 5.) And certainly zeal, fervour, heat, it is. But is this heat from above? Is it the offspring of heaven, or a smoke from the bottomless pit?

O sir, whence is that zeal which makes you talk in such a manner to his grace of Canterbury? “I lay before you the disposition of an enemy who threaten our Church with a general alteration or total subversion; who interrupt us as we walk the streets,” (Whom? When? Where?) “in that very dress which distinguishes us as servants of the state,” (altogether servants of the state?) “in the now sad capacity of ministers of the falling Church of England. Such being the prostrate, miserable condition of the Church, and such the triumphant state of its enemies, none of the English priesthood can expect better security or longer continuance than the rest. They all subsist at mercy. Your grace and those of your order will fare no better than those of our own.” Sir, are

you in earnest? Do you really believe Lambeth is on the point of being blown up?

You go on: "In the remote counties of England, I have seen a whole troop of these divines on horseback, travelling with each a sister behind him." O sir, O sir,

What should be great you turn to farce!

Have you forgot, that the Church and nation are on the brink of ruin? But pray when and where did you see this? in what year, or in what county? I cannot but fear you take this story on trust; for such a sight, I will be bold to say, was never seen.

With an easy familiarity you add: "My lord, permit me here to whisper a word" (Is not this whispering in print something new?) "that may be worth remembering. In our memory, some of the priesthood have not proved so good subjects as might have been expected, till they have been brought over with preferments, that were due to other people." Meaning, I presume, to yourself. Surely his grace will remember this, which is so well worth remembering, and dispose of the next preferment in his gift where it is so justly due. If he does not, if he either forgets this or your other directions, you tell him frankly what will be the consequence: "We must apply to parliament;" (p. 6;) or to his majesty; and, indeed, how can you avoid it? "For it would be using him," you think, "extremely ill, not to give him proper information, that there" are now a set of people offering such indignity to his crown and government.

However, we are not to think your opposing the Methodists was "owing to self-interest" alone. Though, what if it was? "Was I to depart from my duty, because it happened to be my interest? Did these saints ever forbear to preach to the mob in the fields, for fear lest they should get the pence of the mob? Or do not" the pence and the preaching "go hand in hand together?" No, they do not; for many years neither I, nor any connected with me, have got any "pence," as you phrase it, "in the fields." Indeed, properly speaking, they never did. For the collections which Mr. Whitefield made, it is well known, were not for his own use, either in whole or part. And he has long ago given an account, in print, of the manner wherein all that was received was expended.

But it is not my design to examine at large, either your dedication, preface, or sermon. I have only leisure to make a few cursory remarks on your "definition" of the Methodists, (so called,) and on the account you give of their first rise, of their principles and practice; just premising, that I speak of those alone who began, as you observe, at Oxford. If a thousand other sets of men "pass under that denomination," yet they are nothing to me. As they have no connection with me, so I am in no way concerned to answer either for their principles or practice, any more than you are to answer for all who "pass under the denomination of Church of England men."

The account you give of their rise, is this: 'The Methodists began at Oxford. "The name was first given to a few persons, who were so uncommonly methodical, as to keep a diary of the most trivial actions of their lives, as how many slices of bread and butter they ate, how many

country dances they danced at their dancing club, or after a fast how many pounds of mutton they devoured. For upon these occasions they ate like lions, having made themselves uncommonly voracious." Of this, not one line is true; for, (1.) It was from an ancient sect of physicians, whom we were supposed to resemble in our regular diet and exercise, that we were originally styled Methodists. (2.) Not one of us ever kept a diary of "the most trivial actions" of our lives. (3.) Nor did any of us ever set down, what, or how much we ate or drank. (4.) Our "dancing club" never existed; I never heard of it before. (5.) On our "fast days" we used no food but bread; on the day following, we fed as on common days. (6.) Therefore our voraciousness and eating like lions is also pure, lively invention.

You go on: "It was not long before these gentlemen began to dogmatize in a public manner, feeling a strong inclination to new model almost every circumstance or thing in the system of our national religion." Just as true as the rest. These gentlemen were so far from feeling any inclination at all "to new model" any "circumstance or thing," that, during their whole stay at Oxford, they were High Churchmen in the strongest sense; vehemently contending for every "circumstance" of Church order, according to the old "model." And in Georgia too, we were rigorous observers of every rubric and canon; as well as (to the best of our knowledge) every tenet of the Church. Your account, therefore, of the rise of the Methodists is a mistake from beginning to end.

I proceed to your definition of them: "By the Methodists, was then and is now understood, a set of enthusiasts, who, pretending to be members of the Church of England, either offend against the order and discipline of the Church, or pervert its doctrines relating to faith and works, and the terms of salvation."

Another grievous mistake. For whatever "is now, by the Methodists then was" not "understood any set of enthusiasts," or not enthusiasts, "offending against the order and discipline of the Church." They were tenacious of it to the last degree, in every the least jot and tittle. Neither were they "then understood to pervert its doctrines, relating to faith and works, and the terms of salvation." For they thought and talked of all these, just as you do now, till some of them, after their return from Georgia, were "perverted" into different sentiments, by reading the book of Homilies. Their perversion, therefore, (if such it be,) is to be dated from this time. Consequently, your definition by no means agrees with the persons defined.

However, "as a shibboleth to distinguish them at present, when they pretend to conceal themselves, throw out this, or such like proposition, 'Good works are necessary to salvation.'" You might have spared yourself the labour of proving this: for who is there that denies it? Not I: not any in connection with me. So that this shibboleth is just good for nothing.

5. And yet we firmly believe, that a man is justified by faith, without the works of the law; that to him that worketh not, but believeth on Him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith, without any good work preceding, is counted to him for righteousness. We believe (to express it a little more largely) that we are accounted righteous before God, only for the merit of Christ, by faith, and not for our own works or deservings.

Good works follow after justification, springing out of true, living faith ; so that by them living faith may be as evidently known as a tree discerned by the fruit. And hence it follows, that as the body without the soul is dead, so *that* faith which is without works is dead also. This, therefore, properly speaking, is not faith ; as a dead man is not properly a man.

You add, "The original Methodists affect to call themselves Methodists of the Church of England ; by which they plainly inform us, there are others of their body who do not profess to belong to it. Whence we may infer, that the Methodists who take our name, do yet, by acknowledging them as namesakes and brethren, give themselves the lie when they say they are of our communion." *Our name ! Our communion ! Apage cum istâ tuâ magnificentiâ !* [Away with your arrogance !] How came it, I pray, to be *your* name any more than Mr. Venn's ? But waiving this : here is another train of mistakes. For, (1.) We do not call ourselves Methodists at all. (2.) That we call ourselves members of the Church of England is certain. Such we ever were, and such we are at this day. (3.) Yet we do not by this plainly inform you, that there are others of our body who do not belong to it. By what rule of logic do you infer this conclusion from those premises ? (4.) You have another inference full as good : "Hence one may infer, that, by acknowledging them as namesakes and brethren, they give themselves the lie when they say they are of our communion." As we do not take the name of Methodists at all, so we do not acknowledge any "namesakes" in this. But we acknowledge as "brethren" all Dissenters (whether they are called Methodists or not) who labour to have a conscience void of offence toward God and toward man. What lies upon you to prove, is this : Whoever acknowledges any Dissenters as brethren, does hereby give himself the lie, when he says he is a member of the Church of England.

However, you allow, there may be place for repentance : "For if any of the founders of this sect renounce the opinions they once were charged with, they may be permitted to lay aside the name." But what are the opinions which you require us to renounce ? What are, according to you, the principles of the Methodists ?

You say in general, "They are contradictory to the Gospel, contradictory to the Church of England, full of blasphemy, impiety, and ending in downright Atheism :"—

For, " (1.) They expound the Scripture in such a manner as to make it contradict itself.

" (2.) With blasphemy, impiety, and diabolical frenzy, they contradict our Saviour, by denying that he will judge man according to his works.

" (3.) By denying this they destroy the essential attributes of God, and ruin his character as Judge of the world."

In support of the First charge, you say, "It is notorious ; and few men of common sense attempt to prove what is notorious, till they meet with people of such notorious impudence as to deny it."

I must really deny it. Why, then, you will prove it by Mr. Mason's own words. Hold, sir : Mr. Mason's words prove nothing. For we are now speaking of original Methodists ; but he is not one of them ; nor is he in connection with them ; neither with Mr. Whitefield nor me. So that what Mr. Mason speaks, be it right or wrong, is nothing to the

present purpose. Therefore, unless you can find some better proof, this whole charge falls to the ground.

Well, "here it is: Roger Balls."—Pray who is Roger Balls? No more a Methodist than he is a Turk. I know not one good thing he ever did or said, beside the telling all men, "I am no Methodist," which he generally does in the first sentence he speaks, when he can find any one to hear him. He is therefore one of your own allies; and a champion worthy of his cause!

If then you have no more than this to advance in support of your first charge, you have alleged what you are not able to prove. And the more heavy that allegation is, the more unkind, the more unjust, the more unchristian, the more inhuman, it is to bring it without proof.

In support of the Second charge, you say, "Our Saviour declares our works to be the object of his judgment. But the Methodist, for the perdition of the souls of his followers, says our works are of no consideration at all."

Who says so? Mr. Whitefield, or my brother, or I? We say the direct contrary. But one of my "anonymous correspondents says so." Who is he? How do you know he is a Methodist? For aught appears, he may be another of your allies, a brother to Roger Balls.

Three or threescore anonymous correspondents cannot yield one grain of proof, any more than a hundred anonymous remarkers on *Theron* and *Aspasio*. Before these can prove what the Methodists hold, you must prove that these are Methodists; either that they are *original* Methodists, or in connection with them.

Will you say, "If these were not Methodists themselves, they would not defend the Methodists?" I deny the consequence: men may be far from being Methodists, and yet willing to do the Methodists justice. I have known a clergyman of note say to another, who had just been preaching a very warm sermon, "Sir, I do not thank you at all for this. I have no acquaintance with Mr. Whitefield or Mr. Wesley; and I do not agree with them in opinion; but I will have no more railing in my pulpit."

From the principles of the Methodists, you proceed to their practice: "They hunt," say you, "for extraordinary marks and revelations, whereby to know the state of the soul." The marks by which I know the state of any soul, are the inward fruit of the Spirit,—love, joy, peace, and meekness, gentleness, goodness, long suffering, temperance, patience; shown, not by words only, but by the genuine fruit of outward holiness.

Again: "They magnify their office beyond the truth, by high pretences to miraculous inspiration." To this assertion, we have answered over and over, We pretend to no other inspiration than that which, not only every true Gospel minister, but every real Christian, enjoys.

Again: "The end of all impostors is some kind of worldly gain; and it is difficult for them to conceal their views entirely. The love of filthy lucre will appear, either by the use they make of it, or the means of getting it." As to the use made of it, you are silent. But as to the means of getting it, you say, "Besides inhumanly wringing from the poor, the helpless widows, the weeping orphans," (the proof! the proof!) "they creep into houses, and lead captive silly women laden

with divers lusts." It is easy to say this, and ten times more, but can you prove it? And ought you to say it, till you can?

I shall not concern myself with any thing in your *Appendix*, but what relates to me in particular. This premised, I observe on No. I. There are several instances in my Journals, of persons that were in agonies of grief or fear, and roared for the disquietness of their heart; of some that exceedingly trembled before God, perhaps fell down to the ground; and of others whom God, in his adorable providence, suffered to be lunatic and sore vexed. The particular instances hereof, to which you refer, have been largely vindicated already, in the *Two Letters to the Rev. Dr. Church*, as well as that to the late bishop of London.

In the six following numbers, I am not concerned. The eighth contains those words from my *Second Journal*: "The rest of the day we spent in hearing the wonderful work which God is beginning to work all over the earth." Of this likewise I have spoken at large to Dr. Church and Bishop Gibson. The sum is, it is a great work when one notorious sinner is thoroughly changed in heart and life. It is wonderfully great, when God works this entire change in a large number of people; particularly when it is done in a very short time: but so he hath wrought in Kingswood, Cornwall, Newcastle. It is therefore a truly wonderful work, which God hath now more than begun to work upon earth.

I have now, sir, briefly answered for myself, which, if required, I will do more at large. But I trust it does already appear, to every impartial reader, that of the many and heavy allegations you have brought with an unparalleled bitterness of spirit, and an acrimony of language almost without precedent, you have not yet proved one. How far you are to be commended for this, (unless by Messrs Balls and the Monthly Reviewers,) it is not for me to judge. Let all lovers of truth, of humanity, and candour, determine. At present, I have no more to add, than that I beseech the Father of everlasting compassion to show more mercy to you, than you have shown to, Reverend Sir,

Your servant for Christ's sake,

JOHN WESLEY.

A LETTER

TO

THE AUTHOR OF "THE CRAFTSMAN,"

CONCERNING

REAL CHRISTIANITY, DISPARAGED UNDER THE NAME OF METHODISM.

[Printed in the year 1745.]

TO THE AUTHOR OF "THE CRAFTSMAN."

SIR,—In your late paper of June 22, I find (among many to the same effect) these words: "Methodists place all merit in *faith* and *grace*, and none in good works. This unwarrantable strange sect of a religion, founded on madness and folly, hold that there is no justification by good works, but by faith and grace only. They hereby banish that divine part

of our constitution, *reason*; and cut off the most essential recommendation to heaven, *virtue*.

“Men who are far gone in their mad principles of religion, suspend the hand of industry, become inactive, and leave all to providence, without exercising either their heads or hands.

“The doctrine of regeneration is essential with political Methodists;—who are now regenerated, place all merit in faith, and have thrown good works aside.”

I am pressed by those to whose judgment I pay great regard, to take some notice of these assertions; and the rather, because you sometimes seem as if you thought the Christian institution was of God.

Now, if you really think so, or if you desire that any man should believe you do, you must not talk so ludicrously of regeneration; for it is an essential doctrine of Christianity. And you may probably have heard, or even read in former years, that it was the author of this institution who said, “Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God.”

This he represents as the only possible entrance into the experimental knowledge of that religion, which is not founded (whatever you may suppose) on either madness or folly, but on the inmost nature of things, the nature of God and man, and the immutable relations between them.

By this religion, we do not banish reason, but exalt it to its utmost perfection; this being in every point consistent therewith, and in every step guided thereby.

But you say, “They hereby cut off the most essential recommendation to heaven, *virtue*.” What virtue? that of self-murder; that of casting their own infants to be devoured by beasts or wolves; that of dragging at their chariot wheels those whose only crimes were the love of their parents, or children, or country? These Roman virtues our religion does cut off; it leaves no place for them. And a reasonable Deist will allow, “that these are not the most essential recommendation to heaven.” But it is far from cutting off any sort, degree, or instance of genuine virtue; all which is contained in the love of God and man, producing every divine and amiable temper.

And this love we suppose (according to the Christian scheme) to flow from a sense of God’s love to us; which sense and persuasion of God’s love to man in Christ Jesus, particularly applied, we term *faith*; a thing you seem to be totally unacquainted with. For it is not the faith whereof we speak, unless it be a “faith working by love,” a faith “zealous of good works,” careful to maintain, nay, to excel in them. Nor do we acknowledge him to have one grain of faith, who is not continually doing good, who is not willing “to spend and be spent in doing all good, as he has opportunity, to all men.”

Whoever therefore they are, that “throw aside good works; that suspend” (as you prettily phrase it) “the hand of industry, become inactive, and leave all to providence, without exercising either their heads or hands;” they are no more led into this by any doctrine of ours, than by the writings of Paul of Tarsus.

And yet “this unaccountable strange sect” (so I believe we appear to you) “place no merit at all in good works.” Most true. No, nor

in faith neither; (which you may think more unaccountable still;) but only in "the blood of the everlasting covenant." We do assuredly hold, (which I beg to leave with you, and to recommend to your deepest consideration,) that there is no justification, in your sense, either by faith or works, or both together; that is, that we are not pardoned and accepted with God for the merit of either, or both; but only by the grace or free love of God, for the alone merits of his Son Jesus Christ.

I am, sir, your friend, though not admirer,

JOHN WESLEY.

AN ANSWER TO A LETTER

PUBLISHED IN THE BATH JOURNAL, APRIL 17, 1749. SIGNED, N. D.

TO THE AUTHOR OF "A LELLER," &c.

LIMERICK, May 27, 1749.

SIR,—You ask, why I "do not warn the members of our society against fornication and adultery." I answer, For the same reason that I do not warn them (in those short hints) against rebellion or murder; namely, because I do not apprehend them to be in immediate danger thereof. Whereas many of them are in continual danger, either of "taking the name of God in vain, of profaning the day of the Lord, or of drunkenness, or brawling, or of uncharitable or unprofitable conversation."

But, you say, "Many persons of great eminence among you have been publicly charged with the commission of these crimes." But will you undertake to make those charges good? Whenever your "Christian charity, and hearty desire for our success in so important a work," shall oblige you to instance particulars, I do hereby promise to give you a particular answer.

"But has not a preacher of your sect preached and printed to prove the lawfulness of polygamy?" I answer, No preacher in connection with me has ever done any such thing. What Mr. Hall of Salisbury has done, is no more to me than it is to you; only that I am a greater sufferer by it. For he renounced all the Methodists several years since: and, when I was at Salisbury last, turned both me and my sister out of his house. No man therefore of common, Heathen humanity, could ever blame me for the faults of that unhappy man.

In declaring my "abhorrence of all vices of that kind," I cannot be more plain and explicit than I have been. I can only declare again, that I believe neither fornicators, adulterers, nor unclean persons shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; and that I rank together sorcerers, whoremongers, murderers, idolaters, and whosoever maketh or loveth a lie.

I well know, "a weak brother," as you define him, that is, a man of "profane eyes, and an unholy imagination," if you talk either of love-feasts, or persons confessing their faults to one another, will immediately run over all the scenes of the "New Atalantis." But I leave that to himself. I must not neglect a Scriptural advice, because such a one is offended at my following it.

Your "friendly advice to avoid spiritual selfishness," I will endeavour to follow as soon as I understand it. At present I do not; neither do I well understand how any "sober Christian should think me guilty of arrogance or self-conceit," because I relate a fact in which I had no share at all; namely, that other men "prayed for one another, that they might be healed of the faults they had confessed; and it was so."

You add, "Dr. Middleton absolves you from all boasting, in relation to the miracle you worked upon Kirkman." Dr. Middleton does me too much honour, in taking any notice of so inconsiderable a person. But, miracle or no miracle, the fact is plain: William Kirkman is, I apprehend, yet alive and able to certify for himself, that he had that cough threescore years, and that since that time it has not yet returned. I do not know that any "one patient yet has died under my hands." If any person does, let him declare it, with the time and circumstances.

You conclude: "Let me beg of you as a fellow Christian, to remove that great load of scandal that now lies upon your sect; and that you will not, by a careless or premeditated silence, bring yourself and your followers under a just suspicion of not being enemies to certain vices which you seem afraid even to name."

Alas, sir, is your "hearty wish for my success" dwindled down to this? and your "sorrow for any oversight that should afford ground of cavil to those who are disposed to think unfavourably of me?" Sir, I take knowledge of you. I no longer wonder at your so readily answering for Dr. Middleton. I am persuaded none has a better right so to do: no, not the gentleman who lately printed in the public papers a letter to the lord bishop of Exeter. Well, sir, you may now lay aside the mask. I do not require you to style yourself my "fellow Christian." But we are fellow creatures, at least fellow servants of the great Lord of heaven and earth! May we both serve him faithfully! For his sake, I remain, sir, your obedient servant,

JOHN WESLEY.

P. S.—I did not receive yours till last night.

A LETTER

TO THE

AUTHOR OF "THE ENTHUSIASM OF METHODISTS AND PAPISTS
COMPARED."

Agendum! Pauca accipe contra.—HOR.
[Come! hear a brief reply.]

SIR,—1. In your late pamphlets you have undertaken to prove, that Mr. Whitefield and I are gross enthusiasts; and that our "whole conduct is but a counterpart of the most wild fanatacisms of the most abominable communion in its most corrupt ages." (*Pref.* p. 3.)

You endeavour to support this charge against us by quotations from our own writings, compared with quotations from celebrated writers of the Romish communion.

2. It lies upon me to answer for one. But I must not burden you with too long an answer; lest, "for want either of leisure or inclination," (*ib.* p. 5,) you should not give this, any more than my other tracts, a reading. In order therefore to spare both you and myself, I shall consider only your First Part; and that as briefly as possible. Accordingly, I shall not meddle with your other quotations; but, leaving them to whom they may concern, shall only examine whether those you have made from my writings prove the charge of enthusiasm or no.

This I conceive will be abundantly sufficient to decide the question between you and me. If these do prove the charge, I am cast; if they do not, if they are the words of truth and soberness, it will be an objection of no real weight against sentiments just in themselves, though they should also be found in the writings of Papists; yea, of Mohammedans or Pagans.

3. Let the eight pages you borrow stand as they are. I presume they will do neither good nor harm. In the tenth you say, "The Methodists act on the same plan with the Papists; not, perhaps, from compact and design; but a similar configuration and texture of brain, or the fumes of imagination producing similar effects. From a commiseration of horror, arising from the grievous corruptions of the world, perhaps from a real motive of sincere piety, they both set out with warm pretences to a reformation." Sir, this is an uncommon thought,—that sincere piety should arise from the "configuration and texture of the brain!" as well as, that "pretences to a reformation" should spring from "a real motive of sincere piety!"

4. You go on: "Both commonly begin their adventures with field preaching." (*Enthusiasm, &c.* p. 11.) Sir, do you condemn field preaching *toto genere*, [entirely,] as evil in itself? Have a care! or you (I should say, the gentleman that assists you) will speak a little too plain, and betray the real motives of his sincere antipathy to the people called Methodists.

Or do you condemn the preaching on Hannam Mount, in particular, to the colliers of Kingswood? If you doubt whether this has done any real good, it is a very easy thing to be informed. And I leave it with all impartial men, whether the good which has in fact been done by preaching there, and which could not possibly have been done any other way, does not abundantly "justify the irregularity of it." (p. 15.)

5. But you think I am herein inconsistent with myself. For I say, "the uncommonness is the very circumstance that recommends it." (I mean that recommended it to the colliers in Kingswood.) And yet I said, but a page or two before, "We are not suffered to preach in the churches; else we should prefer them to any places whatsoever."

Sir, I still aver both the one and the other. I do prefer the preaching in a church when I am suffered: and yet, when I am not, the wise providence of God overrules this very circumstance for good; many coming to hear, because of the uncommonness of the thing, who would otherwise not have heard at all.

6. Your second charge is, that I "abuse the clergy, throw out so much gall of bitterness against them, and impute this black art of calumny to the Spirit and power given from God." (p. 15.)

Sir, I plead Not Guilty to the whole charge. And you have not cited

one line to support it. But if you could support it, what is this to the point in hand? I presume calumny is not enthusiasm. Perhaps you will say, "But it is something as bad." True; but it is nothing to the purpose: even the imputing this to the Spirit of God, as you here represent it, is an instance of art, not of enthusiasm.

7. You charge me, Thirdly, with "putting on a sanctified appearance, in order to draw followers, by a demure look, precise behaviour, and other marks of external piety. For which reason," you say, "Mr. Wesley made and renewed that noble resolution, not willingly to indulge himself in the least levity of behaviour, or in laughter, no, not for a moment; to speak no word not tending to the glory of God, and not a tittle of worldly things." (pp. 18, 19.)

Sir, you miss the mark again. If this "sanctified appearance was put on to draw followers," if it was for "this reason" (as you flatly affirm it was) that "Mr. Wesley made and renewed that noble resolution;" (it was made eleven or twelve years before, about the time of my removal to Lincoln College;) then it can be no instance of enthusiasm, and so does not fall within the design of your present work; unless your title page does not belong to your book; for that confines you to the enthusiasm of the Methodists.

8. But to consider this point in another view: You accuse me of "putting on a sanctified appearance, a demure look, precise behaviour, and other marks of external piety." How are you assured, sir, this was barely external, and that it was a bare appearance of sanctity? You affirm this as from personal knowledge. Was you then acquainted with me three or four and twenty years ago? "He made and renewed that noble resolution," in order to "draw followers." Sir, how do you know that? Are you in God's place, that you take upon you to be the searcher of hearts? "That noble resolution, not willingly to indulge himself in the least levity of behaviour." Sir, I acquit you of having any concern in this matter. But I appeal to all who have the love of God in their hearts, whether this is not a rational, Scriptural resolution, worthy of the vocation wherewith we are called.—"Or in laughter, no, not for a moment." No, nor ought I to indulge it at all; if I am conscious to myself, it hurts my soul. In which let every man judge for himself. "To speak no word not tending to the glory of God." A peculiar instance of enthusiasm this! "And not a tittle of worldly things." The words immediately following are, "Others may, nay, must. But what is that to me?" (words which in justice you ought to have inserted,) who was then entirely disengaged from worldly business of every kind. Notwithstanding which, I have often since engaged therein when the order of providence plainly required it.

9. Though I did not design to meddle with them, yet I must here take notice of three of your instances of Popish enthusiasm. The First is, that "Mechtildis tortured herself for having spoken an idle word." (p. 19.) (The point of comparison lies, not in torturing herself, but in her doing it on such an occasion.) The Second, that "not a word fell from St. Katharine of Sienna, that was not religious and holy." The Third, that "the lips of Magdalen di Pazzi were never opened but to chant the praises of God." I would to God the comparison between the Methodists and Papists would hold in this respect! yea,

that you and all the clergy in England were guilty of just such enthusiasm!

10. You cite as a Fourth instance of my enthusiasm, that I say, "A Methodist (a real Christian) cannot adorn himself, on any pretence, with gold or costly apparel." (p. 21.) If this be enthusiasm, let the Apostle look to it. His words are clear and express. If you can find a pretence to set them aside, do. I cannot; nor do I desire it.

11. My "seeming contempt of money," (p. 26,) you urge as a Fifth instance of enthusiasm. Sir, I understand you. You was obliged to call it *seeming*, lest you should yourself confute the allegation brought in your title page. But if it be only *seeming*, whatever it prove besides, it cannot prove that I am an enthusiast.

12. Hitherto you have succeeded extremely ill. You have brought five accusations against me; and have not been able to make one good. However, you are resolved to throw dirt enough, that some may stick. So you are next to prove upon me, "a restless impatience and insatiable thirst of travelling, and undertaking dangerous voyages, for the conversion of Infidels; together with a declared contempt of all dangers, pains, and sufferings; and the designing, loving, and praying for ill usage, persecution, martyrdom, death, and hell." (p. 27.)

In order to prove this uncommon charge, you produce four scraps of sentences, (p. 31,) which you mark as my words, though, as they stand in your book, they are neither sense nor grammar. But you do not refer to the page, or even the treatise, where any one of them may be found. Sir, it is well you hide your name, or you would be obliged to hide your face from every man of candour or even common humanity.

13. "Sometimes indeed," you say, "Mr. Wesley complains of the scoffs both of the great vulgar and the small;" (p. 32;) to prove which, you disjoint and murder (as your manner is) another of my sentences. "But at other times the note is changed, and 'till he is despised, no man is in a state of salvation.'" *The note is changed!* How so? When did I say otherwise than I do at this day, viz. "that none are children of God, but those who are hated or despised by the children of the devil?"

I must beg you, sir, in your Third Part to inform your reader, that, whenever any solecism or mangled sentences appear in the quotations from my writings, they are not chargeable upon me; that if the sense be mine, (which is not always; sometimes you do me too much honour, even in this,) yet I lay no claim to the manner of expression; the English is all your own.

14. "Corporal severities or mortification by tormenting the flesh," (p. 31,) is the next thing you charge upon me. Almost two sentences you bring in proof of this. The one, "Our bed being wet," (it was in a storm at sea,) "I laid me down on the floor, and slept sound till morning; and I believe I shall not find it needful to go to bed, as it is called, any more." But whether I do or not, how will you prove, that my motive is, to "gain a reputation for sanctity?" I desire (if it be not too great a favour) a little evidence for this.

The other fragment of a sentence speaks "of bearing cold on the naked head, rain and wind, frost and snow." (p. 32.) True; but not as matter of "mortification, by tormenting the flesh." Nothing less.

These things are not spoken of there as voluntary instances of mortification; (you yourself know perfectly well, they are not, only you make free with your friend;) but as some of the unavoidable inconveniences which attend preaching in the open air.

Therefore you need not be so "sure that the Apostle condemns that *αφειδια σωματος*, 'not sparing the body,' as useless and superstitious; and that it is a false show of humility." (p. 33.) Humility is entirely out of the question, as well as chastity, in the case of hardships endured (but not properly chosen) out of love to the souls for which Christ died.

15. You add a word or two of my "ardent desire of going to hell," which, you think, I "adopted from the Jesuit Nieremberg." (p. 34.) Sir, I know not the man. I am wholly a stranger both to his person and to his doctrine. But if this is his doctrine, I disclaim it from my heart. I ardently desire, that both you and I may go to heaven.

But "Mr. Wesley says, 'A poor old man decided the question of disinterested love. He said, I do not care what place I am in. Let God put me where he will, or do with me what he will, so I may set forth his honour and glory.'" (p. 35.)

He did so. And what then? Do these words imply "an ardent desire of going to hell?" I do not suppose the going to hell ever entered into his thoughts. Nor has it any place in my notion of disinterested love. How you may understand that term, I know not.

But you will prove I have this desire, whether I will or no. You are sure this was my "original meaning," (p. 36,) in the words cited by Mr. Church,

"Doom, if thou canst, to endless pain,
Or drive me from thy face;"

"God's power or justice," you say, "must be intended; because he speaks of God's love in the very next lines,

"But if thy stronger love constrains,
Let me be saved by grace."

Sir, I will tell you a secret. Those lines are not mine. However, I will once more venture to defend them, and to aver, that your consequence is good for nothing: "If this love is spoken of in the latter lines, then it is not in the former." No! Why not? I take it to be spoken of in both. The plain meaning of which is, "If thou art not love, I am content to perish. But if thou art, let me find the effects thereof; let me be saved by grace."

16. You next accuse me of maintaining a stoical insensibility. This objection, also, you borrow from Mr. Church. You ought likewise to have taken notice, that I had answered it, and openly disowned that doctrine; I mean, according to the rules of common justice. But that is not your failing.

17. Part of your thirty-ninth page runs thus: "With respect to all this patient enduring hardships, &c, it has been remarked by learned authors, that 'some persons, by constitutional temper, have been fond of bearing the worst that could befall them; that others, from a sturdy humour, and the force of education, have made light of the most exquisite tortures; that when enthusiasm comes in, in aid of this natural or acquired sturdiness, and men fancy they are upon God's work, and entitled to his

rewards, they are immediately all on fire for rushing into sufferings and pain.' ”

I take knowledge of your having faithfully abridged—your own book, shall I say, or the learned Dr. Middleton's? But what is it you are endeavouring to prove?

Quorsum hæc tam putida tendant?
[What does this putid stuff drive at?]

The paragraph seems to point at me. But the plain, natural tendency of it is, to invalidate that great argument for Christianity which is drawn from the constancy of the martyrs. Have you not here also spoken a little too plain? Had you not better have kept the mask on a little longer?

Indeed, you lamely add, “The solid and just comforts which a true martyr receives from above are groundlessly applied to the counterfeit.” But this is not enough even to save appearances.

18. You subjoin a truly surprising thought: “It may moreover be observed, that both ancient and modern enthusiasts always take care to secure some advantage by their sufferings.” (p. 40.) O rare enthusiasts! So they are not such fools neither as they are vulgarly supposed to be. This is just of a piece with the “cunning epileptic demoniacs,” in your other performance. And do not you think, (if you would but speak all that is in your heart, and let us into the whole secret,) that there was a compact, likewise, between Bishop Hooper and his executioner, as well as between the ventriloquist and the exorcist?

But what “advantage do they take care to secure?” a good salary? a handsome fortune? No; quite another matter; “free communications with God, and fuller manifestations of his goodness.” (*Ib.*) I dare say, you do not envy them, no more than you do those “self-interested enthusiasts” of old who “were tortured, not accepting deliverance, that they might obtain a better resurrection.”

19. You proceed to prove my enthusiasm from my notions of conversion. And here great allowances are to be made, because you are talking of things quite out of your sphere; you are got into an unknown world! Yet you still talk as magisterially as if you was only running down the Fathers of the primitive Church.

And, First, you say, I “represent conversion as sudden and instantaneous.” (*Ib.*) Soft and fair! Do you know what conversion is? (A term, indeed, which I very rarely use, because it rarely occurs in the New Testament.) “Yes; it is to ‘start up perfect men at once.’” (p. 41.) Indeed, sir, it is not. A man is usually converted long before he is a perfect man. It is probable most of those Ephesians to whom St. Paul directed his Epistle were converted. Yet they were not “come” (few, if any,) “to a perfect man, to the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ.”

20. I do not, sir, indeed, I do not undertake to make you understand these things. I am not so vain as to think it is in my power. It is the utmost of my hope to convince you, or, at least, those who read your works, that you understand just nothing about them.

To put this out of dispute, you go on: “Thus faith and being born of God are said to be an instantaneous work, at once, and in a moment, as lightning. Justification, the same as regeneration, and having a lively

faith, this always in a moment." (*It.*) I know not which to admire most, the English or the sense, which you here father upon me; but, in truth, it is all your own; I do not thus confound faith and being born of God. I always speak of them as different things; it is you that thus jumble them together. It is you who discover justification also to be the same as regeneration, and having a lively faith. I take them to be three different things; so different as not ever to come under one genus. And yet it is true, that each of these, "as far as I know," is at first experienced suddenly; although two of them (I leave you to find out which) gradually increase from that hour.

21. "After these sudden conversions," say you, "they receive their assurances of salvation." (p. 43.) Sir, Mr. Bedford's ignorance in charging this doctrine upon me might be involuntary, and I am persuaded was real. But yours cannot be so. It must be voluntary; if it is not rather affected. For you had before you, while you wrote, the very tract wherein I corrected Mr. Bedford's mistake, and explicitly declared, "The assurance whereof I speak is not an assurance of salvation." And the very passages you cite from me prove the same; every one of which (as you yourself know in your own conscience) relates wholly and solely to present pardon, not to future salvation.

Of Christian perfection (p. 45) I shall not say any thing to you, till you have learned a little Heathen honesty.

22. That this is a lesson you have not yet learned, appears, also, from your following section; wherein you roundly affirm, "Whatever they think, say, or do," (that is, the Methodists, according to their own account,) "is from God. And whatever opposeth is from the devil." I doubt not but Mr. Church believed this to be true when he asserted it. But this is no plea for you; who, having read the answer to Mr. Church, still assert what you know to be false.

"Here we have," say you, "the true spirit and very essence of enthusiasm, which sets men above carnal reasoning, and all conviction of plain Scripture." (p. 49.) It may, or may not; that is nothing to me. I am not above either reason or Scripture. To either of these I am ready to submit. But I cannot receive scurrilous invective, instead of Scripture; nor pay the same regard to low buffoonery, as to clear and cogent reasons.

23. With your two following pages I have nothing to do. But in the fifty-second I read as follows: "'A Methodist,' says Mr. Wesley, 'went to receive the sacrament; when God was pleased to let him see a crucified Saviour.'" Very well; and what is this brought to prove? Why, (1.) That I am an enthusiast: (2.) That I "encourage the notion of the real, corporal presence, in the sacrifice of the mass." How so? Why, "this is as good an argument for transubstantiation as several produced by Bellarmine." (p. 57.) Very likely it may; and as good as several produced by you for the enthusiasm of the Methodists.

24. In that "seraphic rhapsody of divine love," as you term it, which you condemn in the lump, as rant and madness, there are several Scriptural expressions, both from the Old and New Testament. At first I imagined you did not know them; those being books which you did not seem to be much acquainted with. But upon laying circumstances together, I rather suppose you was glad of so handsome an opportunity

to make as if you aimed at me, that you might have a home stroke at some of those old enthusiasts.

25. The next words which you cite from me, as a proof of my enthusiasm, are, "The power of God was in an unusual manner present." (p. 61.) I mean, many found an unusual degree of that peace, joy, and love, which St. Paul terms, "the fruit of the Spirit." And all these, in conformity to his doctrine, I ascribe to the power of God. I know you, in conformity to your principles, ascribe them to the power of nature. But I still believe, according to the old, Scriptural hypothesis, that whenever, in hearing the word of God, men are filled with peace and love, God "confirms that word by the Holy Ghost given unto those that hear it."

26. As a farther proof of my enthusiasm you mention "special directions, mission, and calls by immediate revelation." (p. 67.) For an instance of which, you cite those words, "I know, and am assured, that God sent forth his light and his truth." I did know this. But do I say, "by immediate revelation?" Not a tittle about it. This is your own ingenious improvement upon my words.

"However, it was by a special direction. For your own words in the same paragraph are, 'From the direction I received from God this day, touching an affair of the greatest importance.'" (pp. 68, 69.)

What, are these words in the same paragraph with those, "I know and am assured, God sent forth his light and his truth?" Why then do you tear the paragraph in two, and put part in your sixty-seventh, part in your sixty-eighth and sixty-ninth pages? O, for a plain reason,—to make it look like two instances of enthusiasm, otherwise it could have made but one at the most.

But you cannot make out one, till you have proved that these directions were by immediate revelation. I never affirmed they were. I now affirm they were not. Now, sir, make your best of them.

You add, "Let me mention a few directions coming by way of command: Mr. Wesley says, 'I came to Mr. Delamotte's, where I expected a cool reception; but God had prepared the way before me.'" (p. 69.) What, by a command to Mr. Delamotte? Who told you so? Not I, nor any one else, only your own fruitful imagination.

27. Your next discovery is more curious still: That "itinerants order what they want at a public house, and then tell the landlord, that he will be damned if he takes any thing of them." (p. 69.)

I was beating my brain to find out what itinerant this should be; as I could not but imagine, some silly man or other, probably styling himself a Methodist, must somewhere or other have given some ground for a story so punctually delivered. In the midst of this, a letter from Cornwall informed me it was I: I myself was the very man, and acquainted me with the place, and the person to whom I said it. But as there are some particulars in that letter (sent without a name) which I did not well understand, I transcribe a few words of it, in hopes that the author will give me fuller information:—

"As to the bishop's declaring what the landlord of Mitchel says, in respect to your behaviour, I do not at all wonder at the story." *The bishop's declaring!* Whom can he mean? Surely not the Right Reverend Dr. George Lavington, Lord Bishop of Exeter! When, or to

whom did he declare it? at Truro in Cornwall? or in Plymouth, at his visitation? to all the clergy who were assembled before God to receive his pastoral instructions? His lordship of Exeter must certainly have more regard to the dignity of the episcopal office!

28. But to proceed: I was not "offended with the Moravians" for warning men "against mixing nature with grace;" (p. 71;) but for their doing it in such a manner as tended to destroy all the work of grace in their souls. I did not blame the thing itself, but their manner of doing it; and this you know perfectly well: but with you, truth must always give way to wit. At all events, you must have your jest.

29. Had you had any regard to truth, or any desire to represent things as they really are, when you repeated Mr. Church's objection concerning lots, you would have acknowledged that I have answered it at large. When you have replied to that answer, I may add a word more.

30. You are sadly at a loss under the article of *ecstasies* and *raptures*, to glean up any thing that will serve your purpose. At last, from ten or twelve tracts, you pick out two lines; and those the same you had mentioned before: "My soul was got up into the holy mount. I had no thought of coming down again into the body." And truly you might as well have let these alone; for if by "ecstasy" you mean *trance*, here is no account of any such; but only of one "rejoicing" in God "with joy unspeakable and full of glory."

With the "girl of seven years old" (p. 77) I have nothing to do; though you honestly tack that relation to the other, in order to make me accountable for both. But all is fair toward a Methodist.

31. What I assert concerning Peter Wright (p. 79) is this: (1.) That he gave me that relation. (Whether I believed it or no, I did not say.) (2.) That he died within a month after. Now, sir, give us a cast of your office. From these two propositions extract a proof of my being an enthusiast.

You may full as easily prove it from these, as from the words you quote next: "God does now give remission of sins, and the gift of the Holy Ghost, and often in dreams and visions of God." "But afterward," you say, "I speak more distrustfully." (p. 79.) Indeed I do not; but I guard against enthusiasm in those words, part of which you have recited. The whole paragraph runs thus:—

"From those words, 'Beloved, believe not every spirit; but try the spirits, whether they be of God,' I told them they were not to judge of the spirit whereby any one spoke, either by appearances, or by common report, or by their own inward feelings; no, nor by any dreams, visions, or revelations, supposed to be made to their souls, any more than by their tears, or any involuntary effects wrought upon their bodies. I warned them, all these were in themselves of a doubtful, disputable nature; they might be from God, and they might not; and were therefore not simply to be relied on, any more than simply to be condemned, but to be tried by a farther rule; to be brought to the only certain test, the law and the testimony." Sir, can you show them a better way?

23. The last proof that you produce of my enthusiasm, is, my "talking of the great work which God is now beginning to work upon earth." (p. 80.) I own the fact. I do talk of such a work. But I deny the consequence: for if God has begun a great work, then the saying he has, is no enthusiasm.

To bring sinners to repentance, to save them from their sins, is allowed by all to be the work of God. Yea, and to save one sinner is a great work of God; much more to save many.

But many sinners are saved from their sins at this day, in London, in Bristol, in Kingswood, in Cornwall, in Newcastle-upon-Tyne, in Whitehaven, in many other parts of England, in Wales, in Ireland, in Scotland, upon the continent of Europe, in Asia, and in America. This I term 'a great work of God;' so great as I have not read of for several ages.

You ask, how I know so great a work is wrought now—"by inspiration?" No; but by common sense. I know it by the evidence of my own eyes and ears. I have seen a considerable part of it; and I have abundant testimony, such as excludes all possible doubt, for what I have not seen.

33. But you are so far from acknowledging any thing of this, as to conclude, in full triumph, that "this new dispensation is a composition of enthusiasm, superstition, and imposture." (p. 81.) It is not clear what you mean by a new dispensation. But the clear and undeniable fact stands thus: A few years ago, Great Britain and Ireland were covered with vice from sea to sea. Very little of even the form of religion was left; and still less of the power of it. Out of this darkness God commanded light to shine. In a short space, he called thousands of sinners to repentance. They were not only reformed from their outward vices, but likewise changed in their dispositions and tempers; filled with "a serious, sober sense of true religion," with love to God and all mankind, with a holy faith, producing good works of every kind, works both of piety and mercy.

What could the god of this world do in such a case, to prevent the spreading of this "serious, sober religion?" The same that he has done from the beginning of the world. To hinder the light of those whom God hath thus changed, from shining before men, he gave them all in general a nick-name; he called them Methodists. And this name, as insignificant as it was in itself, effectually answered his intention. For by this means, that light was soon obscured by prejudice, which could not be withstood by Scripture or reason. By the odious and ridiculous ideas affixed to that name, they were condemned in the gross, without ever being heard. So that now any scribbler, with a middling share of low wit, not incumbered with good nature or modesty, may raise a laugh on those whom he cannot confute, and run them down whom he dares not look in the face. By this means even a comparer of Methodists and Papists may blaspheme the great work of God, not only without blame, but with applause; at least from readers of his own stamp. But it is high time, sir, you should leave your skulking place. Come out, and let us look each other in the face. I have little leisure and less inclination for controversy. Yet I promise, if you will set your name to your Third Part, I will answer all that shall concern me, in that, as well as the preceding. Till then I remain, Sir,

Your friend and well-wisher,

JOHN WESLEY.

CANTERBURY, February 1, 1749-50.

POSTSCRIPT.—When you come to relate those "horrid and shocking things," there may be a danger you are not aware of. Even you yourself may fall (as little as you intend or suspect it) into seriousness. And

I am afraid, if once you put off your fool's coat, if you stand naked before cool and sober reason, you yourself may appear as inconsiderable a creature, to use your own phrase, "as if your name was Perronet."

A SECOND LETTER

TO THE AUTHOR OF

"THE ENTHUSIASM OF METHODISTS AND PAPISTS COMPARED."

Ecce iterum Crispinus!—JUVENAL.
 ["Again Crispinus comes!"—GIFFORD.]

TO THE RIGHT REVEREND THE LORD BISHOP OF EXETER.

MY LORD,—1. I was grieved when I read the following words in the Third Part of the "Enthusiasm of Methodists and Papists Compared:" "A sensible, honest woman told the Bishop of Exeter, in presence of several witnesses, that Mr. John Wesley came to her house, and questioned her, whether she had 'an assurance of her salvation.' Her answer was, that 'she hoped she should be saved, but had no absolute assurance of it.' 'Why then,' replied he, 'you are in hell, you are damned already.' This so terrified the poor woman, who was then with child, that she was grievously afraid of miscarrying, and could not, in a long time, recover her right mind. For this, and the Methodists asking her to live upon free cost, she determined to admit no more of them into her house. So much is her own account to his lordship, on whose authority it is here published."

2. This renewed the concern I felt some time since, when I was informed (in letters which I have still by me) of your lordship's publishing this account, both at Plymouth in Devonshire, and at Truro in Cornwall, before the clergy assembled from all parts of those counties, at the solemn season of your lordship's visiting your diocess. But I was not informed that your lordship showed a deep concern for the honour of God, which you supposed to be so dreadfully violated, or a tender compassion for a Presbyter whom you believed to be rushing into everlasting destruction.

3. In order to be more fully informed, on Saturday, August 25, 1750, Mr. Trembath, of St. Ginnys, Mr. Haime, of Shaftesbury, and I, called at Mr. Morgan's, at Mitchel. The servant telling me her master was not at home, I desired to speak with her mistress, the "honest, sensible woman." I immediately asked, "Did I ever tell you or your husband that you would be damned if you took any money of me?" (So the story ran in the first part of the "Comparison;" it has now undergone a very considerable alteration.) "Or did you or he ever affirm," (another circumstance related at Truro,) "that I was rude with your maid?" She replied vehemently, "Sir, I never said you was, or that you said any such thing. And I do not suppose my husband did. But we have been belied as well as our neighbours." She added, "When the Bishop came down last, he sent us word that he would dine at our house; but he did not, being invited to a neighbouring gentleman's. He sent for me thither, and said, 'Good woman, do you know these people that

go up and down? Do you know Mr. Wesley? Did not he tell you, you would be damned if you took any money of him? And did not he offer rudeness to your maid? I told him, 'No, my lord; he never said any such thing to me, nor to my husband that I know of. He never offered any rudeness to any maid of mine. I never saw or knew any harm of him: but a man told me once (who, I was told, was a Methodist preacher) that I should be damned if I did not know my sins were forgiven.'

4. This is *her own account* given to me. And an account it is, irreconcilably different (notwithstanding some small resemblance in the last circumstance) from that she is affirmed to have given your lordship. Whether she did give that account to your lordship or no, your lordship knows best. That the Comparer affirms it, is no proof at all; since he will affirm any thing that suits his purpose.

5. Yet I was sorry to see your lordship's authority cited on such an occasion; inasmuch as many of his readers, not considering the man, may think your lordship did really countenance such a writer; one that turns the most serious, the most awful, the most venerable things into mere farce; that makes the most essential parts of real, experimental religion matter of low buffoonery; that, beginning at the very rise of it in the soul, namely, "repentance toward God, a broken and a contrite heart," goes on to "faith in our Lord Jesus Christ," whereby "he that believeth is born of God," to "the love of God shed abroad in the heart," attended with "peace and joy in the Holy Ghost,"—to our subsequent "wrestling not" only "with flesh and blood, but with principalities and powers and wicked spirits in high places,"—and thence to "perfect love," the "loving the Lord our God with all our heart, mind, soul, and strength;" and treats on every one of these sacred topics with the spirit and air of a Merry Andrew. What advantage the common enemies of Christianity may reap from this, your lordship cannot be insensible.

6. Your lordship cannot but discern how the whole tenor of his book tends to destroy the Holy Scriptures, to render them vile in the eyes of the people, to make them stink in the nostrils of Infidels. For instance: After reading his laboured ridicule of the sorrow and fear which usually attend the first repentance, (called by St. Chrysostom, as well as a thousand other writers, "the pangs or throes of the new birth,") what can an Infidel think of those and the like expressions in Scripture: "I have roared for the very disquietness of my heart: Fearfulness and trembling are come upon me, and a horrible dread hath overwhelmed me?" After his flood of satire on all kind of conflicts with Satan, what judgment can a Deist form of what St. Paul speaks concerning the various wrestlings of a Christian with the wicked one? Above all, how will his bringing the lewd Heathen poets to expose the pure and spiritual love of God, naturally cause them to look with the same eyes on the most elevated passages of the inspired writings? What can be more diverting to them than to apply his *γλυκυπικρον ερωτος*, "bitter-sweet of love," to many expressions in the Canticles? (On which, undoubtedly, he supposes the Fair Circassian to be a very just paraphrase!) "Ay," say they, "the very case: 'Stay me with apples; for I am sick of love.'" "

7. Probably the Comparer will reply, "No; I do not ridicule the things themselves; repentance, the new birth, the fight of faith, or the love of God; all which I know are essential to religion; but only the

folly and the enthusiasm which are blended with these by the Methodists." But how poor a pretence is this! Had this really been the case, how carefully would he have drawn the line under each of these heads,—between the sober religion of a Christian, and the enthusiasm of a Methodist! But has he done this? Does he take particular care to show under each what is true, as well as what is false, religion? where the former ends and the latter begins? what are the proper boundaries of each? Your lordship knows he does not so much as endeavour it, or take any pains about it; but indiscriminately pours the flood out of his unclean mouth, upon all repentance, faith, love, and holiness.

8. Your lordship will please to observe that I do not here touch in the least on the merits of the cause. Be the Methodists what they may, fools, madmen, enthusiasts, knaves, impostors, Papists, or any thing, yet your lordship perceives this does not in any degree affect the point in question: still it behooves every Christian, nay, every reasonable Hea-then, to consider the subject he is upon, and to take care not to bring this into contempt, (especially if it be of the last importance,) however inexcusable or contemptible his opponents may be.

9. This consideration, my lord, dwelt much upon my mind when I read the former parts of the Comparison. I immediately saw there was no encountering a buffoon by serious reason and argument. This would naturally have furnished both him and his admirers with fresh matter of ridicule. On the other hand, if I should let myself down to a level with him, by a less serious manner of writing than I was accustomed to, I was afraid of debasing the dignity of the subject. Nay, and I knew not but I might catch something of his spirit. I remembered the advice, "Answer not a fool according to his folly, lest thou also be like unto him," Prov. xxvi, 4. And yet I saw there must be an exception in some cases, as the words immediately following show: "Answer a fool according to his folly, lest he be wise in his own conceit." I conceive, as if he had said, "Yet it is needful, in some cases, to 'answer a fool according to his folly,' otherwise he will be 'wiser in his own conceit, than seven men that can render a reason.'" I therefore constrained myself to approach, as near as I dared, to his own manner of writing. And I trust the occasion will plead my excuse with your lordship, and all reasonable men.

10. One good effect of my thus meeting him on his own ground is visible already. Instead of endeavouring to defend, he entirely gives up, the First Part of his Comparison. Indeed, I did not expect this, when I observed that the Third Part was addressed to me. I took it for granted, that he had therein aimed at something like a reply to my answer: but going on, I found myself quite mistaken. He never once attempts a reply to one page, any otherwise than by screaming out, "Pertness, scurrility, effrontery;" and in subjoining that deep remark, "Paper and time would be wasted on such stuff." (*Third Part*, pref. p. 15.)

11. I cannot but account it another good effect, that he is something less confident than he was before. He is likewise not more angry or more bitter, for that cannot be, but a few degrees more serious: so that I plainly perceive this is the way I am to take if I should have leisure to answer the Third Part; although it is far from my desire to write in this manner; it is as contrary to my inclination as to my custom.

12. But is it possible that a person of your lordship's character should countenance such a performance as this? It cannot be your lordship's desire to pour contempt on all that is truly venerable among men! to stab Christianity to the heart, under the colour of opposing enthusiasm; and to increase and give a sanction to the profaneness which already overspreads our land as a flood.

13. Were the Methodists ever so bad, yet are they not too despicable and inconsiderable for your lordship's notice? "Against whom is the king of Israel come out? against a flea? against a partridge upon the mountains?" Such they undoubtedly are, if that representation of them be just which the Comparer has given. Against whom (if your lordship espouses his cause) are you stirring up the supreme power of the nation? Against whom does your lordship arm the ministers of all denominations, particularly our brethren of the established Church? inciting them to paint us out to their several congregations as not fit to live upon the earth. The effects of this have already appeared in many parts both of Devonshire and Cornwall. Nor have I known any considerable riot in any part of England, for which such preaching did not pave the way.

14. I beg leave to ask, would it be a satisfaction to your lordship if national persecution were to return? Does your lordship desire to revive the old laws, *de hæretico comburendo*? [concerning the burning of heretics?] Would your lordship rejoice to see the Methodists themselves tied to so many stakes in Smithfield? Or would you applaud the execution, though not so legally or decently performed by the mob of Exeter, Plymouth Dock, or Launceston? My lord, what profit would there be in our blood? Would it be an addition to your lordship's happiness, or any advantage to the Protestant cause, or any honour either to our Church or nation?

15. The Comparer, doubtless, would answer, "Yes; for it would prevent the horrid consequences of your preaching." My lord, give me leave to say once more, I willingly put the whole cause upon this issue. What are the general consequences of our preaching? Are there more tares or wheat? more good men destroyed, (as Mr. Church once supposed,) or wicked men saved? The last places in your lordship's diocese, where we began constant preaching, are near Liskeard in Cornwall, and at Tiverton in Devonshire. Now, let any man inquire here, (1.) What kind of people were those a year ago, who now constantly hear this preaching? (2.) What are the main doctrines the Methodists have been teaching this twelvemonth? (3.) What effect have these doctrines had upon their hearers? And if you do not find, (1.) That the greater part of these were, a year or two ago, notoriously wicked men: (2.) Yet the main doctrines they have heard since were, "Love God and your neighbour, and carefully keep his commandments:" and, (3.) That they have since exercised themselves herein, and continue so to do;—I say, if any reasonable man, who will be at the pains to inquire, does not find this to be an unquestionable fact, I will openly acknowledge myself an enthusiast, or whatever else he shall please to style me.

16. I beg leave to conclude this address to your lordship with a few more words transcribed from the same letter: "Allow Mr. Wesley," says Mr. Church, "but these few points, and he will defend his conduct beyond exception." (*Second Letter to Mr. Church*, vol. v, p. 337.)

That is most true. If I have indeed been advancing nothing but the true knowledge and love of God; if God has made me an instrument in reforming many sinners, and bringing them to inward and pure religion; and if many of these continue holy to this day, and free from all wilful sin; then may I, even I, use those awful words, "He that despiseth me, despiseth Him that sent me." But I never expect the world to allow me one of these points. However, I must go on as God shall enable me. I must lay out whatsoever talents he entrusts me with, (whether others will believe I do it or no,) in advancing the true Christian knowledge of God, and the love and fear of God among men; in reforming (if so be it please him to use me still) those who are yet without God in the world; and in propagating inward and pure religion, "righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost."

Sincerely wishing your lordship all happiness in time and in eternity,
I remain your lordship's most obedient servant,

JOHN WESLEY.

NOVEMBER 27, 1750.

SIR,—1. You have undertaken to prove, (as I observed in my former letter, a few sentences of which I beg leave to repeat,) that the "whole conduct of the Methodists is but a counterpart of the most wild fanaticisms of Popery." (*Preface to the First Part*, p. 3.)

You endeavour to support this charge by quotations from our own writings, compared with quotations from Popish authors.

It lies upon me to answer for one. But in order to spare both you and myself, I shall at present consider only your Second Part, and that as briefly as possible. Accordingly, I shall not meddle with your other quotations, but, leaving them to whom they may concern, shall examine whether those you have made from my writings prove the charge for which they were made or no.

If they do, I submit. But if they do not, if they are "the words of truth and soberness," it is an objection of no real weight against any sentiment, just in itself, though it should also be found in the writings of Papists; yea, of Mohammedans or Pagans.

2. In your first section, in order to prove the "vain boasting of the Methodists," you quote a part of the following sentence: "When hath religion, I will not say, since the reformation, but since the time of Constantine the Great, made so large a progress in any nation, within so short a space?" (I beg any impartial person to read the whole passage, from the eighty-fourth to the ninetieth page of the *Third Appeal*. [Vol. v, pp. 145–147 of this edition.] I repeat the question, giving the glory to God; and, I trust, without either boasting or enthusiasm.

In your second, you cite (and murder) four or five lines from one of my Journals, "as instances of the persuasive eloquence of the Methodist preachers." (pp. 1, 9.) But it unfortunately happens, that neither of the sentences you quote were spoke by any preacher at all. You know full well the one was used only in a private letter; the other by a woman on a bed of sickness.

3. You next undertake to prove "the most insufferable pride and vanity of the Methodists." (Sec. iii, p. 12, &c.) For this end you quote five passages from my Journals, and one from the *Third Appeal*.

The first was wrote in the anguish of my heart, to which I gave vent (between God and my own soul) by breaking out, not into "confidence of boasting," as you term it, but into those expressions of bitter sorrow: "I went to America to convert the Indians. But O! who shall convert me?" (Vol. iii, p. 55.) Some of the words which follow you have picked out, and very honestly laid before your reader, without either the beginning or end, or one word of the occasion or manner wherein they were spoken.

Your next quotation is equally fair and generous: "Are they read in philosophy? So was I," &c. (*Ib.* p. 56, &c.) This whole "string of self-commendation," as you call it, being there brought, *ex professo*, [professedly,] to prove that, notwithstanding all this, which I once piqued myself upon, I was at that hour in a state of damnation!

The third is a plain narrative of the manner wherein many of Bristol expressed their joy on my coming unexpectedly into the room, after I had been some time at London. (Vol. iii, p. 210.) And this, I conceive, will prove the charge of high treason, as well as that of "insufferable pride and vanity."

You say, Fourthly, "A dying woman, who had earnestly desired to see me, cried out, as I entered the room, 'Art thou come, thou blessed of the Lord?'" (*Ib.* p. 217.) She did so. And what does this prove?

The fifth passage is this: "In applying which, my soul was so enlarged, that methought I could have cried out, (in another sense than poor, vain Archimedes,) 'Give me where to stand; and I will shake the earth.'" My meaning is, I found such freedom of thought and speech, (jargon, stuff, enthusiasm to you,) that methought, could I have then spoken to all the world, they would all have shared in the blessing.

4. The passage which you quote from the *Third Appeal*, I am obliged to relate more at large:—

"There is one more excuse for denying this work of God, taken from the instruments employed therein: that is, that they are wicked men; and a thousand stories have been handed about to prove it.

"Yet I cannot but remind considerate men, in how remarkable a manner the wisdom of God has, for many years, guarded against this pretence, with regard to my brother and me in particular." "This pretence, that is, 'of not employing fit instruments.'" These words are yours, though you insert them as mine. The pretence I mentioned, was, "that they were wicked men." And how God guarded against this, is shown in what follows: "From that time, both my brother and I, utterly against our will, came to be more and more observed and known; till we were more spoken of than perhaps two so inconsiderable persons ever were before in the nation. To make us more public still, as honest madmen at least, by a strange concurrence of providences, overturning all our preceding resolutions, we were hurried away to America."

Afterward it follows: "What persons could, in the nature of things, have been (antecedently) less liable to exception, with regard to their moral character at least, than those the all-wise God hath now employed? Indeed I cannot devise what manner of men could have been more unexceptionable on all accounts. Had God endued us with greater natural or acquired abilities, this very thing might have been turned into an ob-

jection. Had we been remarkably defective, it would have been matter of objection on the other hand. Had we been Dissenters of any kind, or even Low Churchmen, (so called,) it would have been a great stumbling block in the way of those who are zealous for the Church. And yet had we continued in the impetuosity of our High Church zeal, neither should we have been willing to converse with Dissenters, nor they to receive any good at our hands." Sir, why did you break off your quotation in the middle of this paragraph, just at, "more unexceptionable on all accounts?" Was it not on purpose to give a wrong turn to the whole? to conceal the real and obvious meaning of my words, and put one upon them that never entered into my thoughts?

5. You have reserved your strong reason for the last, namely, my own confession: "Mr. Wesley says himself, 'By the most infallible of proofs, inward feeling, I am convinced of pride, &c.'" Sir, be pleased to decypher that &c. Or I will spare you the pains, and do it myself, by reciting the whole sentence:—

"By the most infallible of proofs, inward feeling, I am convinced,
 "(1.) Of unbelief, having no such faith in Christ as will prevent my heart from being troubled, which it could not be, if I believed in God, and rightly believed also in him.

"(2.) Of pride throughout my life past, inasmuch as I thought I had what I find I have not." (Vol. iii, p. 52.)

Now, sir, you have my whole confession. I entreat you to make the best of it.

But I myself "acknowledge three Methodists to have fallen into pride." Sir, I can tell you of three more. And yet it will not follow, that the doctrines I teach "lead men into horrid pride and blasphemy."

6. In the close of your fourth section, you charge me with "shuffling and prevaricating with regard to extraordinary gifts and miraculous powers." Of these I shall have occasion to speak by and by. At present I need only return the compliment, by charging you with gross, wilful prevarication, from the beginning of your book to the end. Some instances of this have appeared already. Many more will appear in due time.

7. Your fifth charges me with an "affectation of prophesying." Your first proof of it is this:—

"It was about this time that the soldier was executed. For some time I had visited him every day. But when the love of God was shed abroad in his heart, I told him, 'Do not expect to see me any more: I believe Satan will separate us for a season.' Accordingly, the next day, I was informed, the commanding officer had given strict orders, that neither Mr. Wesley, nor any of his people, should be admitted." (Vol. iii, p. 181.) I did believe so, having seen many such things before; yet without affecting a spirit of prophecy.

But that I do claim it, you will prove, secondly, from my mentioning "the great work which God intends, and is now beginning, to work over all the earth." By what art you extract such a conclusion out of such premises, I know not. That God intends this, none who believe the Scripture doubt. And that he has begun it, both in Europe and America, any, who will make use of their eyes and ears, may know without any "miraculous gift of prophesying."

8. In your sixth section, you assert, that I lay claim to other miraculous gifts. (p. 45.) As you borrow this objection from Mr. Church, I need only give the same answer I gave before.

“I shall give,” says Mr. Church, “but one account more, and that is, what you give of yourself.” The sum whereof is, “At two several times, being ill, and in violent pain, I prayed to God, and found immediate ease.” I did so. I assert the fact still. “But if these,” you say, “are not miraculous cures, all this is rank enthusiasm.

“I will put your argument in form:—

“He that believes those are miraculous cures which are not, is a rank enthusiast:

“But you believe those to be miraculous cures which are not:

“Therefore you are a rank enthusiast.

“Before I answer, I must know what you mean by miraculous: if you term every thing so which is ‘not strictly accountable for by the ordinary course of natural causes,’ then I deny the latter part of the second proposition. And unless you can make this good, unless you can prove the effects in question are strictly accountable for by the ordinary course of natural causes, your argument is nothing worth.” (*First Letter to Mr. Church*, vol. v, p. 291.)

Having largely answered your next objection relating to what I still term “a signal instance of God’s particular providence,” (*ib.* pp. 289, 319,) I need only refer you to those answers, not having leisure to say the same thing ten times over.

Whether I sometimes claim, and sometimes disclaim, miracles, will be considered by and by.

In your seventh section, you say, “I shall now give some account of their grievous conflicts and combats with Satan.” (p. 51, &c.) O sir, spare yourself, if not the Methodists! Do not go so far out of your depth. This is a subject you are as utterly unacquainted with, as with justification, or the new birth.

But I attend your motions. “Mr. Wesley,” you say, “was advised to a very high degree of silence. And he spoke to none at all for two days, and travelling fourscore miles together.

“The same whim,” you go on, “has run through several of the religious orders. Hence, St. Bonaventura says, that silence in all the religious is necessary to perfection. St. Agatho held a stone in his mouth for three years, till he had learned taciturnity. St. Alcantara carried several pebbles in his mouth, for three years likewise, and for the same reason. Theon observed a continual silence for thirty years. St. Francis observed it himself, and enjoined it upon his brethren. The rule of silence was religiously observed by St. Dominic.”

I have repeated more of your words than I otherwise should, in order to show to a demonstration, that a man of a lively imagination may run a parallel to any length, without any foundation in nature.

You begin, “The same whim which led Mr. Wesley to observe an absolute silence for two days;” and so run on to St. Bonaventura, St. Agatho, and I know not whom. But did Mr. Wesley “observe an absolute silence for two days?” No; not for one hour. My words, “I spoke to none at all for fourscore miles together,” (vol. iii, p. 212,) imply neither more nor less than that I spoke to none “concerning the things of God,” as it is in the words immediately preceding. And you know

this as well as I. But it is all one for that. Wit, not truth, is the point you aim at.

My supposed inconsistency, with regard to the Moravians, which you likewise drag in (as they say) by head and shoulders, I have shown, again and again, to be no inconsistency at all; particularly in both the Letters to Mr. Church.

10. Well, but as to conflicts with Satan: "Nor can Mr. Wesley," you say, "escape the attacks of this infernal spirit," namely, "suggesting distrustful thoughts, and buffeting him with inward temptations." Sir, did you never hear of any one so attacked, unless among the Papists or Methodists? How deeply then are you experienced both in the ways of God, and the devices of Satan!

You add, with regard to a case mentioned in the *Fourth Journal*, vol. iii, p. 183, "Though I am not convinced that these fits of laughing are to be ascribed to Satan, yet I entirely agree that they are involuntary and unavoidable." I am glad we agree so far. But I must still go farther; I cannot but ascribe them to a preternatural agent; having observed so many circumstances attending them which cannot be accounted for by any natural causes.

Under the head of conflicts with Satan, you observe farther, "Mr. Wesley says, while he was preaching, the devil knew his kingdom shook, and therefore stirred up his servants to make a noise; that, September 18, the prince of the air made another attempt in defence of his tottering kingdom; and that another time, the devil's children fought valiantly for their master." I own the whole charge, I did say all this. Nay, and if need were, I should say it again.

You cite one more instance from my *Fourth Journal*: "The many-headed beast began to roar again." So your head is so full of the subject, that you construe even poor Horace's *bellua multorum capitum* [many-headed beast] into the devil!

These are all the combats and conflicts with Satan which you can prove I ever had. O sir, without more and greater conflicts than these, none shall see the kingdom of God.

11. In the following sections, you are equally out of your element. The first of them relates to "spiritual desertions;" (sec. viii, p. 75, &c;) all which you make the subject of dull ridicule, and place to the account of enthusiasm. And the case of all you give in the following words: "We may look upon enthusiasm as a kind of drunkenness, filling and intoxicating the brain with the heated fumes of spirituous particles. Now, no sooner does the inebriation go off, but a coldness and dulness takes place."

12. As wildly do you talk of the doubts and fears incident to those who are "weak in faith." (Sec. ix, p. 79, &c.) I cannot prevail upon myself to prostitute this awful subject, by entering into any debate concerning it with one who is innocent of the whole affair. Only I must observe that a great part of what you advance concerning me is entirely wide of the question. Such is all you quote from the *First*, and a considerable part of what you quote from my *Second Journal*. This you know in your own conscience; for you know I speak of myself during the whole time, as having no faith at all. Consequently, the "risings and fallings" I experienced then have nothing to do with those "doubts

and fears which many go through, after they have by faith received remission of sins."

The next words which you cite, "thrown into great perplexities," I cannot find in the page you refer to, neither those that follow. The sum of them is, that "at that time I did not feel the love of God, but found deadness and wanderings in public prayer, and coldness even at the holy communion." Well, sir, and have you never found in yourself any such coldness, deadness, and wanderings? I am persuaded you have. And yet surely your brain is always cool and temperate! never "intoxicated with the heated fumes of spirituous particles!"

13. If you quote not incoherent scraps, (by which you may make any thing out of any thing,) but entire connected sentences, it will appear that the rest of your quotations make no more for your purpose than the foregoing. Thus, although I allow, that on May 24, "I was much buffeted with temptations; but I cried to God, and they fled away; that they returned again and again; I as often lifted up my eyes, and he sent me help from his holy place;" (vol. iii, p. 74;) it will only prove the very observation I make myself: "I was fighting both under the law and under grace. But then I was sometimes, if not often, conquered; now I was always conqueror."

That some time after, I "was strongly assaulted again, and after recovering peace and joy, was thrown into perplexity afresh by a letter, asserting that no doubt or fear could consist with true faith; that my weak mind could not then bear to be thus sawn asunder," will not appear strange to any who are not utter novices in experimental religion. No more than that, one night the next year, "I had no life or spirit in me, and was much in doubt, whether God would not lay me aside, and send other labourers into his harvest."

14. You add, "He owns his frequent relapses into sin, for near twice ten years. Such is the case of a person who tells us that he carefully considered every step he took; one of intimate communication with the Deity!" Sir, I did not tell you that; though, according to custom, you mark the words as mine. It is well for you that forging quotations is not felony.

My words are, "O what a hypocrite have I been (if this be so) for near twice ten years! But I know it is not so. I know every one under the law is even as I was;" namely, from the time I was twelve years old, till considerably above thirty.

"And is it strange," you say, "that such a one should be destitute of means to resolve his scruples? should be ever at variance with himself, and find no place to fix his foot?"

Good sir, not too fast. You quite outrun the truth again. Blessed be God, this is not my case. I am not destitute of means to resolve my scruples. I have some friends, and a little reason left. I am not ever at variance with myself; and have found a place to fix my foot:—

Now I have found the ground wherein
Firm my soul's anchor may remain;
The wounds of Jesus, for my sin
Before the world's foundation slain.

And yet one of your assertions I cannot deny; namely, that you "could run the parallel between me and numbers of fanatical Papists:—"

and that not only with regard to my temper, but my stature, complexion yea, (if need were,) the very colour of my hair.

15. In your next section, you are to give an account of the "spiritual succours and advantages received either during these trials or very soon after." (Sec. x, p. 92, &c.) It is no wonder you make as lame work with these, as with the conflicts which preceded them. "As the heart knoweth its own bitterness, so a stranger doth not intermeddle with his joy." But it is no business of mine, as you have not done me the honour to cite any of my words in this section.

16. "The unsteadiness of the Methodists, both in sentiments and practice," (sec. xi, p. 95, &c.) is what you next undertake to prove. Your loose declamation with which you open the cause, I pass over, as it rests on your own bare word; and haste to your main reason, drawn from my sentiments and practice with regard to the Moravians.

"He represents them," you say, "in the blackest colours; yet declares, in the main, they are some of the best people in the world. His love and esteem for them increases more and more. His own disciples among the Methodists go over to them in crowds. But still Methodism is the strongest barrier against the Moravian doctrines and principles."

Sir, I bear you witness you have learned one principle, at least, from those with whom you have lately conversed; namely, that no faith is to be kept with heretics; of which you have given us abundant proof. For you know I have fully answered every article of this charge; which you repeat, as if I had not opened my lips about it. You know that there is not one grain of truth in several things which you here positively assert. For instance: "His love and esteem for them increases more and more." Not so; no more than my love and esteem for you. I love you both; but I do not much esteem either. Again: "His own disciples among the Methodists go over to them in crowds." When? Where? I know not that ten of my disciples, as you call them, have gone over to them for twice ten months. O sir, consider! How do you know but some of your disciples may tell your name?

17. With the same veracity you go on: "In 'The Character of a Methodist,' those of the sect are described as having all the virtues that can adorn the Christian profession. But in their 'Journals' you find them waspish, condemning all the world, except themselves; and among themselves perpetual broils and confusions, with various other irregularities and vices."

I answer, (1.) The tract you refer to (as is expressly declared in the preface) does not describe what the Methodists are already; but what they desire to be, and what they will be then when they fully practise the doctrine they hear. (2.) Be pleased to point the pages in my Journals which mention those "various irregularities and vices." Of their "perpetual broils and confusions" I shall speak under their proper head.

You add: "Sometimes they are so far from fearing death, that they wish it. But the keenness of the edge is soon blunted. They are full of dreadful apprehensions that the clergy intend to murder them." Do you mean me, sir? I plead, Not Guilty. I never had any such apprehension. Yet I suppose you designed the compliment for me, by your dragging in two or three broken sentences from my First Journal.

But how little to the purpose! seeing at the time that was written, I had never pretended to be above the fear of death. So that this is no proof of the point in view,—of the “unsteadiness of my sentiments or practice.”

18. You proceed: “One day they fancy it their duty to preach; the next, they preach with great reluctance.” Very true! But they fancy it their duty still; else they would not preach at all. This, therefore, does not prove any inequality either of sentiment or practice.

“Mr. Wesley is sometimes quite averse from speaking, and then perplexed with the doubt, Is it a prohibition from the good Spirit, or a temptation from nature and the evil one?”

Just of a piece with the rest. The sentence runs thus: “I went several times with a design to speak to the sailors, but could not. I mean, I was quite averse from speaking. Is not this what men commonly mean by, ‘I could not speak?’ And is this a sufficient cause of silence or no? Is it a prohibition from the good Spirit, or a temptation from nature or the evil one?” Sir, I was in no doubt at all on the occasion. Nor did I intend to express any in these words; but to appeal to men’s conscience, whether what they call “a prohibition from the good Spirit,” be not a mere “temptation from nature or the evil one.”

19. In the next section you are to show “the art, cunning, and sophistry of the Methodists, who, when hard pressed by argument, run themselves into inconsistency and self contradiction; and occasionally either defend or give up some of their favourite notions and principal points.” (Section xii, p. 102.)

I dare say, sir, you will not put them to the trial. Argument lies out of the way of one,

—*Solutos*

Qui captat risus hominum, famamque dicacis.

(One that affects the droll, and loves to raise a horse-laugh.)

But to the proof: “Mr. Wesley,” you say, “at one time declares for a disinterested love of God; at another, declares, There is no one caution in all the Bible against the selfish love of God.”

Nay, sir, I will tell you what is stranger still: Mr. Wesley holds, at one time both sides of this contradiction. I now declare both that “all true love is disinterested, ‘seeketh not her own;’ and that there is no one caution in all the Bible against the selfish love of God.”

What, have I the art to slip out of your hands again! “Pardon me,” as your old friend says, “for being jocular.”

20. You add, *altius insurgens*: [rising higher:] “But it is a considerable offence to charge another wrongfully, and contradict himself about the doctrine of assurance.” To prove this upon me, you bring my own words: “The assurance we preach is of quite another kind from that Mr. Bedford writes against. We speak of an assurance of our present pardon; not, as he does, of our final perseverance.” (Vol. iii, p. 111.)

“Mr. Wesley might have considered,” you say, “that when they talk of ‘assurance of pardon and salvation,’ the world will extend the meaning of the words to our eternal state.” I do consider it, sir; and therefore I never use that phrase either in preaching or writing. “Assurance of pardon and salvation” is an expression that never comes out of my

lips; and if Mr. Whitefield does use it, yet he does not preach such an assurance as the privilege of all Christians.

“But Mr. Wesley himself says, that ‘though a full assurance of faith does not necessarily imply a full assurance of our future perseverance, yet some have both the one and the other.’ And now what becomes of his charge against Mr. Bedford? And is it not mere evasion to say afterward, ‘This is not properly an assurance of what is future?’”

Sir, this argument presses me very hard! May I not be allowed a little evasion now? Come, for once I will try to do without it, and to answer flat and plain.

And I answer, (1.) That faith is one thing; the full assurance of faith another. (2.) That even the full assurance of faith does not imply the full assurance of perseverance: this bears another name, being styled by St. Paul, “the full assurance of hope.” (3.) Some Christians have only the first of these; they have faith, but mixed with doubts and fears. Some have also the full assurance of faith, a full conviction of present pardon; and yet not the full assurance of hope; not a full conviction of their future perseverance. (4.) The faith which we preach, as necessary to all Christians, is the first of these, and no other. Therefore, (5.) It is no evasion at all to say, “This (the faith which we preach as necessary to all Christians) is not properly an assurance of what is future.” And consequently, my charge against Mr. Bedford stands good, that his Sermon on Assurance is an *ignoratio elenchi*, an “ignorance of the point in question,” from beginning to end. Therefore, neither do I “charge another wrongfully, nor contradict myself about the doctrine of assurances.”

21. To prove my art, cunning, and evasion, you instance next in the case of impulses and impressions. You begin, “With what pertinacious confidence have impulses, impressions, feelings, &c, been advanced into certain rules of conduct! Their followers have been taught to depend upon them as sure guides and infallible proofs.”

To support this weighty charge, you bring one single scrap, about a line and a quarter, from one of my Journals. The words are these: “By the most infallible of proofs, inward feeling, I am convinced.” Convinced of what? It immediately follows, “Of unbelief, having no such faith as will prevent my heart from being troubled.”

I here assert, that inward feeling or consciousness is the most infallible of proofs of unbelief,—of the want of such a faith as will prevent the heart’s being troubled. But do I here “advance impressions, impulses, feelings, &c, into certain rules of conduct?” or any where else? You may just as well say, I advance them into certain proofs of transubstantiation.

Neither in writing, in preaching, nor in private conversation, have I ever “taught any of my followers to depend upon them as sure guides or infallible proofs” of any thing.

Nay, you yourself own, I have taught quite the reverse; and that at my very first setting out. Then, as well as ever since, I have told the societies, “they were not to judge by their own inward feelings. I warned them, all these were in themselves of a doubtful, disputable nature. They might be from God, or they might not, and were therefore to be tried by a farther rule, to be brought to the only certain test, the law and the testimony.” (Vol. iii, p. 141.)

This is what I have taught from first to last. And now, sir, what becomes of your heavy charge? On which side lies the "pertinacious confidence" now? How clearly have you made out my inconsistency and self contradiction! and that I "occasionally either defend or give up my favourite notions and principal points!"

22. "Inspiration, and the extraordinary calls and guidances of the Holy Ghost, are" what you next affirm to be "given up." (Section xiii, p. 106, &c.) Not by me. I do not "give up" one tittle on this head, which I ever maintained. But observe: Before you attempt to prove my "giving them up," you are to prove that I laid claim to them; that I laid claim to some extraordinary inspiration, call, or guidance of the Holy Ghost.

You say, my "concessions on this head" (to Mr. Church) "are ambiguous and evasive." Sir, you mistake the fact. I make no concessions at all, either to him or you. I give up nothing that ever I advanced on this head; but when Mr. Church charged me with what I did not advance, I replied, "I claim no other direction of God's, but what is common to all believers. I pretend to be no otherwise inspired than you are, if you love God." Where is the ambiguity or evasion in this? I meant it for a flat denial of the charge.

23. Your next section, *spiral tragicum satis*, [breathes enough of tragedy,] charges the Methodists "with skepticism and infidelity, with doubts and denials of the truth of Revelation, and Atheism itself." (Section xiv, p. 110, &c.) The passages brought from my Journals to prove this charge, which you have prudently transposed, I beg leave to consider in the same order as they stand there.

The first you preface thus: "Upon the people's ill usage (or supposed ill usage) of Mr. Wesley in Georgia, and their speaking of all manner of evil falsely (as he says) against him; and trampling under foot the word, after having been very attentive to it; what an emotion in him is hereby raised! 'I do hereby bear witness against myself, that I could scarce refrain from giving the lie to experience, and reason, and Scripture, all together.'"

The passage, as I wrote it, stands thus: "Sunday, March 7.—I entered upon my ministry at Savannah. In the Second lesson, (Luke xviii.) was our Lord's prediction of the treatment which he himself, and consequently his followers, were to meet with from the world.

"Yet notwithstanding these plain declarations of our Lord, notwithstanding my own repeated experience, notwithstanding the experience of all the sincere followers of Christ, whom I ever talked with, read or heard of, nay, and the reason of the thing, evincing to a demonstration, that all who love not the light must hate him who is continually labouring to pour it in upon them; I do here bear witness against myself, that, when I saw the number of people crowding into the church, the deep attention with which they received the word, and the seriousness that afterward sat on all their faces; I could scarce refrain from giving the lie to experience, and reason, and Scripture, all together. I could hardly believe that the greater, the far greater, part of this attentive, serious people, would hereafter trample under foot that word, and say all manner of evil falsely of him that spoke it." (Vol. iii, p. 21.)

Sir, does this prove me guilty of skepticism or infidelity; of doubting

or denying the truth of Revelation? Did I speak this, "upon the people using me ill, and saying all manner of evil against me?" Or am I here describing "any emotion raised in me hereby?" Blush, blush, sir, if you *can* blush. You had here no possible room for mistake. You grossly and wilfully falsify the whole passage, to support a groundless, shameless accusation.

24. The second passage (written January 24, 1737-8) is this: "In a storm, I think, What if the Gospel be not true? Then thou art of all men most foolish. For what hast thou given thy goods, thy ease, thy friends, thy reputation, thy country, thy life? For what art thou wandering over the face of the earth? A dream; a cunningly devised fable." (Vol. iii, p. 55.)

I am here describing the thoughts which passed through my mind when I was confessedly an unbeliever. But even this implies no skepticism, much less Atheism: no "denial of the truth of Revelation;" but barely such transient doubts as, I presume, may assault any thinking man that knows not God.

The third passage (which you tack to the former, as if they were one and the same) runs thus: "I have not such a peace as excludes the possibility either of doubt or fear. When holy men have told me I had no faith, I have often doubted whether I had or no. And those doubts have made me very uneasy, till I was relieved by prayer and the Holy Scriptures." (Vol. iii, p. 112.)

Speak frankly, sir: Does this prove me guilty of skepticism, infidelity, or Atheism? What else does it prove? Just nothing at all, but the "pertinacious confidence" of him that cites it.

25. You recite more at large one passage more. The whole paragraph stands thus:—

"St. Paul tells us, 'The fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, long suffering, gentleness, meekness, temperance.' Now, although, by the grace of God in Christ, I find a measure of some of these in myself, viz. of peace, long suffering, gentleness, meekness, temperance; yet others I find not. I cannot find in myself the love of God or of Christ. Hence my deadness and wanderings in public prayer. Hence it is that, even in the holy communion, I have rarely any more than a cold attention. Hence, when I hear of the highest instance of God's love, my heart is still senseless and unaffected. Yea, at this moment, (October 14, 1738,) I feel no more love to Him, than one I had never heard of." (Vol. iii, p. 112.)

To any who knew something of inward religion I should have observed, that this is what serious divines mean by desertion. But all expressions of this kind are jargon to you. So, allowing it to be whatever you please, I ask only, Do you know how long I continued in this state? how many years, months, weeks, or days? If not, how can you infer what my state of mind is now, from what it was above eleven years ago?

Sir, I do not tell you, or any man else, that "I cannot *now* find the love of God in myself;" or that now, in the year 1751, I rarely feel more than a cold attention in the holy communion: so that your whole argument, built on this supposition, falls to the ground at once.

26. Sensible, I presume, of the weakness of this reason, you immediately apply to the passions, by that artful remark: "Observe, reader, this is the man who charges our religion as no better than the Turkish

pilgrimages to Mecca, or the Popish worship of our Lady of Loretto!" *Our religion!* How naturally will the reader suppose, that I fix the charge either on the Protestant religion in general, or on that of the Church of England in particular! But how far is this from the truth!

My words concerning those who are commonly called religious are, "Wherein does their religion consist? in righteousness and true holiness; in love stronger than death; fervent gratitude to God, and tender affection to all his creatures? Is their religion the religion of the heart; a renewal of the soul in the image of God? Do they resemble Him they worship? Are they free from pride, from vanity, from malice, from envy; from ambition and avarice, from passion and lust, from every uneasy and unlovely temper? Alas! I fear neither they (the greater part at least) nor you have any more notion of this religion, than the peasant that holds the plough, of the religion of a Gymnosophist.

"It is well if the genuine religion of Christ has any more alliance with what you call religion, than with the Turkish pilgrimages to Mecca, or the Popish worship of our Lady of Loretto. Have not you substituted, in the place of the religion of the heart, something, I do not say, equally sinful, but equally vain and foreign to the worshipping of God in spirit and in truth? What else can be said even of prayer, public or private, in the manner wherein you generally perform it? as a thing of course, running round and round, in the same dull track, without either the knowledge or the love of God; without one heavenly temper, either attained or improved?" (*Farther Appeal*, Third Part. Vol. v, p. 143.)

Now, sir, what room is there for your own exclamations?—"What sort of heavenly temper is his? How can he possibly, consistently with charity, call this *our general performance?*" Sir, I do not. I only appeal to the conscience of you, and each particular reader, whether this is, or is not, the manner wherein *you* (in the singular number) *generally* perform public or private prayer. "How, possibly, without being omniscient, can he affirm, that *we* (I presume you mean all the members of our Church) pray without one heavenly temper? or know any thing at all of our private devotions? How monstrous is all this!" Recollect yourself, sir. If your terror is real, you are more afraid than hurt. I do not affirm any such thing. I do not take upon me to know any thing at all of your private devotions. But I suppose I may inquire, without offence, and beg you seriously to examine yourself before God.

So you have brought no one proof, that "skepticism, infidelity, and Atheism are either constituent parts or genuine consequences of Methodism." Therefore your florid declamation, in the following pages, is entirely out of its place. And you might have spared yourself the trouble of accounting for what has no being, but in your own imagination.

27. You charge the Methodists next with "an uncharitable spirit." (Sec. xv, p. 115, &c.) All you advance in proof of this, as if it were from my writings, but without naming either page or book, I have nothing to do with. But whatever you tell me where to find, I shall carefully consider.

I observe but one single passage of this sort; and that you have worn thread bare already: "By the most infallible of proofs, inward feeling, I am convinced of levity and luxuriance of spirit, by speaking words not tending to edify; but most by my *manner of speaking of my enemies.*" Sir, you may print this, not only in italics, but in capitals, and yet it

would do you no service. For what I was convinced of then was not uncharitableness, but, as I expressly mentioned, "levity of spirit."

28. Of the same "uncharitable nature," you say, is "their application of divine judgments to their opposers." (Sec. xvi, p. 119, &c.) You borrow two instances from Mr. Church: but you omit the answers, which I shall therefore subjoin.

His words are, "You describe Heaven as executing judgments, immediate punishments, on those who oppose you. You say, 'Mr. Molther was taken ill this day. I believe it was the hand of God that was upon him.'" (*First Letter to Mr. Church*, vol. v, p. 289.) I do; but I do not say, as a judgment for opposing me. That you say for me.

"Again, you mention," says Mr. Church, "as an awful providence, the case of 'a poor wretch, who was last week cursing and blaspheming, and had boasted to many, that he would come on Sunday, and no man should stop his mouth; but on Friday God laid his hand upon him, and on Sunday he was buried.' I do look on this as a manifest judgment of God on a hardened sinner, for his complicated wickedness."

To repeat these objections, without taking the least notice of the answers, is one of the usual proofs of your charitable spirit.

29. You pass on to "the Methodists' uncharitable custom of summoning their opponents to the bar of judgment." (Sec. xvii, p. 123, &c.)

You bring two passages from my writings to prove this. The First is, "Calling at Newgate, (in Bristol,) I was informed, that the poor wretches under sentence of death were earnestly desirous to speak with me; but that Alderman Beecher had sent an express order that they should not. I cite Alderman Beecher to answer for these souls at the judgment seat of Christ."

Why do you leave out those words, *for these souls?* Because they show the sentence means neither more nor less than, "If these souls perish, he, not I, must answer for them at the great day."

The Second passage is still more wide from the point. The whole of it is as follows:—

"I have often inquired, who were the authors of this report, (that I was a Papist,) and have generally found, they were either bigoted Dissenters, or (I speak it without fear or favour) ministers of our own Church. I have also frequently considered, what possible ground or motive they could have thus to speak; seeing few men in the world have had occasion so clearly and openly to declare their principles as I have done, both by preaching, printing, and conversation, for several years last past. And I can no otherwise think, than that either they spoke thus (to put the most favourable construction upon it) from gross ignorance; they knew not what Popery was; they knew not what doctrines these are which the Papists teach; or they wilfully spoke what they knew to be false, probably thinking thereby to do God service. Now, take this to yourselves, whoever ye are, high or low, Dissenters or Churchmen, clergy or laity, who have advanced this shameful charge, and digest it how you can.

"But how have ye not been afraid, if ye believe there is a God, and that he knoweth the secrets of your hearts, (I speak now to you preachers, more especially, of whatever denomination,) to declare so gross, palpable a lie, in the name of the God of truth? I cite you all, before 'the Judge of all the earth,' either publicly to prove your charge, or, by publicly retracting it, to make the best amends you can, to God, to me, and to the world." (Vol. iii, p. 150.)

Sir, do I here “summon my opponents to the bar of judgment?” So you would make me do, by quoting only that scrap, “I cite you all, before ‘the Judge of all the earth!’” You then add, with equal charity and sincerity, “Here you have the true spirit of an enthusiast, flushed with a modest assurance of his own salvation, and the charitable prospect of the damnation of others.” O sir, never name modesty more!

Here end your laboured attempts to show the “uncharitable spirit” of the Methodists; who, for any thing you have shown to the contrary, may be the most charitable people under the sun.

30. You charge the Methodists next with “violation and contempt of order and authority;” (Sec. xviii, p. 124;) namely, the authority of the governors of the Church. I have answered every article of this charge, in the Second and Third Parts of the “Farther Appeal,” and the “Letter to Mr. Church.” When you have been so good as to reply to what is there advanced, I may possibly say something more.

What you offer of your own upon this head, I shall consider without delay:—

“Women and boys are actually employed in this ministry of public preaching.” Please to tell me where. I know them not, nor ever heard of them before.

You add, what is more marvellous still, “I speak from personal knowledge, that sometimes, a little before delivering of the elements at the communion, three or four Methodists together will take it into their heads to go away; that sometimes, while the sentences of the offertory were reading, they have called out to the minister who carried the bason, reproaching him for asking alms of them; that sometimes, when the minister has delivered the bread into their hands, instead of eating it, they would slip it into their pockets.” Sir, you must show your face, before these stories will find credit on your bare asseveration.

“Yet they are surprised,” you say, “that every man in his senses does not, without the least hesitation, join them.”

Sir, I am surprised (unless you are not in your senses) at your advancing such a barefaced falsehood.

31. You go on: “Under this head may, not improperly, be considered their undutiful behaviour to the civil powers.” What proof have you of this? Why, a single sentence, on which I laid so little stress myself, that it is only inserted by way of parenthesis, in the body of another sentence: “Ye learned in the law, what becomes of *Magna Charta*, and of English liberty and property? Are not these mere sounds, while, on any pretence, there is such a thing as a press gang suffered in the land?”

Upon this you descant: “The legislature has, at several times, made acts for pressing men. But no matter for this; touch but a Methodist, and all may perish, rather than a soldier be pressed. He who had before bound himself not to speak a tittle of worldly things is now bawling for liberty and property.”

Very lively this! But I hope, sir, you do not offer it by way of argument. You are not so unlearned in the law, as not to know, that the legislature is out of the question. The legislature, six years ago, did not appoint press gangs, but legal officers, to press men. Consequently, this is no proof (and find another if you can) of our undutiful behaviour to the civil powers.

32. "Another natural consequence," you say, "of Methodism, is their mutual jealousies and envyings, their manifold divisions, fierce and rancorous quarrels, and accusations of one another." (Vol. iii, p. 171.)

I shall carefully attend whatever you produce on this head: and if you prove this, I will grant you all the rest.

You First cite those words: "Musing on the things that were past, and reflecting how many that came after me were preferred before me, I opened my Testament on those words: 'The Gentiles, which followed not after righteousness, have attained to righteousness; but Israel, which followed after the law of righteousness, hath not attained to the law of righteousness.'"

And how does this prove the manifold divisions and rancorous quarrels of the Methodists?

Your Second argument is: "Mr. Whitefield told me, he and I preached two different Gospels;" (his meaning was, that he preached particular, and I universal, redemption;) "and therefore he would not join with me, but publicly preach against me." (Sec. xix, p. 341, &c.)

Well, sir, here was doubtless a division for a time; but no fierce and rancorous quarrel yet.

You say, Thirdly, "They write and publish against each other." True; but without any degree either of fierceness or rancour.

You assert, Fourthly, "Mr. Wesley, in his sermon 'On Free Grace,' opposes the other for the horrible blasphemies of his horrible doctrine."

Sir, away with your flourishes, and write plain English. I opposed the doctrine of predestination, which he held. But without any degree either of rancour or fierceness. Still, therefore, you miss the mark.

You quote, Fifthly, these words: "I spent an hour with Mr. Stonehouse. O what *πειθανολογια*, 'persuasiveness of speech,' is here! Surely all the deceivableness of unrighteousness." (Vol. iii, p. 196.) But there was no fierceness or rancour on either side.

The passage, a fragment of which you produce as a Sixth argument, stands thus: "A few of us had a long conference together. Mr. C. now told me plainly, he could not agree with me, because I did not preach the truth, particularly with regard to election." He did so; but without any rancour. We had a long conference; but not a fierce one. (Vol. iii, p. 198.)

You, Seventhly, observe, "What scurrility of language the Moravians throw out against Mr. Wesley!" Perhaps so. But this will not prove that "the Methodists quarrel with each other."

"And how does he turn their own artillery upon them!" This is your Eighth argument. But if I do, this no more proves the "mutual quarrels of the Methodists," than my turning your own artillery upon you.

33. Having, by these eight irrefragable arguments, clearly carried the day, you raise your crest, and cry out, "Is this Methodism?"

And reign such mortal feuds in heavenly minds?"

Truly, sir, you have not yet brought one single proof (and yet, I dare say, you have brought the very best you have) of any such feuds among the Methodists as may not be found among the most heavenly-minded men on earth.

But you are resolved to pursue your victory, and so go on: "What are we to think of these charges of Whitefield, and Wesley, and the

Moravians, one against another?" The Moravians, sir, are out of the question; for they are no Methodists; and as to the rest, Mr. Whitefield charges Mr. Wesley with holding universal redemption, and I charge him with holding particular redemption. This is the standing charge on either side. And now, sir, "what are we to think?" Why, that you have not proved one point of this charge against the Methodists.

However, you stumble on: "Are these things so? Are they true, or are they not true? If not true, they are grievous calumniators; if true, they are detestable sectarists. Whether true or false, the allegation stands good of their fierce and rancorous quarrels, and mutual heinous accusations."

Sir, has your passion quite extinguished your reason? Have fierceness and rancour left you no understanding? Otherwise, how is it possible you should run on at this senseless, shameless rate? These things are true which Mr. Whitefield and Wesley object to each other. He holds the decrees; I do not: yet this does not prove us "detestable sectarists." And whether these things are true or false, your allegation of our "fierce and rancorous quarrels, and mutual heinous accusations" cannot stand good, without better proof than you have yet produced.

34. Yet, with the utmost confidence, *quasi re bene gesta*, [as if well done,] you proceed, "And how stands the matter among their disciples? They are all together by the ears, embroiled and broken with unchristian quarrels and confusions."

How do you prove this? Why thus: "Mr. Wesley's Fourth Journal is mostly taken up in enumerating their wrath, dissensions, and apostasies." No, sir, not a tenth part of it; although it gives a full and explicit account of the greatest dissensions which ever were among them.

But, to come to particulars: You First cite these words, "At Oxford, but a few who had not forsaken them."

My words are, "Monday, October 1, 1738.—I rode to Oxford, and found a few who had not yet forsaken the assembling themselves together." This is your First proof that "the Methodists are all together by the ears." Your Second is its very twin-brother. "Tuesday, 2.—I went to many who once heard the word with joy; but 'when the sun arose, they withered away.'" (Vol. iii, p. 156.)

Your Third is this: "Many were induced (by the Moravians) to deny the gift of God, and affirm they never had any faith at all." (*Ib.* p. 167.) You are at liberty to enjoy this argument also; and let it prove what it can prove.

You, Fourthly, cite these words: "Many of our sisters are shaken, grievously torn by reasonings. But few come to Fetter-lane, and then after their names are called over they presently depart. Our brethren here (those who were proselytes to the Moravians) have neither wisdom enough to guide, nor prudence enough to let it alone. They (the Moravians) have much confounded some of our sisters, and many of our brothers are much grieved." (*Ib.* 172.)

This proves thus much, that one society was at that time divided; but not that the Methodists, in general, were, even then, "all together by the ears."

The passage you quote, in the Fifth place, is, "I believe—are deter-

mined to go on according to Mr. Molther's direction, and I suppose (says the writer of the letter) above half our brethren are on their side. But they are so very confused, they do not know how to go on, and yet are unwilling to be taught, except by the Moravians." (*Ib.* 172.)

Add to this: (I recite the whole passages in order; not as you had mangled, and then jumbled them together:) "Wednesday, December 19.—I came to London, though with a heavy heart. Here I found every day the dreadful effects of our brethren's reasoning and disputing with each other. Scarce one in ten retained his first love; and most of the rest were in the utmost confusion," (they were so, more or less, for several months,) "biting and devouring one another."

This also proves so much, neither more nor less, that some of the Methodists were then in confusion. And just so much is proved by your Sixth quotation: "Many were wholly unsettled," (by the Moravians, taking advantage of my absence,) "and lost in vain reasonings and doubtful disputation;—not likely to come to any true foundation." (*Ib.* p. 174.)

Your Seventh quotation (I recite the whole sentence) runs thus: "April 19.—I received a letter, informing me that our poor brethren at Fetter-lane were again in great confusion." This quotation proves just as much as the preceding, or as the following: "The plague" (of false stillness) "was now spread to them also;" namely, to the "little society at Islington." (*Ib.* p. 181.)

Your Ninth is this: "I went to the society, but I found their hearts were quite estranged. Friday, 4.—I met a little handful of them, who still stand in the old paths." (*Ib.* p. 189.)

Thus far you have been speaking of the Methodists in London. And what have you proved concerning them? Only that the Moravians, mixing with them twelve years ago, while they were young and unexperienced, set them a disputing with each other, and thereby occasioned much confusion for several months. But you have not proved that the Methodists in general were, even then, "all together by the ears;" and much less, that they have been so ever since, and that they are so now.

35. I now attend you to Kingswood. Not to "Bristol and Kingswood," which you artfully join together. The society at Bristol was no more concerned with the disputes in Kingswood, than with those in London.

Here the First quotation, though containing but two lines, is extracted from three different paragraphs; in one of which I say: "I had many unpleasing accounts (in December, 1740) concerning our little society in Kingswood." In the Second: "I went to Kingswood, if haply I might repair the breaches which had been made" by the Predestinarian preachers. In the Third: "I laboured to heal the jealousies and misunderstandings which had arisen." (Vol. iii, p. 198.)

The Second passage, part of which you quote, is this: "I returned early in the morning to Kingswood; but my congregation was gone to hear Mr. C.; so that I had not above two or three men, and as many women." (*Ib.* p. 199.)

The Third is, "January 1.—I explained, 'If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature.' But many of our brethren had no ears to hear, having disputed away both their faith and love." (*Ib.* p. 199.)

The Fourth, "February 21.—I inquired concerning the divisions and offences which began afresh to break out in Kingswood. In the afternoon I met a few of the bands; but it was a cold, uncomfortable meeting." (*Ib.* p. 202.)

You have picked out here and there a word from several pages, in order to furnish out a Fifth quotation. The most material part of it is this: "Saturday, 28.—I read the following paper at Kingswood: 'For their scoffing at the word and ministers of God, for their back-biting and evil-speaking, I declare the persons above mentioned, to be no longer members of this society.'" (*Ib.* p. 204.)

¶ "And we had great reason to bless God, that, after fifty-two were withdrawn, we had still upward of ninety left." (*Ib.* 205.)

Who those other "forty were, that," you say, "left them," I know not. Perhaps you may inform me.

Upon the whole, all these quotations prove only this: That about eleven years ago, Mr. C., falling into predestination, set the society in Kingswood a disputing with each other, and occasioned much confusion for some months. But still you have not gone one step toward proving, (which is the one point in question,) that the Methodists in general, were, even then, "all together by the ears;" and much less, that they have been so ever since, and that they are so now.

However, you fail not to triumph, (like Louis le Grand, after his victory at Blenheim,) "What shall we say now? Are these the fruits of Methodism?" No, sir. They are the fruits of opposing it. They are the tares sown among the wheat. You may hear of instances of the same kind, both in earlier and later ages.

You add, "This is bad enough; but it is not the worst. For consider, what becomes of those that leave them?" Why, sir, what, if "their last end be worse than their first?" Will you charge this upon me? By the same rule, you must have charged upon the Apostles themselves whatever befell those who, having "known the way of righteousness," afterward "turned back from the holy commandment once delivered to them."

36. You conclude this section: "Mr. Wesley will probably say, 'Must I be answerable for the Moravians, against whom I have preached and written?' True, since he and the Moravians quarrelled. But who gives them a box on the ear with the one hand, and embraces them with the other? Who first brought over this wicked generation? Who made a Moravian his spiritual guide? Who fanaticized his own followers, and deprived them of their senses? Whose societies (by his own confession) run over in shoals to Moravianism forty or fifty at a time? Would they have split upon this rock, if they had not been first Methodists? Lastly: Where is the spawn of Moravianism so strongly working as in the children of Methodism?"

Sir, you run very fast. And yet I hope to overtake you by and by. "Mr. Wesley," you say, "has preached against the Moravians, since he quarrelled with them." Sir, I never quarrelled with their persons yet: I did with some of their tenets long ago. He "gives them a box on the ear with the one hand, and embraces them with the other." That is, I embrace what is good among them, and at the same time reprove what is evil. "Who first brought over this wicked generation?" Not I, whether they be wicked or not. I once thought I did; but have since

then seen and acknowledged my mistake. "Who made a Moravian his spiritual guide?" Not I; though I have occasionally consulted several. "Who fanaticized his own followers, and deprived them of their senses?" Not I. Prove it upon me if you can. "Whose societies (by his own confession) run over in shoals to Moravianism, forty or fifty at a time?" Truly not mine. Two-and-fifty of Kingswood society ran over to Calvinism, and, a year before, part of Fetter-lane society gradually went over to the Moravians. But I know none of ours that went over "in shoals." They never, that I remember, gained five at a time; nor fifty in all, to the best of my knowledge, for these last ten years. "Would they" (of Fetter-lane) "have split on this rock, if they had not first been Methodists?" Undoubtedly they would; for several of them had not first been Methodists. Mr. Viney, for instance, (as well as several others,) was with the Germans before ever he saw me. "Lastly: Where is the spawn of Moravianism working so strongly as in the children of Methodism?" If you mean the errors of Moravianism, they are not working at all in the generality of the children of Methodism; the Methodists in general being thoroughly apprized of, and fully guarded against, them.

So much for your modest assertion, that the Methodists in general are "all together by the ears;" the very reverse of which is true. They are in general in perfect peace. They enjoy in themselves "the peace of God, which passeth all understanding." They are at peace with each other; and, as much as lieth in them, they live peaceably with all men.

37. Your next charge is, that "Methodism has a tendency to undermine morality and good works." (Section xx, p. 146, &c.) To prove this you assert, (1.) "That the Methodists are trained up to wait in quietness for sudden conversion; whence they are naturally led to neglect the means of salvation." This is a mistake all over. For neither are they taught to wait in quietness (if you mean any more than patience by that term) for either sudden or gradual conversion; neither do they, in fact, neglect the means. So far from it, that they are eminently exact in the use of them.

You assert, (2.) "The doctrine of assurance of pardon and salvation, present and future, causes a false security, to the neglect of future endeavours." Blunder upon blunder again. That all Christians have an assurance of future salvation, is no Methodist doctrine; and an assurance of present pardon is so far from causing negligence, that it is of all others the strongest motive to vigorous endeavours after universal holiness.

You assert, (3.) "Impulses and impressions being made the rule of duty, will lead into dangerous errors." Very true: but the Methodists do not make impulses and impressions the rule of duty. They totally disclaim any other rule of duty than the written word.

You assert, (4.) "A claim of unsinning perfection" (I mean by perfection, the loving God with all our heart) "drives some into frenzies, others into despair." Sir, I doubt the fact.

You assert, (5.) "The Moravian Methodists trample down morality, and multitudes of the Wesleys have been infected." *The Moravian Methodists!* You may as well say the Presbyterian Papists. The Moravians have no connection with the Methodists. Therefore, what-

ever they do, (though you slander them too,) they and not we are to answer for. The Methodists at present, blessed be God, are as little infected with this plague (of condemning or neglecting good works) as any body of people in England or Ireland.

38. From these loose assertions you proceed to quotations from my writings, every one of which I shall consider, to show that, not in one or two, but in every one, you are a wilful prevaricator and false accuser of your neighbour.

You say, First, "The Moravians." Hold, good sir! you are out of the way already. You well know, the Moravians are to answer for themselves. Our present question concerns the Methodists only.

You say, Secondly, "A general temptation prevails among the societies of Methodists, of leaving off good works." (Vol. iii, p. 184.) Sir, you are wrong again. The societies of Methodists are not there spoken of; but the single society of Fetter-lane. Among these only that temptation then prevailed.

You quote, Thirdly, as my words, "The poor, confused, shattered society had erred from the faith." My own words are, "I told the poor, confused, shattered society, wherein they had erred from the faith;" (*ib.* p. 183;) namely, with regard to the ordinances; not in general, as your way of expressing it naturally imports. Nor had all the society erred even in this point. Many of them were still unshaken.

You quote, Fourthly, "A woman of Deptford spoke great words and true. She ordered Mr. Humphreys to leave off doing good."

Must not every reader suppose, as you have placed these words, that they were all spoke at one time? and that the "great words and true" were those whereby she "ordered Mr. Humphreys to leave off doing good?"

What then must every honest man think of you, when he observes, that one half of the sentence (which you thus artfully put together) stands in another page, and at a considerable distance from the other? and that I immediately subjoin to the latter clause, "We talked largely with her, and she was humbled to the dust, under a deep sense of the advantage Satan had gained over her."

You quote, Fifthly, a part of the following sentence, to prove that I "undermine morality and good works:"

"His judgment concerning holiness is new. He no longer judges it to be an outward thing, to consist either in doing no harm, in doing good, or in using the ordinances of God." (And yet how strongly do I insist upon all these! Sir, do not you know this?) "He sees it is the life of God in the soul, the image of God fresh stamped on the heart." It is so. Sir, can you deny it? What then will you prove by this?

You quote, Sixthly, part of these words:—

"They speak of holiness as if it consisted chiefly, if not wholly, in these two points: First, the doing no harm: Secondly, the doing good, as it is called; that is, the using the means of grace, and helping our neighbour." (Vol. iii, p. 154.)

And this you term, "disparaging good works!" Sir, these things, considered barely as to the *opus operatum*, [work done,] are not good works. There must be something good in the heart, before any of our works are good. Insomuch that, "though I give all my goods to feed the poor, and have not" this, "it profiteth me nothing."

You observe, by the way, "The Mystic divinity was once the Methodists' doctrine." Sir, you have stepped out of the way, only to get another fall. The Mystic divinity was never the Methodists' doctrine. They could never swallow either John Tauler or Jacob Behmen; although they often advised with one that did.

39. You say, Seventhly, "I do not find that Mr. Wesley has ever cited those express passages of St. James." Sir, what if I had not? (I mean in print.) I do not cite every text from Genesis to the Revelation. But it happens I have. Look again, sir; and, by and by, you may find where.

You say, Eighthly, "Mr. Wesley affirms, that the condition of our justification is faith alone, and not good works." Most certainly I do. And I learn it from the Eleventh and Twelfth Articles, and from the Homilies of our Church. If you can confute them, do. But I subscribe to them, both with my hand and heart.

You say, Ninthly, "Give me leave to make a remark. The Methodists wandered many years in the new path of salvation by faith and works, which was the time, too, of their highest glory and popularity. During this time, they were seducing their disciples into the most destructive errors." Excuse me, sir. While they preached salvation by faith and works, they had no disciples at all, unless you term a few pupils such; nor had they any popularity at all. They then enjoyed (what they always desired) a quiet, retired life. But whatever disciples we had, they were not seduced by us into the error of justification by works. For they were in it before ever they saw our face, or knew there were such men in the world.

You say, Tenthly, "Mr. Wesley only contends, that it is possible to use them without trusting in them." Not in that page; because the proposition I am confuting is, "It is not possible to use them without trusting in them." (Vol. iii, p. 174.)

You added, "And now, are not such disparaging expressions" (a mere possibility of using them without trusting in them) "a great discouragement to practice?"

O sir, when will you deviate into truth? Dare you affirm, without any regard to God or man, "Mr. Wesley only contends for a mere possibility of using the means without trusting in them?"

To go no farther than the very first page you refer to, (vol. iii, p. 174.) my express words are these:—

"I believe the way to attain faith is to wait for Christ in using all the means of grace.

"Because I believe, these do ordinarily convey God's grace even to unbelievers." Is this "contending only for a mere possibility of using them without trusting in them!"

Not only in this, and many other parts of the Journals, but in a sermon wrote professedly on the subject, I contend that all the ordinances of God are the stated channels of his grace to man; and that it is our bounden duty to use them all, at all possible opportunities. So that to charge the Methodists in general, or me in particular, with undervaluing or disparaging them, shows just as much regard for justice and truth, as if you was to charge us with Mohammedanism.

40. Tedious as it is to wade through so many dirty pages, I will follow

you induce to turn back from God, and to list under the devil's banner ^{gain}. Then you make the success of your own wickedness an excuse for not acknowledging the work of God! You urge, 'that not many sinners were reformed! and that some of those are now as bad as ever!'

"Whose fault is this? Is it ours, or your own? Why have not thousands more been reformed? Yea, for every one who is now turned to God, why are there not ten thousand? Because you and your associates laboured so heartily in the cause of hell; because you and they spared no pains, either to prevent or to destroy the work of God. By using all the power and wisdom you had, you hindered thousands from hearing the Gospel, which they might have found to be the power of God unto salvation. Their blood is upon your heads. By inventing, or countenancing, or retailing lies, some refined, some gross and palpable, you hindered others from profiting by what they did hear. You are answerable to God for these souls also. Many who began to taste the good word and run the way of God's commandments, by various methods you prevailed on to hear it no more. So they soon drew back to perdition. But know, that, for every one of these also, God will require an account of you in the day of judgment!

"And yet, in spite of all the malice and wisdom and strength, not only of men, but of 'principalities and powers,' of the 'rulers of the darkness of this world,' of the 'wicked spirits in high places,' there are thousands found, who are 'turned from dumb idols to serve the living and true God.' What a harvest then might we have seen before now, if all who say they are 'on the Lord's side,' had come, as in all reason they ought, 'to the help of the Lord against the mighty!' Yea, had they only not opposed the work of God, had they only refrained from his messengers, might not the trumpet of God have been heard long since in every corner of our land! and thousands of sinners in every county been brought to 'fear God and honour the king!'"

44. Without any regard to this, your next assertion is, "That the Methodists are carrying on the work of Popery." (Section xxi, p. 164, &c.) This also being a charge of a very high nature, I shall particularly consider whatever you advance in defence of it.

Your First argument is, "They have a strain of Jesuitical sophistry, artifice, and craft, evasion, reserve, equivocation, and prevarication." So you say. But you do not so much as aim at any proof.

Your Second argument is, "Mr. Wesley says, where a Methodist was receiving the sacrament, God was pleased to let him see a crucified Saviour." Sir, Mr. W. does not say this. It is one that occasionally wrote to him. But if he had, what would you infer? that he is a Papist? Where is the consequence? Why, you say, "Was not this as good an argument for transubstantiation, as several produced by the Papists?" Yes, exactly as good as either their arguments or yours; that is, just good for nothing.

Your Third argument runs thus: "We may see in Mr. W.'s writings, that he was once a strict Churchman, but gradually put on a more catholic spirit, tending at length to Roman Catholic. He rejects any design to convert others from any communion; and consequently not from Popery."

This is half true, (which is something uncommon with you,) and only half false. It is true, that, for thirty years last past, I have "gradually put on a more catholic spirit;" finding more and more tenderness for those who differed from me either in opinions or modes of worship. But it is not true, that I "reject any design of converting others from any communion." I have, by the blessing of God, converted several from Popery, who are now alive and ready to testify it.

Your Fourth argument is, That in a Collection of Prayers, I cite the words of an ancient Liturgy, "For the faithful departed." Sir, whenever I use those words in the Burial Service, I pray to the same effect: "That we, with all those who are departed in thy faith and fear, may have our perfect consummation and bliss, both in body and soul:" yea, and whenever I say, "Thy kingdom come;" for I mean both the kingdom of grace and glory. In this kind of general prayer, therefore, "for the faithful departed," I conceive myself to be clearly justified, both by the earliest antiquity, by the Church of England, and by the Lord's Prayer; although the Papists have corrupted this scriptural practice into praying for those who die in their sins.

45. Your Fifth argument is, "That they use private confession, in which every one is to speak the state of his heart, with his several temptations and deliverances, and answer as many searching questions as may be. And what a scene," say you, "is hereby disclosed! What a filthy jakes opened, when the most searching questions are answered without reserve!" Hold, sir, unless you are answering for yourself: this undoubtedly you have a right to do. You can tell best what is in your own heart. And I cannot deny what you say: it may be a very "filthy jakes," for aught I know. But pray do not measure others by yourself. The hearts of believers "are purified through faith." When these open their hearts one to another, there is no such scene disclosed. Yet temptations to pride in various kinds, to self will, to unbelief in many instances, they often feel in themselves. (whether they give any place to them or no,) and occasionally disclose to their brethren.

But this has no resemblance to Popish confession; of which you are very sensible. For you cite my own words: "The Popish confession is, the confession made by a single person to a Priest. Whereas, this is the confession of several persons conjointly, not to a Priest, but to each other." You add, "Will Mr. W. abide by this, and freely answer a question?" I will. For I desire only, "by manifestation of the truth, to commend myself to every man's conscience in the sight of God."

Your question is, "After private confessions taken in their bands are not reports made to Mr. W.?" I answer, No; no reports are made to me of the particulars mentioned in private bands. "Are no delinquents, male and female, brought before him separately, and confessed by him?" No; none at all. You ask, "How then do I know the outward and inward states of those under my care?" I answer, By examining them once a quarter, more or less, not separately, but ten or fifteen together.

Therefore every unprejudiced person must see that there is no analogy between the Popish confession to a Priest, and our confessing our faults one to another, and praying one for another, as St. James directs. Consequently, neither does this argument, though urged with all your art and force, amount to any shadow of proof, that "the Methodists are carrying on the work of Popery."

46. Your Sixth argument, such as it is, stands thus: "Another tendency to Popery appears by the notion of a single drop of Christ's blood being a sufficient atonement for the sins of the whole world. For, however pious this may appear, it is absolutely false and Papistical." Sir, this argument is perfectly new, and entirely your own. It were great pity to disturb you in the enjoyment of it.

it, you induce to turn back from God, and to list under the devil's banner again. Then you make the success of your own wickedness an excuse for not acknowledging the work of God! You urge, 'that not many sinners were reformed! and that some of those are now as bad as ever!'

"Whose fault is this! Is it ours, or your own? Why have not thousands more been reformed? Yea, for every one who is now turned to God, why are there not ten thousand! Because you and your associates laboured so heartily in the cause of hell; because you and they spared no pains, either to prevent or to destroy the work of God. By using all the power and wisdom you had, you hindered thousands from hearing the Gospel, which they might have found to be the power of God unto salvation. Their blood is upon your heads. By inventing, or countenancing, or retailing lies, some refined, some gross and palpable, you hindered others from profiting by what they did hear. You are answerable to God for these souls also. Many who began to taste the good word and run the way of God's commandments, by various methods you prevailed on to hear it no more. So they soon drew back to perdition. But know, that, for every one of these also, God will require an account of you in the day of judgment!

"And yet, in spite of all the malice and wisdom and strength, not only of men, but of 'principalities and powers,' of the 'rulers of the darkness of this world,' of the 'wicked spirits in high places,' there are thousands found, who are 'turned from dumb idols to serve the living and true God.' What a harvest then might we have seen before now, if all who say they are 'on the Lord's side,' had come, as in all reason they ought, 'to the help of the Lord against the mighty!' Yea, had they only not opposed the work of God, had they only refrained from his messengers, might not the trumpet of God have been heard long since in every corner of our land! and thousands of sinners in every county been brought to 'fear God and honour the king?'"

44. Without any regard to this, your next assertion is, "That the Methodists are carrying on the work of Popery." (Section xxi, p. 164, &c.) This also being a charge of a very high nature, I shall particularly consider whatever you advance in defence of it.

Your First argument is, "They have a strain of Jesuitical sophistry, artifice, and craft, evasion, reserve, equivocation, and prevarication." So you say. But you do not so much as aim at any proof.

Your Second argument is, "Mr. Wesley says, where a Methodist was receiving the sacrament, God was pleased to let him see a crucified Saviour." Sir, Mr. W. does not say this. It is one that occasionally wrote to him. But if he had, what would you infer? that he is a Papist? Where is the consequence? Why, you say, "Was not this as good an argument for transubstantiation, as several produced by the Papists?" Yes, exactly as good as either their arguments or yours; that is, just good for nothing.

Your Third argument runs thus: "We may see in Mr. W.'s writings, that he was once a strict Churchman, but gradually put on a more catholic spirit, tending at length to Roman Catholic. He rejects any design to convert others from any communion; and consequently not from Popery."

This is half true, (which is something uncommon with you,) and only half false. It is true, that, for thirty years last past, I have "gradually put on a more catholic spirit;" finding more and more tenderness for those who differed from me either in opinions or modes of worship. But it is not true, that I "reject any design of converting others from any communion." I have, by the blessing of God, converted several from Popery, who are now alive and ready to testify it.

Your Fourth argument is, That in a Collection of Prayers, I cite the words of an ancient Liturgy, "For the faithful departed." Sir, whenever I use those words in the Burial Service, I pray to the same effect: "That we, with all those who are departed in thy faith and fear, may have our perfect consummation and bliss, both in body and soul:" yea, and whenever I say, "Thy kingdom come;" for I mean both the kingdom of grace and glory. In this kind of general prayer, therefore, "for the faithful departed," I conceive myself to be clearly justified, both by the earliest antiquity, by the Church of England, and by the Lord's Prayer; although the Papists have corrupted this scriptural practice into praying for those who die in their sins.

45. Your Fifth argument is, "That they use private confession, in which every one is to speak the state of his heart, with his several temptations and deliverances, and answer as many searching questions as may be. And what a scene," say you, "is hereby disclosed! What a filthy jakes opened, when the most searching questions are answered without reserve!" Hold, sir, unless you are answering for yourself: this undoubtedly you have a right to do. You can tell best what is in your own heart. And I cannot deny what you say: it may be a very "filthy jakes," for aught I know. But pray do not measure others by yourself. The hearts of believers "are purified through faith." When these open their hearts one to another, there is no such scene disclosed. Yet temptations to pride in various kinds, to self will, to unbelief in many instances, they often feel in themselves, (whether they give any place to them or no,) and occasionally disclose to their brethren.

But this has no resemblance to Popish confession; of which you are very sensible. For you cite my own words: "The Popish confession is, the confession made by a single person to a Priest. Whereas, this is the confession of several persons conjointly, not to a Priest, but to each other." You add, "Will Mr. W. abide by this, and freely answer a question?" I will. For I desire only, "by manifestation of the truth, to commend myself to every man's conscience in the sight of God."

Your question is, "After private confessions taken in their bands are not reports made to Mr. W.?" I answer, No; no reports are made to me of the particulars mentioned in private bands. "Are no delinquents, male and female, brought before him separately, and confessed by him?" No; none at all. You ask, "How then do I know the outward and inward states of those under my care?" I answer, By examining them once a quarter, more or less, not separately, but ten or fifteen together.

Therefore every unprejudiced person must see that there is no analogy between the Popish confession to a Priest, and our confessing our faults one to another, and praying one for another, as St. James directs. Consequently, neither does this argument, though urged with all your art and force, amount to any shadow of proof, that "the Methodists are carrying on the work of Popery."

46. Your Sixth argument, such as it is, stands thus: "Another tendency to Popery appears by the notion of a single drop of Christ's blood being a sufficient atonement for the sins of the whole world. For, however pious this may appear, it is absolutely false and Papistical." Sir, this argument is perfectly new, and entirely your own. It were great pity to disturb you in the enjoyment of it.

A Seventh argument you ground on those words in the "Plain Account of the People called Methodists:" "It is a point we chiefly insist upon, that orthodoxy or right opinions is a very slender part of religion, if any part of it at all." "The plain consequence whereof is," (so you affirm,) "that teaching and believing the fundamental errors of Popery, with the whole train of their abominations and idolatries, are of very little moment, if any." Strain again, sir; pull hard, or you will never be able to drag this conclusion out of these premises.

I assert, "(1.) That in a truly righteous man, right opinions are a very slender part of religion. (2.) That in an irreligious, a profane man, they are not any part of religion at all; such a man not being one jot more religious because he is orthodox." Sir, it does not follow from either of these propositions, that wrong opinions are not a hinderance to religion; and much less, that "teaching and believing the fundamental errors of Popery, with the whole train of their abominations and idolatries," (practised, I presume you mean, as well as taught and believed,) "are of very little moment, if any."

I am so far from saying or thinking this, that, in my printed letter to a Priest of that communion, (did you never read it, or hear of it before?) are these express words: "I pity you much, having the same assurance, that Jesus is the Christ, and that no Romanist can expect to be saved, according to the terms of his covenant." (Vol. iii, p. 151.) Do you term this "an extenuation of their abominations; a reducing them to almost a mere nothing?"

47. You argue, Eighthly, thus: "The Methodist doctrine of impressions and assurances holds equally for Popish enthusiasts." This needs no answer; I have already shown that the Methodist doctrine in these respects is both scriptural and rational.

Your Ninth argument is, "Their sudden conversions stand upon the same footing with the Popish." You should say, "are a proof that they are promoting Popery." I leave you to enjoy this argument also.

But the dreadful one you reserve for the last; namely our "recommending Popish books. One is the Life of Mr. de Renty, of which Mr. Wesley has published an extract." To prove your inimitable fairness here, you scrape up again all the trash wherein the weak writer of that Life abounds, and which I had pared off and thrown away. Sir, could you find nothing to your purpose in the extract itself? I fancy you might; for I have purposely left in two or three particulars, to show of what communion he was, which I did not think it right to conceal.

You go on: "Francis of Sales is another Papist, much commended by Mr. W.; and who, he doubts not, is in Abraham's bosom. He is the Methodists' bosom friend."

I believe he is in Abraham's bosom; but he is no bosom friend of the Methodists. I question whether one in five hundred of them has so much as heard his name. And as for me, neither do I commend him much, nor recommend him at all. His life I never saw, nor any of his works, but his "Introduction to a Holy Life." This the late Dr. Nichols translated into English, published, and strongly recommended. Therefore, if this be a proof of promoting Popery, that censure falls, not on me, but him.

I have now considered all the arguments you have brought to prove

that the Methodists are carrying on the work of Popery. And I am persuaded, every candid man, who rightly weighs what has been said with any degree of attention, will clearly see, not only that no one of those arguments is of any real force at all, but that you do not believe yourself; you do not believe the conclusion which you make as if you would prove: only you keep close to your laudable resolution of throwing as much dirt as possible.

48. It remains only to gather up some of your fragments, as still farther proofs of your integrity.

You graciously say, "I do not lay much stress upon the charge of some of the angry Moravians against Mr. W. and brother, for preaching Popery." Sir, if you had, you would only have hurt yourself. For, (1.) The Moravians never, that I know of, brought this charge at all. (2.) When Mr. C., and two other predestinarians, (these were the persons,) affirmed they had heard both my brother and me preach Popery, they meant neither more nor less thereby than the doctrine of universal redemption.

"Some connection between the doctrines of Methodists and Papists hath been shown through this whole Comparison." *Shown!* But how? By the same art of wire-drawing and deciphering, which would prove an equal connection between the Methodists and Mohammedans.

"Jesuits have often mingled, and been the ringleaders, among our enthusiastic sectaries." Sir, I am greatly obliged to you for your compliment, as well as for your parallel of Mr. Faithful Commin.

And pray, sir, at what time do you think it was that I first mingled with those enthusiastic sectaries? when I came back from Germany, or when I returned from Georgia, or while I was at Lincoln College? Although the plot itself might be laid before, when I was at Christ Church, or at the Charter-house school.

But "a Jesuit's or enthusiast's declaring against Popery is no test of their sincerity." Most sure; nor is a nameless person's declaring against Methodism any proof that he is not a Jesuit. I remember well, when a well dressed man, taking his stand not far from Moorfields, had gathered a large company, and was vehemently asserting, that "those rogues, the Methodists, were all Papists;" till a gentleman coming by, fixed his eye on him, and cried, "Stop that man! I know him personally; he is a Romish Priest."

I know not that any thing remains on this head which bears so much as the face of an argument. So that, of all the charges you have brought, (and truly you have not been sparing,) there is not one wherein your proof falls more miserably short than in this, that "the Methodists are advancing Popery."

49. I have at length gone through your whole performance, weighed whatever you cite from my writings, and shown at large how far those passages are from proving all, or any part, of your charge. So that all your attempt to build on them, of the pride and vanity of the Methodists; of their shuffling and prevaricating; of their affectation of prophesying; laying claim to the miraculous favours of Heaven; unsteadiness of temper; unsteadiness in sentiment and practice; art and cunning; giving up inspiration and extraordinary calls; skepticism, infidelity, Atheism; uncharitableness to their opponents; contempt of order and

authority; and fierce, rancorous quarrels with each other; of the tendency of Methodism to undermine morality and good works; and to carry on the good work of Popery:—All this fabric falls to the ground at once, unless you can find some better foundation to support it. (Sections iii–vi; ix, xi–xv; xviii–xxi.)

50. These things being so, what must all unprejudiced men think of you and your whole performance? You have advanced a charge, not against one or two persons only, but indiscriminately against a whole body of people, of his majesty's subjects, Englishmen, Protestants, members, I suppose, of your own Church; a charge containing abundance of articles, and most of them of the highest and blackest nature. You have prosecuted this with unparalleled bitterness of spirit and acrimony of language; using sometimes the most coarse, rude, scurrilous terms, sometimes the keenest sarcasms you could devise. The point you have steadily pursued in thus prosecuting this charge, is, First, to expose the whole people to the hatred and scorn of all mankind; and, next, to stir up the civil powers against them. And when this charge comes to be fairly weighed, there is not a single article of it true! The passages you cite to make it good are one and all such as prove nothing less than the points in question; most of them such as you have palpably maimed, corrupted, and strained to a sense never thought of by the writer; many of them such as are flat against you, and overthrow the very point they are brought to support. What can they think, but that this is the most shocking violation of the Christian rule, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself;" the most open affront to all justice, and even common humanity; the most glaring insult upon the common sense and reason of mankind, which has lately appeared in the world?

If you say, "But I have proved the charge upon Mr. Whitefield;" admit you have, (which I do not allow,) Mr. Whitefield is not the Methodists; no, nor the societies under his care; they are not a third, perhaps not a tenth, part of the Methodists. What then can excuse your ascribing their faults, were they proved, to the whole body? You indict ten men. Suppose you prove the indictment upon one, will you therefore condemn the other nine? Nay, let every man bear his own burden, since every man must give an account of himself to God.

I had occasion once before to say to an opponent, "You know not to show mercy." Yet that gentleman did regard truth and justice. But you regard neither mercy, justice, nor truth. To vilify, to blacken, is your one point. I pray God it may not be laid to your charge! May he show you mercy, though you show none!

I am, Sir, your friend and well-wisher,

JOHN WESLEY.

SECOND LETTER
TO
THE LORD BISHOP OF EXETER:
IN ANSWER
TO HIS LORDSHIP'S LATE LETTER.

MY LORD,—In my late letter to your lordship I used no ceremony; (I suppose it was not expected from one who was so deeply injured;) and I trust I used no rudeness: if I did, I am ready to ask your lordship's pardon.

That Letter* related to a matter of fact published on your lordship's authority, which I endeavoured to falsify, and your lordship now again endeavours to support.

The facts alleged are, First, that I told Mrs. Morgan, at Mitchel, "You are in hell; you are damned already." Secondly, that I asked her to live upon free cost. Thirdly, that she determined to admit no more Methodists into her house.

At first I thought so silly and improbable a story neither deserved nor required a confutation; but when my friends thought otherwise, I called on Mrs. Morgan, who denied she ever said any such thing. I wrote down her words; part of which I transcribed in my letter to your lordship, as follows:—

"On Saturday, August 25, 1750, Mr. Trembath, of St. Ginnys, Mr. Haine, of Shaftesbury, and I, called at Mr. Morgan's, at Mitchel. The servant telling me her master was not at home, I desired to speak with her mistress, the 'honest, sensible woman.' I immediately asked, 'Did I ever tell you or your husband, that you would be damned if you took any money of me?' (So the story ran in the first part of the 'Comparison;'[†] it has now undergone a very considerable alteration.) 'Or did you or he ever affirm,' (another circumstance related at Truro,) 'that I was rude with your maid?' She replied, vehemently, 'Sir, I never said you was, or that you said any such thing. And I do not suppose my husband did. But we have been belied as well as our neighbours.' She added, 'When the Bishop came down last, he sent us word he would dine at our house; but he did not, being invited to a neighbouring gentleman's. He sent for me thither, and said, *Good woman, do you know these people that go up and down? Do you know Mr. Wesley? Did not he tell you, you would be damned if you took any money of him? And did not he offer rudeness to your maid?* I told him, No, my lord; he never said any such thing to me, nor to my husband that I know of. He never offered any rudeness to any maid of mine. I never saw or knew any harm of him: but a man told me once, (who, I was told, was a Methodist preacher,) that I should be damned if I did not know my sins were forgiven."

Your lordship replies, "I neither sent word that I would dine at their house, nor did I send for Mrs. Morgan; every word that passed between us was at her own house at Mitchel." (p. 7.) I believe it; and consequently, that the want of exactness in this point rests on Mrs. Morgan, not on your lordship.

* The Bishop of Exeter's Letter, pp. 2, 3.

Your lordship adds, "The following attestations will sufficiently clear me from any imputation, or even suspicion, of having published a falsehood." I apprehend otherwise; to waive what is past, if the facts now published by your lordship, or any part of them, be not true, then certainly your lordship will lie under more than a "suspicion of having published a falsehood."

The attestations your lordship produces are, First, those of your lordship's chancellor and archdeacon: Secondly, those of Mr. Bennet.

The former attests, that, in June or July, 1748, Mrs. Morgan did say those things to your lordship. (p. 8.) I believe she did, and therefore acquit your lordship of being the inventor of those falsehoods.

Mr. Bennet avers, that, in January last, Mrs. Morgan repeated to him what she had before said to your lordship. (p. 11.) Probably she might; having said those things once, I do not wonder if she said them again.

Nevertheless, before Mr. Trembath and Mr. Haime she denied every word of it.

To get over this difficulty, your lordship publishes a second letter from Mr. Bennet, wherein he says, "On March 4th, last, Mrs. Morgan said, 'I was told by my servant, that I was wanted above stairs; where, when I came, the chamber door being open, I found them' (Mr. Wesley and others) 'round the table on their knees.'" He adds, "That Mrs. Morgan owned one circumstance in it was true; but as to the other parts of Mr. Wesley's letter to the Bishop, she declares it is all false."

I believe Mrs. Morgan did say this to Mr. Bennet; and that therefore neither is he "the maker of a lie." But he is the relater of a whole train of falsehoods, and those told merely for telling sake. I was never yet in any chamber at Mrs. Morgan's. I was never above stairs there in my life. On August 25, 1750, I was below stairs all the time I was in the house. When Mrs. Morgan came in, I was standing in the large parlour; nor did any of us kneel while we were under the roof. This both Mr. Trembath and Mr. Haime, can attest upon oath, whatsoever Mrs. Morgan may declare to the contrary.

But she declared farther, (so Mr. Bennet writes,) "That Mr. John Wesley, some time ago, said to a maid of her's such things as were not fit to be spoken;" (p. 11;) and Mr. Morgan declared, that he "did or said such indecent things to the above-named maid" (the same fact, I presume, only a little embellished) "in his chamber, in the night, that she immediately ran down stairs, and protested she would not go near him or any of the Methodists more." (p. 12.)

To save trouble to your lordship, as well as to myself, I will put this cause upon a very short issue: If your lordship will only prove that ever I lay one night in Mrs. Morgan's house, nay, that ever I was in the town of Mitchel after sunset, I will confess the whole charge.

What your lordship mentions "by the way," I will now consider: "Some of your western correspondents imposed upon the leaders of Methodism, by transmitting to London a notoriously false account of my Charge to the Clergy. Afterward the Methodists confessed themselves to have been deceived; yet some time after, the Methodists at Cork, in Ireland, your own brother at the head of them, reprinted the same lying pamphlet, as my performance." (pp. 4, 5.)

My lord, I know not who are your lordship's Irish correspondents; but here are almost as many mistakes as lines. For, (1.) They were none of my correspondents who sent that account to London. (2.) It was sent, not to the leaders of Methodism, but to one who was no Methodist at all. (3.) That it was a false account, I do not know: but your lordship may easily put it out of dispute. And many have wondered, that your lordship did not do so long ago, by printing the Charge in question. (4.) I did never confess it was a false account; nor any person by my consent, or with my knowledge. (5.) That account was never reprinted at Cork at all. (6.) When it was reprinted at Dublin, your lordship had not disowned it. (7.) My brother was not in Dublin when it was done; nor did either he or I know of it till long after.

Therefore, when my brother was asked, how he could reprint such an account, after your lordship had publicly disowned it, I do not at all wonder, that "he did not offer a single word in answer."

Whether this, as well as my former letter be "mere rant and declamation," or plain and sober reason, I must refer to the world, and your lordship's own conscience.

I am, my lord, your lordship's most obedient servant,

JOHN WESLEY.

NEWCASTLE-UPON-TYNE, May 8, 1752.

A LETTER TO

THE REVEREND MR. BAILY, O.F. CORK.

IN ANSWER TO

A LETTER TO THE REV JOHN WESLEY.

LIMERICK, June 8, 1750.

REVEREND SIR,—1. Why do you not subscribe your name to a performance so perfectly agreeing, both as to the matter and form, with the sermons you have been occasionally preaching for more than a year last past? As to your seeming to disclaim it by saying once and again, "I am but a plain, simple man;" and, "The doctrine you teach is only a revival of the old Antinomian heresy, I think they call it;" I presume it is only a pious fraud. But how came so plain and simple a man to know the meaning of the Greek word *Philalethes*? Sir, this is not of a piece. If you did not care to own your child, had not you better have subscribed the second (as well as the first) letter, *George Fisher*?*

2. I confess you have timed your performance well. When the other pointless thing was published, I came unluckily to Cork on the self-same day. But you might now suppose I was at a convenient distance. However, I will not plead this as an excuse for taking no notice of your last favour; although, to say the truth, I scarce know how to answer it, as you write in a language I am not accustomed to. Both Dr. Tucker, Dr. Church, and all the other gentlemen who have wrote to

* The letter thus subscribed was published at Cork, on May 30th last.

me in public for some years, have wrote as gentlemen, having some regard to their own, whatever my character was. But as you fight in the dark, you regard not what weapons you use. We are not, therefore, on even terms; I cannot answer you in kind; I am constrained to leave this to your good allies of Blackpool and Fair-lane.*

I shall first state the facts on which the present controversy turns; and then consider the most material parts of your performance.

First. I am to state the facts. But here I am under a great disadvantage, having few of my papers by me. Excuse me therefore if I do not give so full an account now, as I may possibly do hereafter; if I only give you for the present the extracts of some papers, which were lately put into my hands.

1. "THOMAS JONES, of Cork, merchant, deposes,

"That on May 3, 1749, Nicholas Butler, ballad singer, came before the house of this deponent, and assembled a large mob: that this deponent went to Daniel Crone, Esq., then mayor of Cork, and desired that he would put a stop to those riots; asking, at the same time, whether he gave the said Butler leave to go about in this manner: that Mr. Mayor said, he neither gave him leave, neither did he hinder him: that in the evening Butler gathered a larger mob than before, and went to the house where the people called Methodists were assembled to hear the word of God, and, as they came out, threw dirt, and hurt several of them.

"That on May 4, this deponent, with some others, went to the mayor and told what had been done, adding, 'If your worship pleases only to speak three words to Butler, it will all be over:' that the mayor gave his word and honour there should be no more of it, he would put an entire stop to it: that, notwithstanding, a larger mob than ever came to the house the same evening: that they threw much dirt and many stones at the people, both while they were in the house, and when they came out: that the mob then fell upon them, both on men and women, with clubs, hangers, and swords; so that many of them were much wounded, and lost a considerable quantity of blood.

"That on May 5, this deponent informed the mayor of all, and also that Butler had openly declared there should be a greater mob than ever there was that night: that the mayor promised he would prevent it: that in the evening Butler did bring a greater mob than ever: that this deponent, hearing the mayor designed to go out of the way, set two men to watch him, and, when the riot was begun, went to the ale house, and inquired for him: that the woman of the house denying he was there, this deponent insisted he was, declared he would not go till he had seen him, and began searching the house: that Mr. Mayor then appearing, he demanded his assistance to suppress a riotous mob: that when the mayor came in sight of them, he beckoned to Butler, who immediately came down from the place where he stood: that the mayor then went with this deponent, and looked on many of the people covered with dirt and blood: that some of them still remained in the house, tearing their lives, till James Chatterton and John Reilly, Esqrs., sheriffs of Cork, and Hugh Millard, junior, Esq., alderman, turned them out to the mob, and nailed up the doors.

2. "ELIZABETH HOLLERAN, of Cork, deposes,

"That on May, 3, as she was going down to Castle-street, she saw Nicholas Butler on a table, with ballads in one hand, and a Bible in the other: that she expressed some concern thereat; on which Sheriff Reilly ordered his bailiff to carry her to Bridewell: that afterward the bailiff came and said, his master ordered she should be carried to gaol: and that she continued in gaol from May 3, about eight in the evening, till between ten and twelve on May 5.

* Celebrated parts of Cork.

3. "JOHN STOCKDALE, of Cork, tallow chandler, deposes,

"That on May 5, while he and others were assembled to hear the word of God, Nicholas Butler came down to the house where they were, with a very numerous mob: that when this deponent came out, they threw all manner of dirt and abundance of stones at him: that they then beat, bruised, and cut him in several places: that seeing his wife on the ground, and the mob abusing her still, he called out, and besought them not to kill his wife: that on this one of them struck him with a large stick, as did also many others, so that he was hurt in several parts, and his face in a gore of blood.

"DANIEL SULLIVAN, of Cork, baker, deposes,

4. "That every day but one from the sixth to the sixteenth of May, Nicholas Butler assembled a riotous mob before this deponent's house: that they abused all who came into the shop, to the great damage of this deponent's business: that, on or about the fifteenth, Butler swore he would bring a mob the next day, and pull down his house: that, accordingly, on the sixteenth he did bring a large mob, and beat or abused all that came to the house: that the mayor walked by while the mob was so employed, but did not hinder them: that afterward they broke his windows, threw dirt and stones into his shop, and spoiled a great quantity of his goods.

"Daniel Sullivan is ready to depose farther,

"That, from the sixteenth of May to the twenty-eighth, the mob gathered every day before his house: that on Sunday, 28, Butler swore they would come the next day and pull down the house of that heretic dog; and called aloud to the mob, 'Let the heretic dogs indict you: I will bring you all off without a farthing cost.'

"That, accordingly, on May 29, Butler came with a greater mob than before: that he went to the mayor and begged him to come, which he for some time refused to do; but after much importunity, rose up, and walked with him down the street; that when they were in the midst of the mob, the mayor said aloud, 'It is your own fault for entertaining these preachers: if you will turn them out of your house, I will engage there shall be no more harm done; but if you will not turn them out, you must take what you will get:' that upon this the mob set up a huzza, and threw stones faster than before; that he said, 'This is fine usage under a Protestant government! If I had a priest saying mass in every room of it, my house would not be touched:' that the mayor replied, 'The priests are tolerated, but you are not; you talk too much: go in, and shut up your doors!' that, seeing no remedy, he did so; and the mob continued breaking the windows and throwing stones in till near twelve at night.

"That on May 31, the said Sullivan and two more went and informed the mayor of what the mob was then doing: that it was not without great importunity they brought him as far as the exchange: that he would go no farther, nor send any help, though some that were much bruised and wounded came by: that some hours after, when the mob had finished their work, he sent a party of soldiers to guard the walls.

5. "JOHN STOCKDALE deposes farther,

"That on May 31, he with others was quietly hearing the word of God, when Butler and his mob came down to the house: that as they came out, the mob threw showers of dirt and stones: that many were hurt, many beat, bruised, and cut; among whom was this deponent, who was so bruised and cut, that the effusion of blood from his head could not be stopped for a considerable time.

6. "JOHN M'NERNY, of Cork, deposes,

"That on the 31st of May last, as this deponent with others was hearing a sermon, Butler came down with a large mob: that the stones and dirt coming in fast, obliged the congregation to shut the doors; and lock themselves in: that the mob broke open the door; on which this deponent endeavoured to escape through a window: that not being able to do it, he

returned into the house, where he saw the mob tear up the pews, benches, and floor; part of which they afterward burned in the open street, and carried away part for their own use.

7. "DANIEL SULLIVAN is ready to depose farther,

"That Butler, with a large mob, went about from street to street, and from house to house, abusing, threatening, and beating whomsoever he pleased, from June 1st to the 16th, when they assaulted, bruised, and cut Ann Jenkins; and from the 16th to the 30th, when a woman whom they had beaten, miscarried, and narrowly escaped with life."

Some of the particulars were as follows:—

"THOMAS BURNET, of Cork, nailer, deposes,

"That on or about the 12th of June, as this deponent was at work in his master's shop, Nicholas Butler came with a great mob to the door, and seeing this deponent, told him he was a heretic dog, and his soul was burning in hell: that this deponent asking, 'Why do you use me thus?' Butler took up a stone, and struck him so violently on the side, that he was thereby rendered incapable of working for upwards of a week: that he hit this deponent's wife with another stone, without any kind of provocation; which so hurt her, that she was obliged to take to her bed, and has not been right well since.

"ANN COOSHEA, of Cork, deposes,

"That on or about the 12th of June, as she was standing at her father's door, Nicholas Butler, with a riotous mob, began to abuse this deponent and her family, calling them heretic bitches, saying they were damned and all their souls were in hell: that then, without any provocation, he took up a great stone, and threw it at this deponent, which struck her on the head with such force that it deprived her of her senses for some time.

1 "ANN WRIGHT, of Cork, deposes,

"That on or about the 12th of June, as this deponent was in her own house, Butler and his mob came before her door, calling her and her family heretic bitches, and swearing he would make her house hotter than hell fire: that he threw dirt and stones at them, hit her in the face, dashed all the goods about which she had in her window, and, she really believes, would have dashed out her brains, had she not quitted her shop, and fled for her life.

"MARGARET GRIFFIN, of Cork, deposes,

"That on the 24th of June, as this deponent was about her business, Butler and his mob came up, took hold on her, tore her clothes, struck her several times, and cut her mouth; that after she broke from him, he and his mob pursued her to her house, and would have broken in, had not some neighbours interposed: that he had beat and abused her several times before, and one of those times to such a degree, that she was all in a gore of blood, and continued spitting blood for several days after.

"JACOB CONNER, clothier, of Cork, deposes,

"That on the 24th of June, as he was employed in his lawful business, Butler and his mob came up, and, without any manner of provocation, fell upon him: that they beat him till they caused such an effusion of blood as could not be stopped for a considerable time: and that he verily believes, had not a gentleman interposed, they would have killed him on the spot.

9. "ANN HUGHES, of Cork, deposes,

"That on the 29th of June, she asked Nicholas Butler, why he broke open her house on the 21st: that hereon he called her many abusive names, (being attended with his usual mob,) dragged her up and down, tore her clothes in pieces, and with his sword stabbed and cut her in both her arms.

"DANIEL FILTS, blacksmith, of Cork, deposes,

"That on the 29th of June, Butler and a riotous mob came before his door, called him many abusive names, drew his hanger, and threatened to stab him: that he and his mob the next day assaulted the house of this

deponent with drawn swords: and that he is persuaded, had not one who came by prevented, they would have taken away his life.

10. "MARY FULLER, of Cork, deposes,

"That on the 30th of June, Butler, at the head of his mob, came between nine and ten at night to the deponent's shop, with a naked sword in his hand; that he swore he would cleave the deponent's skull, and immediately made a full stroke at her head; whereupon she was obliged to fly for her life, leaving her shop and goods to the mob, many of which they hacked and hewed with their swords, to her no small loss and damage.

"HENRY DUNKLE, joiner, of Cork, deposes,

"That on the 30th of June, as he was standing at the widow Fuller's shop window, he saw Butler, accompanied with a large mob, who stopped before her shop: that after he had grossly abused her, he made a full stroke with his hanger at her head, which must have cleft her in two, had not this deponent received the guard of the hanger on his shoulder: that presently after, the said Butler seized upon this deponent: that he seized him by the collar with one hand, and with the other held the hanger over his head, calling him all manner of names, and tearing his shirt and clothes: and that, had it not been for the timely assistance of some neighbours, he verily believes he should have been torn in pieces.

"MARGARET TRIMNELL, of Cork, deposes,

"That on the 30th of June, John Austin and Nicholas Butler, with a numerous mob, came to her shop: that, after calling her many names, Austin struck her with his club on the right arm, so that it has been black ever since from the shoulder to the elbow: that Butler came next, and with a great stick struck her a violent blow across the back: that many of them then drew their swords, which they carried under their coats, and cut and hacked her goods, part of which they threw out into the street, while others of them threw dirt and stones into the shop, to the considerable damage of her goods, and loss of this deponent."

11. It was not for those who had any regard either to their persons or goods, to oppose Mr. Butler after this. So the poor people patiently suffered whatever he and his mob were pleased to inflict upon them, till the assizes drew on, at which they doubted not to find a sufficient, though late, relief.

Accordingly, twenty-eight depositions were taken, (from the foul copies of some of which the preceding account is mostly transcribed,) and laid before the grand jury, August 19. But they did not find any one of these bills. Instead of this, they made that memorable presentment which is worthy to be preserved in the annals of Ireland to all succeeding generations:—

"We find and present Charles Wesley to be a person of ill fame, a vagabond, and a common disturber of his majesty's peace; and we pray he may be transported. We find and present James Williams, &c. We find and present Robert Swindle, &c. We find and present Jonathan Reeves, &c. We find and present James Wheatly, &c. We find and present John Larwood, &c. We find and present Joseph McAuliff, &c. We find and present Charles Skelton, &c. We find and present William Tooker, &c. We find and present Daniel Sullivan, &c."

12. Mr. Butler and his mob were now in higher spirits than ever. They scoured the streets day and night; frequently hallooing, as they went along, "Five pounds for a Swaddler's head!"* their chief declaring to them all, he had full liberty now to do whatever he would, even to

* A name first given to Mr. Cennick, from his first preaching on those words: "Ye shall find the babe wrapped in swaddling clothes, lying in a manger."

murder if he pleased; as Mr. Swain of North Abbey, and others are ready to testify.

13. The sessions, held at Cork on the 5th of October following, produced another memorable presentment:—

“ We find and present John Horton to be a person of ill fame, a vagabond, and a common disturber of his majesty’s peace; and we pray that he may be transported.”

But complaint being made of this above, as wholly illegal, it vanished into air.

14. Some time after, Mr. Butler removed to Dublin, and began to sing his ballads there. But having little success, he returned to Cork, and in January began to scour the streets again, pursuing all of “ this way,” with a large mob at his heels, armed with swords, staves, and pistols. Complaint was made of this to William Holmes, Esq., the present mayor of Cork. But there was no removal of the thing complained of; the riots were not suppressed: nay, they not only continued, but increased.

15. From the beginning of February to the end, his majesty’s peace was preserved just as before; of which it may be proper to subjoin two or three instances, for the information of all thinking men:—

“ WILLIAM JEWELL, clothier, of Shandon Church-lane, deposes,

“ That Nicholas Butler, with a riotous mob, several times assaulted this deponent’s house: that particularly on the 23d of February, he came thither with a large mob, armed with clubs and other weapons: that several of the rioters entered the house, and swore, the first who resisted, they would blow their brains out: that the deponent’s wife, endeavouring to stop them, was assaulted and beaten by the said Butler; who then ordered his men to break the deponent’s windows, which they did with stones of a considerable weight.

“ MARY PHILIPS, of St. Peter’s Church-lane, deposes,

“ That on the 26th of February, about seven in the evening, Nicholas Butler came to her house with a large mob, and asked where her husband was: that as soon as she appeared, he first abused her in the grossest terms, and then struck her on the head, so that it stunned her; and she verily believes, had not some within thrust to and fastened the door, she should have been murdered on the spot.”

It may suffice for the present to add one instance more:—

“ ELIZABETH GARDELET, wife of Joseph Gardelet, corporal, in Colonel Pawlet’s regiment, Captain Charlton’s company, deposes,

“ That on February 28, as she was going out of her lodgings, she was met by Butler and his mob: that Butler, without any manner of provocation, immediately fell upon her, striking her with both his fists on the side of the head, which knocked her head against the wall: that she endeavoured to escape from him; but he pursued her, and struck her several times in the face: that she ran into the school yard for shelter; but he followed, and caught hold of her, saying, ‘ You whore, you stand on consecrated ground,’ and threw her with such force across the lane, that she was driven against the opposite wall: that when she had recovered herself a little, she made the best of her way to her lodging; but Butler still pursued, and overtook her as she was going up the stairs: that he struck her with his fist on the stomach; which stroke knocked her down backwards: that falling with the small of her back against the edge of one of the stairs, she was not able to rise again: that her pains immediately came upon her, and about two in the morning she miscarried.”

16. These, with several more depositions to the same effect, were, in April, laid before the grand jury. Yet they did not find any of these bills! But they found one against Daniel Sullivan, the younger, (no preacher, but a hearer of the people called Methodists,) who, when Butler and his mob were discharging a shower of stones upon him, fired a pistol without any ball, over their heads. If any man has wrote this story to England in a quite different manner, and fixed it on a young Methodist preacher, let him be ashamed in the presence of God and man, unless shame and he have shook hands and parted.

17. Several of the persons presented as vagabonds in autumn appeared at the Lent assizes. But, none appearing against them, they were discharged, with honour to themselves and shame to their prosecutors; who, by bringing the matter to a judicial determination, plainly showed there is a law even for Methodists; and gave his majesty's judge a full occasion to declare the utter illegality of all riots, and the inexcusableness of tolerating (much more causing) them on any pretence whatsoever.

18. It was now generally believed there would be no more riots in Cork; although I cannot say that was my opinion. On May 19, I accepted the repeated invitation of Mr. Alderman Pembroke, and came to his house. Understanding the place where the preaching usually was, would by no means contain those who desired to hear me, at eight in the morning I went to Hammond's Marsh. The congregation was large and deeply attentive. A few of the rabble gathered at a distance; but by little and little they drew near, and mixed with the congregation. So that I have seldom seen a more quiet and orderly assembly at any church in England or Ireland.

19. In the afternoon a report being spread abroad, that the mayor designed to hinder my preaching on the Marsh, I desired Mr. Skelton and Jones to wait upon him, and inquire concerning it. Mr. Skelton asked if my preaching there would be offensive to him; adding, "If it would, Mr. W. would not do it." He replied, warmly, "Sir, I will have no mobbing." Mr. S. said, "Sir, there was none this morning." He answered, "There was. Are there not churches and meeting houses enough? I will have no more mobs and riots." Mr. S. replied, "Sir, neither Mr. W. nor they that heard him made either mobs or riots." He answered plain, "I will have no more preaching; and if Mr. W. attempts to preach, I am prepared for him."

I did not conceive till now, that there was any real meaning in what a gentleman said some time since; who being told, "Sir, King George tolerates Methodists," replied, "Sir, you shall find, the mayor is king of Cork."

20. I began preaching in our own house soon after five. Mr. Mayor meantime was walking in the 'Change, where he gave orders to the drummers of the town, and to his sergeants,—doubtless, to go down and keep the peace! They came down, with an innumerable mob to the house. They continued drumming, and I continued preaching, till I had finished my discourse. When I came out, the mob immediately closed me in. I desired one of the sergeants to protect me from the mob; but he replied, "Sir, I have no orders to do that." When I came into the street, they threw whatever came to hand. I walked on straight

through the midst of them, looking every man in the face, and they opened to the right and left, till I came near Dant's Bridge. A large party had taken possession of this, one of whom was bawling out, "Now, heigh for the Romans!" When I came up, these likewise shrunk back, and I walked through them into Mr. Jenkins's house.

But many of the congregation were more roughly handled; particularly Mr. Jones, who was covered with dirt, and escaped with his life almost by miracle. The main body of the mob then went to the house, brought out all the seats and benches, tore up the floor, the door, the frames of the windows, and whatever of wood work remained, part of which they carried off for their own use, and the rest they burnt in the open street.

21. Monday, 21. I rode on to Bandon. From three in the afternoon till after seven, the mob of Cork marched in grand procession, and then burnt me in effigy near Dant's Bridge.

Tuesday, 22. The mob and drummers were moving again between three and four in the morning. The same evening the mob came down to Hammond's Marsh, but stood at a distance from Mr. Stockdale's house, till the drums beat, and the mayor's sergeants beckoned to them; on which they drew up, and began the attack. The mayor being sent for, came with a party of soldiers. Mr. Stockdale earnestly desired that he would disperse the mob, or at least leave the soldiers there to protect them from the rioters. But he took them all away with him; on which the mob went on, and broke all the glass and most of the window frames in pieces.

22. Wednesday, 23. The mob was still patrolling the streets; abusing all that were called Methodists; and threatening to murder them, and pull down their houses if they did not leave "this way."

Thursday, 24. They again assaulted Mr. Stockdale's house, broke down the boards he had nailed up against the windows, destroyed what little remained of the window frames and shutters, and damaged a considerable part of his goods.

Friday, 25, and again on Saturday, 26, one Roger O'Ferrall fixed up an advertisement at the public Exchange, (as he had also done for several days before,) that he was ready to head any mob, in order to pull down any house that should dare to harbour a Swaddler.

23. Sunday, 27. I wrote the following letter to the mayor:—

"MR. MAYOR,—An hour ago I received *A Letter to Mr. Butler*, just reprinted at Cork. The publishers assert, '*It was brought down from Dublin to be distributed among the society. But Mr. Wesley called in as many as he could.*' Both these assertions are absolutely false. I read some lines of that letter when I was in Dublin, but never read it over before this morning. Who the author of it is, I know not. But this I know; I never called in one; neither concerned myself about it; much less brought any down to distribute among the society.

"Yet I cannot but return my hearty thanks to the gentlemen who have distributed them through the town. I believe it will do more good than they are sensible of. For though I dislike its condemning the magistrates and clergy in general, (several of whom were not concerned in the late proceedings,) yet I think the reasoning is strong and clear; and that the facts referred to therein are not at all misrepresented, will sufficiently appear in due time.

"I fear God and honour the king. I earnestly desire to be at peace with

all men. I have not willingly given any offence, either to the magistrates, the clergy, or any of the inhabitants of the city of Cork; neither do I desire any thing of them, but to be treated (I will not say, as a clergyman, a gentleman, or a Christian, but) with such justice and humanity as are due to a Jew, a Turk, or a Pagan.

“I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

“J. WESLEY.”

II. 1. Your performance is dated, May 28th, the most material parts of which I am now to consider.

It contains, First, a charge against the Methodist preachers: Secondly, a defence of the corporation and clergy of Cork.

With regard to your charge against those preachers, may I take the liberty to inquire why you drop six out of the eleven that have been at Cork, viz. Mr. Swindells, Wheatly, Larwood, Skelton, Tucker, and Haughton? Can you glean up no story concerning these; or is it out of mere compassion that you spare them?

2. But before I proceed, I must beg leave to ask, Who is this evidence against the other five? Why, one that neither dares show his face, nor tell his name, or the place of his abode; one that is ashamed (and truly not without cause) of the dirty work he is employed in; so that we could not even conjecture who he was, but that his speech bewrayeth him. How much credit is due to such an evidence, let any man of reason judge.

3. This worthy witness falls foul upon Mr. Cownly, and miserably murders a tale he has got by the end. (p. 13.) Sir, Mr. M. is nothing obliged to you for bringing the character of his niece into question. He is perfectly satisfied that Mr. C. acted, in that whole affair, with the strictest regard both to honour and conscience.

You next aver, that Mr. Reeves “asked a young woman, whether she had a mind to go to hell with her father.” (p. 16.) It is possible. I will neither deny nor affirm it without some better proof. But, suppose he did; unless I know the circumstances of the case, I could not say whether he spoke right or wrong.

4. But what is this to the “monstrous, shocking, amazing blasphemy, spoken by Mr. Charles Wesley? who one day,” you say, “preaching on Hammond’s Marsh, called out, ‘Has any of you got the Spirit?’ and when none answered, said, ‘I am sure some of you have got it; for I feel virtue go out of me.’” (p. 18.) Sir, do you expect any one to believe this story? I doubt it will not pass even at Cork; unless with your wise friend, who said, “Methodists! Ay, they are the people who place all their religion in wearing long whiskers.”

5. In the same page, you attack Mr. Williams for applying those words, “I thy Maker am thy husband.” Sir, by the same rule that you conclude “these expressions could only flow from a mind full of lascivious ideas,” you may conclude the forty-fifth psalm to be only a wanton sonnet, and the Canticles a counterpart to Rochester’s poems.

But you say, he likewise “made use of unwarrantable expressions, particularly with regard to faith and good works; and the next day denied that he had used them.” (pp. 10, 11.) Sir, your word is not proof of this. Be pleased to produce proper vouchers of the facts, and I will then give a farther answer.

Likewise, as to his “indecent and irreverent behaviour at church, turn-

ing all the preacher said into ridicule, so that numbers asked, in your hearing, why the churchwardens did not put the profane, wicked scoundrel in the stocks ;" my present answer is, I doubt the facts. Will your "men of undoubted character" be so good as to attest them?

6. Of all these, Mr. Williams, Cownly, Reeves, Haughton, Larwood, Skelton, Swindells, Tucker, and Wheatly, you pronounce in the lump, that they are "a parcel of vagabond, illiterate babblers;" (pp. 3, 4;) of whom "every body that has the least share of reason must know," that, though "they amuse the populace with nonsense, ribaldry, and blasphemy, they are not capable of writing orthography or good sense." Sir, that is not an adjudged ease. Some who have a little share of reason, think they are capable both of speaking and writing good sense. But if they are not, if they cannot write or read, they can save souls from death; they can, by the grace of God, bring sinners from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God.

7. But they "made a woman plunder her poor old husband, and another absent herself from her husband and children." (pp. 24, 25.) Pray, what are their names; where do they live; and how may one come to the speech of them? I have heard so many plausible tales of this kind, which on examination vanished away, that I cannot believe one word of this till I have more proof than your bare assertion.

8. So far I have been pleading for others. But I am now called to answer for myself. For "Theophilus and John Wesley," say you, "seem to me the same individual person." (p. 4.) They may seem so to you; but not to any who knows either my style or manner of writing. Besides, if it had been mine, it would have borne my name: for I do not love fighting in the dark.

But were not "a great number" of those books "brought from Dublin, to be dispersed throughout the city?" Not by me; not by my order, nor to my knowledge. However, I thank you again for dispersing them.

9. But "while charity stands in the front of Christian graces, the author of such a book can have none of that grace. For you must allow the vulgar to think." (p. 26.) Mal-a-propos enough, a lively saying; but for any use it is of, it may stand either in the front or rear of the sentence.

The argument itself is something new. A man knocks me down: I cry, "Help! Help! or I shall be murdered." He replies, "While charity stands in the front of Christian graces, the author of such a cry can have none of that grace."

So now you have shown to all the world "the uncharitable and consequently unchristian spirit of Methodism." What! because the Methodists cry out for help, before you have beat out their brains?

What grimace is this! His majesty's quiet, loyal, Protestant subjects are abused, insulted, outraged, beaten, covered with dirt, rolled in the mire, bruised, wounded with swords and hangers, murdered, have their houses broke open, their goods destroyed, or carried away before their face; and all this in open day, in the face of the sun, yet without any remedy! And those who treat them thus are "charitable" men! brimful of a Christian spirit! But if they who are so treated appeal to the common sense and reason of mankind, you gravely cry, "See the uncharitable, the unchristian spirit of Methodism!"

10. You proceed: "But pray, what are those facts which you say are not misrepresented? Do you mean, that Butler was hired and paid by the corporation and clergy?" or, "that this" remarkably loyal "city is disaffected to the present government?" and that "a Papist was supported, nay, hired by the chief magistrate, to walk the streets, threatening bloodshed and murder? Declare openly whether these are the facts." Sir, I understand you well; but for the present I beg to be excused. There is a time and a place for all things.

11. I rejoice to hear the city of Cork is so "remarkably loyal;" so entirely "well affected to the present government." I presume you mean this chiefly of the Friendly Society, (in whom the power of the city is now lodged,) erected some time since, in opposition to that body of Jacobites commonly called, "The Hanover Club." I suppose that zealous anti-Methodist who, some days ago, stabbed the Methodist preacher in the street, and then cried out, "Damn King George and all his armies!" did this as a specimen of his "eminent loyalty."

It cannot be denied that this loyal subject of King George, Simon Rawlins by name, was, upon oath made of those words, committed to gaol on May 31; and it was not till six days after, that he walked in procession through the town, with drums beating, and colours flying, and declared, at the head of his mob, he would never rest till he had driven all these false prophets out of Cork. How sincere they were in their good wishes to King George and his armies, they gave a clear proof, the 10th of this instant June, when, as ten or twelve soldiers were walking along in a very quiet and inoffensive manner, the mob fell upon them, swore they would have their lives, knocked them down, and beat them to such a degree, that, on June 12, one of them died of his wounds, and another was not then expected to live many hours.

12. But you have more proofs of my uncharitableness, that is, supposing I am the author of that pamphlet; for you read there, "Riches, ease, and honour are what the clergy set their hearts upon; but the souls for whom Christ died, they leave to the tender mercies of hell." Sir, can you deny it? Is it not true, literally true, concerning some of the clergy? You ask, "But ought we to condemn all, for the faults of a few?" (p. 20.) I answer, No; no more than I will condemn all in the affair of Cork for the faults of a few. It is you that do this; and if it were as you say, if they were all concerned in the late proceedings, then it would be no uncharitableness to say, "They were in a miserable state indeed;" then they would doubtless be "kicking against the pricks, contending with Heaven, fighting against God."

13. I come now to the general charge against me, independent on the letter to Mr. Butler. And, (1.) You charge me with "a frontless assurance, and a well-dissembled hypocrisy." (p. 22.) Sir, I thank you. This is as kind, as if you was to call me, (with Mr. Williams,) "a profane, wicked scoundrel." I am not careful to answer in this matter: shortly we shall both stand at a higher bar.

14. You charge me, Secondly, with being a "harebrained enthusiast." (p. 7.) Sir, I am your most obedient servant.

But you will prove me an enthusiast: "For you say" (those are your words) "you are sent of God to inform mankind of some other revelation of his will, than what has been left by Christ and his Apostles."

(p. 28.) Not so. I never said any such thing. When I do this, then call for miracles; but at present your demand is quite unreasonable: there is no room for it at all. What I advance I prove by the words of Christ or his Apostles. If not, let it fall to the ground.

15. You charge me, Thirdly, with being employed in "promoting the cause of arbitrary Popish power." (p. 7.) Sir, I plead, Not Guilty. Produce your witnesses. Prove this, and I will allow all the rest.

You charge me, Fourthly, with holding "midnight assemblies." (p. 24.) Sir, did you never see the word *Vigil* in your Common-Prayer Book? Do you know what it means? If not, permit me to tell you, that it was customary with the ancient Christians to spend whole nights in prayer; and that these nights were termed *Vigiliae*, or Vigils. Therefore for spending a part of some nights in this manner, in public and solemn prayer, we have not only the authority of our own national Church, but of the universal Church, in the earliest ages.

16. You charge me, Fifthly, with "being the cause of all that Butler has done." (p. 17.) True; just as Latimer and Ridley (if I may dare to name myself with those venerable men) were the cause of all that Bishop Bonner did. In this sense, the charge is true. It has pleased God, (unto him be all the glory!) even by my preaching or writings, to convince some of the old Christian scriptural doctrine, which till then they knew not. And while they declared this to others, you showed them the same love as Edmund of London did to their forefathers. Only the expressions of your love were not quite the same; because (blessed be God!) you had not the same power.

17. You affirm, Sixthly, that I "rob and plunder the poor, so as to leave them neither bread to eat, nor raiment to put on." (p. 8.) A heavy charge, but without all colour of truth. Yea, just the reverse is true. Abundance of those in Cork, Bandon, Limerick, Dublin, as well as in all parts of England, who, a few years ago, either through sloth or profuseness, had not bread to eat, or raiment to put on, have now, by means of the preachers called Methodists, a sufficiency of both. Since, by hearing these, they have learned to fear God, they have learned also to work with their hands, as well as to cut off every needless expense, to be good stewards of the mammon of unrighteousness.

18. You assert, Seventhly, that I am "myself as fond of riches as the most worldly clergyman." (p. 21.) "Two thousand pence a week! a fine yearly revenue from assurance and salvation tickets!" (p. 8.) I answer, (1.) What do you mean by "assurance and salvation tickets?" Is not the very expression a mixture of nonsense and blasphemy? (2.) How strangely did you under-rate my revenue, when you wrote in the person of George Fisher! You then allowed me only a hundred pounds a year. What is this to two thousand pence a week? (3.) "There is not a clergyman," you say, "who would not willingly exchange his livings for your yearly penny contributions." (p. 21.) And no wonder: for, according to a late computation, they amount to no less, every year, than eight hundred, eighty-six thousand pounds, besides some odd shillings and pence; in comparison of which, the revenue of his Grace of Armagh, or of Canterbury, is a very trifle. And yet, sir, so great is my regard for you, and my gratitude for your late services,

that if you will only resign your curacy of Christ's Church, I will make over to you my whole revenue in Ireland.

19. But "the honour" I gain, you think, is even "greater than the profit." Alas, sir, I have not generosity enough to relish it. I was always of Juvenal's mind,—

Gloria quantalibet, quid erit, si gloria tantum est?
(What is glory, without profit too?)

And especially, while there are so many drawbacks, so many dead flies in the pot of ointment. Sheer honour might taste tolerably well. But there is gall with the honey, and less of the honey than the gall. Pray, sir, what think you? Have I more honour or dishonour? Do more people praise or blame me? How is it in Cork? nay, to go no farther, among your own little circle of acquaintance? Where you hear one commend, do not ten cry out, "Away with such a fellow from the earth?"

Above all, I do not love honour with dry blows. I do not find it will cure broken bones. But perhaps you may think I glory in these. O how should I have gloried then, if your good friends at Dant's Bridge had burnt my person, instead of my effigy!

We are here to set religion out of the question. You do not suppose I have any thing to do with that. Why, if so, I should rather leave you the honour, and myself sleep in a whole skin. On that supposition I quite agree with the epigrammatist:—

*Virgilii in tumulto, divini præmia vatis,
Explicet en viridem laurea læta comam.
Quid te defunctum juvat hæc? Felicior olim
Sub patulæ fagi tegmine vivens eras.**

20. Your last charge is, that "I profess myself to be a member of the Established Church, and yet act contrary to the commands of my spiritual governors, and stab the Church to the very vitals." (p. 27.) I answer, (1.) What "spiritual governor" has commanded me not to preach in any part of his majesty's dominions? I know not one, to this very day, either in England or Ireland. (2.) What is it, to "stab the Church to the very vitals?" Why, to deny her fundamental doctrines. And do I, or you, do this? Let any one who has read her Liturgy, Articles, and Homilies, judge, which of us two denies, that "we are justified by faith alone;" that every believer has "the inspiration of God's Holy Spirit;" that all who are strong in faith do "perfectly love him, and worthily magnify his holy name:" he that denies this, is "the treacherous son who stabs this affectionate and tender mother."

If you deny it, you have already disowned the Church. But as for me, I neither can nor will; though I know you sincerely desire I should.

Hoc Itharus velit et magno mercentur Atride.

[This Ulysses wishes, and the sons of Atreus would buy it at a great price.]

But I choose to stay in the Church, were it only to reprove those who "betray" her "with a kiss."

21. I come now to your defence of the corporation and clergy. But sure such a defence was never seen before. For whereas I had said,

* See, the green laurel rears her graceful head
O'er Virgil's tomb! But can this cheer the dead?
Happier by far thou wast of old, when laid
Beneath thy spreading beech's ample shade!

“I dislike the condemning the magistrates or clergy in general, because several of them” (so I charitably supposed) “were not concerned in the late proceedings;” you answer, “Pray by all means point them out, that they may be distinguished by some mark of honour above their brethren.” (pp. 29, 30.) What do you mean? If you mean any thing at all, it must be that they were *all* concerned in the late proceedings. Sir, if they were, (of which I own you are a better judge than I,) was it needful to declare this to all the world? especially in so plain terms as these? Did not your zeal here a little outrun your wisdom?

22. “But the magistrate,” you say, was only “endeavouring to secure the peace of the city.” (p. 6.) A very extraordinary way of securing peace! Truly, sir, I cannot yet believe, not even on your word, that “all the magistrates except one,” (pp. 29, 30,) were concerned in this method of securing peace. Much less can I believe that “all the clergy” were concerned in thus “endeavouring to bring back their flock, led astray by these hirelings,” (an unlucky word,) “into the right fold.”

23. Of the clergy you add, “What need have they to rage and foam at your preaching? Suppose you could delude the greater part of their flocks, this could not affect their temporal interest.” (p. 7.) We do not desire it should. We only desire to delude all mankind (if you will term it a delusion) into a serious concern for their eternal interest, for a treasure which none can take away.

Having now both stated the facts to which you referred, and considered the most material parts of your performance, I have only to subjoin a few obvious reflections, naturally arising from a view of those uncommon occurrences; partly with regard to the motives of those who were active therein; partly to their manner of acting.

1. With regard to the former, every reasonable man will naturally inquire on what motives could any, either of the clergy or the corporation, ever think of opposing that preaching by which so many notoriously vicious men have been brought to an eminently virtuous life and conversation.

You supply us yourself with one unexceptionable answer: “Those of the clergy with whom I have conversed freely own they have not learning sufficient to comprehend your scheme of religion.” (p. 30.) If they have not, I am sorry for them. My scheme of religion is this:—Love is the fulfilling of the law. From the true love of God and man, directly flows every Christian grace, every holy and happy temper; and from these springs uniform holiness of conversation, in conformity to those great rules, “Whether ye eat or drink, or whatever you do, do all to the glory of God;” and, “Whatsoever you would that men should do unto you, even so do unto them.” But this, you say, “those of the clergy with whom you converse have not learning enough to comprehend.” Consequently, their ignorance, or not understanding our doctrine, is the reason why they oppose us.

2. I learn from you, that ignorance of another kind is a Second reason why some of the clergy oppose us: they, like you, think us enemies to the Church. The natural consequence is, that, in proportion to their zeal for the Church, their zeal against us will be.

3. The zeal which many of them have for orthodoxy, or right opinions,

is a Third reason for opposing us. For they judge us heterodox in several points, maintainers of strange opinions. And the truth is, the old doctrines of the reformation are now quite new in the world. Hence those who revive them cannot fail to be opposed by those of the clergy who know them not.

4. Fourthly. Their honour is touched when others pretend to know what they do not know themselves; especially when unlearned and (otherwise) ignorant men lay claim to any such knowledge. "What is the tendency of all this," as you observe on another head, "but to work in men's minds a mean opinion of the clergy?" But who can tamely suffer this? None but those who have the mind that was in Christ Jesus.

5. Again: Will not some say, "Master, by thus acting, thou reproachest us?" by preaching sixteen or eighteen times a week; and by a thousand other things of the same kind? Is not this, in effect, reproaching us, as if we were lazy and indolent? as if we had not a sufficient love to the souls of those committed to our charge?

6. May there not likewise be some (perhaps unobserved) envy in the breast even of men that fear God? How much more in them that do not, when they hear of the great success of these preachers, of the esteem and honour that are paid to them by the people, and the immense riches which they acquire! What wonder if this occasions a zeal which is not the flame of fervent love?

7. Add to this, a desire in some of the inferior clergy of pleasing their superiors; supposing these (which is no impossible supposition) are first influenced by any of these motives. Add the imprudence of some that hear those preachers, and, perhaps, needlessly provoke their parochial ministers. And when all these things are considered, none need be at a loss for the motives on which many of the clergy have opposed us.

8. But from what motives can any of the corporation oppose us? I must beg the gentlemen of this body to observe, that I dare by no means lump them all together, as their awkward defender has done. But this I may say without offence, there are some even among you who are not so remarkably loyal as others, not so eminently well affected to the present government. Now, these cannot but observe, (gentlemen, I speak plain, for I am to deliver my own soul in the sight of God,) that, wherever we preach, many who were his enemies before, became zealous friends to his majesty. The instances glare both in England and Ireland. Those, therefore, who are not so zealously his friends have a strong motive to oppose us; though it cannot be expected they should own this to be the motive on which they act.

9. Others may have been prejudiced by the artful misrepresentations these have made, or by those they have frequently heard from the pulpit. Indeed this has been the grand fountain of popular prejudice. In every part both of England and Ireland, the clergy, where they were inclined so to do, have most effectually stirred up the people.

10. There has been another reason assigned for the opposition that was made to me in particular at Cork, viz. that the mayor was offended at my preaching on Hammond's Marsh, and therefore resolved I should not preach at all; whereas, if I had not preached abroad, he would have

given me leave to preach in the house. Would Mr. Mayor have given me leave to preach in my own house? I return him most humble thanks. But should he be so courteous as to make me the offer even now, I should not accept it on any such terms. Greater men than he have endeavoured to hinder me from calling sinners to repentance in that open and public manner; but hitherto it has been all lost labour. They have never yet been able to prevail; nor ever will, till they can conquer King George and his armies. To curse them is not enough.

11. Lastly. Some (I hope but a few) do cordially believe, that "private vices are public benefits." I myself heard this in Cork, when I was there last. These, consequently, think us the destroyers of their city, by so lessening the number of their public benefactors, the gluttons, the drunkards, the dram drinkers, the Sabbath breakers, the common swearers, the cheats of every kind, and the followers of that ancient and honourable trade, adultery and fornication.

12. These are the undeniable motives to this opposition. I come now to the manner of it.

When some gentlemen inquired of one of the bishops in England, "My lord, what must we do to stop these new preachers?" he answered, "If they preach contrary to Scripture, confute them by Scripture; if contrary to reason, confute them by reason. But beware you use no other weapons than these, either in opposing error, or defending the truth."

Would to God this rule had been followed at Cork! But how little has it been thought of there! The opposition was begun with lies of all kinds, frequently delivered in the name of God: so that never was any thing so ill judged as for you to ask, "Does Christianity encourage its professors to make use of lies, invectives, or low, mean abuse, and scurrility, to carry on its interest?" No, sir, it does not. I disclaim and abhor every weapon of this kind. But with these have the Methodist preachers been opposed in Cork above any other place. In England, in all Ireland, have I neither heard nor read any like those gross, palpable lies, those low Billingsgate invectives, and that inexpressibly mean abuse, and base scurrility, which the opposers of Methodism, so called, have continually made use of, and which has been the strength of their cause from the beginning.

13. If it be not so, let the Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Cork, (for he too has openly entered the lists against the Methodists,) the Rev. Dr. Tisdale, or any other whom his lordship shall appoint, meet me on even ground, writing as a gentleman to a gentleman, a scholar to a scholar, a clergyman to a clergyman. Let him thus show me wherein I have preached or written amiss, and I will stand reprov'd before all the world.

14. But let not his lordship, or any other, continue to put persecution in the place of reason; either private persecution, stirring up husbands to threaten or beat their wives, parents their children, masters their servants; gentlemen to ruin their tenants, labourers, or tradesmen, by turning them out of their farms or cottages, employing or buying of them no more, because they worship God according to their own conscience; or open, barefaced, noonday, Cork persecution, breaking open the houses of his majesty's Protestant subjects, destroying their goods, spoiling or tearing the very clothes from their backs; striking, bruising, wounding,

murdering them in the streets; dragging them through the mire, without any regard to age or sex; not sparing even those of tender years; no, nor women, though great with child; but, with more than Pagan or Mohammedan barbarity, destroying infants that were yet unborn.

15. Ought these things so to be? Are they right before God or man? Are they to the honour of our nation? I appeal unto Cæsar; unto his gracious majesty King George, and to the governors under him, both in England and Ireland. I appeal to all true, disinterested lovers of this their native country. Is this the way to make it a flourishing nation? happy at home, amiable and honourable abroad? Men of Ireland, judge! Nay, and is there not some weight in that additional consideration,—that this is not a concern of a private nature? Rather, is it not a common cause?

If the dams are once broken down, if you tamely give up the fundamental laws of your country, if these are openly violated in the case of your fellow subjects, how soon may the case be your own! For what protection then have any of you left for either your liberty or property? What security for either your goods or lives, if a riotous mob is to be both judge, jury, and executioner?

16. Protestants! What is become of that liberty of conscience for which your forefathers spent their blood? Is it not an empty shadow, a mere, unmeaning name, if these things are suffered among you? Romans, such of you as are calm and candid men, do you approve of these proceedings? I cannot think you yourselves would use such methods of convincing us, if we think amiss. Christians of all denominations, can you reconcile this to our royal law, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself?" O tell it not in Gath! Let it not be named among those who are enemies to the Christian cause; lest that worthy name, whereby we are called be still more blasphemed among the Heathen!

A LETTER TO THE REVEREND MR. POTTER.

NORWICH, November 4, 1758.

REVEREND SIR,—1. Till to-day I had not a sight of your sermon, "On the Pretended Inspiration of the Methodists." Otherwise I should have taken the liberty, some days sooner, of sending you a few lines. That sermon, indeed, only repeats what has been often said before, and as often answered. But as it is said again, I believe it is my duty to answer it again. Not that I have any acquaintance with Mr. Cayley or Osborn: I never exchanged a word with either. However, as you lump me and them together, I am constrained to speak for myself, and once more to give a reason of my hope, that I am clear from the charge you bring against me.

2. There are several assertions in your sermon which need not be allowed; but they are not worth disputing. At present, therefore I shall only speak of two things: (1.) Your account of the new birth; and, (2.) "The pretended inspiration" (as you are pleased to term it) "of the Methodists."

3. Of the new birth, you say, "The terms of being *regenerated*, of

being *born again*, of being *born of God*, are often used to express *the works* of Gospel righteousness." (pp. 10, 11.) I cannot allow this. I know not that they are ever used in Scripture to express any outward work at all. They always express an inward work of the Spirit, whereof baptism is the outward sign. You add, "Their primary, peculiar, and precise meaning signifies" (a little impropriety of expression) "our redemption from death, and restoration to eternal life, through the grace of God." (p. 13.) It does not, unless by *death* you mean sin; and by *eternal life*, holiness. The precise meaning of the term is, "a new birth unto righteousness," an inward change from unholy to holy tempers. You go on: "This grace our Lord here calls, 'entering into the kingdom of God.'" If so, his assertion is, "Except a man be born again,—he cannot" be born again. Not so. What he says is, Except a man experience this change, he cannot enter into my kingdom.

4. You proceed: "Our holy Church doth teach us, that—by the laver of regeneration in baptism, we are received into the number of the children of God—This is the first part of the new birth." What is the first part of the new birth? baptism? It is the outward sign of that inward and spiritual grace; but no part of it at all. It is impossible it should be. The outward sign is no more a part of the inward grace than the body is a part of the soul. Or do you mean, that regeneration is a part of the new birth? Nay, this is the whole of it. Or is it the "laver of regeneration" which is the first part of it? That cannot be; for you suppose this to be the same with baptism.

5. "The second part, the inward and spiritual grace, is a death unto sin, and a new birth unto righteousness." What! Is the new birth the *second part* of the new birth? I apprehend it is the first and second part too: and surely nothing could have prevented your seeing this, but the ardour of your spirit, and the impetuosity with which you rush along and trample down all before you. Your manner of writing reminds me of an honest Quaker in Cornwall, whose words I would recommend to your consideration. Being consulted by one of the Friends, whether he should publish a tract which he had read to many in private, he replied, "What! Art thou not content with laying John Wesley on his back, but thou must tread his guts out too?"

6. So much for your account of the new birth. I am, in the Second place, to consider the account you give of "the pretended inspiration" (so you are pleased to term it) "of the Methodists."

"The Holy Ghost sat on the Apostles with cloven tongues as of fire;—and signs and wonders were done by their hands." (pp. 16, 17, 18.) Wonders indeed! For they healed the sick by a word, a touch, a shadow!

They spake the dead alive, and living dead.

"But though these extraordinary operations of the Spirit have been long since withdrawn, yet the pretension to them still subsists in the confident claim of the Methodists." This you boldly affirm, and I flatly deny. I deny that either I, or any in connection with me, (for others, whether called Methodists or any thing else, I am no more concerned to answer than you are,) do now, or ever did, lay any claim to "these extraordinary operations of the Spirit."

7. But you will prove it. They "confidently and presumptuously claim a particular and immediate inspiration." (*Ib.*) I answer, First, so

do you, and in this very sermon, though you call it by another name. By inspiration, we mean that inward assistance of the Holy Ghost, which "helps our infirmities, enlightens our understanding, rectifies our will, comforts, purifies, and sanctifies us." (p. 14.) Now, all this you claim as well as I; for these are your own words. "Nay, but you claim a particular inspiration." So do you; do not you expect Him to sanctify you in particular? "Yes; but I look for no immediate inspiration." You do; you expect He will immediately and directly help your infirmities. Sometimes, it is true, He does this by the mediation or intervention of other men; but at other times, particularly in private prayer, he gives that help directly from himself. "But is this all you mean by particular, immediate inspiration?" It is, and so I have declared a thousand times in private, in public, by every method I could devise. It is pity, therefore, that any should still undertake to give an account of my sentiments, without either hearing or reading what I say. Is this doing as we would be done to?

8. I answer, Secondly, there is no analogy between claiming this inspiration of the Spirit, who, you allow, "assists, and will assist, all true believers to the end of the world;" (p. 18;) and claiming those extraordinary operations of the Spirit which were vouchsafed to the Apostles. The former both you and I pretend to; yea, and enjoy, or we are no believers. The latter you do not pretend to; nor do I, nor any that are in connection with me.

9. "But you do pretend to them. For you pray that 'signs and wonders may still be wrought in the name of Jesus.'" True; but what signs and wonders? The conversion of sinners; the "healing the broken in heart; the turning men from darkness to light, from the power of Satan unto God." These and these only are the signs and wonders which were mentioned in that prayer. And did I not see these signs and wonders still wrought, I would sooner hew wood, or draw water, than preach the Gospel. For those are to me very awful words, which our Lord speaks of prophets or teachers: "Ye shall know them" (whether they are true or false prophets) "by their fruits. Every good tree bringeth forth good fruit; every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit, is hewn down and cast into the fire." What fruit you have brought forth at Reymerston, I know not; God knoweth.

10. "Your followers, however, do pretend to the grace of a miraculous conversion." Is there any conversion that is not miraculous? Is conversion a natural or supernatural work? I suppose all who allow there is any such thing believe it to be supernatural. And what is the difference between a supernatural and a miraculous work, I am yet to learn.

"But they say, that at such a time, and in such a manner, the divine illumination shone upon them; Jesus knocked at the door of their hearts, and the Holy Ghost descended upon their souls;" that is, in plain terms, raiery apart, at a particular time, which they cannot easily forget, God did, in so eminent a manner as they never experienced before, "enlighten their understanding," (they are your own words,) "comfort and purify their hearts, and give his heavenly Spirit to dwell in them." But what has all this to do with those extraordinary operations of the Holy Spirit?

11. "Under these pretended impressions, their next advance is, to a call

to preach the word themselves ; and forth they issue, as under the immediate inspiration of God's Spirit, with the language of Apostles, and zeal of martyrs, to publish the Gospel, as if they were among our remotest-ancestors, strangers to the name of Christ." (pp. 20, 21.)

The plain truth is this : One in five hundred of those whom God so *enlightens and comforts*, sooner or later, believes it to be his duty to call other sinners to repentance. Such a one commonly stifles this conviction till he is so uneasy he can stifle it no longer. He then consults one or more of those whom he believes to be competent judges ; and, under the direction of these, goes on, step by step, from a narrower to a larger sphere of action. Meantime he endeavours to use only "the language of the Apostles," to speak the things of the Spirit in the words of the Spirit. And he longs and prays for "the zeal of martyrs," continually finding the need thereof ; seeing our present countrymen are as great strangers to the mind that was in Christ, as our ancestors were to his name.

12. "But the Holy Spirit no longer comes from heaven like a rushing mighty wind. It no longer appears in cloven tongues as of fire." I wonder who imagines it does. "We now discern not between his suggestions and the motions of our own rational nature." Many times we do not ; but at other times, God may give such peace or joy, and such love to himself and all mankind, as we are sure are not "the motions of our own nature." "To say, then, that the Holy Spirit began his work at such a time, and continued it so long in such a manner, is as vain as to account for the blowing of the wind." Hold ! *accounting for* is not the thing. To make a parallel, it must be, "is as vain as to say, that the wind *began to blow at such a time, and continued so long in such a manner.*" And where is the vanity of this ? Why may I not say, either that the wind *began to blow at such a time, and blew so long in such a manner* ; or that *God began at such a time to comfort my soul* ; that *He continued that consolation so long, and in such a manner*, by giving me either peace and joy in believing, or a lively hope of the glory of God ?

13. "Not that we are without a memorable instance of this instantaneous impulse in the sudden conversion of St. Paul." (p. 23.) A poor instance this ; for it does not appear that his was a sudden conversion. It is true, "a great light suddenly shone round about him ;" but this light did not convert him. After he had seen this, "he was three days without sight and neither did eat nor drink." And, probably, during the whole time, God was gradually working in his heart, till he "arose, and, being baptized, washed away his sins, and was filled with the Holy Ghost."

14. But to return : "Their teachers claim a particular and immediate inspiration in their nauseous effusions." (p. 22.) Certainly they claim either a particular and immediate inspiration, (as above explained,) or none at all. But this is no other inspiration (call it *influence*, if you please, though it is a far stronger term) than every one must have, before he can either understand, or preach, or live the Gospel. "But there is not in Scripture the least promise or encouragement to expect any particular inspiration." Yes, surely, such an inspiration as this ; you have allowed it over and over. And what external evidence of this would you have ? I will believe you are thus inspired, if you convert sinners to God, and if you yourself are "holy in all manner of conversation."

15. Is there "no need of this inspiration now, because the prejudices of mankind are in favour of the Gospel, and the profession of it is under the protection and encouragement of the civil power?" *The prejudices of mankind are in favour of the Gospel!* What! the prejudices of the bulk of mankind? To go no farther than England: are the bulk of our nation prejudiced in favour of the genuine Gospel; of the holiness which it enjoins; of chastity and temperance; of denying ourselves, and taking up our cross daily; of dying to the world, and devoting all our heart and all our life to God? Are they prejudiced in favour of presenting our souls and bodies a constant, holy sacrifice to God? What less than this is Gospel holiness? And are the prejudices of mankind in favour of this?

16. Likewise, how far this real Christianity is "under the protection and encouragement of the civil power," I know not. But I know, "all that will live godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution," domestic persecution, if no other; for "the foes of" such "a man shall be they of his own household. There shall be," and there are now, "five in one house, three against two, and two against three;" and that not for being Methodists, for having a nick-name; (although that may be the pretence, for want of a better; for who scruples to throw a man into the ditch, and then beat him because his clothes are dirty?) but for living godly; for loving and serving God, according to the best light they have. And certainly these need the assistance of God's Spirit to strengthen and comfort them, that they may suffer all things, rather than turn aside, in any point, from the Gospel way.

17. "But the Scriptures are a complete and a sufficient rule. Therefore, to what purpose could any farther inspiration serve? All farther inspiration is unnecessary; the supposed need of it is highly injurious to the written word, and the pretension thereto (which must be either to explain or to supply it) is a wicked presumption, with which Satan hath filled their hearts, to lie of the Holy Ghost." (pp. 27, 28.)

High sounding words! But, blessed be God, they are only *brutum fulmen*: [empty sound:] they make much noise, but do not wound. "To what purpose could any farther inspiration serve?" Answer yourself: "To enlighten the understanding, and to rectify the will." Else, be the Scriptures ever so complete, they will not save your soul. How, then, can you imagine it is unnecessary; and that "the supposed need of it is injurious to the written word?" And when you say yourself, "The Spirit is to teach us all things, and to guide us into all truth;" judge you, whether this is "to explain, or to supply, the written word." "O, He does this by the written word." True; but also "by his holy inspiration." So the compilers of our Liturgy speak; who, therefore, according to you, are guilty of "wicked presumption, with which Satan filled their hearts, to lie of the Holy Ghost."

18. These, also, are the men upon whom you fall in the following warm words:—"The power of enthusiasm over a heated imagination may be very great. But it must be under the ferment of that old, sour leaven, hypocrisy, to rise to that daring height." I think not: I think they were neither hypocrites nor enthusiasts, though they teach me to pray for, and consequently to expect, (unless I am a hypocrite indeed,) "God's holy inspiration," both in order to "think the things that be

good," and also "perfectly to love him, and worthily to magnify his holy name."

19. You go on: "They boast that their heart is clean, and their spirit right within them." Sir, did you ever read morning prayer on the tenth day of the month? You then said, "Make me a clean heart, O God, and renew a right spirit within me." Did you mean what you said? If you did not, you was guilty of the grossest hypocrisy. If you did, when did you expect God would answer that prayer? when your body was in the grave? Too late! Unless we have clean hearts before we die, it had been good we had never been born.

20. "But they boast they are pure from sin, harmless, and undefiled." So, in a sound sense, is every true believer. "Nay, they boast that their bodies are a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable to God." Sir, is not yours? Are not your soul and body such a sacrifice, holy, acceptable to God? As the Lord God liveth, before whom we stand, if they are not, you are not a Christian. If you are not a holy, living sacrifice, you are still "dead in trespasses and sins." You are an "alien from the commonwealth of Israel, without" Christian "hope, without God in the world!"

21. You add, "Thus have I exposed their boasted claim to a particular and immediate inspiration." (p. 30.) No, sir, you have only exposed yourself; for all that we claim, you allow. "I have shown what a miserable farce is carrying on, beneath the mask of a more refined holiness." No tittle of this have you shown yet; and before you attempt again to show any thing concerning us, let me entreat you, sir, to acquaint yourself better with our real sentiments. Perhaps you may then find, that there is not so wide a difference as you imagined between you and,

Reverend Sir, your servant for Christ's sake,

JOHN WESLEY.

LAKENHEATH, November 7, 1758.

A LETTER TO THE
 REVEREND MR. DOWNES, RECTOR OF ST. MICHAEL'S,
 WOOD-STREET:
 OCCASIONED BY HIS LATE TRACT,
 ENTITLED, "METHODISM EXAMINED AND EXPOSED."

REVEREND SIR,—1. In the Tract which you have just published concerning the people called Methodists, you very properly say, "Our first care should be, candidly and fairly to examine their doctrines. For, as to censure them unexamined would be unjust; so to do the same without a fair and impartial examination would be ungenerous." And again: "We should, in the first place, carefully and candidly examine their doctrines." (p. 68.) This is undoubtedly true. But have you done it? Have you ever examined their doctrines yet? Have you examined them fairly? fairly and candidly? candidly and carefully? Have you read

over so much as the Sermons they have published, or the "Appeal to Men of Reason and Religion?" I hope you have not; for I would fain make some little excuse for your uttering so many senseless, shameless falsehoods. I hope you know nothing about the Methodists, no more than I do about the Cham of Tartary; that you are ignorant of the whole affair, and are so bold, only because you are blind. *Bold enough!* Throughout your whole Tract, you speak *satis pro imperio*, [sufficiently authoritatively,]—as authoritatively as if you was, not an archbishop only, but apostolic vicar also; as if you had the full papal power in your hands, and fire and faggot at your beck! And *blind enough*; so that you blunder on, through thick and thin, bespattering all that come in your way, according to the old, laudable maxim, "Throw dirt enough, and some will stick."

2. I hope, I say, that this is the case, and that you do not knowingly assert so many palpable falsehoods. You say, "If I am mistaken, I shall always be ready and desirous to retract my error." (p. 56.) A little candour and care might have prevented those mistakes; this is the first thing one would have desired. The next is, that they may be removed; that you may see wherein you have been mistaken, and be more wary for the time to come.

3. You undertake to give an account, First, of the rise and principles, Then, of the practices, of the Methodists.

On the former head you say, "Our Church has long been infested with these grievous wolves, who, though no more than two when they entered in, and they so young they might rather be called wolflings," (that is lively and pretty!) "have yet spread their ravenous kind through every part of this kingdom. Where, what havoc they have made, how many of the sheep they have torn, I need not say." (pp. 4, 5.) "About twenty-five years ago, these two bold though beardless divines," (pity, sir, that you had not taught me, twenty-five years ago, *sapientem pascere barbam*, [to cherish a sapient beard,] and thereby to avoid some part of your displeasure,) "being lifted with spiritual pride, were presumptuous enough to become founders of the sect called Methodists." (p. 6.) "A couple of young, raw, aspiring twigs of the ministry dreamed of a special and supernatural call to this." (p. 25.) No, sir; it was you dreamed of this, not we. We dreamed of nothing twenty-five years ago, but instructing our pupils in religion and learning, and a few prisoners in the common principles of Christianity. You go on: "They were ambitious of being accounted missionaries, immediately delegated by Heaven to correct the errors of bishops and archbishops, and reform their abuses; to instruct the clergy in the true nature of Christianity, and to caution the laity not to venture their souls in any such unhallowed hands as refused to be initiated in all the mysteries of Methodism." (pp. 20, 21.) Well asserted indeed; but where is the *proof* of any one of these propositions? I must insist upon this; clear, cogent proof: else they must be set down for so many glaring falsehoods.

4. "The Church of Rome (to which on so many accounts they were much obliged, and as gratefully returned the obligation) taught them to set up for infallible interpreters of Scripture." (p. 54.) Pray, on what accounts are we "obliged to the Church of Rome?" And how have we "returned the obligation?" I beg you would please, (1.) To explain this; and, (2.) To prove that

we ever yet (whoever taught us) "set up for infallible interpreters of Scripture." So far from it, that we have over and over declared, in print as well as in public preaching, "We are no more to expect any living man to be infallible than to be omniscient." (Vol. i, p. 357.)

5. "As to other extraordinary gifts, influences, and operations of the Holy Ghost, no man who has but once dipped into their Journals, and other ostentatious trash of the same kind, can doubt their looking upon themselves as not coming one whit behind the greatest of the Apostles." (*Methodism Examined*, p. 21.)

I acquit you, sir, of ever having "once dipped into that ostentatious trash." I do not accuse you of having read so much as the titles of my Journals. I say, *my Journals*; for (as little as you seem to know it) my brother has published none. I therefore look upon this as simple ignorance. You talk thus, because you know no better. You do not know, that in these very Journals I utterly disclaim the "extraordinary gifts of the Spirit," and all other "influences and operations of the Holy Ghost" than those that are common to all real Christians.

And yet I will not say, this ignorance is blameless. For ought you not to have known better? Ought you not to have taken the pains of procuring better information, when it might so easily have been had? Ought you to have publicly advanced so heavy charges as these, without knowing whether they were true or no?

6. You proceed to give as punctual an account of us, *tanquam intus et in cute nosset*: [as if you had known us in heart and life:] "They outstripped, if possible, even Montanus, for external sanctity and severity of discipline." (p. 22.) "They condemned all regard for temporal concerns. They encouraged their devotees to take no thought for any one thing upon earth; the consequence of which was, a total neglect of their affairs, and impoverishment of their families." (p. 23.) Blunder all over! We had no room for any discipline, severe or not, five-and-twenty years ago, unless college discipline; my brother then residing at Christ Church, and I at Lincoln College. And as to our "sanctity," (were it more or less,) how do you know it was only external? Was you intimately acquainted with us? I do not remember where I had the honour of conversing with you. Or could you (as the legend says of St. Pabomius) "smell a heretic ten miles" off? And how came you to dream, again, that we "condemned all regard for temporal concerns, and encouraged men to take no thought for any one thing upon earth?" Vain dream! We on the contrary, severely condemn all who neglect their temporal concerns, and who do not take care of every thing on earth wherewith God hath entrusted them. The consequence of this is, that the Methodists, so called, do not "neglect their affairs and impoverish their families;" but, by diligence in business, "provide things honest in the sight of all men." Inasmuch, that multitudes of them, who, in time past, had scarce food to eat or raiment to put on, have now "all things needful for life and godliness;" and that for their families, as well as themselves.

7. Hitherto you have been giving an account of two wolfings only; but now they are grown into perfect wolves. Let us see what a picture you draw of them in this state, both as to their principles and practice.

You begin with a home stroke: "In the Montanist you may behold the bold lineaments and bloated countenance of the Methodist." (p. 17.)

I wish you do not squint at the honest countenance of Mr. Venn, who is indeed as far from fear as he is from guile. But if it is somewhat "bloated," that is not his fault; sickness may have the same effect on yours or mine.

But to come closer to the point: "They have darkened religion with many ridiculous fancies, tending to confound the head, and to corrupt the heart." (p. 13.) "A thorough knowledge of them would work, in every rightly-disposed mind, an abhorrence of those doctrines which directly tend to distract the head, and to debauch the heart, by turning faith into frenzy, and the grace of God into wantonness." (pp. 101, 102.) "These doctrines are unreasonable and ridiculous, clashing with our natural ideas of the divine perfections, with the end of religion, with the honour of God, and man's both present and future happiness. Therefore we pronounce them 'filthy dreamers,' turning faith into fancy, the Gospel into farce; thus adding blasphemy to enthusiasm." (pp. 66, 68.)

Take breath, sir; there is a long paragraph behind. "The abettors of these wild and whimsical notions are, (1.) Close friends to the Church of Rome, agreeing with her in almost every thing but the doctrine of merit: (2.) They are no less kind to infidelity, by making the Christian religion a mere creature of the imagination: (3.) They cut up Christianity by the roots, frustrating the very end for which Christ died, which was, that by holiness we might be 'made meet for the inheritance of the saints:' (4.) They are enemies not only to Christianity, but to 'every religion whatsoever,' by labouring to subvert or overturn the whole system of morality: (5.) Consequently, they must be enemies of society, dissolving the band by which it is united and knit together." In a word: "All ancient heresies have in a manner concentrated in the Methodists; particularly those of the Simonians, Gnostics, Antinomians," (as widely distant from each other as Predestinarians from Calvinists!) "Valentinians, Donatists, and Montanists." (pp. 101, 102.) While your hand was in, you might as well have added, Carpocratians, Eutychians, Nestorians, Sabellians. If you say, "I never heard of them;" no matter for that; you may find them, as well as the rest, in Bishop Pearson's index.

Well, all this is mere flourish; raising a dust, to blind the eyes of the spectators. Generals, you know, prove nothing. So, leaving this as it is, let us come to particulars.

But, first, give me leave to transcribe a few words from a tract published some years ago. "Your lordship premises, 'It is not at all needful to charge the particular tenets upon the particular persons among them.' Indeed, it is needful in the highest degree. Just as needful as it is not to put a stumbling block in the way of our brethren; not to lay them under an almost insuperable temptation of condemning the innocent with the guilty." (*Letter to the Bishop of London*, vol. v, pp. 340, 341.)

And it is now far more needful than it was then; as that title of reproach, *Methodist*, is now affixed to many people who are not under my care, nor ever had any connection with me. And what have I to do with these? If you give me a nick-name, and then give it to others whom I know not, does this make me accountable for them? either for their principles or practice? In nowise. I am to answer for myself,

and for those that are in connection with me. This is all that a man of common sense can undertake, or a man of common humanity require.

Let us begin then upon even ground ; and if you can prove upon me, John Wesley, any one of the charges which you have advanced, call me not only a wolf, but an otter, if you please.

8. Your First particular charge (which, indeed, runs through your book, and is repeated in twenty different places) is, that we make the way to heaven too broad, teaching, men may be saved by faith without works. Some of your words are, "They set out with forming a fair and tempting model of religion, so flattering the follies of degenerate man, that it could not fail to gain the hearts of multitudes, especially of the loose and vicious, the lazy and indolent. They want to get to heaven the shortest way, and with the least trouble : now, a reliance on Christ, and a disclaiming of good works, are terms as easy as the merest libertine can ask. They persuade their people that they may be saved by the righteousness of Christ, without any holiness of their own ; nay, that good works are not only unnecessary, but also dangerous ; that we may be saved by faith, without any other requisite, such as Gospel obedience, and a holy life. Lastly : The Valentinians pretended, that if good works were necessary to salvation, it was only to animal men, that is, to all who were not of their clan ; and that, although sin might damn others, it could not hurt them. In consequence of which they lived in all lust and impurity, and wallowed in the most unheard-of bestialities. The Methodists distinguish much after the same manner." (*Methodism Examined*, pp. 52, 31, 38, 14.)

Sir, you are not awake yet. You are dreaming still, and fighting with shadows of your own raising. The "model of religion with which the Methodists set out" is perfectly well known ; if not to you, yet to many thousands in England who are no Methodists. I laid it before the university of Oxford, at St. Mary's, on January 1, 1733. You may read it when you are at leisure ; for it is in print, entitled, "The Circumcision of the Heart." And whoever reads only that one discourse, with any tolerable share of attention, will easily judge, whether that "model of religion flatters the follies of degenerate man," or is likely to "gain the hearts of multitudes, especially of the loose and vicious, the lazy and indolent !" Will a man choose this, as "the shortest way to heaven, and with the least trouble ?" Are these "as easy terms as any libertine" or infidel "can desire ?" The truth is, we have been these thirty years continually reproached for just the contrary to what you dream of ; with making the way to heaven too strait ; with being ourselves "righteous overmuch," and teaching others, they could not be saved without so many works as it was impossible for them to perform. And to this day, instead of teaching men that they may be saved by a faith which is without good works, without "Gospel obedience and holiness of life," we teach exactly the reverse, continually insisting on all outward as well as all inward holiness. For the notorious truth of this we appeal to the whole tenor of our sermons, printed and unprinted ; in particular to those upon "Our Lord's Sermon on the Mount," wherein every branch of Gospel obedience is both asserted and proved to be indispensably necessary to eternal salvation.

Therefore, as to the rest of the "Antinomian trash" which you have

so carefully gathered up, as, "that the regenerate are as pure as Christ himself; that it would be criminal for them to pray for pardon; that the greatest crimes are no crimes in the saints," &c, &c, (p. 17.) I have no concern therewith at all, no more than with any that teach it. Indeed I have confuted it over and over, in tracts published many years ago.

9. A Second charge which you advance is, that "we suppose every man's final doom to depend on God's sovereign will and pleasure;" (I presume you mean, on his absolute, unconditional decree;) that we "consider man as a mere machine;" that we suppose believers "cannot fall from grace." (p. 31.) Nay, I suppose none of these things. Let those who do, answer for themselves. I suppose just the contrary in "Predestination Calmly Considered," a tract published ten years ago.

10. A Third charge is, "They represent faith as a supernatural principle, altogether precluding the judgment and understanding, and discerned by some internal signs; not as a firm persuasion, founded on the evidence of reason, and discernible only by a conformity of life and manners to such a persuasion." (p. 11.)

We do not represent faith "as altogether precluding," or at all "precluding, the judgment and understanding;" rather as enlightening and strengthening the understanding, as clearing and improving the judgment. But we do represent it as the gift of God, yea, and a "supernatural gift;" yet it does not preclude "the evidence of reason;" though neither is this its whole foundation. "A conformity of life and manners" to that persuasion, "Christ loved me, and gave himself for me," is doubtless one mark by which it is discerned; but not the only one. It is likewise discerned by internal signs,—both by the witness of the Spirit, and the fruit of the Spirit; namely, "love, peace, joy, meekness, gentleness;" by all "the mind which was in Christ Jesus."

11. You assert, Fourthly, "They speak of grace, that it is as perceptible to the heart as sensible objects are to the senses; whereas the Scriptures speak of grace, that it is conveyed imperceptibly; and that the only way to be satisfied whether we have it or no, is to appeal, not to our inward feelings, but our outward actions." (p. 32.)

We do speak of grace, (meaning thereby, that power of God which worketh in us both to will and to do of his good pleasure,) that it is "as perceptible to the heart" (while it comforts, refreshes, purifies, and sheds the love of God abroad therein) "as sensible objects are to the senses." And yet we do not doubt, but it may frequently be "conveyed to us imperceptibly." But we know no scripture which speaks of it as always conveyed, and always working in an imperceptible manner. We likewise allow, that outward actions are one way of satisfying us that we have grace in our hearts. But we cannot possibly allow, that "the only way to be satisfied of this is to appeal to our outward actions, and not our inward feelings." On the contrary, we believe that love, joy, peace, are inwardly felt, or they have no being; and that men are satisfied they have grace, first by feeling these, and afterward by their outward actions.

12. You assert, Fifthly, "They talk of regeneration in every Christian, as if it was as sudden and miraculous a conversion as that of St. Paul and the first converts to Christianity, and as if the signs of it were frightful tremors of body, and convulsive agonies of mind; not as a work

graciously begun and gradually carried on by the blessed Spirit, in conjunction with our rational powers and faculties; the signs of which are, sincere and universal obedience." (p. 33.)

This is part true, part false. We do believe regeneration, or, in plain English, the new birth, to be as miraculous or supernatural a work now as it was seventeen hundred years ago. We likewise believe, that the spiritual life, which commences when we are born again, must, in the nature of the thing, have a first moment, as well as the natural. But we say again and again, we are concerned for the substance of the work, not the circumstance. Let it be wrought at all, and we will not contend whether it be wrought gradually or instantaneously. "But what are the signs that it is wrought?" We never said or thought, that they were either "frightful tremors of body," or "convulsive agonies of mind;" (I presume you mean, agonies of mind attended with bodily convulsions;) although we know many persons who, before this change was wrought, felt much fear and sorrow of mind, which, in some of these, had such an effect on the body as to make all their bones to shake. Neither did we ever deny, that it is "a work graciously begun by the Holy Spirit," enlightening our understanding, (which, I suppose, you call "our rational powers and faculties,") as well as influencing our affections. And it is certain, he "gradually carries on this work," by continuing to influence all the powers of the soul; and that the outward sign of this inward work is, "sincere and universal obedience."

13. A Sixth charge is: "They treat Christianity as a wild, enthusiastic scheme, which will bear no examination." (p. 30.) Where, or when? In what sermon? In what tract, practical or polemical? I wholly deny the charge. I have myself closely and carefully examined every part of it, every verse of the New Testament, in the original, as well as in our own and other translations.

14. Nearly allied to this is the threadbare charge of enthusiasm, with which you frequently and largely compliment us. But as this also is asserted only, and not proved, it falls to the ground of itself. Meantime, your asserting it is a plain proof that you know nothing of the men you talk of. Because you know them not, you so boldly say, "One advantage we have over them, and that is reason." Nay, that is the very question. I appeal to all mankind, whether you have it or no. However, you are sure we have it not, and are never likely to have. For "reason," you say, "cannot do much with an enthusiast, whose first principle is, to have nothing to do with reason, but resolve all his religious opinions and notions into immediate inspiration." Then, by your own account, I am no enthusiast; for I resolve none of my notions into immediate inspiration. I have something to do with reason; perhaps as much as many of those who make no account of my labours. And I am ready to give up every opinion which I cannot by calm, clear reason defend. Whenever, therefore, you will try what you can do by argument, which you have not done yet, I wait your leisure, and will follow you step by step, which way soever you lead.

15. "But is not this plain proof of the enthusiasm of the Methodists, that they despise human learning, and make a loud and terrible outcry against it?" Pray, sir, when and where was this done! Be so good as to point out the time and place; for I am quite a stranger to it. I

believe, indeed, and so do you, that many men make an ill use of their learning. But so they do of their Bibles: therefore this is no reason for despising or crying out against it. I would use it just as far as it will go; how far I apprehend it may be of use, how far I judge it to be expedient at least, if not necessary, for a clergyman, you might have seen in the "Earnest Address to the Clergy." But, in the meantime, I bless God that there is a more excellent gift than either the knowledge of languages or philosophy. For tongues, and knowledge, and learning, will vanish away; but love never faileth.

16. I think this is all you have said which is any way material concerning the doctrines of the Methodists. The charges you bring concerning their spirit or practice may be despatched in fewer words.

And, First, you charge them with pride and uncharitableness: "They talk as proudly as the Donatists, of their being the only true preachers of the Gospel, and esteem themselves, in contradistinction to others, as the regenerate, the children of God, and as having arrived at sinless perfection." (p. 15.)

All of a piece. We neither talk nor think so. We doubt not but there are many true preachers of the Gospel, both in England and elsewhere, who have no connection with, no knowledge of, us. Neither can we doubt but that there are many thousand children of God who never heard our voice or saw our face. And this may suffice for an answer to all the assertions of the same kind which are scattered up and down your work. Of sinless perfection, here brought in by head and shoulders, I have nothing to say at present.

17. You charge them, Secondly, "with boldness and blasphemy, who, triumphing in their train of credulous and crazy followers, the spurious" (should it not be rather *the genuine*?) "offspring of their insidious craft, ascribe the glorious event to divine grace, and, in almost every page of their paltry harangues, invoke the blessed Spirit to go along with them in their soul-awakening work; that is, to continue to assist them in seducing the simple and unwary." (p. 41.)

What we ascribe to divine grace is this: the convincing sinners of the errors of their ways, and the "turning them from darkness to light, from the power of Satan to God." Do not you yourself ascribe this to grace? And do not you too invoke the blessed Spirit to go along with you in every part of your work? If you do not, you lose all your labour. Whether we "seduce men into sin," or by his grace save them from it, is another question.

18. You charge us, Thirdly, with "requiring a blind and implicit trust from our disciples;" (p. 10;) who, accordingly, "trust us implicitly in their preachers, as the Papists in their Pope, Councils, or Church." (p. 51.) Far from it: neither do we require it; nor do they that hear us place any such trust in any creature. They "search the Scriptures," and hereby try every doctrine whether it be of God: and what is agreeable to Scripture, they embrace; what is contrary to it they reject.

19. You charge us, Fourthly, with injuring the clergy in various ways: (1.) "They are very industrious to dissolve or break off that spiritual intercourse which the relation wherein we stand requires should be preserved betwixt us and our people." But can that spiritual intercourse be either preserved or broke off, which never existed? What spiritual

intercourse exists between you, the rector of St. Michael, and the people of your parish? I suppose you preach to them once a week, and now and then read prayers. Perhaps you visit one in ten of the sick. And is this all the spiritual intercourse which you have with those over whom the Holy Ghost hath made you an overseer? In how poor a sense then do you watch over the souls for whom you are to give an account to God! Sir, I wish to God there were a truly spiritual intercourse between you and all your people! I wish you "knew all your flock by name, not excepting the men-servants and women-servants!" Then you might cherish each, "as a nurse her own children," and "train them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord." Then might you "warn every one, and exhort every one," till you should "present every one perfect in Christ Jesus."

"But they say our sermons contradict the Articles, Homilies, and Liturgy of our own Church; yea, that we contradict ourselves, saying one thing in the desk, and another in the pulpit." And is there not cause to say so? I myself have heard several sermons preached in churches, which flatly contradicted both the Articles, Homilies, and Liturgy; particularly on the head of justification. I have likewise heard more than one or two persons, who said one thing in the desk, and another in the pulpit. In the desk, they prayed God to "cleanse the thoughts of their hearts by the inspiration of his Holy Spirit." In the pulpit they said there was "no such thing as inspiration since the time of the Apostles."

"But this is not all. You poison the people by the most peevish and spiteful invectives against the clergy, the most rude and rancorous revilings, and the most invidious calumnies." (p. 51.) No more than I poison them with arsenic. I make no peevish or spiteful invectives against any man. Rude and rancorous revilings (such as your present tract abounds with) are also far from me. I dare not "return railing for railing," because (whether you know it or no) I fear God. Invidious calumnies, likewise, I never dealt in; all such weapons I leave to you.

20. One charge remains which you repeat over and over, and lay a peculiar stress upon. (As to what you talk about perverting Scripture, I pass it by, as mere unmeaning common-place declamation.) It is the poor old worn-out tale of "getting money by preaching." This you only intimate at first. "Some of their followers had an inward call to sell all that they had, and lay it at their feet." (p. 22.) Pray, sir, favour us with the name of one, and we will excuse you as to all the rest. In the next page you grow bolder, and roundly affirm, "With all their heavenly mindedness, they could not help casting a sheep's eye at the unrighteous mammon. Nor did they pay their court to it with less cunning and success than Montanus. Under the specious appearance of gifts and offerings, they raised contributions from every quarter. Besides the weekly pensions squeezed out of the poorer and lower part of their community, they were favoured with very large oblations from persons of better figure and fortune; and especially from many believing wives, who had learned to practise pious frauds on their unbelieving husbands."

I am almost ashamed (having done it twenty times before) to answer

this stale calumny again. But the bold, frontless manner wherein you advance it, obliges me so to do. Know then, sir, that you have no authority, either from Scripture or reason, to judge of other men by yourself. If your own conscience convicts you of loving money, of "casting a sheep's eye at the unrighteous mammon," humble yourself before God, if haply the thoughts and desires of your heart may be forgiven you. But, blessed be God, my conscience is clear. My heart does not condemn me in this matter. I know, and God knoweth, that I have no desire to load myself with thick clay; that I love money no more than I love the mire in the streets; that I seek it not. And I have it not, any more than suffices for food and raiment, for the plain conveniences of life. I pay no court to it at all, or to those that have it, either with cunning or without. For myself, for my own use, I raise no contributions, either great or small. The weekly contributions of our community, (which are freely given, not *squeezed* out of any,) as well as the gifts and offerings at the Lord's table, never come into my hands. I have no concern with them, not so much as the beholding them with my eyes. They are received every week by the stewards of the society, men of well known character in the world; and by them constantly distributed, within the week, to those whom they know to be in real necessity. As to the "very large oblations wherewith I am favoured by persons of better figure and fortune," I know nothing of them. Be so kind as to refresh my memory by mentioning a few of their names. I have the happiness of knowing some of great figure and fortune; some right honourable persons. But if I were to say, that all of them together had given me seven pounds in seven years, I should say more than I could make good. And yet I doubt not, but they would freely give me any thing I wanted; but, by the blessing of God, I want nothing that they can give. I want only more of the Spirit of love and power, and of a healthful mind. As to those "many believing wives who practise pious frauds on their unbelieving husbands," I know^d them not, no, not one of that kind; therefore I doubt the fact. If you know any such, be pleased to give us their names and places of abod. Otherwise you must bear the blame of being the lover, if not the maker, of a lie.

Perhaps you will say, "Why, a great man said the same thing but a few years ago." What, if he did? Let the frog swell as long as he can, he will not equal the ox. He might say many things, all circumstances considered, which will not come well from you, as you have neither his wit, nor sense, nor learning, nor age, nor dignity.

Tibi parvula res est:

Metiri se quemque suo modulo, ac pede, verum est.

(You are not upon a level with Bishop Warburton. Let every man know his own size.)

If you fall upon people that meddle not with you, without either fear or wit, you may possibly find they have a little more to say for themselves than you was aware of. I "follow peace with all men;" but if a man set upon me without either rhyme or reason, I think it my duty to defend myself, so far as truth and justice permit. Yet still I am, (if a poor enthusiast may not be so bold as to style himself your brother,)

Reverend Sir, your servant for Christ's sake,

LONDON, November 17, 1759.

JOHN WESLEY.

A LETTER
TO
THE REVEREND DR. HORNE:

OCCASIONED BY HIS LATE SERMON, PREACHED BEFORE THE UNIVERSITY
OF OXFORD, ABOUT 1762.

REVEREND SIR,—When you spoke of “heresies making their periodical revolutions,” of “Antinomianism rampant among us,” and immediately after, of the “new lights at the Tabernacle and Foundery,” must not your hearers naturally think that Mr. Whitefield and I were reviving those heresies? But do you know the persons of whom you speak? Have you ever conversed with them? Have you read their writings? If not, is it kind, is it just, to pass so severe a censure upon them? Had you only taken the trouble of reading one tract, the “Appeal to Men of Reason and Religion,” you would have seen that a great part of what you affirm is what I never denied. To put this beyond dispute, I beg leave to transcribe some passages from that treatise; which will show not only what I teach now, but what I have taught for many years. I will afterward simply and plainly declare wherein I as yet differ from you: and the rather, that if I err therein, you may, by God’s assistance, convince me of it.

I. 1. “Justification sometimes means our acquittal at the last day: Matt. xii, 37. But this is altogether out of the present question; that justification whereof our Articles and Homilies speak, meaning present forgiveness, pardon of sins, and, consequently, acceptance with God; who therein ‘declares his righteousness’ (or mercy, by or) ‘for the remission of the sins that are past;’ saying, ‘I will be merciful to thy unrighteousness, and thine iniquities I will remember no more,’ Rom. iii, 25; Heb. viii, 12.

“I believe the condition of this is faith: Rom. iv, 5, &c. I mean, not only, that without faith we cannot be justified; but also, that as soon as any one has true faith, in that moment he is justified.

“Good works follow this faith, but cannot go before it: Luke vi, 43: much less can sanctification, which implies a continued course of good works, springing from holiness of heart. But it is allowed, that entire sanctification goes before our justification at the last day: Heb. xii, 14.

“It is allowed, also, that repentance, and ‘fruits meet for repentance,’ go before faith: Mark i, 15; Matt. iii, 8. Repentance absolutely must go before faith; fruits meet for it, if there be opportunity. By repentance, I mean conviction of sin, producing real desires and sincere resolutions of amendment; and by ‘fruits meet for repentance,’ forgiving our brother: Matt. vi, 14, 15: ceasing from evil, doing good; Luke iii, 4, 9, &c: using the ordinances of God, and, in general, obeying him according to the measure of grace which we have received: Matt. vii, 7; xxv, 29. But these I cannot as yet term good works; because they do not spring from faith and the love of God.” (*Farther Appeal*, vol. v, pp. 34, 35.)

2. “Faith alone is the proximate condition of present justification.”

II. 1. I have shown here, at large, what is the doctrine I teach with regard to justification, and have taught ever since I was convinced of it myself, by carefully reading the New Testament and the Homilies. In many points, I apprehend, it agrees with yours; in some, it does not; these I come now to consider. May God enable me to do it in love and meekness of wisdom.

You say, "Happy times, when faith and a good life were synonymous terms!" (p. 7.) I conceive, they never were. Is not faith the root, a good life the tree springing therefrom?

"That good works are a necessary condition of our justification, may be proved, (1.) From express testimonies of Scripture. So Isaiah i, 16, 17: 'Cease from evil, learn to do well.' Then 'your sins that were as scarlet, shall be white as snow.' Here, ceasing from evil, and learning to do well, are the conditions of pardon." I answer: Without them there is no pardon; yet the immediate condition of it is faith. He that believeth, and he alone, is justified before God. "So Ezekiel xxxiii, 14-16: If the sinner 'turn from his evil ways,' and 'walk in the statutes of life,' then 'all his sins shall not be once mentioned to him.' Most sure; that is, if he believe; else, whatever his outward walking be, he cannot be justified.

The next scripture you cite, Matt. xi, 28, (*Sermon*, p. 10,) proves no more than this, that none find "rest to their souls," unless they first come to Christ, (namely by faith,) and then obey him.

But, "He says, 'Ye are my friends, if ye do whatsoever I command you.'" He does so; but how does it appear, that this relates to justification at all?

"St. Peter also declares, 'In every nation, he that feareth God and worketh righteousness is accepted of him,'" Acts x, 35. He is; but none can either fear God, or work righteousness, till he believes according to the dispensation he is under. "And St. John: 'He that doeth righteousness is righteous.'" I do not see that this proves any thing. "And again: 'If we walk in the light, as God is in the light, then have we communion with him, and the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin,'" 1 John i, 7. This would prove something, if it could be proved, that "cleansing us from all sin" meant only justification.

"The Scriptures insist upon the necessity of repentance, in particular, for that purpose. But repentance comprehends compunction, humiliation, hatred of sin, confession of it, prayer for mercy, ceasing from evil, a firm purpose to do well, restitution of ill got goods, forgiveness of all who have done us wrong, and works of beneficence." (pp. 11, 12.) I believe it does comprehend all these, either as parts or as fruits of it: and it comprehends "the fear" but not "the love of God;" that flows from a higher principle. And he who loves God is not barely in the right way to justification: he is actually justified. The rest of the paragraph asserts just the same thing which was asserted in those words: "Previous to justifying faith must be repentance, and, if opportunity permits, 'fruits meet for repentance.'" But still I must observe, that "neither the one nor the other is necessary, either in the same sense, or in the same degree with faith." No scripture testimony can be produced, which any way contradicts this.

2. "That works are a necessary condition of our justification, may be proved, Secondly, from scripture examples; particularly those recited in the eleventh chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews. These all "through faith wrought righteousness; without working righteousness, they had never obtained the promises." (p. 13.) I say the same thing: none are finally saved, but those whose faith "worketh by love."

"Even in the thief upon the cross, faith was attended by repentance,

piety, and charity." It was; repentance went before his faith; piety and charity accompanied it. "Therefore, he was not justified by faith alone." Our Church, adopting the words of St. Chrysostom, expressly affirms, in the passage above cited, he was justified by faith alone. And her authority ought to weigh more than even that of Bishop Bull, or of any single man whatever. Authority, be pleased to observe, I plead against authority; reason against reason.

It is no objection, that the faith whereby he was justified immediately produced good works.

3. How we are justified by faith alone, and yet by such a faith as is not alone, it may be proper to explain. And this also I choose to do, not in my own words, but in those of our church:—

"Faith does not shut out repentance, hope, love, and the fear of God, to be joined with faith in every man that is justified: but it shutteth them out from the office of justifying. So that although they be all present together in him that is justified, yet they justify not altogether. Neither doth faith shut out good works, necessarily to be done afterward, of duty toward God.

"That we are justified only by this faith in Christ, speak all the ancient authors; especially Origen, St. Cyprian, St. Chrysostom, Hilary, Basil, St. Ambrose, and St. Augustine." (*Homily on the Salvation of Man.*)

4. You go on: "Thirdly, if we consider the nature of faith, it will appear impossible that a man should be justified by that alone. Faith is either an assent to the Gospel truths, or a reliance on the Gospel promises. I know of no other notion of faith." (*Sermon*, p. 15.) I do; an *ελεγχος* [evidence or conviction] of things not seen; which is far more than a bare assent, and yet *toto genere* [wholly] different from a reliance. Therefore, if you prove that neither an assent nor a reliance justifies, nor both of them together, still you do not prove that we are not justified by faith, even by faith alone. But how do you prove, that we cannot be justified by faith as a reliance on the promises? Thus: "Such a reliance must be founded on a consciousness of having performed the conditions. And a reliance so founded is the result of works wrought through faith." No; of works wrought without faith; else the argument implies a contradiction. For it runs thus: (on the supposition that faith and reliance were synonymous terms:) Such a reliance is the result of works wrought through such a reliance.

5. Your Fourth argument against justification by faith alone, is drawn from the nature of justification. This, you observe, "implies a prisoner at the bar, and a law by which he is to be tried; and this is not the law of Moses, but that of Christ, requiring repentance and faith, with their proper fruits;" (p. 16;) which now, through the blood of Christ, are accepted and "counted for righteousness." St. Paul affirms this concerning faith, in the fourth chapter of his Epistle to the Romans. But where does he say, that either repentance or its fruits are counted for righteousness? Nevertheless, I allow that the law of Christ requires such repentance and faith before justification, as, if there be opportunity, will bring forth the "fruits of righteousness." But if there be not, he that repents and believes is justified notwithstanding. Consequently, these alone are necessary, indispensably necessary, conditions of our justification.

6. Your Last argument against justification by faith alone "is drawn from the method of God's proceeding at the last day. He will then

judge every man 'according to his works.' If, therefore, works wrought through faith are the ground of the sentence passed upon us in that day, then are they a necessary condition of our justification;" (p. 19;) in other words, "if they are a condition of our final, they are a condition of our present, justification." I cannot allow the consequence. All holiness must precede our entering into glory. But no holiness can exist, till, "being justified by faith, we have peace with God, through our Lord Jesus Christ."

7. You next attempt to reconcile the writings of St. Paul with justification by works. In order to this you say, "In the three first chapters of his Epistle to the Romans, he proves that both Jews and Gentiles must have recourse to the Gospel of Christ. To this end he convicts the whole world of sin; and having stopped every mouth, he makes his inference, 'Therefore, by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified. We conclude,' then, says he, 'a man is justified by faith, without the deeds of the law.' But here arise two questions: First, What are the works excluded from justifying? Secondly, What is the faith which justifies?" (pp. 20, 21, 22.)

"The works excluded are Heathen and Jewish works, set up as meritorious. This is evident from hence,—that Heathens and carnal Jews are the persons against whom he is arguing." Not so: he is arguing against all mankind: he is convicting the whole world of sin. His concern is, to stop every mouth, by proving that no flesh, none born of a woman, no child of man, can be justified by his own works. Consequently, he speaks of all the works of all mankind, antecedent to justification, whether Jewish or any other, whether supposed meritorious or not, of which the text says not one word. Therefore, all works antecedent to justification are excluded, and faith is set in flat opposition to them. "Unto him that worketh not, but believeth, his faith is counted to him for righteousness."

"But what is the faith to which he attributes justification? That 'which worketh by love;' which is the same with the 'new creature,' and implies in it the keeping the commandments of God."

It is undoubtedly true, that nothing avails for our final salvation, without *καινη κτισις*, "a new creation," and, consequent thereon, a sincere, uniform keeping of the commandments of God. This St. Paul constantly declares. But where does he say, this is the condition of our justification? In the Epistles to the Romans and Galatians particularly, he vehemently asserts the contrary; earnestly maintaining, that nothing is absolutely necessary to this, but "believing in Him that justifieth the ungodly;" not the godly, not him that is already a "new creature," that previously keeps all the commandments of God. He does this afterward; when he is justified by faith, then his faith "worketh love."

"Therefore, there is no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus," justified by faith in him, provided they "walk in Him whom they have received, not after the flesh, but after the Spirit." (p. 23.) But, should they turn back, and walk again after the flesh, they would again be under condemnation. But this no way proves that "walking after the Spirit" was the condition of their justification.

Neither will any thing like this follow from the Apostle's saying to the Corinthians, "Though I had all faith, so as to remove mountains,

and have not charity, I am nothing." This only proves that *miracle-working* faith may be where *saving* faith is not.

8. To the argument, "St. Paul says, 'Abraham was justified by faith,'" you answer, "St. James says, 'Abraham was justified by works.'" (p. 24.) True: but he neither speaks of the same justification, nor the same faith, nor the same works. Not of the same justification; for St. Paul speaks of that justification which was five-and-twenty years before Isaac was born; (Genesis;) St. James, of that wherewith he was justified when he offered up Isaac on the altar. It is *living* faith whereby St. Paul affirms we are justified: it is *dead* faith whereby St. James affirms we are not justified. St. Paul speaks of works antecedent to justification; St. James, of works consequent upon it. This is the plain, easy, natural way of reconciling the two Apostles.

The fact was manifestly this: (1.) When Abraham dwelt in Haran, being then seventy-five years old, God called him thence: he "believed God," and He "counted it to him for righteousness;" that is, he "was justified by faith," as St. Paul strenuously asserts. (2.) Many years after Isaac was born, (some of the ancients thought three-and-thirty,) Abraham, showing his faith by his works, offered him up upon the altar. (3.) Here the "faith" by which, in St. Paul's sense, he was justified long before, "wrought together with his works;" and he was justified in St. James's sense, that is, (as the Apostle explains his own meaning,) "by works his faith was made perfect." God confirmed, increased, and perfected the principle from which those works sprang.

9. Drawing to a conclusion, you say, "What pity, so many volumes should have been written upon the question,—whether a man be justified by faith or works, seeing they are two essential parts of the same thing!" (p. 25.) If by *works* you understand inward and outward holiness, both faith and works are essential parts of Christianity; and yet they are essentially different, and by God himself contradistinguished from each other; and that in the very question before us: "Him that worketh not, but believeth." Therefore, whether a man be justified by faith or works, is a point of the last importance; otherwise, our Reformers could not have answered to God their spending so much time upon it. Indeed, they were both too wise and too good men to have wrote so many volumes on a trifling or needless question.

10. If in speaking on this important point, (such at least it appears to me,) I have said any thing offensive, any that implies the least degree of anger or disrespect, it was entirely foreign to my intention; nor indeed have I any provocation: I have no room to be angry at your maintaining what you believe to be the truth of the Gospel; even though I might wish you had omitted a few expressions,

Quas aut incuria fudit,

Aut humana parum cavit natura.

(Such as escaped my notice; or such as may be placed to the account of human infirmity.)

In the general, from all I have heard concerning you, I cannot but very highly esteem you in love. And that God may give you both "a right judgment in all things, and evermore to rejoice in his holy comfort," is the prayer of,

Reverend Sir, your affectionate brother and servant,

JOHN WESLEY.

A LETTER

TO THE

RIGHT REVEREND THE LORD BISHOP OF GLOUCESTER :

OCCASIONED BY HIS TRACT

“ON THE OFFICE AND OPERATIONS OF THE HOLY SPIRIT.”

MY LORD,—Your lordship well observes, “To employ buffoonery in the service of religion is to violate the majesty of truth, and to deprive it of a fair hearing. To examine, men must be serious.” (*Pref.* p. 11.) I will endeavour to be so in all the following pages; and the rather, not only because I am writing to a person who is so far, and in so many respects, my superior, but also because of the importance of the subject: for is the question only, What I am? a madman, or a man in his senses? a knave, or an honest man? No; this is only brought in by way of illustration. The question is, of the office and operation of the Holy Spirit; with which the doctrine of the new birth, and indeed the whole of real religion, is connected. On a subject of so deep concern, I desire to be serious as death. But, at the same time, your lordship will permit me to use great plainness. And this I am the more emboldened to do, because, by naming my name, your lordship, as it were, condescends to meet me on even ground.

I shall consider, First, what your lordship advances concerning me; and, Then, what is advanced concerning the operations of the Holy Spirit.

1. First. Concerning me. It is true I am here dealing in *crambe repetita*, [stale repetition,] reciting objections which have been urged and answered a hundred times. . But as your lordship is pleased to repeat them again, I am obliged to repeat the answers.

Your lordship begins: “If the false prophet pretend to some extraordinary measure of the Spirit, we are directed to try that spirit by James iii, 17.” (p. 117.) I answer, 1. (as I have done many times before,) I do not pretend to any extraordinary measure of the Spirit. I pretend to no other measure of it than may be claimed by every Christian minister. 2. Where are we directed to “try prophets” by this text? How does it appear that it was given for any such purpose? It is certain we may try *Christians* hereby, whether they are real or pretended ones; but I know not that either St. James, or any other inspired writer, gives us the least hint of trying prophets thereby.

Your lordship adds, “In this rule or direction for the trial of spirits, the marks are to be applied only negatively. The man in whom they are not found hath not the ‘wisdom from above.’ But we are not to conclude, that he has it in whom any or all of them are found.” (p. 118.) We are not to conclude that he is a prophet, for the Apostle says nothing about prophets; but may we not conclude, the man in whom all these are found has “the wisdom from above?” Surely we may; for these are the essential parts of that wisdom; and can he have all the parts and not have the whole.

Is not this enough to show, that the Apostle is here giving “a set of marks,” not “to detect impostor prophets,” but impostor Christians?

those that impose either upon themselves or others, as if they were Christians when they are not?

In what follows, I shall simply consider the argument, without directly addressing your lordship.

“Apply these marks to the features of modern fanatics, especially Mr. John Wesley. He has laid claim to almost every apostolic gift, in as full and ample a manner as they were possessed of old.” (p. 119.)

The miraculous gifts bestowed upon the Apostles are enumerated in two places: First, Mark xvi, 17, 18: “In my name they shall cast out devils; they shall speak with new tongues; they shall take up serpents; if they drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them; they shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover.” Second, 1 Cor. xii, 8–10: “To one is given the word of wisdom; to another the word of knowledge; to another faith; to another the gifts of healing; to another the working of miracles; to another prophecy; to another the discernment of spirits; to another tongues; to another the interpretation of tongues.”

Do I lay claim to almost every one of these “in as full and ample a manner as they were possessed of old?”

Five of them are enumerated in the former catalogue; to three of which—speaking with new tongues, taking up serpents, drinking deadly things—it is not even pretended I lay any claim at all. In the latter, nine are enumerated. And as to seven of these, none has yet seen good to call me in question;—miraculous wisdom, or knowledge, or faith, prophecy, discernment of spirits, strange tongues, and the interpretation of tongues. What becomes then of the assertion, that I lay “claim to almost every one of them in the most full and ample manner?”

Do I lay claim to any one of them? To prove that I do, my own words are produced, extracted from an account of the occurrences of about sixteen years.

I shall set them down naked and unadorned: 1. “May 13, 1740. The devil stirred up his servants to make all the noise they could.” 2. “May 3, 1741. I explained, to a vast multitude of people, ‘What doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?’ The devil’s children fought valiantly for their master, that his kingdom should not be destroyed. And many stones fell on my right hand and my left.” 3. “April 3, 1740. Some or other of the children of Belial had laboured to disturb us several nights before. Now all the street was filled with people, shouting, cursing, swearing, and ready to swallow the ground with rage.” (p. 120.) 4. “June 27, 1747. I found only one person among them who knew the love of God, before my brother came. No wonder the devil was so still; ‘for his goods were in peace.’” 5. “April 29, 1752. I preached at Durham to a quiet, stupid congregation.” (p. 121.) 6. “May 9, 1740. I was a little surprised at some who were buffeted of Satan in an unusual manner, by such a spirit of laughter as they could in nowise resist. I could scarce have believed the account they gave me, had I not known the same thing ten or eleven years ago, when both my brother and I were seized in the same manner.” (If any man call this hysterics, I am not concerned: I think and let think.) 7. “May 21, 1740. In the evening such a spirit of laughter was among us, that many were much offended. But the attention of all was soon fixed on poor

L— S—, whom we all knew to be no dissembler. One so violently and variously torn of the evil one did I never see before. Sometimes she laughed till almost strangled; then broke out into cursing and blaspheming. At last she faintly called on Christ to help her; and the violence of her pangs ceased." (Let any who please impute this likewise to hysterics: only permit me to think otherwise.) S. "May 17, 1740. I found more and more undeniable proofs, that we have need to watch and pray every moment. Outward trials, indeed, were now removed: but so much the more did inward trials abound; and 'if one member suffered, all the members suffered with it.' So strange a sympathy did I never observe before; whatever considerable temptation fell on any one, unaccountably spreading itself to the rest, so that exceeding few were able to escape it." (pp. 122, 123.)

I know not what these eight quotations prove, but that I believe the devil still variously tempts and troubles good men; while he "works with energy in the children of disobedience." Certainly they do not prove that I lay claim to any of the preceding gifts. Let us see whether any more is proved by the ten next quotations: 1. "So many living witnesses hath God given, that his hand is still stretched out to heal," (namely, the souls of sinners, as the whole paragraph fixes the sense,) "and that signs and wonders are even now wrought" (p. 124) (namely, in the conversion of the greatest sinners.) 2. "Among the poor colliers of Placey, Jo. Lane, then nine or ten years old, was one of the first that found peace with God." (*Ib.*) 3. "Mrs. Nowers said her little son appeared to have a continual fear of God, and an awful sense of his presence. A few days since, she said, he broke out into prayers aloud, and said, 'I shall go to heaven soon.'" This child, when he began to have the fear of God, was, as his parents said, just three years old. 4. I did receive that "account of the young woman of Manchester from her own mouth." But I pass no judgment on it, good or bad; nor, 5. On "the trance," (p. 126,) as her mother called it, of S. T., neither denying nor affirming the truth of it. 6. "You deny that God does work these effects; at least, that he works them in this manner: I affirm both. I have seen very many persons changed in a moment, from the spirit of fear, horror, despair, to the spirit of love, joy, and praise. In several of them this change was wrought in a dream, or during a strong representation to their mind of Christ, either on the cross, or in glory." (p. 127.)

"But here the symptoms of grace and of perdition are interwoven and confounded with one another." (p. 128.) No. Though light followed darkness, yet they were not interwoven, much less confounded with each other. 7. "But some imputed the work to the force of imagination, or even to the delusion of the devil." (*Ib.*) They did so; which made me say, 8. "I fear we have grieved the Spirit of the jealous God, by questioning his work." (*Ib.*) 9. "Yet he says himself, 'These symptoms I can no more impute to any natural cause, than to the Spirit of God. I make no doubt, it was Satan tearing them, as they were coming to Christ.'" (p. 129.) But these symptoms, and the work mentioned before, are wholly different things. The work spoken of is the conversion of sinners to God; these symptoms are cries and bodily pain. The very next instance makes this plain. 10. "I visited a poor old woman. Her trials had been uncommon; inexpressible agonies of

mind, joined with all sorts of bodily pain; not, it seemed, from any natural cause, but the direct operation of Satan." (p. 130.)

Neither do any of those quotations prove that I lay claim to any miraculous gift.

"Such was the evangelic state of things when Mr. Wesley first entered on this ministry; who, seeing himself surrounded with subjects so harmoniously disposed, thus triumphantly exults." To illustrate this, let us add the date: "Such was the evangelic state of things, August 9, 1750;" (on that day, I preached that sermon;) "when Mr. Wesley first entered on this ministry." Nay, that was in the year 1738. So I triumphed, because I saw what would be twelve years after!

Let us see what the ten next quotations prove. 1. "In applying these words, 'I came not to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance,' my soul was so enlarged, that methought I could have cried out, (in another sense than poor vain Archimedes,) 'Give me where to stand, and I will shake the earth.'" (p. 130.) I meant neither more nor less (though I will not justify the use of so strong an expression) than, I was so deeply penetrated with a sense of the love of God to sinners, that it seemed, if I could have declared it to all the world, they could not but be moved thereby.

"Here then was a scene well prepared for a good actor, and excellently fitted up for the part he was to play." (p. 131.) But how came so good an actor to begin playing the part twelve years before the scene was fitted up?

"He sets out with declaring his mission. 2. 'I cried aloud, *All things are ready; come ye to the marriage.* I then delivered my message.'" And does not every minister do the same whenever he preaches?

But how is this? "He sets out with declaring his mission." Nay, but this was ten years after my setting out.

3. "My heart was not wholly resigned. Yet I know he heard my voice." (p. 132.) 4. "The longer I spoke, the more strength I had; till at twelve, I was as one refreshed with wine." (p. 133.) 5. "I explained the nature of inward religion, words flowing upon me faster than I could speak." (*Ib.*) 6. "I intended to have given an exhortation to the society. But as soon as we met, the spirit of supplication fell upon us, (on the congregation as well as me,) so that I could hardly do any thing but pray and give thanks." (*Ib.*) I believe every true Christian may experience all that is contained in these three instances. 7. "The spirit of prayer was so poured upon us all, that we could only speak to God." (*Ib.*) 8. "Many were seated on a wall, which, in the middle of the sermon, fell down; but not one was hurt at all. Nor was there any interruption, either of my speaking, or of the attention of the hearers." (p. 134.) 9. "The mob had just broke open the doors, and while they burst in at one door, we walked out at the other. Nor did one man take any notice of us, though we were within five yards of each other." (p. 135.) The fact was just so. I do not attempt to account for it; because I cannot. 10. "The next miracle was on his friends." They were no friends of mine. I had seen few of them before in my life. Neither do I say or think it was any miracle at all, that they were all "silent while I spake;" or that "the moment I had done, the chain fell off, and they all began talking at once."

Do any or all of these quotations prove, that I "lay claim to almost every miraculous gift?"

Will the eight following quotations prove any more? 1. "Some heard perfectly well on the side of the opposite hill, which was seven score yards from the place where I stood." (*Ib.*) I believe they did, as it was a calm day, and the hill rose gradually like a theatre. 2. "What I here aver is the naked fact. Let every one account for it as he sees good. My horse was exceeding lame; and my head ached much. I thought, Cannot God heal man or beast by means or without? Immediately, my weariness and headache ceased, and my horse's lameness in the same instant." (p. 136.) It was so; and I believe thousands of serious Christians have found as plain answers to prayer as this. 3. William Kirkman's case proves only, that God does what pleases him; not that I make myself either "a great saint or a great physician." (p. 137.) 4. "R. A. was freed at once, without any human means, from a distemper naturally incurable." (p. 138.) He was; but it was before I knew him. So, what is that to me? 5. "I found Mr. Lunell in a violent fever. He revived the moment he saw me, and began to recover from that time. Perhaps for this also was I sent." (*Ib.*) I mean, perhaps this was one end for which the providence of God brought me thither at that time. 6. "In the evening, I called upon Ann Calcut. She had been speechless for some time. But almost as soon as we began to pray, God restored her speech. And from that hour the fever left her." 7. "I visited several ill of the spotted fever, which had been extremely mortal. But God had said, 'Hitherto shalt thou come.' I believe there was not one with whom we were, but he recovered." (p. 139.) 8. "Mr. Meyrick had been speechless and senseless for some time. A few of us joined in prayer. Before we had done his sense and his speech returned. Others may account for this by natural causes. I believe this is the power of God." (*Ib.*)

But what does all this prove? Not that I claim any gift above other men; but only that I believe God now hears and answers prayer, even beyond the ordinary course of nature: otherwise, the clerk was in the right, who, in order to prevent the fanaticism of his rector, told him, "Sir, you should not pray for fair weather yet; for the moon does not change till Saturday."

While the two accounts (pp. 143, 146,) which are next recited lay before me, a venerable old clergyman calling upon me, I asked him, "Sir, would you advise me to publish these strange relations, or not?" He answered, "Are you sure of the facts?" I replied, "As sure as that I am alive." "Then," said he, "publish them in God's name, and be not careful about the event."

The short of the case is this: Two young women were tormented of the devil in an uncommon manner. Several serious persons desired my brother and me to pray with them. We, with many others, did; and they were delivered. But where, meantime, were "the exorcisms in form, according to the Roman fashion?" I never used them: I never saw them: I know nothing about them.

"Such were the blessings which Mr. W. distributed among his friends. For his enemies he had in store the judgments of Heaven." (p. 144.) Did I then ever distribute, or profess to distribute, these? Do I claim

any such power? This is the present question. Let us calmly consider the eight quotations brought to prove it.

1. "I preached at Darlaston, late a den of lions. But the fiercest of them God has called away, by a train of surprising strokes." (*Ib.*) But not by me: I was not there. 2. "I preached at R., late a place of furious riot and persecution; but quiet and calm, since the bitter rector is gone to give an account of himself to God." (p. 145.) 3. "Hence we rode to T—n, where the minister was slowly recovering from a violent fit of the palsy, with which he was struck immediately after he had been preaching a virulent sermon against the Methodists." (p. 145.) 4. "The case of Mr. W——n was dreadful indeed, and too notorious to be denied." (*Ib.*) 5. "One of the chief of those who came to make the disturbance, on the first instant hanged himself." (p. 146.) 6. "I was quite surprised when I heard Mr. R. preach; that soft, smooth, tuneful voice, which he so often employed to blaspheme the work of God, was lost, without hope of recovery." (*Ib.*) 7. "Mr. C. spoke so much in favour of the rioters, that they were all discharged. A few days after, walking over the same field, he dropped down, and spoke no more." (p. 147.)

And what is the utmost that can be inferred from all these passages? That I believe these things to have been judgments. What if I did? To believe these things to have been judgments is one thing; to claim a power of inflicting judgments is another. If, indeed, I believe things to be judgments which are not, I am to blame. But still this is not "claiming any miraculous gift."

But "you cite one who forbid your speaking to some dying criminals, to answer for their souls at the judgment-seat of Christ." (*Ib.*) I do; but, be this right or wrong, it is not "claiming a power to inflict judgments."

"Yes, it is: for these judgments are fulminated with the air of one who had the Divine vengeance at his disposal." (p. 147.) I think not: and I believe all impartial men will be of the same mind.

"These are some of the extraordinary gifts which Mr. W. claims." (p. 149.) I claim no *extraordinary gift* at all; nor has any thing to the contrary been proved yet, so much as in a single instance.

"We come now to the application of this sovereign test, James iii, 17." But let us see that we understand it first. I beg leave to consider the whole: "Who is a wise and knowing man among you? Let him show his wisdom," as well as his faith, "by his works," not by words only. "But if ye have bitter zeal and strife in your heart, do not glory and lie against the truth;" as if any such zeal, any thing contrary to love, could consist with true wisdom. "This wisdom descendeth not from above; but is earthly, sensual, devilish: for where bitter zeal and strife are, there is confusion and every evil work. But the wisdom which is from above,"—which every one that hath is a real Christian, and he only,— "is first pure," free from all that is earthly, sensual, devilish; "then peaceable," benign, loving, making peace; "gentle," soft, mild, yielding, not morose, or sour; "easy to be entreated," to be persuaded or convinced, not stubborn, self-willed, or self-conceited; "full of mercy," of tenderness and compassion; "and good fruits," both in the heart and life. Two of these are immediately specified; "without

partiality," loving and doing good to all, without respect of persons ; "and without hypocrisy," sincere, frank, open.

I desire to be tried by this test. I try myself by it continually : not, indeed, whether I am a prophet, (for it has nothing to do with this,) but whether I am a Christian.

1. The present question then is, (not what is Mr. Law, or what are the Moravians, but) what is John Wesley ? And, (1.) Is he pure or not ? "Not pure ; for he separates reason from grace." (p. 156.) A wonderful proof ! But I deny the fact. I never did separate reason from grace. "Yes, you do ; for your own words are, 'The points we chiefly insisted on were four : (1.) That orthodoxy, or right opinion, is at best but a very slender part of religion ; if it can be allowed to be any part of it at all.'" (p. 157.)

After premising that it is our bounden duty to labour after a right judgment in all things, as a wrong judgment naturally leads to wrong practice, I say again, right opinion is at best but a very slender part of religion, (which properly and directly consists in right tempers, words, and actions,) and frequently it is no part of religion. For it may be where there is no religion at all ; in men of the most abandoned lives ; yea, in the devil himself.

And yet this does not prove that I "separate reason from grace ;" that I "discard reason from the service of religion." I do continually "employ it to distinguish between right and wrong opinions." I never affirmed "this distinction to be of little consequence," or denied "the Gospel to be a reasonable service." (p. 158.)

But "the Apostle Paul considered right opinions as a full third part, at least, of religion. For he says, 'The fruit of the Spirit is in all goodness, and righteousness, and truth.' By goodness is meant the conduct of particulars to the whole, and consists in habits of social virtue ; and this refers to Christian practice. By righteousness is meant the conduct of the whole to particulars, and consists in the gentle use of church authority ; and this refers to Christian discipline. By truth is meant the conduct of the whole, and of particulars to one another, and consists in orthodoxy or right opinion ; and this refers to Christian doctrine." (p. 159.)

My objections to this account are, First, It contradicts St. Paul ; Secondly, It contradicts itself.

First. It contradicts St. Paul. It fixes a meaning upon his words, foreign both to the text and context. The plain sense of the text, taken in connection with the context, is no other than this : Eph. v, 9, "The fruit of the Spirit" (rather "of the light," which Bengelius proves to be the true reading, opposite to "the unfruitful works of darkness," mentioned verse 11) "is," consists, "in all goodness, kindness, tender heartedness," iv, 32,—opposite to "bitterness, wrath, anger, clamour, evil-speaking ;" verse 31 ; "in all righteousness," rendering unto all their dues,—opposite to "stealing ;" verse 28 ; "and in all truth," veracity, sincerity,—opposite to "lying," verse 25.

Secondly. That interpretation contradicts itself ; and that in every article. For, 1. If by "goodness" be meant "the conduct of particulars to the whole," then it does not consist in habits of social virtue. For social virtue regulates the conduct of particulars, not so properly to the

whole as to each other. 2. If by "righteousness" be meant "the conduct of the whole to particulars," then it cannot consist in the gentleness of Church authority; unless Church governors are the whole Church, or the parliament the whole nation. 3. If by "truth" be meant "the conduct of the whole, and of particulars to one another," then it cannot possibly consist in orthodoxy or right opinion. For opinion, right or wrong, is not conduct: they differ *toto genere*. [Entirely.] If, then, it be orthodoxy, it is not "the conduct of the governors and governed toward each other." If it be their conduct toward each other, it is not orthodoxy.

Although, therefore, it be allowed that right opinions are a great help, and wrong opinions a great hinderance, to religion, yet, till stronger proof be brought against it, that proposition remains unshaken, "Right opinions are a slender part of religion, if any part of it at all." (p. 160.)

(As to the affair of Abbé Paris, whoever will read over with calmness and impartiality but one volume of Monsieur Montgeron, will then be a competent judge. Meantime I would just observe, that if these miracles were real, they strike at the root of the whole Papal authority; as having been wrought in direct opposition to the famous Bull Unigenitus.) (p. 161.)

Yet I do not say, "Errors in faith have little to do with religion;" or that they "are no let or impediment to the Holy Spirit." (p. 162.) But still it is true, that "God, generally speaking, begins his work at the heart." (*Ib.*) Men usually feel desires to please God, before they know how to please him. Their heart says, "What must I do to be saved?" before they understand the way of salvation.

But see "the character he gives his own saints! 'The more I converse with this people, the more I am amazed. That God hath wrought a great work is manifest, by saving many sinners from their sins. And yet the main of them are not able to give a rational account of the plainest principles of religion.'" They were not able then, as there had not been time to instruct them. But the case is far different now.

Again: Did I "give this character," even then, of the people called Methodists, in general? No, but of the people of a particular town in Ireland, where nine in ten of the inhabitants are Romanists.

"Nor is the observation confined to the people. He had made a proselyte of Mr. D., vicar of B. And, to show he was no discredit to his master, he gives him this character: 'He seemed to stagger at nothing, though as yet his understanding is not opened.'" (p. 162.)

Mr. D. was never a proselyte of mine; nor did I ever see him before or since. I endeavoured to show him that we are justified by faith. And he did not object; though neither did he understand.

"But in the first propagation of religion, God began with the understanding, and rational conviction won the heart." (p. 163.) Frequently, but not always. The juler's heart was touched first, then he understood what he must do to be saved. In this respect then there is nothing new in the present work of God. So the lively story from Moliere is just nothing to the purpose.

In drawing the parallel between the work God has wrought in Eng-land and in America, I do not so much as "insinuate that the understanding has nothing to do in the work." (p. 165.) Whoever is engaged

therein will find full employment for all the understanding which God has given him.

“On the whole, therefore, we conclude, that wisdom which divests the Christian faith of its truth, and the test of it, reason, and resolves all religion into spiritual mysticism and ecstatic raptures, cannot be the wisdom from above, whose characteristic is purity.” (p. 166.)

Perhaps so, but I do not “divest faith either of truth or reason;” much less do I resolve all into “spiritual mysticism and ecstatic raptures.” Therefore suppose purity here meant *sound doctrine*, (which it no more means than it does a sound constitution,) still it touches not me, who, for any thing that has yet been said, may teach the soundest doctrine in the world.

(2.) “Our next business is to apply the other marks to these pretending sectaries. The First of these, purity, respects the nature of ‘the wisdom from above,’ or in other words, the doctrine taught.” (p. 167.) Not in the least. It has no more to do with “doctrine,” than the whole text has with “prophets.” “All the rest concern the manner of teaching.” Neither can this be allowed. They no farther concern either teaching or teachers than they concern all mankind.

But to proceed: “Methodism signifies only the manner of preaching; not either an old or a new religion; it is the manner in which Mr. W. and his followers attempt to propagate the plain old religion.” (p. 168.) And is not this sound doctrine? Is this “spiritual mysticism and ecstatic raptures?”

“Of all men, Mr. W. should best know the meaning of the term; since it was not a nick-name imposed on the sect by its enemies, but an appellation of honour bestowed upon it by themselves.” In answer to this, I need only transcribe what was published twenty years ago:—

“Since the name first came abroad into the world, many have been at a loss to know what a Methodist is; what are the principles and practice of those who are commonly called by that name; and what are the distinguishing marks of the sect, which ‘is everywhere spoken against.’

“And it being generally believed that I was able to give the clearest account of these things, (as having been one of the first to whom the name was given, and the person by whom the rest were supposed to be directed,) I have been called upon, in all manner of ways, and with the utmost earnestness, so to do. I yield at last to the continued importunity both of friends and enemies; and do now give the clearest account I can, in the presence of the Lord, the Judge of heaven and earth, of the principles and practice whereby those who are called Methodists are distinguished from other men.

“I say, those who are called Methodists; for, let it be well observed, that this is not a name which they take upon themselves, but one fixed on them by way of reproach, without their approbation or consent. It was first given to three or four young men at Oxford, by a student of Christ’s Church; either in allusion to the ancient sect of physicians, (so called from their teaching that almost all diseases might be cured by a specific method of diet and exercise,) or from their observing a more regular method of study and behaviour than was usual with those of their age and station.” (*Preface to “The Character of a Methodist.”*)

I need only add, that this nick-name was imposed upon us before “this manner of preaching” had a being; yea, at a time when I thought it as lawful to cut a throat, as to preach out of a church.

“Why then will Mr. W. so grossly misrepresent his adversaries, as

to say, that, when they speak against Methodism, they speak against the plain, old doctrine of the Church of England?" (*Tract*, p. 169.) This is no misrepresentation. Many of our adversaries, all over the kingdom, speak against us, *eo nomine*, [on this very ground,] for preaching these doctrines, justification by faith in particular.

However "a fanatic manner of preaching, though it were the doctrine of an Apostle, may do more harm to society at least, than reviving old heresies, or inventing new. It tends to bewilder the imaginations of some, to inflame the passions of others, and to spread disorder and confusion through the whole community." (p. 169.) I would gladly have the term defined. What is a "fanatic manner of preaching?" Is it field preaching? But this has no such effect, even among the wildest of men. This has not "bewildered the imagination" even of the Kingswood colliers, or "inflamed their passions." It has not spread disorder or confusion among them, but just the contrary. From the time it was heard in that chaos,

Confusion heard the voice, and wild uproar
Stood ruled, and order from disorder sprung.

"But St. James, who delivers the test for the trial of these men's pretensions," (the same mistake still,) "unquestionably thought a fanatic spirit did more mischief in the mode of teaching, than in the matter taught; since of six marks, one only concerns doctrine, all the rest the manner of the teacher." (p. 170.) Nay, all six concern doctrine as much as one. The truth is, they have nothing to do either with doctrine or manner.

"From St. Paul's words, 'Be instant in season, out of season,' he infers more than they will bear; and misapplies them into the bargain." (p. 171.) When and where? I do not remember applying them at all.

"When seasonable times are appointed for holy offices, to fly to unseasonable is factious." (p. 172.) But it is not clear, that five in the morning, and seven in the evening, (our usual times,) are unseasonable.

2. We come now directly to the second article, "'The wisdom from above is peaceable.' But the propagation of Methodism has occasioned many and great violations of peace. In order to know where the blame hereof lies, let us inquire the temper which 'makes for peace.' For we may be assured the fault lies not there, where such a temper is found." (p. 173.) Thus far we are quite agreed. "Now, the temper which makes for peace is prudence." This is one of the tempers which make for peace; others are kindness, meekness, patience. "This our Lord recommended by his own example." (pp. 174-177.) "But this Mr. W. calls, 'the mystery of iniquity, and the offspring of hell.'" (p. 178.) No, not this; not the prudence which our Lord recommends. I call that so, and that only, which the world, the men who know not God, style Christian prudence. By this I mean subtlety, craft, dissimulation; study to please man rather than God; the art of trimming between God and the world, of serving God and mammon. Will any serious man defend this? And this only do I condemn.

But you "say, 'Good sort of men,' as they are called, are 'the bane of all religion.'" (pp. 179, 180.) And I think so. By this "good sort of men," I mean, persons who have a liking to, but no sense of, religion; no real fear or love of God; no truly Christian tempers. "These steal

away the little zeal he has, that is, persuade him to be peaceable." No; persuade me to be like themselves,—without love either to God or man.

"Again, speaking of one, he says, 'Indulging himself in harmless company,' (vulgarly so called,) "he first made shipwreck of his zeal, then of his faith. In this I think he is right. The zeal and faith of a fanatic are such exact tallies, that neither can exist alone. They came into the world together, to disturb society and dishonour religion."

By zeal, I mean the flame of love, or fervent love to God and man; by faith, the substance or confidence of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen. Is this the zeal and faith of a fanatic? Then St. Paul was the greatest fanatic on earth. Did these come into the world to "disturb society and dishonour religion?"

"On the whole, we find Mr. W., by his own confession, entirely destitute of prudence. Therefore it must be ascribed to the want of this, if his preaching be attended with tumult and disorder." (p. 181.) *By his own confession?* Surely no. This I confess, and this only: what is falsely called prudence, I abhor; but true prudence I love and admire.

However, "You set at nought the discipline of the Church, by invading the province of the parochial minister:" (p. 182:) nay, if ever I preach at all, it must be in the province of some parochial minister. "By assembling in undue places, and at unfit times." I know of no times unfit for those who assemble. And I believe Hannam Mount and Rose Green were the most proper places under heaven for preaching to the colliers in Kingswood. "By scurrilous invectives against the governors and pastors of the National Church." This is an entire mistake. I dare not make any "scurrilous invectives" against any man. "Insolencies of this nature provoke warm men to tumult." But these insolencies do not exist. So that whatever tumult either warm or cool men raise, I am not chargeable therewith.

"To know the true character of Methodism." The present point is, to know the true character of John Wesley. Now, in order to know this, we need not inquire what others were before he was born. All therefore that follows, of old Precisians, Puritans, and Independents, may stand just as it is. (pp. 184–186.)

But "Mr. W. wanted to be persecuted." (p. 187.) As this is averred over and over, I will explain myself upon it, once for all. I never desired, or wanted to be persecuted.

Lives there who loves his pain?

I love and desire to "live peaceably with all men." "But persecution would not come at his call." However, it came uncalled; and, more than once or twice, it was not "mock persecution." It was not only the huzzas of the mob; showers of stones are something more than huzzas. And whosoever saw the mob either at Walsal or Cork, (to instance in no more,) saw that they were not "in jest," but in great earnest, eagerly athirst, not for sport, (as you suppose,) but for blood.

But though I do not desire persecution, I expect it. I must if I believe St. Paul: "All that will live godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution;" 2 Tim. iii, 12; either sooner or later, more or less, according to the wise providence of God. But I believe, "all these things work together for good to them that love God." And from a

conviction of this, they may even rejoice when they are "persecuted for righteousness' sake."

Yet, as I seldom "complain of ill treatment," so I am never "dissatisfied with good." (p. 188.) But I often wonder at it: and I once expressed my wonder nearly in the words of the old Athenian: "What have we done, that the world should be so civil to us?"

You conclude the head: "As he who persecutes is but the tool of him that invites persecution," (I know not who does,) "the crime finally comes home to him who set the rioter at work." (p. 191.) And is this all the proof that I am not peaceable? Then let all men judge if the charge is made good.

3. "The next mark of the celestial wisdom is, it is 'gentle, and easy to be entreated;' compliant and even obsequious to all men." And how does it appear that I am wanting in this? Why, he is "a severe condemner of his fellow citizens, and a severe exactor of conformity to his own observances." Now, the proof: (1.) "He tells us this in the very appellation he assumes." (p. 192.) Nay, I never assumed it at all. (2.) But "you say, 'Useless conversation is an abomination to the Lord.' And what is this, but to withstand St. Paul to the face?" Why, did St. Paul join in, or condemn, useless conversation? I rather think he reproves it. He condemns as *σαπρος λογος*, "putrid, stinking conversation," all that is not good, all that is not "to the use of edifying," and meet to "minister grace to the hearers," Eph. iv, 29. (3.) Mr. Wesley "resolved never to laugh, nor to speak a tittle of wordly things;" (p. 193;)—"though others may, nay, must." Pray add that, with the reason of my so resolving, namely, that I expected to die in a few days. If I expected it now, probably, I should resume the resolution. But, be it as it may, this proves nothing against my being both gentle, and easy to be entreated. (4.) "He says, Mr. G—— was a clumsy, overgrown, hardfaced man." (p. 194.) So he was. And this was the best of him. I spare him much in saying no more. But he is gone; let his ashes rest. (5.) "I heard a most miserable sermon, full of dull, senseless, improbable lies." It was so, from the beginning to the end. I have seldom heard the like. (6.) "'The persecution at St. Ives'" (which ended before I came; what I saw I do not term *persecution*) "'was owing to the indefatigable labours of Mr. H. and Mr. S., gentlemen worthy to be had in everlasting remembrance.' Here he tells us, it is his purpose to gibbet up the names of his two great persecutors to everlasting infamy." (p. 195.) These gentlemen had occasioned several innocent people to be turned out of their livelihood; and others to be outraged in the most shocking manner, and beat only not to death. My purpose is, by setting down their names, to make others afraid so to offend. Yet I say still, God forbid that I should rail, either at a Turk, infidel, or heretic. But I will bring to light the actions of such Christians, to be a warning to others. And all this I judge to be perfectly consistent with "the spirit of meekness." (p. 196.)

4. "The Fourth mark is, 'full of mercy and good fruits.' Let us inquire into the 'mercy and good fruits' of Mr. W." (p. 198.)

(1.) And First: "He has no mercy on his opposers. They pass with him under no other title, than that of the devil's servants, and the devil's children." (*Ib.*) This is far from true. Many have opposed

and do oppose me still, whom I believe to be children and servants of God. "We have seen him dispatching the principal of these children of the devil, without mercy, to their father." (p. 199.) No, not one. This has been affirmed over and over, but never proved yet. I fling about no exterminating judgments of God; I call down no fire from heaven. "But it would be for the credit of these new saints, to distinguish between rage and zeal." That is easily done. Rage is furious fire from hell; zeal is loving fire from heaven. (2.) "If what has been said above does not suffice, turn again to Mr. W.'s Journals: 'Mr. S., while he was speaking to the society against my brother and me, was struck raving mad.'" (p. 200.) He was so, before a hundred witnesses; though I was the last to believe it. "But, it seems, God is at length entreated for him, and has restored him to a sound mind." And is my relating this fact an instance of "dooming men to perdition?" (3.) "John Haydon cried aloud, 'Let the world see the just judgment of God.'" (p. 201.) He did. But let John Haydon look to that. It was he said so, not I. (4.) "I was informed of an awful providence. A poor wretch, who was here the last week, cursing and blaspheming, and labouring with all his might to hinder the word of God, had afterward boasted, he would come again on Sunday, and no man should stop his mouth then. But on Friday God laid his hand upon him, and on Sunday he was buried." (p. 202.) And was not this an awful providence? But yet I do not doom even him to perdition. (5.) "I saw a poor man, once joined with us, who wanted nothing in this world. A day or two before, he hanged himself, but was cut down before he was dead. He has been crying out ever since, God had left him, because he had left the children of God." This was his assertion, not mine. I neither affirm nor deny it. (6.) The true account of Lucy Godshall is this: "I buried the body of Lucy Godshall. After pressing toward the mark for more than two years, since she had known the pardoning love of God, she was for some time weary and faint in her mind, till I put her out of the bands. God blessed this greatly to her soul, so that, in a short time, she was admitted again. Soon after, being at home, she felt the love of God in an unusual manner poured into her heart. She fell down upon her knees, and delivered up her soul and body into the hands of God. In the instant, the use of all her limbs was taken away, and she was in a burning fever. For three days, she mightily praised God, and rejoiced in him all the day long. She then cried out, 'Now Satan hath desired to have me, that he may sift me as wheat.' Immediately darkness and heaviness fell upon her, which continued till Saturday, the 4th instant. On Sunday the light shone again upon her heart. About ten in the evening, one said to her, 'Jesus is ready to receive your soul.' She said, 'Amen! Amen!' closed her eyes, and died." (Vol. iii, p. 289.) Is this brought as a proof of my inexorableness, or of my dooming men to perdition?

(7.) "I found Nicholas Palmer in great weakness of body, and heaviness of spirit. We wrestled with God in his behalf; and our labour was not in vain. His soul was comforted; and a few hours after he quietly fell asleep." A strange proof this likewise, either of inexorableness, or of "dooming men to perdition!" Therefore this charge too stands totally unsupported. Here is no proof of my unmercifulness yet.

“Good fruits come next to be considered, which Mr. Wesley’s idea of true religion does not promise. He saith,” (I will repeat the words a little at large, that their true sense may more clearly appear,) “‘In explaining those words, *The kingdom of God*, or true religion, *is not meats and drinks*, I was led to show, that religion does not properly consist in harmlessness, using the means of grace, and doing good, that is, helping our neighbours, chiefly by giving alms; but that a man might both be harmless, use the means of grace, and do much good, and yet have no true religion at all.’” (*Tract*, p. 203.) He may so. Yet whoever has true religion, must be “zealous of good works.” And zeal for all good works, is, according to my idea, an essential ingredient of true religion.

“Spiritual cures are all the good fruits he pretends to.” (pp. 204, 205.) Not quite all, says William Kirkman, with some others. “A few of his spiritual cures we will set in a fair light: ‘The first time I preached at Swalwell,’” (chiefly to colliers, and workers in the iron work,) “‘none seemed to be convinced, only stunned.’” I mean, amazed at what they heard, though they were the first principles of religion. “But he brings them to their senses with a vengeance.” No, not them. These were different persons. Are they lumped together, in order to set things in a fair light? The whole paragraph runs thus: “I carefully examined those who had lately cried out in the congregation. Some of these, I found, could give no account at all, how or wherefore they had done so; only that of a sudden they dropped down, they knew not how; and what they afterward said or did they knew not. Others could just remember, they were in fear, but could not tell what they were in fear of. Several said they were afraid of the devil; and this was all they knew. But a few gave a more intelligible account of the piercing sense they then had of their sins, both inward and outward, which were set in array against them round about; of the dread they were in of the wrath of God, and the punishment they had deserved, into which they seemed to be just falling, without any way to escape. One of them told me, ‘I was as if I was just falling down from the highest place I had ever seen. I thought the devil was pushing me off, and that God had forsaken me.’ Another said, ‘I felt the very fire of hell already kindled in my breast; and all my body was in as much pain, as if I had been in a burning fiery furnace.’ What wisdom is this which rebuketh these, that they should hold their peace? Nay, let such a one cry after Jesus of Nazareth, till he saith, ‘Thy faith hath made thee whole.’” (*Journal*, vol. iii, p. 276.)

Now follow the proofs of my driving men mad: (1.) “Another of Dr. Monro’s patients came to ask my advice. I found no reason to believe she had been any otherwise mad, than every one is that is deeply convinced of sin.” (*Tract*, p. 208.) Let this prove all that it can prove. (2.) “A middle-aged woman was really distracted.” Yes, before I ever saw her, or she me. (3.) “I could not but be under some concern with regard to one or two persons, who were tormented in an unaccountable manner, and seemed to be indeed lunatic, as well as sore vexed.” True; for a time. But the deliverance of one of them is related in the very next paragraph. (4.) “Two or three are gone quite distracted; that is, they mourn and refuse to be comforted till they have redemption.” (p. 209.) (5.) “I desired one to visit Mrs. G. in Bedlam, put in by her husband as a mad woman.” But she never was mad in any degree, as he himself

afterward acknowledged. (6.) "One was so deeply convinced of her ungodliness, that she cried out day and night, 'Lord, save, or I perish!' All the neighbours agreed she was stark mad." But I did not make her so. For this was before she ever saw my face. Now let every one judge, whether here is yet a single proof that I drive men mad.

"The time when this spiritual madness was at its height, he calls a glorious time." (p. 210.) I call that a glorious time when many notorious sinners are converted to God; (whether with any outward symptoms or none, for those are no way essential;) and when many are in the triumph of faith, greatly rejoicing in God their Saviour.

"But though Mr. Wesley does so well in turning fools into madmen, yet his craftmaster is certainly one Mr. Wheatley, of whom he gives this extraordinary account:" (p. 211.)

"A poor woman (on Wednesday, September 17, 1740) said, it was four years (namely, in Sept. 1736, above a year before I left Georgia) since her son, by hearing a sermon of Mr. Wheatley's, fell into great uneasiness. She thought he was ill and would have sent for a physician. But he said, 'No, no; send for Mr. Wheatley.' He was sent for, and came; and after asking a few questions, told her, 'The boy is mad. Get a coach, and carry him to Dr. Monro. Use my name. I have sent several such to him.' Who this Mr. Wheatley is, I know not." He was lecturer at Spitalfields church. The event was, after the apothecary had half murdered him, he was discharged, and the lad soon recovered his strength. His senses he never had lost. The supposing this, was a blunder from the beginning.

"These are the exploits which Mr. Wesley calls blessings from God." (p. 212.) Certainly I do, both repentance and faith. "And which therefore we may call the good fruits of his ministry." May God increase them a hundred fold! "What the Apostle calls 'good fruits,' namely, doing much good, Mr. Wesley tells us belongs not to true religion." I never told any man so yet. I tell all men just the contrary.

I may then safely leave all mankind to judge, whether a single article of the charge against me has yet been made good. So much for the first charge, that I am a madman. Now for the second, that I am a knave.

5. The proof is short: "Every enthusiast is a knave; but he is an enthusiast; therefore he is a knave." I deny both the first and second proposition. Nay, the first is proved thus: "Enthusiasm must always be accompanied with craft and knavery." (p. 213.) It is often so, but not always; for there may be honest enthusiasts. Therefore the whole account of that odd combination which follows is ingenious, but proves nothing. (pp. 214-218.)

Yet I must touch upon one or two parts of it. "An enthusiast thinks he is dispensed with in breaking, nay, that he is authorized to break, the common laws of morality." Does every enthusiast? Then I am none; for I never thought any such thing. I believe no man living is authorized to break, or dispensed with in breaking, any law of morality. I know, whoever (habitually) breaks one of the least of these, "shall be called least in the kingdom of heaven."

"Can any but an enthusiast believe, that he may use guile to promote the glory of God?" Yes, ten thousand that are no enthusiasts firmly believe this. How few do we find that do not believe it! that do not

plead for officious lies! How few will subscribe to St. Augustine's declaration, (to which I assent with my whole heart,) "I would not tell a wilful lie, to save the souls of the whole world!"

But to return: "'The wisdom from above is without partiality and without hypocrisy.' Partiality consists in dispensing an unequal measure in our transactions with others; hypocrisy, in attempting to cover that unequal measure by prevarication and false pretences."

The former of these definitions is not clear; the latter, neither clear nor adequate to the defined.

But let this pass. My partiality is now the point. What are the proofs of it? (1.) "His followers are always the children of God, his opposers the children of the devil." (p. 220.) Neither so, nor so. I never affirmed either one or the other universally. That some of the former are children of God, and some of the latter children of the devil, I believe. But what will this prove?

"His followers are directed by inward feelings, the impulses of an inflamed fancy;" (no more than they are directed by the Alcoran;) "his opposers, by the Scripture." What, while they are cursing, swearing, blaspheming; beating and maiming men that have done them no wrong; and treating women in a manner too shocking to be repeated? (2.) The next proof is very extraordinary. My words are, "I was with two persons, who, I doubt, are properly enthusiasts: for, first, they think to attain the end without the means, which is enthusiasm properly so called. Again, they think themselves inspired of God, and are not. But false imaginary inspiration is enthusiasm. That theirs is only imaginary inspiration appears hence,—it contradicts the law and the testimony." (p. 221.)

Now, by what art of man can this be made a proof of my partiality? Why, thus: "These are wise words. But what do they amount to? Only to this; that these two persons would not take out their patents of inspiration from his office." But what proof is there of this round assertion? Truly, none at all.

Full as extraordinary is the third proof of my partiality. "Miss Gr—— told Mrs. Sp——, Mr. Wesley was a Papist. Upon this Miss Gr—— is anathematized. And we are told that, in consequence, she had lately been raving mad, and, as such, was tied down in her bed. Yet all these circumstances of madness have befallen his favourite saints, whom he has vindicated from the opprobrium." (p. 222.)

The passage in my Journal stands thus: "Mrs. Spa—— told me, two or three nights since, 'Miss Gr—— met me, and said, *I assure you, Mr. Wesley is a Papist.*' Perhaps I need observe no more upon this, than that Miss Gr—— had lately been raving mad, in consequence of a fever; (not of an anathema, which never had any being;) that, as such, she was tied down in her bed; and as soon as she was suffered to go abroad, went to Mr. Whitefield, to inquire of him whether she was not a Papist. But he quickly perceived she was only a lunatic; the nature of her disorder soon betraying itself." Certainly then my allowing her to be mad is no proof of my partiality. I will allow every one to be so who is attended with "all these circumstances of madness."

(4.) "He pronounces sentence of enthusiasm upon another, and tells us wherefore, without any disguise: 'Here I took leave of a poor, mad,

original enthusiast, who had been scattering lies in every quarter.' ” It was the famous John Adams, since confined at Box, whose capital lie, the source of the rest, was that he was a prophet, greater than Moses, or any of the Apostles. And is the pronouncing him a madman a proof of my partiality?

(5.) “I had much conversation with Mr. Simpson, an original enthusiast. I desired him in the evening to give an exhortation. He did so, and spoke many good things, in a manner peculiar to himself;”—without order or connection, head or tail; and in a language very near as mystical as that of Jacob Behmen. “When he had done, I summed up what he had said, methodizing and explaining it. Oh what pity it is, this well-meaning man should ever speak without an interpreter!” (p. 223.)

Let this passage likewise stand as it is, and who can guess how it is to prove my partiality? But by a sleight-of-hand the thing is done. “How differently does Mr. Wesley treat these two enthusiasts! The first is accused of spreading lies of his master.” (No, he never was any disciple of mine.) “On which Mr. W. took his leave of him;—a gentle expression, to signify the thrusting him out, head and shoulders, from the society of saints.” It signifies neither more nor less than that I went out of the room and left him. “The other’s enthusiasm is made to consist only in want of method.” No. His enthusiasm did not consist in this. It was the cause of it. But he was quite another man than John Adams; and, I believe, a right honest man.

(6.) “I was both surprised and grieved at a genuine instance of enthusiasm. I. B., who had received a sense of the love of God a few days before, came riding through the town, hallooing, and shouting, and driving all the people before him, telling them God had told him he should be a king, and should tread all his enemies under his feet. I sent him home immediately to his work; and advised him to cry day and night to God that he might be lowly in heart, lest Satan should again ‘get an advantage over him.’”

What this proves, or is intended to prove, I cannot tell. Certainly, neither this, nor any of the preceding passages, prove the point now in question,—my partiality. So this likewise is wholly unproved still.

“We shall end, where every fanatic leader ends, with his hypocrisy.” (p. 227.) Five arguments are brought in proof of this. I shall take them in their order. (1.) “After having heaped up miracles one upon another, he sneaks away under the protection of a puny wonder: ‘About five I began near the Keelman’s Hospital, many thousands standing round. The wind was high just before, but scarce a breath was felt all the time we assembled before God. I praise God for this also. Is it enthusiasm to see God in every benefit we receive?’ It is not; the enthusiasm consists in believing those benefits to be conferred through a change in the established course of nature. But here he insinuates, that he meant no more by his miracles, than the seeing God in every benefit we receive.” (pp. 228, 229.) That sudden and total ceasing of the wind I impute to the particular providence of God. This I mean by seeing God therein. But this I knew many would count enthusiasm. In guarding against it, I had an eye to that single incident, and no other. Nor did I insinuate any thing more than I expressed in as plain a manner as I could.

A little digression follows: “A friend of his advises, not to establish

the power of working miracles, as the great criterion of a divine mission; seeing the agreement of doctrines with Scripture, is the only infallible rule." (p. 230.) "But Christ himself establishes the power of working miracles, as the great criterion of a divine mission." (p. 231.) True, of a mission to be the Saviour of the world; to put a period to the Jewish, and introduce the Christian dispensation. And whoever pretends to such a mission will stand in need of such credentials.

(2.) "He shifts and doubles no less" (neither less nor more) "as to the ecstasies of his saints. Sometimes they are of God, sometimes of the devil; but he is constant in this,—that natural causes have no hand in them." This is not true: in what are here termed ecstasies, strong joy or grief, attended with various bodily symptoms, I have openly affirmed, again and again, that natural causes have a part: nor did I ever shift or double on the head. I have steadily and uniformly maintained, that, if the mind be affected to such a degree, the body must be affected by the laws of the vital union. The mind I believe was, in many of those cases, affected by the Spirit of God, in others by the devil, and in some by both; and, in consequence of this, the body was affected also. (3.) "Mr. W. says, 'I fear we have grieved the Spirit of the jealous God by questioning his work, and by blaspheming it, by imputing it to nature, or even to the devil.'" (pp. 232, 233.) True; by imputing the conviction and conversion of sinners, which is the work of God alone, (because of these unusual circumstances attending it,) either to nature or to the devil. This is flat and plain. No prevarication yet. Let us attend to the next proof of it: "Innumerable cautions were given me, not to regard visions or dreams, or to fancy people had remission of sins because of their cries, or tears, or outward professions. The sum of my answer was, You deny that God does now work these effects; at least, that he works them in this manner. I affirm both. I have seen very many persons changed in a moment from a spirit of fear, horror, despair, to a spirit of love, joy, peace. What I have to say touching visions and dreams is this: I know several persons in whom this great change was wrought in a dream, or during a strong representation to the eye of their mind of Christ, either on the cross, or in glory. This is the fact; let any judge of it as they please. And that such a change was then wrought, appears (not from their shedding tears only, or falling into fits, or crying out; these are not the fruits, as you seem to suppose, whereby I judge, but) from the whole tenor of their life; till then many ways wicked, from that time holy, and just, and good." "Nay, he is so convinced of its being the work of God, that the horrid blasphemies which ensued, he ascribes to the abundance of joy which God had given to a poor mad woman." (p. 234.) Do I ascribe those blasphemies to her joy in God? No; but to her pride. My words are, "I met with one, who, having been lifted up with the abundance of joy which God had given her, had fallen into such blasphemies and vain imaginations as are not common to men. In the afternoon I found another instance, nearly, I fear, of the same kind; one who set her private revelations, so called, on the self-same foot with the written word." (p. 235.)

But how is this to prove prevarication? "Why, on a sudden, he directly revokes all he had advanced. He says, 'I told them they were not to judge of the spirit whereby any one spoke, either by appearances,

or by common report, or by their own inward feelings; no, not by any dreams, visions, or revelations, supposed to be made to the soul, any more than by their tears, or any involuntary effects wrought upon their bodies. I warned them, that all these things were in themselves of a doubtful, disputable nature: they might be from God, or they might not; and were therefore not simply to be relied on, any more than simply to be condemned; but to be tried by a farther rule, to be brought to the only certain test, *the law and the testimony.* Now, is not this a formal recantation of what he had said just above?" (p. 235.) Nothing less, as I will show in two minutes, to every calm, impartial man. What I say now, I have said any time this thirty years; I have never varied therefrom for an hour: "Every thing disputable is to be brought to the only certain test, 'the law and the testimony.'" "But did not you talk just now of visions and dreams?" Yes; but not as of a test of any thing; only as a channel through which God is sometimes pleased to convey "love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, fidelity, meekness, temperance," the indisputable fruit of his Spirit: and these, we may observe, wherever they exist, must be inwardly felt. Now, where is the prevarication, where the formal recantation? They are vanished into air.

But here is more proof: "At length he gives up all these divine agitations to the devil: 'I inquired,' says he, 'into the case of those who had lately cried out aloud during the preaching. I found this had come upon every one of them in a moment, without any previous notice. In that moment they dropped down, lost all their strength, and were seized with violent pain. Some said they felt as if a sword were running through them; others, as if their whole body was tearing in pieces. These symptoms I can no more impute to any natural cause, than to the Spirit of God. I make no doubt but it was Satan tearing them as they were coming to Christ.'" (p. 236.)

"Now, these were the very symptoms which he had before ascribed to the Spirit of God." (p. 237.) Never in my life. Indeed some of them I never met with before. Those outward symptoms which I had met with before, bodily agitations in particular, I did not ascribe to the Spirit of God, but to the natural union of the soul and body. And those symptoms which I now ascribe to the devil, I never ascribed to any other cause. The second proof of my prevarication or hypocrisy is therefore just as conclusive as the first.

3. Now for the Third: "Mr. W. before spoke contemptuously of orthodoxy, to take in the sectaries. But when he would take off churchmen, then orthodoxy is the *unum necessarium.*" [One essential.] Did I ever say so? No more than, in the other extreme, speak contemptuously of it. "Yes, you say, 'I described the plain, old religion of the Church of England, which is now almost every where spoken against under the new name of Methodism.'" Very well; and what shadow of prevarication is here? May I not still declare the plain, old religion of the Church of England, and yet very consistently aver, that right opinion is a very slender part of it?

4. The next passage, I am sorry to say, is neither related with seriousness nor truth: "We have seen him inviting persecution." Never; though I "rejoiced," in the instance alleged, at having an op-

portunity of calling a multitude of the most abandoned sinners to repentance.

What is peculiarly unfair, is, the lame, false account is palmed upon me, by "So he himself tells the story." I must therefore tell the story once more, in as few words as I can:—

"Sunday, August 7, 1737. I repelled Mrs. W. from the communion. Tuesday, 9. I was required by Mr. Bailiff Parker to appear at the next court. Thursday, 11. Mr. Causton, her uncle, said to me, 'Give your reasons for repelling her before the whole congregation.' I answered: 'Sir, if you insist upon it, I will.' But I heard no more of it. Afterward he said, (but not to me,) 'Mr. W. had repelled Sophy out of revenge, because he had made proposals of marriage to her, which she rejected.' Tuesday, 16. Mrs. W. made affidavit of it. Thursday, September 1. A grand jury, prepared by Mr. Causton, found, that 'John Wesley had broken the laws of the realm, by speaking and writing to Mrs. W. against her husband's consent, and by repelling her from the communion.'

"Friday, 2, was the third court-day at which I appeared, since my being required so to do by Mr. Parker. I moved for an immediate hearing, but was put off till the next court-day. On the next court-day I appeared again, as also at the two courts following; but could not be heard. Thursday, November 3, I appeared in court again; and yet again on Tuesday, November 22, on which day Mr. C. desired to speak with me, and read me an affidavit, in which it was affirmed, that I 'abused Mr. C. in his own house, calling him liar, villain, and so on.' It was likewise repeated, that I had been reprimanded at the last court, by Mr. C. as an enemy to, and hinderer of, the public peace.

"My friends agreed with me, that the time we looked for was now come. And the next morning, calling on Mr. C. I told him, I designed to set out for England immediately.

"Friday, December 2. I proposed to set out for Carolina about noon. But about ten, the magistrates sent for me, and told me, I must not go out of the province; for I had not answered the allegations laid against me. I replied, 'I have appeared at six or seven courts, in order to answer them. But I was not suffered so to do.' After a few more words, I said, 'You use me very ill. And so you do the trustees. You know your business, and I know mine.'

"In the afternoon, they published an order, forbidding any to assist me in going out of the province. But I knew I had no more business there. So as soon as evening prayer was over, the tide then serving, I took boat at the Bluff, for Carolina."

This is the plain account of the matter. I need only add a remark or two on the pleasantry of my censor. "He had recourse, as usual, to his revelations. 'I consulted my friends, whether God did not call me to England.'" (p. 242.) Not by revelations; these were out of the question; but by clear, strong reasons. "The magistrate soon quickened his pace, by declaring him an enemy to the public peace." No; that senseless assertion of Mr. C. made me go neither sooner nor later. "The reader has seen him long languish for persecution." What, before November, 1737? I never languished for it, either before or since. But I submit to what pleases God. "To hide his poltroonery in a bravado, he gave public notice of his apostolical intention." (p. 243.) Kind and civil! I may be excused from taking notice of what follows. It is equally serious and genteel.

"Had his longings for persecution been without hypocrisy." The same mistake throughout. I never longed or professed to long for it

at all. But if I had professed it ever since I returned from Georgia, what was done before I returned could not prove that profession to be hypocrisy. So all this ribaldry serves no end; only to throw much dirt, if haply some may stick.

Meantime, how many untruths are here in one page! (1.) "He made the path doubly perplexed for his followers. (2.) He left them to answer for his crimes. (3.) He longed for persecution. (4.) He went as far as Georgia for it. (5.) The truth of his mission was questioned by the magistrate, and (6.) decried by the people, (7.) for his false morals. (8.) The Gospel was wounded through the sides of its pretended missionary. (9.) The first Christian preachers offered up themselves." So did I. "Instead of this, our paltry mimic." (p. 244.) *Bona verba!* [Gently!] Surely a writer should reverence himself, how much soever he despises his opponent. So, upon the whole, this proof of my hypocrisy is as lame as the three former.

5. "We have seen above, how he sets all prudence at defiance." None but false prudence. "But he uses a different language when his rivals are to be restrained." No; always the same, both with regard to false prudence and true.

"But take the affair from the beginning. He began to suspect rivals in the year thirty-nine; for he says, 'Remembering how many that came after me were preferred before me.'" The very next words show in what sense. They "had attained unto the law of righteousness;" I had not. But what has this to do with rivals?

However, go on: "At this time, December 8, 1739, his opening the Bible afforded him but small relief. He sunk so far in his despondency, as to doubt if God would not lay him aside, and send other labourers into his harvest." But this was another time. It was June 22; and the occasion of the doubt is expressly mentioned: "I preached, but had no life or spirit in me, and was much in doubt," on that account. Not on account of Mr. Whitefield. He did not "now begin to set up for himself." We were in full union; nor was there the least shadow of rivalry or contention between us. I still sincerely "praise God for his wisdom in giving different talents to different preachers;" (p. 250;) and particularly for his giving Mr. Whitefield the talents which I have not.

6. What farther proof of hypocrisy? Why, "he had given innumerable flirts of contempt in his Journals against human learning." (pp. 252, 253.) Where? I do not know. Let the passages be cited; else, let me speak for it ever so much, it will prove nothing. "At last he was forced to have recourse to what he had so much scorned, I mean, prudence." (p. 255.) All a mistake. I hope never to have recourse to false prudence; and true prudence I never scorned.

"He might have met Mr. Whitefield half way; but he was too formidable a rival. With a less formidable one he pursues this way. 'I laboured,' says he, 'to convince Mr. Gr—,' (my assistant, not rival,) "'that he had not done well, in confuting, as he termed it, the sermon I preached the Sunday before. I asked, Will you meet me half way?'" (The words following put my meaning beyond all dispute :) "'I will never publicly preach against you. Will not you against me?' Here we see a fair invitation for Mr. Gr— to play the hypocrite with him." (*Ib.*) Not in the least. Each might simply deliver his own sentiments

without preaching against the other. "We conclude that Mr. Wesley, amidst his warmest exclamations against all prudence, had still a *succedaneum*, which indeed he calls prudence; but its true name is craft." (p. 257.)

Craft is an essential part of worldly prudence. This I detest and abhor. And let him prove it upon me that can. But it must be by better arguments than the foregoing. Truly Christian prudence, such as was recommended by our Lord, and practised by him and his Apostles, I reverence, and desire to learn, being convinced of its abundant usefulness.

I know nothing material in the argument which I have left untouched. And I must now refer it to all the world, whether, for all that has been brought to the contrary, I may not still have a measure of the "wisdom from above, which is first pure, then peaceable, gentle, easy to be intreated, full of mercy and good fruits, without partiality, and without hypocrisy."

I have spoke abundantly more concerning myself than I intended or expected. Yet I must beg leave to add a few words more. How far I am from being an enemy to prudence, I hope appears already. It remains to inquire, whether I am an enemy to reason or natural religion.

"As to the first, he frankly tells us, the father of lies was the father of reasonings also. For he says, 'I observed more and more the advantage Satan had gained over us. Many were thrown into idle reasonings.'" (p. 289.) Yes, and they were hurt thereby. But reason is good, though idle reasonings are evil. Nor does it follow that I am an enemy to the one because I condemn the other.

"However, you are an enemy to natural religion. For you say, 'A Frenchman gave us a full account of the Chicasaws. They do nothing but eat, and drink, and smoke, from morning till night, and almost from night till morning. For they rise at any hour of the night when they awake, and, after eating and drinking as much as they can, go to sleep again. Hence we could not but remark what is the religion of nature, properly so called, or that religion which flows from natural reason, unassisted by revelation.'" (p. 290.) I believe this dispute may be cut short by only defining the term. What does your lordship mean by *natural religion*? a system of principles? But I mean by it, in this place, *men's natural manners*. These certainly "flow from their natural passions and appetites," with that degree of reason which they have. And this, in other instances, is not contemptible; though it is not sufficient to teach them true religion.

II. I proceed to consider, in the Second place, what is advanced concerning the operations of the Holy Spirit.

"Our blessed Redeemer promised to send among his followers the Holy Ghost, called 'the Spirit of Truth' and 'the Comforter,' which should co-operate with man, in establishing his faith, and in perfecting his obedience; or, in other words, should sanctify him to redemption." (p. 2.)

Accordingly, "the sanctification and redemption of the world, man cannot frustrate nor render ineffectual. For it is not in his power to make that to be undone, which is once done and perfected." (p. 337.)

I do not comprehend. Is all the world sanctified? Is not to be *sanctified* the same as to be *made holy*? Is all the world holy? And can no man frustrate his own sanctification?

“The Holy Ghost establishes our faith, and perfects our obedience, by enlightening the understanding and rectifying the will.” (p. 3.)

“In the former respect, 1. He gave the gift of tongues at the day of Pentecost.

“Indeed, enthusiasts, in their ecstasies, have talked very fluently in languages they had a very imperfect knowledge of in their sober intervals.” I can no more believe this on the credit of Lord Shaftesbury and a Popish exorcist, than I can believe the tale of a hundred people talking without tongues, on the credit of Dr. Middleton.

“The other gifts of the Spirit St. Paul reckons up thus: ‘To one is given the word of wisdom; to another the word of knowledge; to another the gifts of healing; to another working of miracles; to another prophecy; to another the discerning of spirits.’” (p. 23.) But why are the other three left out?—Faith, divers kinds of tongues, and the interpretation of tongues.

I believe the “word of wisdom” means, light to explain the manifold wisdom of God in the grand scheme of Gospel salvation; the “word of knowledge,” a power of explaining the Old Testament types and prophecies. “Faith” may mean an extraordinary trust in God, under the most difficult and dangerous circumstances; “the gifts of healing,” a miraculous power of curing diseases; “the discerning of spirits,” a supernatural discernment, whether men were upright or not; whether they were qualified for offices in the Church; and whether they who professed to speak by inspiration, really did so or not.

But “the richest of the fruits of the Spirit is the inspiration of Scripture.” (p. 30.) Herein the promise, that “the Comforter” should “abide with us for ever,” is eminently fulfilled. For though his ordinary influence occasionally assists the faithful of all ages, yet his constant abode and supreme illumination is in the Scriptures of the New Testament. I mean, he is there only as the Illuminator of the understanding.” (p. 39.)

But does this agree with the following words?—“Nature is not able to keep a mean: but grace is able; for ‘the Spirit helpeth our infirmities.’ We must apply to the Guide of truth, to prevent our being ‘carried about with divers and strange doctrines.’” (p. 340.) Is he not, then, every where, to illuminate the understanding, as well as to rectify the will? And, indeed, do we not need the one as continually as the other?

“But how did he inspire the Scripture? He so directed the writers, that no considerable error should fall from them.” (p. 45.) Nay, will not the allowing there is any error in Scripture, shake the authority of the whole?

Again: What is the difference between the immediate and the virtual influence of the Holy Spirit? I know, Milton speaks of “virtual or immediate touch.” But most incline to think, virtual touch is no touch at all.

“Were the style of the New Testament utterly rude and barbarous, and abounding with every fault that can possibly deform a language; this is so far from proving such language not divinely inspired, that it is one certain mark of this original.” (p. 55.)

A vehement paradox this! But it is not proved yet, and probably never will.

“The labours of those who have attempted to defend the purity of Scripture Greek have been very idly employed.” (p. 66.)

Others think they have been very wisely employed, and that they have abundantly proved their point.

Having now “considered the operations of the Holy Spirit as the Guide of truth, who clears and enlightens the understanding, I proceed to consider him as the Comforter, who purifies and supports the will.” (p. 89.)

“Sacred antiquity is full in its accounts of the sudden and entire change made by the Holy Spirit in the dispositions and manners of those whom it had enlightened; instantaneously effacing their evil habits, and familiarizing them to the performance of every good action.” (p. 90.)

“No natural cause could effect this. Neither fanaticism nor superstition, nor both of them, will account for so sudden and lasting a conversion.” (*Ibid.*)

“Superstition never effects any considerable change in the manners. Its utmost force is just enough to make us exact in the ceremonious offices of religion, or to cause some acts of penitence, as death approaches.” (p. 91.)

“Fanaticism, indeed, acts with greater violence, and by influencing the will, frequently forces the manners from their bent, and sometimes effaces the strongest impressions of custom and nature. But this fervour, though violent, is rarely lasting; never so long as to establish the new system into a habit. So that when its rage subsides, as it very soon does, (but where it drives into downright madness,) the bias on the will keeps abating, till all the former habitudes recover their relaxed tone.” (p. 92.)

Never were reflections more just than these. And whoever applies them to the matters of fact, which daily occur all over England, and particularly in London, will easily discern, that the changes now wrought cannot be accounted for by natural causes: not by superstition; for the manners are changed; the whole life and conversation: not by fanaticism; for these changes are so lasting, “as to establish the new system into a habit:” not by mere reason; for they are sudden; therefore they can only be wrought by the Holy Spirit.

As to Savanarola’s being a fanatic, or assuming the person of a prophet, I cannot take a Popish historian’s word. And what a man says on the rack proves nothing; no more than his dying silent. Probably this might arise from shame, and consciousness of having accused himself falsely under the torture.

“But how does the Spirit, as Comforter, abide with us for ever? He abides with the Church for ever, as well personally in his office of Comforter, as virtually in his office of Enlightener.” (p. 96.)

Does he not then abide with the Church personally in both these respects? What is meant by *abiding virtually*? And what is the difference between *abiding virtually*, and *abiding personally*?

“The question will be, Does he still exercise his office in the same extraordinary manner as in the Apostles’ days?” (p. 97.)

I know none that affirms it. “St. Paul has determined this question. ‘Charity,’ says he, ‘never faileth: but whether there be prophecies, they shall fail; whether there be tongues, they shall cease; whether there be knowledge, it shall vanish away,’ 1 Cor. xiii, 8, &c.”

“The common opinion is, that this respects another life, as he enforces his argument by this observation: ‘Now we see through a glass darkly; but then face to face: now we know in part; but then shall we know, even as also we are known.’” (p. 99.)

“But the Apostle means, charity is to accompany the Church in all its stages; whereas prophecy and all the rest are only bestowed during its infant state, to support it against the delusions and powers of darkness.” (p. 100.)

“The Corinthians abounded in these gifts, but were wanting in charity. And this the Apostle here exposes, by proving charity to be superior to them all, both in its qualities and duration. The three first verses declare that the other gifts are useless without charity. The next four specify the qualities of charity; the remaining six declare its continuance: ‘Charity never faileth: but whether there be prophecies, they shall fail; whether there be tongues they shall cease; whether there be knowledge it shall vanish away.’ In the next verse he gives the reason: ‘For we know in part, and we prophesy in part; but when that which is perfect is come, then that which is in part shall be done away:’ that is, when that Christian life, the lines of which are marked out by the Gospel, shall arrive to its full vigour and maturity, then the temporary aids, given to subdue prejudice, and to support the weak, shall, like scaffolding, be removed. In other words, when that Christian life, wherein the Apostles and first Christians were but infants, shall arrive to its full vigour and maturity in their successors, then miracles shall cease.” (p. 102.) But I fear that time is not yet come. I doubt, none that are now alive enjoy more of the vigour and maturity of the Christian life than the very first Christians did.

“To show that the loss of these will not be regretted when the Church has advanced from a state of infancy to manhood,” (alas the day! Were the Apostles but infants to us?) “he illustrates the case by an elegant similitude: ‘When I was a child, I spake as a child;—but when I became a man, I put away childish things.’ His next remark, concerning the defects of human knowledge, is only an occasional answer to an objection. And the last verse shows that the superior duration of charity refers to the present life only: ‘Now abideth faith, hope, charity, these three: but the greatest of these is charity.’ That is, you may perhaps object, Faith and hope will likewise remain in the Church, when prophecy, tongues, and knowledge are ceased: they will so; but still charity is the greatest, because of its excellent qualities.” (p. 107.)

The last verse shows! Is not this begging the question? How forced is all this! The plain natural meaning of the passage is, love (the absolute necessity and the nature of which is shown in the foregoing verses) has another commendation,—it “never faileth;” it accompanies and adorns us to eternity. “But whether they be prophecies, they shall fail,” when all things are fulfilled, and God is all in all: “Whether there be tongues, they shall cease.” One language shall prevail among all the inhabitants of heaven, while the low, imperfect languages of earth are forgotten. The “knowledge,” likewise, we now so eagerly pursue, shall then “vanish away.” As star-light is lost in that of the mid-day sun, so our present knowledge in the light of eternity. “For we know in part, and we prophesy in part.” We have here but short, narrow, imperfect conceptions, even of the things round about us, and much more of the deep things of God. And even the prophecies which men deliver from God are far from taking in the whole of future events. “But when that which is perfect is come,” at death, and in the last day, “that which is in part shall be done away.” Both that low, imperfect, glimmering light, which is all the knowledge we can now attain to; and

these slow and unsatisfactory methods of attaining, as well as of imparting it to others. "When I was a child, I talked as a child, I understood as a child, I reasoned as a child." As if he had said, In our present state we are mere infants, compared to what we shall be hereafter. "But when I became a man, I put away childish things;" and a proportionable change shall we all find, when we launch into eternity. Now we see even the things which surround us by means of a glass or mirror, in a dim, faint, obscure manner, so that every thing is a kind of riddle to us; but then we shall see, not a faint reflection, but the objects themselves, face to face, directly and distinctly. "Now I know but in part." Even when God reveals things to me, great part of them is still kept under the veil. "But then shall I know even as I also am known;" in a clear, full, comprehensive manner, in some measure like God, who penetrates the centre of every object, and sees, at one glance, through my soul and all things. "And now," during the present life, "abide these three, faith, hope, love; but the greatest of these," in its duration, as well as the excellence of its nature, "is love." Faith, hope, love, are the sum of perfection on earth: love alone is the sum of perfection in heaven.

"It appears, then, that the miraculous powers of the Church were to cease upon its perfect establishment." (p. 107.) Nothing like it appears from this Scripture. But supposing it did, is Christianity perfectly established yet? even nominal Christianity? Mr. Brerewood took large pains to be fully informed; and, according to his account, five parts in six of the known world are Mohammedans or Pagans to this day. If so, Christianity is yet far from being perfectly established, either in Europe, Asia, Africa, or America.

"Having now established the fact," (wonderfully established!) "we may inquire into the fitness of it. There were two causes of the extraordinary operations of the Holy Spirit,—one to manifest his mission, (and this was done once for all,) the other to comfort and instruct the Church." (p. 110.)

"At his first descent on the Apostles, he found their minds rude and uninformed, strangers to all heavenly knowledge, and utterly averse to the Gospel. He illuminated their minds with all necessary truth. For a rule of faith not being yet composed," (No! Had they not "the Law and the Prophets?") "some extraordinary infusion of his virtue was still necessary. But when this rule was perfected, part of this office was transferred upon the sacred canon; and his enlightening grace was not to be expected in such abundant measure, as to make the recipients infallible guides." (p. 112.)

Certainly it was not. If this is all that is intended, no one will gainsay.

"Yet modern fanatics pretend to as high a degree of divine communications, as if no such rule were in being;" (I do not;) "or, at least, as if that rule needed the farther assistance of the Holy Spirit to explain his own meaning." This is quite another thing. I do firmly believe, (and what serious man does not?) *omnis scriptura legi debet eo Spiritu quo scripta est*: "We need the same Spirit to understand the Scripture, which enabled the holy men of old to write it."

"Again, the whole strength of human prejudices was then set in opposition to the Gospel, to overcome the obstinacy and violence of

which, nothing less than the power of the Holy One was sufficient. At present, whatever prejudices may remain, it draws the other way." (p. 113.) What, toward holiness? toward temperance and chastity? toward justice, mercy, and truth? Quite the reverse. And to overcome the obstinacy and violence of the heart prejudices which still lie against these, the power of the Holy One is as necessary now, as ever it was from the beginning of the world.

"A farther reason for the ceasing of miracles is, the peace and security of the Church. The profession of the Christian faith is now attended with ease and honour." *The profession*, true; but not the thing itself, as "all that will live godly in Christ Jesus" experience.

"But if miracles are not ceased, why do you not prove your mission thereby?" As your lordship has frequently spoke to this effect, I will now give a clear answer. And I purposely do it in the same words which I published many years since:—

"1. I have in some measure explained myself on the head of miracles, in the Third Part of the 'Farther Appeal.' But since you repeat the demand, (though without taking any notice of the arguments there advanced,) I will endeavour once more to give you a distinct, full, and determinate answer. And, First, I acknowledge that I have seen with my eyes, and heard with my ears, several things, which to the best of my judgment, cannot be accounted for by the ordinary course of natural causes, and which, I therefore believe, ought to be 'ascribed to the extraordinary interposition of God.' If any man choose to style these *miracles*, I reclaim not. I have diligently inquired into the facts. I have weighed the preceding and following circumstances. I have strove to account for them in a natural way; but could not, without doing violence to my reason. Not to go far back, I am clearly persuaded that the sudden deliverance of John Haydon was one instance of this kind; and my own recovery, on May the 10th, another. I cannot account for either of these in a natural way. Therefore I believe they were both supernatural.

"I must, Secondly, observe, that the truth of these facts is supported by the same kind of proof as that of all other facts is wont to be, namely, the testimony of competent witnesses; and that the testimony here is in as high a degree as any reasonable man can desire. Those witnesses were many in number: they could not be deceived themselves; for the facts in question they saw with their own eyes, and heard with their own ears. Nor is it credible, that so many of them would combine together with a view of deceiving others; the greater part being men who feared God, as appeared by the general tenor of their lives. Thus, in the case of John Haydon: this thing was not contrived and executed in a corner, and in the presence of his own family only, or three or four persons prepared for the purpose. No; it was in an open street in the city of Bristol, at one or two in the afternoon; and, the doors being open from the beginning, not only many of the neighbours from every side, but several others, (indeed, whosoever desired it,) went in, till the house could contain no more. Nor yet does the account of my own illness and recovery depend, as you suppose, on my bare word. There were many witnesses both of my disorder on Friday and Saturday, and my lying down most part of Sunday; (a thing they were well satisfied could not be the effect of a slight indisposition;) and all who saw me that evening, plainly discerned (what I could not wholly conceal) that I was in pain; about two hundred of whom were present when I was seized with the cough, which cut me short, so that I could speak no more; till I cried aloud, 'Lord, increase my faith! Lord, confirm the word of thy grace!' The same persons saw and heard, that at the instant I changed my posture, and broke out into thanksgiving; that quickly after, I stood upright, (which I could not before,) and showed no sign either of sickness or pain.

“ Yet I must desire you well to observe, Thirdly, that my will, or choice, or desire, had no place either in this, or any case of this kind, that has ever fallen under my notice. Five minutes before I had no thought of this. I expected nothing less. I was willing to wait for a gradual recovery, in the ordinary use of outward means. I did not look for any other cure, till the moment before I found it. And it is my belief, that the case was always the same with regard to the most real and undoubted miracles. I believe God never interposed his miraculous power, but according to his own sovereign will; not according to the will of man; neither of him by whom he wrought, nor of any other man whatsoever. The wisdom as well as the power are his; nor can I find that ever, from the beginning of the world, he lodged this power in any mere man, to be used whenever that man saw good. Suppose, therefore, there was a man now upon earth, who did work real and undoubted miracles, I would ask, By whose power doth he work these, and at whose pleasure? his own, or God’s! Not his own, but God’s. But if so, then your demand is made, not on man, but on God. I cannot say it is modest, thus to challenge God; or well suiting the relation of a creature to his Creator.

“ 2. However, I cannot but think there have been already so many interpositions of Divine power, as will shortly leave you without excuse, if you either deny or despise them. We desire no favour, but the justice that diligent inquiry may be made concerning them. We are ready to name the persons on whom the power was shown which belongeth to none but God; (not one or two, or ten or twelve only;) to point out their places of abode; and we engage they shall answer every pertinent question fairly and directly; and, if required, shall give all their answers upon oath, before any who are empowered to receive them. It is our particular request, that the circumstances which went before, which accompanied, and which followed after, the facts under consideration, may be thoroughly examined, and punctually noted down. Let but this be done, (and is it not highly needful it should? at least by those who would form an exact judgment,) and we have no fear that any reasonable man should scruple to say, ‘This hath God wrought.’

“ As there have been already so many instances of this kind, far beyond what we dared to ask or think, I cannot take upon me to say, whether or no it will please God to add to their number. I have not herein ‘known the mind of the Lord,’ neither am I ‘his counsellor.’ He may, or he may not; I cannot affirm or deny. I have no light, and I have no desire either way. ‘It is the Lord, let him do what seemeth him good.’ I desire only to be as clay in his hand.

“ 3. But what, if there were now to be wrought ever so many ‘real and undoubted miracles? (I suppose you mean, by *undoubted*, such as, being sufficiently attested, ought not to be doubted of.) ‘Why, this,’ you say, ‘would put the controversy on a short foot, and be an effectual proof of the truth of your pretences.’ By no means. As common as this assertion is, there is none upon earth more false. Suppose a teacher was now, on this very day, to work real and undoubted miracles; this would extremely little shorten the controversy between him and the greatest part of his opposers: for all this would not force them to believe; but many would still stand just where they did before; seeing men may harden their hearts against miracles, as well as against arguments.

“ So men have done from the beginning of the world, even against such signal, glorious miracles, against such interpositions of the power of God, as may not be again till the consummation of all things. Permit me to remind you only of a few instances, and to observe, that the argument holds *a fortiori*; [the stronger;] for who will ever be empowered of God again to work such miracles as these were? Did Pharaoh look on all that Moses and Aaron wrought, as an effectual proof of the truth of their pretences? even when the ‘Lord made the sea to be dry land, and the waters were divided; when the children of Israel went into the midst of the sea, and the waters were a wall on the right and on the left?’ Exod. xiv, 21, 22. Nay,

The wounded dragon raged in vain ;
 And, fierce the utmost plagues to brave,
 Madly he dared the parting main,
 And sunk beneath the o'erwhelming wave.

Was all this an effectual proof of the truth of their pretences, to the Israelites themselves ? It was not ; they were still ' disobedient at the sea, even at the Red Sea.' Was the giving them day by day bread from heaven, an effectual proof to those ' two hundred and fifty of the princes of the assembly, famous in the congregation, men of renown, who said, with Dathan and Abiram, Wilt thou put out the eyes of these men ? we will not come up ;' Numb. xvi, 14 ; nay, ' when the ground clave asunder that was under them, and the earth opened her mouth and swallowed them up !' verse 32. Neither was this an effectual proof to those who saw it with their eyes, and heard the cries of those who went down into the pit ; but, the very next day, they ' murmured against Moses and against Aaron, saying, Ye have killed the people of the Lord !' verse 41. Was not the case generally the same with regard to the Prophets that followed ! several of whom ' stopped the mouths of lions, quenched the violence of fire,' and did many other mighty works ; yet their own people received them not ; yet ' they were stoned, they were sawn asunder, they were slain with the sword, they were destitute, afflicted, tormented !'—utterly contrary to the commonly received supposition, ' that the working real undoubted miracles, must bring all controversy to an end, and convince every gainsayer.'

" Let us come nearer yet. How stood the case between our Lord himself and his opposers ? Did he not work real and undoubted miracles ? And what was the effect ? Still, ' when he came to his own, his own received him not.' Still ' he was despised and rejected of men.' Still it was a challenge not to be answered, ' Have any of the rulers or of the Pharisees believed on him ?' After this, how can you imagine, that whoever works miracles must convince all men of the truth of his pretences ?

" I would just remind you of only one instance more : ' There sat a certain man at Lystra, impotent in his feet, being a cripple from his mother's womb, who had never walked. The same heard Paul speak ; who steadfastly beholding him, and perceiving he had faith to be healed, said with a loud voice, Stand upright on thy feet. And he leaped and walked.' Here was so undoubted a miracle, that the people ' lifted up their voices, saying, The gods are come down in the likeness of men.' But how long were even these convinced of the truth of his pretences ! Only till ' there came thither certain Jews from Antioch and Iconium ;' and then they ' stoned him' (as they supposed) ' to death !' Acts xiv, 7, &c. So certain it is, that no miracles whatever, that were ever yet wrought in the world, were effectual to prove the most glaring truth to those who hardened their hearts against it.

" 4. And it will equally hold in every age and nation. ' If they hear not Moses and the Prophets, neither will they be' convinced of what they desire not to believe, ' though one rose from the dead.' Without a miracle, without one rising from the dead, *εαν τις βελη το θελημα αυτου ποιειν*, ' if any man be willing to do his will, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God :' but if he is not ' willing to do his will,' he will never want an excuse, a plausible reason, for rejecting it ; yea, though ever so many miracles were wrought to confirm it. For, let ever so much light come into the world, it will have no effect (such is the wise and just will of God) on those who ' love darkness rather than light.' It will not convince those who do not simply desire to do ' the will of their Father which is in heaven ;' those ' who mind earthly things,' who, if they do not continue in any gross outward sin, yet love pleasure and ease, yet seek profit or power, preferment or reputation. Nothing will ever be an effectual proof to these of the holy and acceptable will of God, unless first their proud hearts be humbled, their stubborn wills bowed down, and their desires brought, at least in some degree, into obedience to the law of Christ.

“Hence, although it should please God to work anew all the wonders that ever were wrought on earth, still these men, however wise and prudent they may be in things relating to the present world, would fight against God and all his messengers, and that in spite of these miracles. Meanwhile, God will reveal his truth unto babes, unto those who are meek and lowly, whose desires are in heaven, who want to ‘know nothing save Jesus Christ, and him crucified.’ These need no outward miracles to show them his will; they have a plain rule,—the written word: and ‘the anointing which they have received of Him abideth in them, and teacheth them of all things,’ 1 John ii, 27. Through this they are enabled to bring all doctrines ‘to the law and the testimony:’ and whatsoever is agreeable to this they receive, without waiting to see it attested by miracles: as, on the other hand, whatsoever is contrary to this they reject; nor can any miracles move them to receive it.

“5. Yet I do not know that God hath any where precluded himself from thus exerting his sovereign power, from working miracles in any kind or degree, in any age, to the end of the world. I do not recollect any scripture wherein we are taught that miracles were to be confined within the limits either of the apostolic or the Cyprianic age; or of any period of time, longer or shorter, even till the restitution of all things. I have not observed, either in the Old Testament or the New, any intimation at all of this kind. St. Paul indeed says once, concerning two of the miraculous gifts of the Spirit, (so I think that text is usually understood,) ‘Whether there be prophecies, they shall fail; whether there be tongues, they shall cease.’ But he does not say, either that these or any other miracles shall cease till faith and hope shall cease also; till they shall all be swallowed up in the vision of God, and love be all in all.

“I presume you will allow there is one kind of miracles (loosely speaking) which are not ceased; namely, *τερατα ψευδός*, ‘lying wonders,’ diabolical miracles, wrought by the power of the evil spirits. Nor can you easily conceive that these will cease, as long as the father of lies is the prince of this world. And why should you think that the God of truth is less active than him, or that he will not have his miracles also? only not as man wills, neither when he wills; but according to his own excellent wisdom and goodness.

“6. But even if it were supposed that God does now work beyond the operation of merely natural causes, yet what impression would this make upon you, in the disposition of mind you are now in? Suppose the trial was repeated, and made again to-morrow. One informs you the next day, ‘While a clergyman was preaching yesterday, where I was, a man came who had been long ill of an incurable distemper. Prayer was made for him; and he was restored to perfect health.’

“Suppose now that this was a real fact, perhaps you would scarce have patience to hear the account of it; but would cut it short in the midst, with ‘Do you tell this as something supernatural? Then miracles are not ceased.’ But if you should venture to ask, ‘Where was this; and who was the person who prayed?’ and it was answered, ‘At the Foundery, near Moorfields; the person who prayed was Mr. Wesley;’ what a damp comes at once! What a weight falls on your mind at the first setting out! It is well if you have any heart or desire to move one step farther; or if you should, what a strong additional propensity do you now feel to deny the fact! And is there not a ready excuse for so doing! ‘O! they who tell the story are his own people; most of whom, we may be sure, will say any thing for him, and the rest will believe any thing.’ But if you at length allowed the fact, might you not find means to account for it by natural causes? ‘Great crowds, violent heats, with obstructions and irregularities of the blood and spirits,’ will do wonders. If you could not but allow it was more than natural, might not some plausible reason be found for ranking it among the lying wonders, for ascribing it to the devil rather than God? And if, after all, you was convinced it was the finger of God, must you not still bring every doctrine advanced ‘to the law and the testimony,’ the only sure and infallible test of

all? What then is the use of this continual demand, 'Show us a sign, and we will believe?' What will you believe? I hope no more than is written in the book of God: and thus far you might venture to believe, even without a miracle.

"7. Let us consider this point a little farther: what is it you would have us prove by miracles! the doctrines we preach? We prove these by Scripture and reason; and, if need be, by antiquity. What else is it then we are to prove by miracles! At length we have a distinct reply: 'Wise and sober men will not otherwise be convinced, (that is, unless you prove it by miracles,) that God is, by the means of such teachers and such doctrines, working a great and extraordinary work in the earth.'

"So then the determinate point which you, in their name, call upon us to prove by miracles, is this,—that God is, by these teachers, working a great and extraordinary work in the earth.

"What I mean by a great and extraordinary work, is, the bringing multitudes of gross, notorious sinners, in a short space, to the fear, and love, and service of God, to an entire change of heart and life.

"Now, then, let us take a nearer view of the proposition, and see which part of it we are to prove by miracles:

"Is it, (1.) That A. B. was for many years without God in the world, a common swearer, a drunkard, or a Sabbath breaker!

"Or, (2.) That he is not so now?

"Or, (3.) That he continued so till he heard this man preach, and from that time was another man?

"Not so. The proper way to prove these facts is, by the testimony of competent witnesses. And these witnesses are ready, whenever required, to give full evidence of them.

"Or, would you have us prove by miracles,

"(4.) That this was not done by our own power or holiness? that God only is able to raise the dead, to quicken those who are dead in trespasses and sins?

"Surely no. Whosoever believes the Scriptures will want no new proof of this.

"Where then is the wisdom of those men who demand miracles in proof of such a proposition! One branch of which, 'that such sinners are reformed by means of these teachers,' being a plain fact, can only be proved by testimony, as all other facts are; and the other, 'that this is a work of God, and a great and more than ordinary work,' needs no proof, as carrying its own evidence to every thinking man.

"8. To sum up this: no truly wise or sober man can possibly desire or expect miracles to prove, either, (1.) That these doctrines are true;—this must be decided by Scripture and reason: or, (2.) That these facts are true;—this can only be proved by testimony: or, (3.) That to change sinners from darkness to light, is the work of God alone; only using what instruments he pleases;—this is glaringly self evident: or, (4.) That such a change wrought in so many notorious sinners, within so short a time, is a great and extraordinary work of God. What then is it remains to be proved by miracles? Perhaps you will say, it is this: 'That God has called, or sent, you to do this.' Nay, this is implied in the Third of the foregoing propositions. If God has actually used us therein, if his work hath in fact prospered in our hands, then he hath called or sent us to do this. I entreat reasonable men to weigh this thoroughly, whether the fact does not plainly prove the call; whether He who thus enables us to save souls alive, does not commission us so to do; whether by giving us the power to pluck these brands out of the burning, He does not authorize us to exert it. O that it were possible for you to consider calmly, whether the success of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, even as it is preached by us, the least of his servants, be not itself a miracle, never to be forgotten! one which cannot be denied, as being visible at this day, not in one, but a hundred places; one which cannot be

accounted for by the ordinary course of any natural causes whatsoever; one which cannot be ascribed, with any colour of reason, to diabolical agency; and, lastly, one which will bear the infallible test,—the trial of the written word.” (*Second Letter to Dr. Church*, vol. v, pp. 324–330.)

“But ‘why do you talk of the success of the Gospel in England, which was a Christian country before you was born?’ Was it indeed! Is it so at this day? I would explain myself a little on this head also.

“And, (1.) None can deny that the people of England, in general, are called Christians. They are called so, a few only excepted, by others, as well as by themselves. But I presume no man will say, the name makes the thing; that men are Christians, barely because they are called so. It must be allowed, (2.) That the people of England, generally speaking, have been christened or baptized: but neither can we infer, ‘These were once baptized; therefore, they are Christians now.’ It is allowed, (3.) That many of those who were once baptized, and are called Christians to this day, hear the word of God, attend public prayers, and partake of the Lord’s Supper. But neither does this prove that they are Christians. For, notwithstanding this, some of them live in open sin; and others (though not conscious to themselves of hypocrisy, yet) are utter strangers to the religion of the heart; are full of pride, vanity, covetousness, ambition; of hatred, anger, malice, or envy; and, consequently, are no more spiritual Christians than the open drunkard or common swearer.

“Now, these being removed, where are the Christians from whom we may properly term England a Christian country! the men who have ‘the mind which was in Christ,’ and who ‘walk as he also walked?’ whose inmost soul is renewed after the image of God; and who are outwardly holy, as He who hath called them is holy! There are doubtless a few such to be found. To deny this would be ‘want of candour.’ But how few! How thinly scattered up and down! And as for a Christian visible Church, or a body of Christians visibly united together, where is this to be seen!

Ye different sects, who all declare,
Lo! here is Christ, or, Christ is there;
Your stronger proofs divinely give,
And show me where the Christians live!

“And what use is it of, what good end does it serve, to term England a Christian country! Although, it is true, most of the natives are called Christians, have been baptized, frequent the ordinances; and although here and there a real Christian is to be found, ‘as a light shining in a dark place;’ does it do any honour to our great Master, among those who are not called by his name! Does it recommend Christianity to the Jews, the Mohammedans, or the avowed Heathens! Surely no one can conceive it does. It only makes Christianity stink in their nostrils. Does it answer any good end, with regard to those who are called by this worthy name! I fear not; but rather, an exceeding bad one. For does it not keep multitudes easy in their Heathen practice! Does it not make, or keep, still greater numbers satisfied with their Heathen tempers! Does it not directly tend to make both the one and the other imagine, that they are what indeed they are not; that they are Christians, while they are utterly without Christ, and without God in the world! To close this point: if men are not Christians till they are renewed after the image of Christ, and if the people of England, in general, are not thus renewed, why do we term them so! ‘The God of this world hath’ long ‘blinded their hearts.’ Let us do nothing to increase their blindness; but rather to recover them from that strong delusion, that they may no longer believe a lie.

“Let us labour to convince all mankind, that to be a real Christian is, to love the Lord our God with all our heart, and to serve him with all our strength; to love our neighbour as ourselves, and therefore to do unto every man as we would he should do unto us.” (*Second Letter to Dr. Church*, vol. v, pp. 332–333.)

To change one of these Heathens into a real Christian, and to continue him such, all the ordinary operations of the Holy Spirit are absolutely necessary.

“But what are they?” I sum them up (as I did in the “Farther Appeal to Men of Reason and Religion”) in the words of as learned and orthodox a divine as ever England bred:—

“Sanctification being opposed to our corruption, and answering fully to the latitude thereof, whatsoever holiness and perfection is wanting in our nature must be supplied by the Spirit of God. Wherefore, we being by nature totally void of all saving truth, and under an impossibility of knowing the will of God; this Spirit searcheth all things, yea, even the deep things of God; and revealeth them unto the sons of men; so that thereby the darkness of their understanding is expelled, and they are enlightened with the knowledge of God. The same Spirit which revealeth the object of faith, generally, to the universal Church, doth also illuminate the understanding of such as believe; that they may receive the truth. For faith is the gift of God, not only in the object, but also in the act. And this gift is a gift of the Holy Ghost working within us. And as the increase of perfection, so the original of faith, is from the Spirit of God, by an internal illumination of the soul.

“The second part of the office of the Holy Ghost is the renewing of man in all the parts and faculties of his soul. For our natural corruption consisting in an aversion of our wills and a depravation of our affections, an inclination of them to the will of God is wrought within us by the Spirit of God.

“The third part of his office is to lead, direct, and govern us in our actions and conversations. ‘If we live in the Spirit,’ quickened by his renovation, we must also ‘walk in the Spirit,’ following his direction, led by his manuduction. We are also animated and acted by the Spirit of God, who giveth ‘both to will and to do.’

“And ‘as many as are thus led by the Spirit of God, are the sons of God,’ Rom. viii, 14. Moreover, that this direction may prove more effectual, we are guided in our prayers by the same Spirit, according to the promise, ‘I will pour upon the house of David, and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the Spirit of grace and supplication,’ Zech. xii, 10. Whereas then, ‘this is the confidence we have in Him, that, if we ask any thing according to his will, he heareth us;’ and whereas, ‘we know not what we should pray for as we ought, the Spirit itself maketh intercession for us with groaning that cannot be uttered,’ Rom. viii, 26, 27. ‘And He that searcheth the heart knoweth what is the mind of the Spirit, because he maketh intercession for the saints according to the will of God.’ From which intercession, (made for all true Christians,) he hath the name of the Paraclete given him by Christ; who said, ‘I will pray the Father, and He will give you another Paraclete,’ John xiv, 16, 26. For, ‘if any man sin, we have a Paraclete with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous,’ saith St. John. ‘Who maketh intercession for us,’ saith St. Paul, Rom. viii, 34. And we have ‘another Paraclete,’ saith our Saviour, John xiv, 16; Rom. viii, 27, ‘which also maketh intercession for us,’ saith St. Paul. A Paraclete then, in the notion of the Scriptures, is an Intercessor.

“It is also the office of the Holy Ghost to assure us of the adoption of sons, to create in us a sense of the paternal love of God toward us, to give us an earnest of our everlasting inheritance. The love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us. For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God. And because we are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into our hearts, crying, Abba, Father. For we have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear, but we have received the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father; the Spirit itself bearing witness with our spirit, that we are the

children of God.' As, therefore, we are born again by the Spirit, and receive from him our regeneration, so we are also by the same Spirit assured of our adoption. Because, being 'sons, we are also heirs, heirs of God, and joint heirs with Christ,' by the same Spirit we have the pledge, or rather the earnest, of our inheritance. 'For he which establisheth us in Christ, and hath anointed us, is God; who hath also sealed us, and hath given us the earnest of his Spirit in our hearts; so that we are sealed with that Holy Spirit of promise, which is the earnest of our inheritance.' The Spirit of God, as given to us in this life, is to be looked upon as an earnest, being part of that reward which is promised, and, upon performance of the covenant which God hath made with us, certainly to be received."

It now rests with your lordship to take your choice, either to condemn or to acquit both; either your lordship must condemn Bishop Pearson for an enthusiast, or you must acquit me: for I have his express authority on my side, concerning every text which I affirm to belong to all Christians.

But I have greater authority than his, and such as I reverence only less than the oracles of God; I mean that of our own Church. I shall close this head by setting down what occurs in her authentic records, concerning either our receiving the Holy Ghost, or his ordinary operations in all true Christians.

In her daily service she teacheth us all to "beseech God to grant us his Holy Spirit, that those things may please him which we do at this present, and that the rest of our life may be pure and holy;" to pray for our sovereign lord the king, that God would "replenish him with the grace of his Holy Spirit;" for all the royal family, that "they may be endued with his Holy Spirit, and enriched with his heavenly grace;" for all the clergy and people, that he would "send down upon them the healthful Spirit of his grace;" for the catholic church, that "it may be guided and governed by his good Spirit;" and for all therein, who, at any time, make their common supplications unto him, that "the fellowship" or communication "of the Holy Ghost may be with them all evermore."

Her Collects are full of petitions to the same effect: "Grant that we may daily be renewed by thy Holy Spirit." (*Collect for Christmas Day.*) "Grant that in all our sufferings here, for the testimony of thy truth, we may by faith behold the glory that shall be revealed, and, being filled with the Holy Ghost, may love and bless our persecutors." (*St. Stephen's Day.*) "Send thy Holy Ghost, and pour into our hearts that most excellent gift of charity." (*Quinquagesima Sunday.*) "O Lord, from whom all good things do come, grant to us thy humble servants, that by thy holy inspiration we may think those things that are good, and by thy merciful guidance may perform the same." (*Fifth Sunday after Easter.*) "We beseech thee, leave us not comfortless, but send to us the Holy Ghost to comfort us." (*Sunday after Ascension Day.*) "Grant us by the same Spirit to have a right judgment in all things, and evermore to rejoice in his holy comfort." (*Whitsunday.*) "Grant us, Lord, we beseech thee, the Spirit to think and do always such things as be rightful." (*Ninth Sunday after Trinity.*) "O God, forasmuch as without thee we are not able to please thee, mercifully grant that thy Holy Spirit may in all things direct and rule our hearts." (*Nineteenth Sunday after Trinity.*) "Cleanse the thoughts of our hearts by the inspiration of thy

Holy Spirit, that we may perfectly love thee, and worthily magnify thy holy name." (*Communion Office.*)

"Give thy Holy Spirit to this infant, (or this person,) that he may be born again. Give thy Holy Spirit to these persons," (N. B. already baptized,) "that they may continue thy servants."

"Almighty God, who hast vouchsafed to regenerate these persons by water and the Holy Ghost, strengthen them with the Holy Ghost the Comforter, and daily increase in them the manifold gifts of thy grace." (*Office of Confirmation.*)

From these passages, it may sufficiently appear for what purposes every Christian, according to the doctrine of the Church of England, does now receive the Holy Ghost. But this will be still more clear from those that follow; wherein we may likewise observe a plain rational sense of God's "revealing" himself to us, of the "inspiration" of the Holy Ghost, and of a believer's "feeling" in himself the "mighty working" of the Spirit of Christ.

"God gave them of old, grace to be his children, as he doth us now. But now by the coming of our Saviour Christ, we have received more abundantly the Spirit of God in our hearts." (*Homily on Faith, part ii.*)

"He died to destroy the rule of the devil in us, and he rose again to send down his Holy Spirit to rule in our hearts." (*Homily on the Resurrection.*)

"We have the Holy Spirit in our hearts, as a seal and pledge of our everlasting inheritance." (*Ib.*)

"The Holy Ghost sat upon each of them, like as it had been cloven tongues of fire, to teach that it is he that giveth eloquence and utterance in preaching the Gospel, which engendereth a burning zeal toward God's word, and giveth all men a tongue, yea, a fiery tongue." (N. B.—Whatever occurs, in any of the Journals, of God's "giving me utterance," or "enabling me to speak with power," cannot therefore be quoted as enthusiasm, without wounding the Church through my side.) "So that if any man be a dumb Christian, not professing his faith openly, he giveth men occasion to doubt lest he have not the grace of the Holy Ghost within him." (*Homily on Whitsunday, part i.*)

"It is the office of the Holy Ghost to sanctify; which the more it is hid from our understanding," (that is, the particular manner of his working,) "the more it ought to move all men to wonder at the secret and mighty workings of God's Holy Spirit, which is within us. For it is the Holy Ghost that doth quicken the minds of men, stirring up godly motions in their hearts. Neither does he think it sufficient inwardly to work the new birth of men, unless he does also dwell and abide in them. 'Know ye not,' saith St. Paul, 'that ye are the temples of God, and that his Spirit dwelleth in you? Know ye not that your bodies are the temples of the Holy Ghost, which is within you?' Again he saith, 'Ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit.' For why? 'The Spirit of God dwelleth in you.' To this agreeth St. John: 'The anointing which ye have received' (he meaneth the Holy Ghost) 'abideth in you,' 1 John ii, 27. And St. Peter saith the same: 'The Spirit of glory and of God resteth upon you.' O what comfort is this to the heart of a true Christian, to think that the Holy Ghost dwelleth in him! 'If God be with us,' as the Apostle saith, 'who can be against us?' He giveth patience and joyfulness of heart in temptation and affliction, and is therefore worthily called 'the Comforter:' John xiv, 16. He doth instruct the hearts of the simple in the knowledge of God and his word; therefore he is justly termed, 'the Spirit of Truth,' John xvi, 13. And (N. B.) where the Holy Ghost doth instruct and teach, there is no delay at all in learning." (*Ib.*)

From this passage, I learn, (1.) That every true Christian now "receives the Holy Ghost," as the Paraclete or Comforter promised by our Lord: John xiv, 16. (2.) That every Christian receives him, as "the Spirit of Truth," (promised John xvi, 13,) to "teach him all things." And, (3.) That the anointing, mentioned in the First Epistle of St. John, "abides in every Christian."

"In reading of God's word, he profiteth most who is most inspired with the Holy Ghost." (*Homily on reading the Scripture*, part i.)

"Human and worldly reason is not needful to the understanding the Scripture; but the 'revelation of the Holy Ghost,' who inspireth the true meaning unto them who, with humility and diligence, search for it." (*ib.* part ii.)

"Make him know and feel, that there is no other name given under heaven unto men whereby we can be saved."

"If we feel our conscience at peace with God, through remission of our sins, all is of God." (*Homily on Rogation Week*, part iii.)

"If you feel such a faith in you, rejoice in it, and let it be daily increasing by well working." (*Homily on Faith*, part iii.)

"The faithful may feel wrought, tranquillity of conscience, the increase of faith and hope, with many other graces of God." (*Homily on the Sacrament*, part i.)

"Godly men feel inwardly God's Holy Spirit inflaming their hearts with love." (*Homily on certain places of Scripture*, part i.)

"God give us grace to know these things, and feel them in our hearts! This knowledge and feeling is not of ourselves. Let us therefore meekly call upon the bountiful Spirit, the Holy Ghost, to inspire us with his presence, that we may be able to hear the goodness of God to our salvation. For without his lively inspiration we cannot so much as speak the name of the Mediator: 'No man can say, Jesus is the Lord, but by the Holy Ghost.' Much less should we be able to believe and know these great mysteries that be opened to us by Christ. 'But we have received,' saith St. Paul, 'not the spirit of the world, but the Spirit which is of God;' for this purpose, 'that we may know the things which are freely given to us of God.' In the power of the Holy Ghost resteth all ability to know God, and to please him. It is he that purifieth the mind by his secret working. He enlighteneth the heart to conceive worthy thoughts of Almighty God. He sitteth on the tongue of man, to stir him to speak his honour. He only ministereth spiritual strength to the powers of the soul and body. And if we have any gift whereby we may profit our neighbour, all is wrought by this one and self-same Spirit." (*Homily for Rogation Week*, part iii.)

Every proposition which I have any where advanced concerning those operations of the Holy Ghost, which I believe are common to all Christians in all ages, is here clearly maintained by our own Church.

Being fully convinced of this, I could not well understand, for many years, how it was, that on the mentioning any of these great truths, even among men of education, the cry immediately rose, "An enthusiast, an enthusiast!" But I now plainly perceive, this is only an old fallacy in a new shape. To object enthusiasm to any person or doctrine, is but a decent method of begging the question. It generally spares the objector the trouble of reasoning, and is a shorter and easier way of carrying his cause.

For instance: I assert, that "till a man 'receives the Holy Ghost,' he is without God in the world; that he cannot know the things of God, unless God reveal them unto him by his Spirit; no, nor have even one holy or heavenly temper, without the inspiration of the Holy One."

Now, should one who is conscious to himself that he has experienced none of these things, attempt to confute these propositions either from Scripture or antiquity, it might prove a difficult task. What then shall he do? Why, cry out, "Enthusiasm! Fanaticism!" and the work is done.

"But is it not mere enthusiasm or fanaticism to talk of the new birth?" So one might imagine, from the manner in which your lordship talks of it: "The Spirit did not stop till it had manifested itself in the last effort of its power,—the new birth. The new birth began in storms and tempests, in cries and ecstasies, in tumults and confusions. Persons who had no sense of religion, that is, no ecstatic feelings, or pains of the new birth. What can be the issue of the new birth, attended with those infernal throes? Why would he elicit sense from these Gentiles, when they were finally to be deprived of it in ecstasies and new births? All these circumstances Mr. W. has declared to be constant symptoms of the new birth." (pp. 123, 126, 180, 170, 225, 222.)

So the new birth is, throughout the whole tract, the standing topic of ridicule.

"No, not the new birth itself, but your enthusiastic, ridiculous account of it." What is then my account of the new birth? I gave it some years ago in these words:—

"It is that great change which God works in the soul when he brings it into life; when he raises it from the death of sin to the life of righteousness. It is the change wrought in the whole soul by the almighty Spirit of God, when it is 'created anew in Christ Jesus,' when it is 'renewed after the image of God in righteousness and true holiness;' when the love of the world is changed into the love of God, pride into humility, passion into meekness, hatred, envy, malice, into a sincere, tender, disinterested love to all mankind. In a word, it is that change whereby the 'earthly, sensual, devilish' mind is turned into 'the mind which was in Christ Jesus.'" (Vol. i, p. 403.)

This is my account of the new birth. What is there ridiculous or enthusiastic in it?

"But what do you mean by those tempests, and cries, and pains, and infernal throes attending the new birth?" I will tell you as plainly as I can, in the very same words I used to Dr. Church, after premising, that some experience much, some very little, of these pains and throes:—

"When men feel in themselves the heavy burden of sin, see damnation to be the reward of it, behold with the eye of their mind the horror of hell, they tremble, they quake, and are inwardly touched with sorrowfulness of heart, and cannot but accuse themselves, and open their grief unto Almighty God, and call unto him for mercy. This being done seriously, their mind is so occupied, partly with sorrow and heaviness, partly with an earnest desire to be delivered from this danger of hell and damnation, that all desire of meat and drink is laid apart, and loathing of worldly things and pleasures comes in place, so that nothing then liketh them more than to weep, to lament, to mourn, and both with words and behaviour of body, to show themselves weary of life."

"Now, permit me to ask, What, if, before you had observed that these were the very words of your own Church, one of your acquaintance or parishioners had come and told you that, ever since he heard a sermon at the Foundery, he saw damnation before him, and beheld with the eye of his mind the horror of hell! What, if he had trembled and quaked, and been so taken up, partly with sorrow and heaviness, partly with an earnest desire to be delivered from the danger of hell and damnation, as to weep, to lament,

to mourn, and both with words and behaviour to show himself weary of life? Would you have scrupled to say, 'Here is another deplorable instance of the Methodists driving men to distraction?' " (*Second Letter to Dr. Church*, vol. v, p. 333.)

I have now finished, as my time permits, what I had to say, either concerning myself, or on the operations of the Holy Spirit. In doing this, I have used great plainness of speech, and yet, I hope, without rudeness. If any thing of that kind has slipped from me, I am ready to retract it. I desire, on the one hand, to "accept no man's person;" and yet, on the other, to give "honour to whom honour is due."

If your lordship should think it worth your while to spend any more words upon me, may I presume to request one thing of your lordship,—to be more serious? It cannot injure your lordship's character or your cause. Truth is great, and will prevail.

Wishing your lordship all temporal and spiritual blessings,

I am, my lord, your lordship's dutiful son and servant,

NOVEMBER 26, 1762.

JOHN WESLEY.

A SHORT

ADDRESS TO THE INHABITANTS OF IRELAND.

OCCASIONED BY SOME LATE OCCURRENCES.

1. THERE has lately appeared (as you cannot be ignorant) a set of men preaching up and down in several parts of this kingdom, who for ten or twelve years have been known in England by the title of Methodists. The vulgar in Ireland term them Swaddlers;—a name first given them in Dublin from one of them preaching on those words: "Ye shall find the young child wrapped in swaddling clothes, lying in a manger."

2. Extremely various have been the reports concerning them. Some persons have spoken favourably: but the generality of men treat them in a different manner,—with utter contempt, if not detestation; and relate abundance of things in order to prove that they are not fit to live upon the earth.

3. A question, then, which you may naturally ask, is this: "In what manner ought a man of religion, a man of reason, a lover of mankind, and a lover of his country, to act on this occasion?"

4. Before we can properly answer this, it should be inquired, concerning the persons in question, what they are; what they teach; and what are the effects which are generally observed to attend their teaching.

5. It should first be inquired, what they are. And in order to a speedy determination of this, we may set aside whatever will admit of any dispute, as, whether they are good men or bad, rich or poor, fools, madmen, and enthusiasts, or sober, rational men. Now, waiving all this, one point is indisputable: It is allowed on all hands, they are men who spend all their time and strength in teaching those doctrines, the nature and consequences whereof are described in the following pages.

6. The doctrines they constantly teach are these: That religion does not consist in *negatives* only,—in not taking the name of God in vain, in not robbing or murdering our neighbour, in bare abstaining from evil

of any or every kind; but is a *real, positive* thing: That it does not consist in externals only,—in attending the church and sacrament, (although all these things they approve and recommend,) in using all the means of grace, or in works of charity, (commonly so called,) super-added to works of piety; but that it is, properly and strictly, a principle within, seated in the inmost soul, and thence manifesting itself by these outward fruits, on all suitable occasions.

7. They insist, that nothing deserves the name of religion, but a virtuous heart, producing a virtuous life: a complication of justice, mercy, and truth, of every right and amiable temper, beaming forth from the deepest recesses of the mind, in a series of wise and generous actions.

*Compositum jus, fasque animo, sanctosque recessus
Mentis, et incoctum generoso pectus honesto.*

[“ A mind,
Which civil and religious duties bind;
A guileless heart, which no dark secrets knows,
But with the generous love of virtue glows.”—

DRUMMOND'S PERSIUS.]

8. These are their constant doctrines. It is true, they occasionally touch on abundance of other things. Thus they frequently maintain, that there is an inseparable connection between virtue and happiness; that none but a virtuous (or, as they usually express it, a religious) man can be happy; and that every man is happy in the same proportion as he is truly religious; seeing a contented mind, (according to them,) a cheerful, thankful, joyous acquiescence in every disposal of that Sovereign Wisdom who governs both heaven and earth, if it be not an essential branch of religion, is, at least, a necessary consequence of it. On all proper occasions they strongly recommend, on the one hand, the most intense love of our country; on the other, the firmest loyalty to our prince, abstracted from all views of private interest. They likewise take every opportunity of enforcing the absolute necessity of sobriety and temperance; of unwearied industry in the works of our calling; of moral honesty in all its branches; and, particularly, in the discharge of all relative duties, without which, they say, religion is vain. But all these they recommend on that one single ground,—the love of God and of all mankind; declaring them to be of no avail, if they do not spring from this love, as well as terminate and centre therein.

9. Whoever is at the pains of hearing these preachers, or of reading what they have wrote, with any degree of attention and impartiality, must perceive that these are their doctrines. And it is equally easy to discern what the effects of their preaching have been. These doctrines they spread wherever they come. They convince many in every place, that religion does not consist (as they imagined once) either in negatives or externals, in barely doing no harm or even doing good; but in the tempers of the heart, in right dispositions of mind toward God and man, producing all right words and actions.

10. And these dispositions of mind are, more or less, the continual consequence of their preaching: (that is, if we may know the tree by its fruit, which is doubtless the most rational way of judging:) the lives of many who constantly attend it show, that God has wrought a real

change in their heart ; and that the grand principle of love to God and man already begins to take root therein.

11. Hence those who were before of quite the opposite temper, are now generous, disinterested lovers of their country ; and faithful, loyal subjects to their prince, his sacred majesty King George : they are now sober and temperate in all things, and punctually honest in all their dealings : they are strict in every relative duty, and laborious and diligent in their callings, notwithstanding the continual discouragement they receive from many who still cry out, “Ye are idle, ye are idle ; therefore ye say, Let us go and serve the Lord.” They are content in every state, whether of plenty or want, and thankful to God and man. These are plain, glaring, undeniable facts, whereof, if any magistrate will be at the trouble to take them, numerous affidavits may be made, in Dublin, Cork, Limerick, and many other places.

But if these things are so, it is easy to conceive in what manner every man of religion, every man of reason, every lover of mankind, every lover of his country, ought to act on this occasion.

12. For, First, ought not every man of religion, with all the earnestness of his soul, to praise God, who, after so long a night of ignorance and error had overspread our country, has poured light on so many of those that sat in darkness and the shadow of death ? has shown such numbers even of the lowest and most brutish of men, wherein true religion lies ; has taught them both to lay the right foundation, and to build the whole fabric thereon ; has convinced them, “Other foundation can no man lay than that which is laid, even Jesus Christ ;” and, “The end of the commandment is love,” of the whole commandment or law of Christ ; love, the life, the soul, the spirit of religion, the river that makes glad the city of God, the living water continually springing up into everlasting life ?

13. Admit that they do not exactly judge right as to some of the appendages of religion ; that you have a clearer and juster conception than they of several things pertaining to the beauty of holiness ; yet ought you not to bless God for giving these outcasts of men to see at least the essence of it ? nay, to be living witnesses of the substance of religion, though they may still mistake as to some of the circumstances of it.

14. Ought not every man of reason (whether he assents, or no, to that system of opinions commonly called Christianity) sincerely and heartily to rejoice in the advancement of solid, rational virtue ? in the propagation, not of this or that set of opinions, but of genuine pure morality ? of disinterested benevolence, of tender affections, to the whole of human race ? Ought you not to be glad, that there are any instruments found, till others appear who are more equal to the task, whose one employment it is (from whatever motive) to diffuse generous honesty throughout the land ?

15. Allow that, in doing this, they have some particularities of opinion, (for *humanum est errare et nescire*,) [to err and be ignorant is the lot of humanity,] or some little, odd customs, which you do not conceive to be grounded upon strict reason, yet so long as neither those customs nor those opinions prevent the advancement of that great end, ought you not, as a reasonable man, to rejoice in the increase of solid virtue ?

especially when you consider, that they do not impose their own opinions on other men; that (whatever they are) they think and let think, and condemn no man barely for his opinion; neither blame you for not regarding those little prudential rules which many observe by their own full and free consent.

16. Ought not every lover of mankind to have something more than a common regard for those who both labour and suffer reproach, in order to promote that love in every place; and to remove every method of speaking or acting, every temper, contrary to love? Ought not you who are truly moral men, (a lovely and venerable character,) to have some value for those who spend and are spent to advance genuine morality? who spare no pains, if by any means they may induce any of their countrymen, in any part of the nation, to practise justice, mercy, and truth, in all their intercourse with each other? to behave in every circumstance and relation according to those eternal rules, invariably observing the royal law, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself;" and, "Whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, even so do unto them."

17. If you are a lover of mankind, must you not sympathize with those who suffer evil in various kinds, for this very thing, because they do good to mankind, looking for no reward on this side heaven? As to the idle tale of their laying up treasures on earth, it neither agrees with fact nor reason. *Not with fact*; for it is notorious, that those who before piqued themselves on owing no man any thing, are now indebted in larger sums, than, humanly speaking, they can ever pay. *Not with reason*; for if riches had been their aim, they would have sought out the rich, not the poor; not the tanners in Cornwall, the colliers of Kingswood, the keelmen in Newcastle-upon-Tyne. At the same time, they showed they were not afraid or ashamed to appear before the greatest or wisest of men: witness their appearing in the most public manner, both at Dublin, Bristol, Oxford, and London.

18. Ought not every lover of his country, not only not to oppose, but to assist with all the power and interest he has, those who continually, and not without success, recommend the love of our country, and, what is so closely connected therewith, duty and loyalty to the best of princes? Ought you not to forward, so far as ever your influence will go, sobriety and temperance among your countrymen? What can be more for the interest of this poor nation, and for the good of all, whether rich or poor? You do well to promote that excellent design of spreading the linen manufacture among us. None can doubt but this is admirably well calculated for the good of the whole kingdom: but are not temperance and honesty still more conducive to the good of this and of every kingdom? Nay, and how directly conducive are these virtues to that very end,—the flourishing of our manufactures!

19. And what can conduce more to the general good of all the inhabitants of this land, than industry joined to content? to peace with God, peace with yourselves, peace with one another? O how needful is this, above all lands! For, what a stranger has it been in our coasts! Ye men of Ireland, help! Come all, as one man, all men of religion and reason, all lovers of God and of mankind, all lovers of your country. O suffer not yourselves to be thus grossly abused, thus miserably im-

posed upon, any longer! Open your eyes; look around and judge for yourselves; see plain and undeniable facts; be convinced by the force of truth and love, that the work is indeed of God. Rejoice in the good of your country, in peace and good will continually advanced among men. Beware you do not oppose, or speak or think evil of, what God hath done in the earth. Rather, each in the station wherein he is placed, join hearts and hands in the work, till holiness and happiness cover our land as the waters cover the sea.

JOHN WESLEY.

DUBLIN, July 6, 1749.

A LETTER
TO THE REVEREND MR. FLEURY.

I labour for peace: But when I speak thereof, they make themselves ready for battle.
PSALM CXX, 7.

REVEREND SIR,—1. In JUNE, 1769, I spent two or three days at Waterford. As soon as my back was turned, you valiantly attacked me, I suppose both morning and afternoon. Hearing, when I was there, two or three weeks ago, that you designed me the same favour, I waited upon you at the cathedral, on Sunday, April 28. You was as good as your word: you drew the sword, and, in effect threw away the scabbard. You made a furious attack on a large body of people, of whom you knew just nothing. Blind and bold, you laid about you without fear or wit, without any regard either to truth, justice, or mercy. And thus you entertained, both morning and evening, a large congregation, who came to hear “the words of eternal life.”

2. Not having leisure myself, I desired Mr. Bourke to wait upon you the next morning. He proposed our writing to each other. You said, “No; if any thing can be said against my sermons, I expect it shall be printed: let it be done in a public, not a private way.” I did not desire this; I had much rather it had been done privately. But since you will have it so, I submit.

3. Your text was, “I know this, that after my departure shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock. Also of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them,” Acts xx, 29, 30. Having shown that St.¹ Paul foresaw these false teachers, you undertake to show, (1.) The mischiefs which they occasioned. (2.) The character of them, and how nearly this concerns a set of men called Methodists. (*First Sermon*, pp. 1-4.)

4. Against these false teachers, you observe, St. Paul warned the Corinthians, Galatians, Colossians, and Hebrews. (pp. 5-8.) Very true; but what is this to the point? O, much more than some are aware of. The insinuation was, all along, just as if you had said, “I beseech you, my dear hearers, mark the titles he gives to these grievous wolves, false apostles, deceitful workers, and apply them to the Methodist teachers. There I give them a deadly thrust.”

5. “These are well styled by Christ, ‘ravens wolves;’ by St. Paul,

'grievous wolves,' from the mischiefs they do, rending the church of Christ, and perverting the true sense of the Gospel, for their own private ends. They ever did, and to this day do, pretend to extraordinary inspiration." (p. 8.)

Round assertions! Let us consider them one by one: (1.) "These are styled by Christ, 'ravens wolves;' by St. Paul, 'grievous wolves.'" True; but how does it appear that these names are applicable to the Methodists? Why, they "rend the Church of Christ." What is the Church of Christ? According to our Article, a Church is, "a company of faithful people," of true believers, who have "the mind that was in Christ," and "walk as Christ walked." Who then are the Church of Christ in Waterford? Point them out, sir, if you know them; and then be pleased to show how the Methodists rend this Church of Christ. You may as justly say they rend the walls or the steeple of the cathedral church. "However, they pervert the true sense of the Gospel, for their own private ends." Wherein do they pervert the true sense of the Gospel? I have published Notes both on the Gospels and the other Scriptures. But wherein do those Notes pervert the sense? None has yet attempted to show. But for what private ends should I pervert it? for ease or honour? Then I should be sadly disappointed. Or for money? This is the silliest tale of all. You may easily know, if you are willing to know it, that I did not leave Waterford, without being some pounds lighter than I was when I came thither.

6. "But they pretend to extraordinary inspiration." They do not; they expressly disclaim it. I have declared a hundred times, I suppose ten times in print, that I pretend to no other inspiration than that which is common to all real Christians, without which no one can be a Christian at all. "They denounce hell and damnation to all that reject their pretences." (p. 9.) This is another charge; but it is as groundless as the former; it is without all shadow of truth. You may as well say, The Methodists denounce hell and damnation to all that reject Mohammedanism. As groundless, as senselessly, shamelessly false, is the assertion following: "To reject their ecstasies and fanatic pretences to revelation is cried up as a crime of the blackest die." It cannot be, that we should count it a crime to reject what we do not pretend to at all. But I pretend to no ecstasies of any kind, nor to any other kind of revelation than you yourself, yea, and every Christian enjoys, unless he is "without God in the world."

7. "These grievous wolves pretended to greater mortification and self-denial than the Apostles themselves." (p. 11.) This discovery is spick and span new: I never heard of it before. But pray, sir, where did you find it? I think, not in the canonical Scriptures. I doubt you had it from some apocryphal writer. "Thus also do the modern false teachers." I know not any that do. Indeed I have read of some such among the Mohammedan dervises, and among the Indian Brahmins. But I doubt whether any of these outlandish creatures have been yet imported into Great Britain or Ireland.

8. "They pretend to know the mind of Christ better than his Apostles." (p. 12.) Certainly the Methodists do not: this is another sad mistake, not to say slander. "However, better than their successors do." That is another question. If you rank yourself among their successors, as undoubtedly you do, I will not deny that some of these poor, despised

people, though not acting in a public character, do know the mind of Christ, that is, the meaning of the Scripture, better than you do yet. But, perhaps, when ten years more are gone over your head, you may know it as well as they.

9. You conclude this sermon, "Let us not be led away by those who represent the comfortable religion of Christ, as a path covered over with thorns." (p. 14.) This cap does not fit me. I appeal to all that have heard me at Waterford or elsewhere, whether I represent religion as an uncomfortable thing. No, sir; both in preaching and writing I represent it as far more comfortable than you do, or are able to do. "But you represent us as lovers of pleasure more than lovers of God." If any do this, I doubt they touch a sore spot; I am afraid the shoe pinches. "They affirm pleasure in general to be unlawful, grounding it on, 'They that are in the flesh cannot please God.'" (p. 15.) Wrong, top and bottom. Did we hold the conclusion, we should never infer it from such premises. But we do not hold it: we no more affirm pleasure in general to be unlawful, than eating and drinking. This is another invention of your own brain, which never entered into our thoughts. It is really curious when you add, "This is bringing men 'after the principles of the world, and not after Christ.'" What, the affirming that pleasure is unlawful? Is this "after the principles of the world?" Was ever text so unhappily applied?

10. So much for your first sermon; wherein, though you do not seem to want good will, yet you are marvellously barren of invention; having only retailed two or three old, threadbare objections, which have been answered twenty times over. You begin the second, "I shall now consider some of their many absurd doctrines: the first of which is, 'the pretending to be divinely inspired.'" (*Second Sermon*, p. 1.) An odd doctrine enough. "And called in an extraordinary manner to preach the word of God." (pp. 2-4.)

This is all harping upon the same string, the grand objection of lay-preachers. We have it again and again, ten, twenty times over. I shall answer it once for all. Not by any thing new,—that is utterly needless; but barely by repeating the answer which convinced a serious clergyman many years ago:—

"TULLAMORE, May 4, 1748.

"REVEREND SIR,—I have at present neither leisure nor inclination to enter into a formal controversy; but you will give me leave just to offer a few loose hints relating to the subject of our last night's conversation:—

"1. Seeing life and health are things of so great importance, it is without question, highly expedient that physicians should have all possible advantages of learning and education.

"2. That trial should be made of them by competent judges, before they practise publicly.

"3. That, after such trial, they be authorized to practise by those who are empowered to convey that authority.

"4. And that, while they are preserving the lives of others, they should have what is sufficient to sustain their own.

"5. But supposing a gentleman bred at the university in Dublin, with all the advantages of education, after he has undergone all the usual trials, and then been regularly authorized to practise:

"6. Suppose, I say, this physician settles at ——— for some years, and yet makes no cures at all; but, after trying his skill on five hundred persons,

cannot show that he has healed one ; many of his patients dying under his hands, and the rest remaining just as they were before he came :

“ 7. Will you condemn a man who, having some little skill in physic, and a tender compassion for those who are sick or dying all around him, cures many of those, without fee or reward, whom the doctor *could* not cure ?

“ 8. At least, *did* not, (which is the same thing as to the case in hand,) were it only for this reason,—because he did not go to them, and they would not come to him !

“ 9. Will you condemn him because he has not learning, or has not had a university education !

“ What then ! He cures those whom the man of learning and education cannot cure.

“ 10. Will you object, that he is no physician, nor has any authority to practise !

“ I cannot come into your opinion. I think *Medicus est qui medetur* ; ‘ he is a physician who heals ;’ and that every man has authority to save the life of a dying man.

“ But if you only mean, he has no authority to take fees, I contend not : for he takes none at all.

“ 11. Nay, and I am afraid it will hold, on the other hand, *Medicus non est qui non medetur* ; I am afraid, if we use propriety of speech, ‘ he is no physician who works no cure.’

“ 12. ‘ O, but he has taken his degree of Doctor of Physic, and therefore has authority.’

“ Authority to do what ? ‘ Why, to heal all the sick that will employ him.’ But (to waive the case of those who will not employ him ; and would you have even their lives thrown away ?) he does not heal those that do employ him. He that was sick before, is sick still ; or else he is gone hence, and is no more seen.

“ Therefore his authority is not worth a rush ; for it serves not the end for which it was given.

“ 13. And surely he has not authority to kill them, by hindering another from saving their lives !

“ 14. If he either attempts or desires to hinder him, if he condemns or dislikes him for it, it is plain to all thinking men, he regards his own fees more than the lives of his patients.

“ II. Now, to apply. I. Seeing life everlasting, and holiness or health of soul, are things of so great importance, it is highly expedient that ministers, being physicians of the soul, should have all advantage of education and learning.

“ 2. That full trial should be made of them in all respects, and that by the most competent judges, before they enter on the public exercise of their office, the saving souls from death :

“ 3. That, after such trial, they be authorized to exercise that office by those who are empowered to convey that authority. (I believe bishops are empowered to do this, and have been so from the apostolic age.)

“ 4. And that those whose souls they save ought, meantime, to provide them what is needful for the body.

“ 5. But suppose a gentleman bred at the university of Dublin, with all the advantages of education, after he has undergone the usual trials, and been regularly authorized to save souls from death :

“ 6. Suppose, I say, this minister settles at — for some years, and yet saves no souls at all ; saves no sinners from their sins ; but after he has preached all this time to five or six hundred persons, cannot show that he has converted one from the error of his ways ; many of his parishioners dying as they lived, and the rest remaining just as they were before he came :

“ 7. Will you condemn a man who, having compassion on dying souls, and some knowledge of the Gospel of Christ, without any temporal reward, saves many from their sins whom the minister *could* not save !

"8. At least, *did* not: nor ever was likely to do it; for he did not go to them, and they would not come to him.

"9. Will you condemn such a preacher, because he has not learning, or has not had a university education?

"What then! He saves those sinners from their sins whom the man of learning and education cannot save.

"A peasant being brought before the College of Physicians at Paris, a learned doctor accosted him, 'What, friend, do you pretend to prescribe to people that have agues? Dost thou know what an ague is?'

"He replied, 'Yes, sir. An ague is, what I can cure and you cannot.'

"10. Will you object, 'But he is no minister, nor has any authority to save souls?'

"I must beg leave to dissent from you in this. I think he is a true evangelical minister, *Διακονος*, servant of Christ and his Church, who *πρω διακονει*, 'so ministers' as to save souls from death, to reclaim sinners from their sins; and that every Christian, if he is able to do it, has authority to save a dying soul.

"But if you only mean, he has no authority to take tithes, I grant it. He takes none. As he has freely received, so he freely gives.

"11. But to carry the matter a little farther, I am afraid it will hold, on the other hand, with regard to the soul as well as the body, *Medicus non est qui non medetur*. [He who cures none is no physician.] I am afraid reasonable men will be inclined to think, 'he that saves no souls is no minister of Christ.'

"12. 'O but he is ordained, and therefore has authority.'

"Authority to do what! 'To save all the souls that will put themselves under his care.' True; but (to waive the case of them that will not; and would you desire that even those should perish?) he does not, in fact, save them that are under his care: therefore, what end does his authority serve? He that was a drunkard, is a drunkard still. The same is true of the Sabbath breaker, the thief, the common swearer. This is the best of the case; for many have died in their iniquity, and their blood will God require at the watchman's hand.

"13. For surely he has no authority to murder souls; either by his neglect, by his smooth, if not false, doctrine, or by hindering another from plucking them out of the fire and bringing them to life everlasting.

"14. If he either attempts or desires to hinder him, if he condemns or is displeased with him for it, how great reason is there to fear, that he regards his own profit more than the salvation of souls!"

11. "But why do you not prove your mission by miracles?" This likewise you repeat over and over. But I have not leisure to answer the same stale objection a hundred times. I therefore give this also the same answer which I gave many years ago:—

12. "What is it you would have us prove by miracles? that the doctrines we preach are true! This is not the way to prove that: we prove the doctrines we preach by Scripture and reason. Is it, (1.) That A. B. was for many years without God in the world, a common swearer, a Sabbath breaker, a drunkard? Or, (2.) That he is not so now? Or, (3.) That he continued so till he heard us preach, and from that time was another man? Not so; the proper way to prove these facts, is by the testimony of competent witnesses. And these witnesses are ready, whenever required, to give full evidence of them. Or would you have it proved by miracles, (4.) That this was not done by our own power or holiness? that God only is able to raise the dead, those who are dead in trespasses and sins? Nay, 'if you hear not Moses and the prophets,' and the Apostles, on this head, neither will you believe 'though one rose from the dead.' It is therefore utterly unreasonable and absurd, to require or expect the proof of miracles, in questions of such a kind

as are always decided by proofs of quite another nature." (*Farther Appeal to Men of Reason and Religion*, vol. v, p. 165.)

If you will take the trouble of reading that little tract, you will find more upon the same head.

13. If you say, "But those who lay claim to extraordinary inspiration and revelation ought to prove that claim by miracles," we allow it: but this is not our case. We lay claim to no such thing. The Apostles did lay claim to extraordinary inspiration, and accordingly proved their claim by miracles. And their blessed Master claimed to be Lord of all, the eternal Son of God. Well therefore might he be expected to "do the works which no other man did;" especially as he came to put an end to that dispensation which all men knew to be of God. See then how idly and impertinently you require the Methodists to work miracles "because Christ and his Apostles did!"

14. You proceed: "They pretend to be as free from sin as Jesus Christ." (p. 6.) You bring three proofs of this: (1.) "Mr. Wesley, in his answer to a divine of our Church, says, 'Jesus Christ stands as our regeneration, to help us to the same holy undefiled nature which he himself had. And if this very life and identical nature is not propagated and derived on us, he is not our Saviour.'" (p. 7.) When I heard you read these words, I listened and studied, and could not imagine where you got them. I knew they were not mine: I use no such queer language; but did not then recollect, that they are Mr. Law's words, in his answer to Dr. Trapp, an extract from which I have published. But be they whose they will, they by no means imply that we are to be "as righteous as Christ was," but that we are to be (which St. Peter likewise affirms) "partakers of the divine nature." (2.) "A preacher of yours declared he was as free from sin as Christ ever was." I did not hear him declare it: pray, did you? If not, how do you know he declared it at all? Nay, but "another declared he believed it was impossible for one whom he named to sin, for the Spirit of God dwelt in him bodily." (p. 8.) Pray, sir, did you hear this yourself? Else the testimony is nothing worth. Hearsay evidence will not be admitted by any court in the kingdom.

What you say of that good man Mr. Whitefield, now with God, I leave with Mr. H——'s remark: "I admire your prudence, though not your generosity; for it is much safer to cudgel a dead man than a living one."

15. You next descant upon "the disorders which the spirit of enthusiasm created in the last age." Very likely it might; but, blessed be God, that is nothing at all to us. For he hath given us, not the spirit of enthusiasm, but of love and of a sound mind. In the following page you quaintly compare your hearers to sheep, and yourself and friends to the dogs in the fable; and seem much afraid, lest the silly sheep should be "persuaded to give you up to these ravening wolves." Nay, should you not rather be ranked with the sheep than the dogs? For your teeth are not so sharp as razors.

16. "Another fundamental error of the Methodists is, the asserting that laymen may preach; yea, the most ignorant and illiterate of them, provided they have the inward call of the Spirit." (p. 11.)

The former part of this objection we had before. The latter is a total

mistake. They do not allow the "most ignorant" men to preach, whatever "inward call" they pretend to. Among them none are allowed to be stated preachers, but such as, (1.) Are truly alive to God; such as experience the "faith that worketh by love;" such as love God and all mankind. (2.) Such as have a competent knowledge of the word of God, and of the work of God in the souls of men. (3.) Such as have given proof that they are called of God, by converting sinners from the error of their ways. And to show whether they have these qualifications or no, they are a year, sometimes more, upon trial. Now, I pray, what is the common examination, either for deacon's or priest's orders, to this?

17. "But no ambassador can act without a commission from his king: consequently, no preacher without a commission from God." (p. 11.) This is a tender point; but you constrain me to speak. I ask then, Is he commissioned from God to preach the Gospel, who does not know the Gospel? who knows little more of the Bible than of the Koran? I fear not. But if so, what are many of our brethren? Sent of man, but not of God!

"However, these laymen are not sent of God to preach; for does not St. Paul say, 'No man taketh this honour to himself, but he that is called of God, as was Aaron?'" (p. 13.) Another text most unhappily applied; for Aaron did not preach at all. But if these men are not sent of God, how comes God to confirm their word, by convincing and converting sinners? He confirms the word of his messenger, but of none else. Therefore, if God owns their word, it is plain that God has sent them.

"But the earth opened and swallowed up those intruders into the priestly office, Korah, Dathan, and Abiram." (p. 14.) Such an intruder are you, if you convert no sinners to God. Take heed lest a deeper pit swallow *you* up!

18. "But the Church of Rome has sent out preachers among us, such as Thomas Heath, a Jesuit; and Faithful Commin, a Dominican friar." (pp. 16, 17.) And what do you infer from hence? that my brother, who was thought a student of Christ Church in Oxford, was really a Jesuit? and that while I passed for a fellow of Lincoln College, I was in fact a Dominican friar? Even to hint at such absurdities as these is an insult on common sense.

19. We have now done with the argumentative part of your sermons, and come to the exhortation: "'Mark them that cause divisions and offences among you; for they serve not the Lord, but their own bellies.'" (p. 18.) Who "serve their own bellies?" the Methodists, or —? Alas, how terribly might this be retorted! "'And by fair speeches deceive the hearts of the simple.'" Deceive them into what? into the knowledge and love of God! the loving their neighbour as themselves! the walking in justice, mercy, and truth! the doing to all as they would be done to! *Felices errore suo!* [Happy in their deception!] Would to God all the people of Waterford, rich and poor, yea, all the men, women and children in the three kingdoms, may be thus deceived!

20. "Do not credit those who tell you that we must judge of our regeneration by sensible impulses, impressions, ardours, and ecstasies." (p. 19.) Who tells them so? Not I: not Mr. Bourke: not any in

connoction with me. Sir, you yourself either do or ought to know the contrary. Whether therefore these are, or are not, "signs of the Spirit," (p. 20,) see you to it; it is nothing to me; any more than whether the Spirit does or does not "show itself in groanings and sighings, in fits and starts." I never affirmed it did: and when you represent me as so doing, you are a sinner against God, and me, and your own soul.

21. If you should see good to write any thing more about the Methodists, I beg you would first learn who and what they are. Be so kind as at least to read over my "Journals," and the "Appeals to Men of Reason and Religion." Then you will no longer "run" thus "uncertainly," or "fight as one that beateth the air." But I would rather hope you will not fight at all. For, whom would you fight with? If you will fight, it must be with your friends; for such we really are. We wish all the same happiness to you which we wish to our own souls. We desire no worse for you, than that you may "present" yourself "a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable to God;" that you may watch over the souls committed to your charge, as he "that must give account;" and that, in the end, you may receive "the crown which the Lord, the righteous Judge, will give to all that love his appearing!" So prays, Reverend Sir,

Your affectionate brother,

JOHN WESLEY.

May 18 1771.

THE
DOCTRINE OF ORIGINAL SIN,
ACCORDING TO
SCRIPTURE, REASON, AND EXPERIENCE.

PREFACE.

1. A FEW years ago, a friend put into my hands Dr. Taylor's "Doctrine of Original Sin," which I read carefully over and partly transcribed, and have many times since diligently considered. The author is doubtless a person of sense, nay, of unusually strong understanding, joined with no small liveliness of imagination, and a good degree of various learning. He has likewise an admirable command of temper, so that he almost every where speaks as one in good humour. Add to this, that he has a smooth and pleasing, yet a manly and nervous, style. And all these talents he exerts to the uttermost, on a favourite subject in the Treatise before us; which he has had leisure for many years to revise, file, correct, and strengthen against all objections.

2. So finished a piece surely deserves the consideration of all those masters of reason which the age has produced. And I have long hoped that some of those would attempt to show how far the doctrine there laid down is true; and what weight there is in the arguments which are produced in confirmation of it. I know not how to believe that all the clergy in England are of the same opinion with this author. And certainly there are some whom all his skill in Greek, and even in Hebrew, does not make afraid. I should rejoice had any of these undertaken the task, who are, in many respects, better qualified for it; particularly in this, that they have time upon their hands; they have full leisure for such an employment. But since none else will,* I cannot but speak, though lying under many peculiar disadvantages. I dare not be silent any longer: necessity is laid upon me to provide those who desire to know the truth with some antidote against that deadly poison which has been diffusing itself for several years through our nation, our Church, and even our universities. Nay, one (I hope, only one) father of the Church has declared that he knows no book more proper than this to settle the principles of a young clergyman. Is it not time, then, for "the very stones to cry out?"

3. For this is not a point of small importance; a question that may safely be determined either way. On the contrary, it may be doubted whether the scheme before us be not far more dangerous than open Deism itself. It does not shock us like bare-faced infidelity: we feel no pain, and suspect no evil, while it steals like "water into our bowels," like "oil into our bones." One who would be upon his guard in reading the Works of Dr. Middleton, or Lord Bolingbroke, is quite open and unguarded in reading the smooth, decent writings of Dr. Taylor; one who does not oppose, (far be it from him!) but only explain, the Scripture, who does not raise any difficulties or objections against the Christian Revelation, but only removes those with which it had been unhappily encumbered for so many centuries!

4. I said, *than open Deism*: for I cannot look on this scheme as any other than old Deism in a new dress; seeing it saps the very foundation of all revealed religion, whether Jewish or Christian. "Indeed, my L—," said an eminent man to a person of quality, "I cannot see that we have much

* Since the writing of this, I have seen several Tracts, which I shall have occasion to take notice of hereafter. There are likewise many excellent remarks on this subject in Mr. Hervey's Dialogues.

need of Jesus Christ." And who might not say upon this supposition, "I cannot see that we have much need of Christianity!" Nay, not any at all; for "they that are whole have no need of a physician;" and the Christian Revelation speaks of nothing else but the great "Physician" of our souls; nor can Christian philosophy, whatever be thought of the Pagan, be more properly defined than in Plato's word: it is *θεραπευτικὴ ψυχῆς*, "the only true method of healing a distempered soul." But what need of this, if we are in perfect health? If we are not diseased, we do not want a cure. If we are not sick, why should we seek for a medicine to heal our sickness? What room is there to talk of our being renewed in "knowledge" or "holiness, after the image wherein we were created," if we never have lost that image? if we are as knowing and holy now, nay, far more so, than Adam was immediately after his creation? If, therefore, we take away this foundation, that man is by nature foolish and sinful, "fallen short of the glorious image of God," the Christian system falls at once; nor will it deserve so honourable an appellation, as that of a "cunningly devised fable."

5. In considering this confutation of the Christian system, I am under some difficulty from Dr. Taylor's manner of writing. It is his custom to say the same thing (sometimes in different, sometimes in nearly the same words) six or eight, perhaps twelve or fifteen times, in different parts of his book. Now, I have accustomed myself, for many years, to say one and the same thing once only. However, to comply with his manner as far as possible, I shall add, at proper intervals, extracts from others, expressing nearly the same sentiments which I have before expressed in my own words.

6. I am sensible, in speaking on so tender a point as this must needs be, to those who believe the Christian system, there is danger of a warmth which does no honour to our cause, nor is it at all countenanced by the Revelation which we defend. I desire neither to show nor to feel this, but to "speak the truth in love," (the only warmth which the Gospel allows,) and to write with calmness, though not indifference. There is likewise a danger of despising our opponents, and of speaking with an air of contempt or disdain. I would gladly keep clear of this also; well knowing that a diffidence of ourselves is far from implying a diffidence of our cause: I distrust myself, not my argument. Oh that the God of the Christians may be with me! that his Spirit may give me understanding, and enable me to think and "speak as the oracles of God," without going from them to the right hand or to the left!

LEWISHAM, November 30, 1756.

THE DOCTRINE OF ORIGINAL SIN.

PART I.

THE PAST AND PRESENT STATE OF MANKIND.

BEFORE we attempt to account for any fact, we should be well assured of the fact itself. First, therefore, let us inquire what is the real state of mankind; and, in the second place, endeavour to account for it.

I. First, I say, let us inquire, What is the real state, with regard to knowledge and virtue, wherein mankind have been from the earliest times? And what state are they in at this day?

I. 1. What is the state, (to begin with the former branch of the inquiry,) with regard to knowledge and virtue, wherein, according to the most authentic accounts, mankind have been from the earliest times? We have no authentic account of the state of mankind in the times antecedent to the deluge, but in the writings of Moses. What then, accord-

ing to these, was the state of mankind in those times? Moses gives us an exact and full account: God then "saw that the wickedness of man was great, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually," Gen. vi, 5, 12, 13. And this was not the case of only part of mankind; but "all flesh had corrupted his way upon the earth:" and accordingly God said, "The end of all flesh is come, for the earth is filled with violence through them." Only Noah was "righteous before God," Gen. vii, 1. Therefore only he and his household were spared, when God "brought the flood upon the world of the ungodly," and destroyed them all from the face of the earth.

"Let us examine the most distinguishing features in this draught. Not barely the works of their hands, or the words of their tongue, but 'every imagination of the thoughts of their hearts was evil.' The contagion had spread itself through the inner man; had tainted the seat of their principles, and the source of their actions. But was there not some mixture of good? No; they were only evil: not so much as a little leaven of piety, unless in one single family. But were there no lucid intervals; no happy moments wherein virtue gained the ascendancy? None; every imagination, every thought was only evil continually." (Mr. Hervey's *Theron and Aspasio*: Dial. 11.)

2. Such was the state of mankind for at least sixteen hundred years. Men were corrupting themselves and each other, and proceeding from one degree of wickedness to another, till they were all (save eight persons) ripe for destruction. So deplorable was the state of the moral world, while the natural was in its highest perfection. And yet it is highly probable, that the inhabitants of the earth were then abundantly more numerous than ever they have been since, considering the length of their lives, falling little short of a thousand years, and the strength and vigour of their bodies, which we may easily gather from the time they were to continue; to say nothing of the fertility of the earth, probably far greater than it is at present. Consequently, it was then capable of sustaining such a number of inhabitants as could not now subsist on the produce of it.

3. Let us next take a view of the "families of the sons of Noah," the inhabitants of the earth after the flood. The first remarkable incident we read concerning them is, that while "they were all of one language, they said one to another, Let us build a city and a tower, whose top may reach unto heaven, lest we be scattered abroad upon the face of the earth." It is not easy to determine what were the peculiar aggravations which attended this attempt. But it is certain, there was daring wickedness therein, which brought upon them the very thing they feared; for "the Lord," by "confounding their language," (not their religious worship: can we suppose God would confound this?) "scattered them abroad upon the face of all the earth," Gen. xi, 4, 9. Now, whatever particulars in this account may be variously interpreted, thus much is clear and undeniable,—that all these, that is, all the inhabitants of the earth, had again "corrupted their way;" the universal wickedness being legible in the universal punishment.

4. We have no account of their reforming their ways, of any universal or general repentance, before God separated Abraham to himself, to be the father of his chosen people, Gen. xii, 1, 2. Nor is there any reason to believe, that the rest of mankind were improved either in wis-

dom or virtue, when "Lot and Abraham separated themselves, and Lot pitched his tent toward Sodom," Gen. xiii, 11, 12. Of those among whom he dwelt it is particularly remarked, "The men of Sodom" (and of all "the cities of the plain") "were wicked and sinners before the Lord exceedingly;" Gen. xiii, 13; so that not even "ten righteous persons" could be found among them: the consequence of which was, that "the Lord rained upon them brimstone and fire from the Lord out of heaven," Gen. xix, 24.

5. We have no ground to suppose that the other inhabitants of the earth (Abraham, with his family and descendants, excepted) had either the knowledge or the fear of God, from that time till Jacob "went into Egypt." This was then, as well as for several ages after, the great seat of learning; insomuch that "the wisdom of the Egyptians" was celebrated even to a proverb. And indeed for this end, as well as "to save much people alive," Gen. l, 20, did "God send Joseph into Egypt," even "to inform their princes after his will, and to teach their senators wisdom." And yet not long after his death, as their king "knew not Joseph," so his people knew not God. Yea, they set him at defiance: they and their king provoked him more and more, and "hardened their hearts" against him; even after they had "seen his wonders in Egypt," after they had groaned under his repeated vengeance. They still added sin to sin, till they constrained the Lord to destroy them with an utter destruction; till the divided "waters returned, and covered the chariots and horsemen, and all the host of Pharaoh."

6. Nor were the other nations who then inhabited the earth, any better than the Egyptians; the true knowledge and spiritual worship of God being confined to the descendants of Abraham. "He had not dealt so with other nations, neither had the Heathens knowledge of his laws," Psalm cxlvii, 20. And in what state were the Israelites themselves? How did they worship the God of their fathers? Why, even these were "a stubborn and rebellious generation, a generation that set not their heart aright. They kept not the covenant of God, and refused to walk in his law. They provoked him at the sea, even at the Red Sea;" Psalm lxxviii, 8, 10; cvi, 7; Exod. xiv, 11, 12; the very place where he had so signally delivered them. "They made a calf in Horeb, and worshipped the molten image," Psalm cvi, 19, where they had heard the Lord, but a little before, saying, out of the midst of the fire, "Thou shalt not make unto thyself any graven image; thou shalt not bow down to them, nor worship them." And how amazing was their behaviour during those whole forty years that they sojourned in the wilderness! even while he "led them in the day-time with a cloud, and all the night with a light of fire!" Psalm lxxviii, 14. Such were the knowledge and virtue of God's peculiar people, (certainly the most knowing and virtuous nation which was then to be found upon the face of the earth,) till God brought them into the land of Canaan;—considerably more than two thousand years from the creation of the world.

None, I presume, will say there was any other nation at that time more knowing and more virtuous than the Israelites. None can say this while he professes to believe, according to the Scriptural account, that Israel was then under a theocracy, under the immediate government of God; that he conversed with their subordinate governor "face to

face, as a man talketh with his friend ;” and that God was daily, through him, conveying such instructions to them as they were capable of receiving.

7. Shall we turn our eyes for a moment from the Scriptural to the profane account of mankind in the earliest ages? What was the general sentiment of the most polite and knowing nation, the Romans, when their learning was in its utmost perfection? Let one, who certainly was no bigot or enthusiast, speak for the rest. And he speaks home to the point :—

*Nam fuit ante Helenam cunctis teterrima belli
Causa ; sed ignotis perierunt mortibus omnes
Quos venerem incertam rapientes more ferarum,
Viribus editior cædebat, ut in grege taurus.*

“ Full many a war has been for women waged
Ere half the world in Helen’s cause engaged ;
But, unrecorded in historic verse,
Obscurely died those savage ravishers,
Who like brute beasts the female bore away,
Till some superior brute re-seized the prey :
As a wild bull, his rival bull o’erthrown,
Claims the whole subject herd, and reigns alone.”

I doubt he who gives this, not as his peculiar opinion, but as what was then a generally received notion, would scarce have allowed even so much as Juvenal,—

*Pudicitiam Saturno rege moratam
In terris.....*

“ Chastity did once, I grant, remain
On earth, and flourish’d in old Saturn’s reign :”

Unless one should suppose the reign of Saturn to have expired when Adam was driven out of Paradise.

I cannot forbear adding another picture of the ancient dignity of human nature, drawn by the same masterly hand. Before men dwelt in cities, he says, this

*Turpe pecus, glandem atque cubilia propter,
Unguibus et pugnīs, dein fustibus, atque ita porro
Pugnabant armīs, quæ post fabricaverat usus.*

“ The human herd, unbroken and untaught,
For acorns first, and grassy couches fought ;
With fists, and then with clubs maintain’d the fray,
Till, urged by hate, they found a quicker way,
And forged pernicious arms, and learn’d the art to slay.”

What a difference is there between this and the gay, florid accounts which many moderns give of their own species!

8. But to return to more authentic accounts: At the time when God brought the Israelites into Canaan, in what state were the rest of mankind? Doubtless in nearly the same with the Canaanites, with the Amorites, Hittites, Perizzites, and the rest of the seven nations. But the wickedness of these, we know, was full; they were corrupt in the highest degree. All manner of vice, all ungodliness and unrighteousness, reigned among them without control; and therefore the wise and just Governor of the world gave them up to a swift and total destruction.

9. Of Israel, indeed, we read, that they “served the Lord all the days of Joshua, and all the days of the Elders that over-lived Joshua,” Josh. xxiv, 31. And yet even at that time they did not serve him alone; they

were not free from gross idolatry ; otherwise, there had been no need of his giving them that exhortation a little before his death : " Now, therefore, put away the strange gods which are among you," the gods which your fathers served on the other side of the river Jordan, verse 23. What gods these were, we learn by the words of Amos, cited by St. Stephen : " O ye house of Israel, have ye offered sacrifices to me by the space of forty years ? Yea, ye took up the tabernacle of Moloch, and the star of your god Remphan, figures which ye made to worship them," Acts vii, 42, 43.

10. The sacred history of what occurred within a short space after the death of Joshua, for some hundred years, even until the time that Samuel judged Israel, gives us a large account of their astonishing wickedness during almost that whole period. It is true, just " when God smote them, then they sought him ; they returned, and inquired after God." Yet " their heart was not right with him, neither were they steadfast in his covenant," Psalm lxxviii, 34, 37. And we find little alteration among them for the better in the succeeding ages ; insomuch that, in the reign of Ahab, about nine hundred years before Christ, there were only " seven thousand left in Israel who had not bowed the knee to Baal," 1 Kings xix, 18. What manner of men they were for the next three hundred years, we may learn from the books of the Kings, and from the Prophets ; whence it fully appears that, except a few short intervals, they were given up to all manner of abominations ; by reason of which the name of the Most High was the more abundantly blasphemed among the Heathens. And this continued, until their open rebellion against God brought upon the whole nation of the Jews (a hundred and thirty-four years after the captivity of the ten tribes, and about six hundred before Christ) those terrible and long-deserved calamities which made them a spectacle to all that were round about them. The writings of Ezekiel, Daniel, and Jeremiah, leave us no room to think that they were reformed by those calamities. Nor was there any lasting reformation in the time of Ezra, or of Nehemiah and Malachi ; but they were still, as their forefathers had been, " a faithless and stubborn generation." Such were they likewise, as we may gather from the books of Maccabees and Josephus, to the very time when Christ came into the world.

11. Our blessed Lord has given us a large description of those who were then the most eminent for religion : " Ye devour," says he, " widows' houses, and for a pretence make long prayers. Ye make" your proselytes " twofold more the children of hell than yourselves. Ye neglect the weightier matters of the law, judgment, mercy, and faith. Ye make clean the outside of the cup, but within are full of extortion and excess. Ye are like whited sepulchres, outwardly beautiful, but within full of dead men's bones, and of all uncleanness. Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers, how can ye escape the damnation of hell !" Matt. xxiii, 14, &c. And to these very men, after they had murdered the Just One, his faithful follower declared, " Ye stiff-necked, and un-circumcised in heart and ears, ye do always resist the Holy Ghost ; as your fathers did, so do ye," Acts vii, 51. And so they continued to do, until the wrath of God did indeed " come upon them to the uttermost ;" until eleven hundred thousand of them were destroyed, their city and

temple levelled with the dust, and above ninety thousand sold for slaves and scattered into all lands.

12. Such in all generations were the lineal children of Abraham, who had so unspeakable advantages over the rest of mankind; “to whom pertained the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises:” among whom, therefore, we may reasonably expect to find the greatest eminence of knowledge and virtue. If these then were so stupidly, brutishly ignorant, so desperately wicked, what can we expect from the Heathen world, from them who had not the knowledge either of his law or promises? Certainly we cannot expect to find more goodness among them. But let us make a fair and impartial inquiry; and that not among wild and barbarous nations, but the most civilized and refined. What then were the ancient Romans? the people whose virtue is so highly extolled, and so warmly commended to our imitation? We have their character given by one who cannot deceive or be deceived,—the unerring Spirit of God. And what account does he give of these best of men, these heroes of antiquity? “When they knew God,” says he, at least as to his eternity and power, (both implied in that appellation, which occurs more than once in their own poet, *Pater omnipotens*, “Almighty Father,”) “they glorified him not as God, neither were thankful,” Rom. i, 21, &c. So far from it, that one of their oracles of wisdom (though once he stumbled on that great truth, *Nemo unquam vir magnus sine afflatu divino fuit*,—“There never was any great man without the afflatus or inspiration of God;” yet, almost in the same breath) does not scruple to ask, *Quis pro virtute aut sapientiâ gratias diis dedit unquam?* “Who ever thanked God for virtue or wisdom?” No, why should he? since these are “his own acquisition, the pure result of his own industry.” Accordingly, another virtuous Roman has left it on record, as an unquestioned maxim,—

*Hæc satis est orare Jovem, quæ donat et aufert :
Det vitam, det opes ; æquum mi animum ipse parabo.*

“Enough for common benefits to pray,
Which Jove can either give or take away :
Long life or wealth his bounty may bestow ;
Wisdom and virtue to myself I owe.”

So “vain” were they become “in their imaginations!” So were their “foolish hearts darkened!” Rom. i, 21, &c.

13. But this was only the first step : they did not stop here. “Professing themselves wise,” they yet sunk into such gross, astonishing folly, as to “change the glory of the incorruptible God” (whom they might have known, even from their own writers, to be

*Vastam
Mens agitans molem, et magno se corpore miscens,—*

“The all-informing soul
That fills the mighty mass, and moves the whole,”)

“into an image made like to corruptible man; yea, to birds, to beasts, to creeping things!” What wonder was it then, that, after they had thus “changed his glory into an image, God gave them up to uncleanness, through the lusts of their own hearts, to dishonour their own bodies between themselves?” How justly, when they had “changed the truth of God into a lie, and worshipped and served the creature rather than

the Creator," did he "for this cause," punishing sin by sin, "give them up unto vile affections! For even the women did change the natural use into that which is against nature." Yea, the modest, honourable Roman matrons (so little were they ashamed!) wore their *priapi* [emblems of the god of obscenity] openly on their breasts. "And likewise the men burned in their lust one toward another, men with men working that which is unseemly." What an amazing testimony of this is left us on record, even by the most modest of all the Roman poets!

Fornosum pastor Corydon ardebat. Alexim!

How does this pattern of Heathen chastity avow, without either fear or shame, as if it were an innocent, at least, if not laudable, passion, their "burning in lust one toward another!" And did men of the finest taste in the nation censure the song, or the subject of it? We read nothing of this; on the contrary, the universal honour and esteem paid to the writer, and that by persons of the highest rank, plainly shows that the case of Corydon, as it was not uncommon in any part of the Roman dominions, so it was not conceived to be any blemish, either to him or his master, but an innocent infirmity.

Meantime, how delicate an idea of love had this favourite of Rome and of the Muses! Hear him explaining himself a little more fully on this tender point:—

*Eheu! quàm pingui macer est mihi taurus in agro!
Idem amor exitium est pecori, pecorisque magistro.*

Idem amor! The same love in the bull and in the man! What elegance of sentiment! Is it possible any thing can exceed this? One would imagine nothing could, had not the same chaste poet furnished us with yet another scene, more abundantly shocking than this:—

Pasiphæen nivei solatur amore juvenעי!

"He comforts Pasiphæe with the love of her milk white bull!" *Nilil supra!* [The capsheaf!] The condoling a woman on her unsuccessful amour with a bull, shows a brutality which nothing can exceed! How justly then does the Apostle add, as "they did not like," or desire, "to retain God in their knowledge, God gave them over to an undiscerning mind, to do those things which are not convenient!" In consequence of this, they were "filled with all unrighteousness," vice of every kind, and in every degree;—in particular "with fornication," (taking the word in its largest sense, as including every sin of the kind,) "with wickedness, covetousness, maliciousness, with envy, murder, debate, deceit, malignity;"—being "haters of God," the true God, the God of Israel, to whom they allowed no place among all their herd of deities;—"despiteful, proud, boasters," in as eminent a degree as ever was any nation under heaven;—"inventors of evil things," in great abundance, of *mille nocendi artes*, [a thousand destructive arts,] both in peace and war;—"disobedient to parents,"—although duty to these is supposed to be inscribed on the hearts of the most barbarous nations;—"covenant breakers,"—even of those of the most solemn kind, those wherein the public faith was engaged by their supreme magistrate; which, notwithstanding, they made no manner of scruple of breaking, whenever they saw good; only colouring over their perfidiousness, by giving those magistrates into their hands with whom the "covenant" was made. And what was this to the purpose? Is the king of France, or the republic of Holland, at liberty

to violate their most solemn treaties at pleasure, provided they give up to the king of England, the ambassador, or general, by whom that treaty was made? What would all Europe have said of the late Czar, if, instead of punctually performing the engagements made with the Porte when in his distress, he had only given up the persons by whom he transacted, and immediately broke through them all? There is therefore no room to say,

*Modo Punica scripta supersint,
Non minus infamis forte Latina fides.*

“Perhaps, if the Carthaginian writings were extant, Roman faith would be as infamous as Punic.” We need them not. In vain have they destroyed the Carthaginian writings; for their own sufficiently testify of them; and fully prove that in perfidy the natives of Carthage could not exceed the senate and people of Rome.

14. They were as a nation *ασπργοι*, void of natural affection, even to their own bowels. Witness the universal custom which obtained for several ages in Rome, and all its dependencies, (as it had done before through all the cities of Greece,) when in their highest repute for wisdom and virtue, of exposing their own new-born children, more or fewer of them, as every man pleased, when he had as many as he thought good to keep; throwing them out to perish by cold and hunger, unless some more merciful wild beast shortened their pain, and provided them a sepulchre. Nor do I remember a single Greek, or Roman, of all those that occasionally mention it, ever complaining of this diabolical custom, or fixing the least touch of blame upon it. Even the tender mother in Terence, who had some compassion for her helpless infant, does not dare to acknowledge it to her husband, without that remarkable preface, *Ut miserè superstitiosæ sumus omnes*; “As we women are all miserably superstitious.”

15. I would desire those gentlemen who are so very severe upon the Israelites for killing the children of the Canaanites, at their entrance into the land of Canaan, to spend a few thoughts on this. Not to insist, that the Creator is the absolute Lord and Proprietor of the lives of all his creatures; that, as such, he may at any time, without the least injustice, take away the life which he has given; that he may do this in whatsoever manner, and by whatever instruments, he pleases; and consequently may inflict death on any creature by whom he pleases, without any blame either to him or them;—not to insist, I say, on this, or many other things which might be offered, let us at present fix on this single consideration: The Israelites destroyed the children for some weeks or months; the Greeks and Romans for above a thousand years. The one put them out of their pain at once, doubtless by the shortest and easiest way; the others were not so compassionate as to cut their throats, but left them to pine away by a lingering death. Above all, the Hebrews destroyed only the children of their enemies; the Romans destroyed their own. O fair pattern indeed! Where shall we find a parallel to this virtue? I read of a modern, who took up a child, that fell from its mother’s womb, and threw it back into the flames. (Pure, genuine human nature!) And reason good,—for it was the child of a heretic. But what evil, ye worthies of ancient Rome, did ye find in your own children? I must still say, this is without a parallel even in the Papal history.

16. They were *implacable, unmerciful*. Witness (one or two instances of ten thousand) poor grey-headed Hannibal, (whom, very probably, had we any other accounts of him than those which were given by his bitterest enemies, we should have revered as one of the most amiable of men, as well as the most valiant of all the ancient Heathens,) hunted from nation to nation, and never quitted, till he fell by his own hand. Witness the famous suffrage, *Delenda est Carthago*; "Let Carthage be destroyed." Why? It was *imperii æmula*; "the rival of the Roman glory." These were open, undeniable evidences of the public, national placability and mercy of the Romans. Need instances of a more private nature be added? Behold, then, one for all, in that glory of Rome, that prodigy of virtue, the great, the celebrated Cato. Cato the Elder, when any of his domestics had worn themselves out in his service, and grew decrepit with age, constantly turned them out to starve; and was much applauded for his frugality in so doing. But what mercy was this? Just such as that which dwelt in Cato of Utica, who repaid the tenderness of his servant endeavouring to save his life, to prevent his tearing open his wound, by striking him on the face with such violence as to fill his mouth with blood. These are thy gods, O Deism! These the patterns so zealously recommended to our imitation!

17. And what was the real character of that hero, whom Cato himself so admired? whose cause he espoused with such eagerness, with such unwearied diligence? of Pompey the Great? Surely never did any man purchase that title at so cheap a rate! What made him great? The villany of Perpenna, and the treachery of Pharnaces. Had not the one murdered his friend, the other rebelled against his father, where had been Pompey's greatness? So this stalking horse of a party procured his reputation in the commonwealth. And when it was procured, how did he use it? Let his own poet Lucan speak:—

*Nec quenquam jam ferre potest Cæsare priorem,
Pompeiusve parem.*

"Nor Cæsar could to a superior look;
Nor patriot Pompey could an equal brook."

He would bear no equal! And this a senator of Rome! Nay, the grand patron of the republic! But what a republican himself, when this principle was the spring of all his designs and actions! Indeed, a less amiable character it is not easy to find among all the great men of antiquity; ambitious, vain, haughty, surly, and overbearing, beyond the common rate of men. And what virtue had he to balance these faults? I can scarce find one, even in Lucan's account: It does not appear that in the latter part of his life he had even military virtues. What proof did he give of personal courage, in all his war with Cæsar? what instances of eminent conduct? None at all, if we may credit his friend Cicero; who complains heavily to Atticus, that he acted like a madman, and would ruin the cause he had undertaken to defend.

18. Let none therefore look for placability or mercy in Pompey. But was there any unmercifulness in Cæsar?

"Who than Julius hopes to rise
More brave, more generous, or more wise?"

Of his courage and sense there can be no doubt. And much may be said, with regard to his contest with Pompey, even for the justice of his

cause ; for with him he certainly fought for life rather than glory ; of which he had the strongest conviction (though he was ashamed to own it) when he passed the Rubicon. Nor can it be doubted but he was often merciful. It is no proof to the contrary that he rode up and down his ranks, during the battle of Pharsalia, and cried to those who were engaged with the pretty gentlemen of Pompey's army, *Miles, faciem feri*, "Soldiers, strike at the face;" for this greatly shortened the dispute with those who were more afraid of losing their beauty than their lives, and so prevented the effusion of much blood. But I cannot get over (to say nothing of the myriads of common Gauls whom he destroyed) a short sentence in his own Commentaries : *Vercingetorix per tormenta necatus*. [Vercingetorix tortured to death.] Who was this Vercingetorix? As brave a man, and (considering his years) as great a General, as even Cæsar. What was his crime? The love of his parents, wife, children, country ; and sacrificing all things in defence of them. And how did Cæsar treat him on this account? "He tortured him to death." O Roman mercy! Did not Brutus and Cassius avenge Vercingetorix rather than Pompey? How well was Rome represented in the prophetic vision by that beast, "dreadful and terrible," which had "great iron teeth, and devoured, and brake in pieces, and stamped under his feet," all other kingdoms!

II. 1. Such is the state, with regard to knowledge and virtue, wherein, according to the most authentic accounts, mankind was from the earliest times, for above four thousand years. Such nearly did it continue, during the decline, and since the destruction, of the Roman empire. But we will waive all that is past, if it only appears that mankind is virtuous and wise at this day. This, then, is the point we are at present to consider: are men in general now wise and virtuous?

Our ingenious countryman, Mr. Brerewood, after his most careful and laborious inquiries, computes, that, supposing that part of the earth which we know to be inhabited were divided into thirty equal parts, nineteen of these are Heathen still; and of the remaining eleven, six are Mohammedan, and only five Christian. Let us take as fair and impartial a survey as we can, of the Heathens first, and then of the Mohammedans and Christians.

2. And, First, of the Heathens. What manner of men are these, as to virtue and knowledge, at this day? Many of late, who still bear the Christian name, have entertained very honourable thoughts of the old Heathens. They cannot believe them to have been so stupid and senseless as they have been represented to be; particularly with regard to idolatry, in worshipping birds, beasts, and creeping things; much less can they credit the stories told of many nations, the Egyptians in particular,

Who are said to
Have set the leek they after prayed to.

But if they do not consider who they are that transmit to us these accounts, namely, both those writers who, they profess to believe, spake "as they were moved by the Holy Ghost," and those whom perhaps they value more, the most credible of their contemporary Heathens; if, I say, they forget this, do they not consider the present state of the Heathen world? Now, allowing the bulk of the ancient Heathens (which itself

is not easily proved) to have had as much understanding as the modern, we have no pretence to suppose they had more. What therefore they were, we may safely gather from what they are; we may judge of the past by the present. Would we know, then, (to begin with a part of the world known to very early antiquity,) what manner of men the Heathens in Africa were two or three thousand years ago? Inquire what they are now, who are genuine Pagans still, not tainted either with Mohammedanism or Christianity. They are to be found in abundance, either in Negroland, or round the Cape of Good Hope. Now, what measure of knowledge have the natives of these countries? I do not say in metaphysics, mathematics, or astronomy. Of these it is plain they know just as much as their four footed brethren; the lion and the man are equally accomplished with regard to this knowledge. I will not ask what they know of the nature of government, of the respective rights of kings and various orders of subjects: in this regard, a herd of men are manifestly inferior to a herd of elephants. But let us view them with respect to common life. What do they know of the things they continually stand in need of? How do they build habitations for themselves and their families; how select and prepare their food; clothe and adorn their persons? As to their habitations, it is certain, I will not say, our horses, (particularly those belonging to the nobility and gentry,) but an English peasant's dogs, nay, his very swine, are more commodiously lodged; and as to their food, apparel, and ornaments, they are just suitable to their edifices:

Your nicer Hottentots think meet
 With guts and tripe to deck their feet.
 With downcast eyes on Totta's legs,
 The love-sick youth most humbly begs,
 She would not from his sight remove
 At once his breakfast and his love.

Such is the knowledge of these accomplished animals, in things which cannot but daily employ their thoughts; and wherein, consequently, they cannot avoid exerting, to the uttermost, both their natural and acquired understanding.

And what are their present attainments in virtue? Are they not, one and all, "without God in the world?" having either no knowledge of him at all; no conception of any thing he has to do with them, or they with him; or such conceptions as are far worse than none, as make him such a one as themselves. And what are their social virtues? What are their dispositions and behaviour between man and man? Are they eminent for justice, for mercy, or truth? As to mercy, they know not what it means, being continually cutting each other's throats, from generation to generation, and selling for slaves as many of those who fall into their hands, as on that consideration only they do not murder. Justice they have none; no courts of justice at all; no public method of redressing wrong; but every man does what is right in his own eyes, till a stronger than he beats out his brains for so doing. And they have just as much regard to truth; cozening, cheating, and overreaching every man that believes a word they say. Such are the moral, such the intellectual perfections, according to the latest and most accurate accounts, of the present Heathens, who are diffused in great numbers over a fourth part of the known world!

3. It is true, that in the new world, in America, they seem to breathe a purer air, and to be in general men of a stronger understanding, and a less savage temper. Among these, then, we may surely find higher degrees of knowledge as well as virtue. But in order to form a just conception of them, we must not take our account from their enemies; from any that would justify themselves by blackening those whom they seek to destroy. No; but let us inquire of more impartial judges, concerning those whom they have personally known, the Indians bordering upon our own settlements, from New-England down to Georgia.

We cannot learn that there is any great difference, in point of knowledge, between any of these, from east to west, or from north to south. They are all equally unacquainted with European learning, being total strangers to every branch of literature, having not the least conception of any part of philosophy, speculative or practical. Neither have they (whatever accounts some have given) any such thing as a regular civil government among them. They have no laws of any kind, unless a few temporary rules made in and for the time of war. They are likewise utter strangers to the arts of peace, having scarce any such thing as an artificer in a nation. They know nothing of building; having only poor, miserable, ill-contrived huts, far inferior to many English dog kennels. Their clothing, till of late, was only skins of beasts, commonly of deer, hanging down before and behind them. Now, among those who have commerce with our nation, it is frequently a blanket wrapped about them. Their food is equally delicate,—pounded Indian corn, sometimes mixed with water, and so eaten at once; sometimes kneaded into cakes, meal and bran together, and half baked upon the coals. Fish or flesh, dried in the sun, is frequently added to this; and now and then a piece of tough, fresh-killed deer.

Such is the knowledge of the Americans, whether in things of an abstruser nature, or in the affairs of common life. And this, so far as we can learn, is the condition of all, without any considerable difference. But, in point of religion, there is a very material difference between the northern and the southern Indians: those in the north are idolaters of the lowest kind. If they do not worship the devil, appearing in person, (which many firmly believe they do, many think incredible,) certainly they worship the most vile and contemptible idols. It were more excusable if they only “turned the glory of the incorruptible God into the image of corruptible man;” yea, or “of birds, or four-footed beasts, or reptiles,” or any creature which God has made. But their idols are more horrid and deformed than any thing in the visible creation; and their whole worship is at once the highest affront to the Divine, and disgrace to the human, nature.

On the contrary, the Indians of our southern provinces do not appear to have any worship at all. By the most diligent inquiry from those who had spent many years among them, I could never learn that any of the Indian nations who border on Georgia and Carolina have any public worship of any kind, nor any private; for they have no idea of prayer. It is not without much difficulty that one can make any of them understand what is meant by prayer; and when they do, they cannot be made to apprehend that God will answer or even hear it. They say, “He that sitteth in heaven is too high; he is too far off to hear us.” In con-

sequence of which they leave him to himself, and manage their affairs without him. Only the Chicasaws, of all the Indian nations, are an exception to this.

I believe it will be found, on the strictest inquiry, that the whole body of southern Indians, as they have no letters and no laws, so, properly speaking, have no religion at all; so that every one does what he sees good; and if it appears wrong to his neighbour, he usually comes upon him unawares, and shoots or scalps him alive. They are likewise all (I could never find any exception) gluttons, drunkards, thieves, dissemblers, liars. They are *implacable*; never forgiving an injury or affront, or being satisfied with less than blood. They are *unmerciful*; killing all whom they take prisoners in war, with the most exquisite tortures. They are murderers of fathers, murderers of mothers, murderers of their own children; it being a common thing for a son to shoot his father or mother because they are old and past labour; and for a woman either to procure abortion, or to throw her child into the next river, because she will go to the war with her husband. Indeed, husbands, properly speaking, they have none; for any man leaves his wife, so called, at pleasure; who frequently, in return, cuts the throats of all the children she has had by him.

The Chicasaws alone seem to have some notion of an intercourse between man and a superior Being. They speak much of their *beloved ones*; with whom they say they converse both day and night. But their *beloved ones* teach them to eat and drink from morning to night, and, in a manner, from night to morning; for they rise at any hour of the night when they wake, and eat and drink as much as they can, and sleep again. Their beloved ones likewise expressly command them to torture and burn all their prisoners. Their manner of doing it is this: they hold lighted canes to their arms and legs, and several parts of their body, for some time, and then for a while take them away. They also stick burning pieces of wood in their flesh; in which condition they keep them from morning to evening. Such are at present the knowledge and virtue of the native Heathens, over another fourth of the known world.

4. In Asia, however, we are informed that the case is widely different. For although the Heathens bordering on Europe, the thousands and myriads of Tartars, have not much to boast either as to knowledge or virtue; and although the numerous little nations under the Mogul, who retain their original Heathenism, are nearly on a level with them, as are the inhabitants of the many large and populous islands in the eastern seas; yet we hear high encomiums of the Chinese, who are as numerous as all these together; some late travellers assuring us, that China alone has fifty-eight million of inhabitants. Now, these have been described as men of the deepest penetration, the highest learning, and the strictest integrity; and such doubtless they are, at least with regard to their understanding, if we will believe their own proverb: "The Chinese have two eyes, the Europeans one, and other men none at all."

And one circumstance, it must be owned, is much in their favour, —they live some thousand miles off; so that if it were affirmed, that every Chinese had literally three eyes, it would be difficult for us to disprove it. Nevertheless, there is room to doubt even of their un-

derstanding; nay, one of the arguments often brought to prove the greatness, to me clearly demonstrates the littleness, of it; namely, the thirty thousand letters of their alphabet. To keep an alphabet of thirty hundred letters could never be reconciled to common sense; since every alphabet ought to be as short, simple, and easy as possible. No more can we reconcile to any degree of common sense, their crippling all the women in the empire, by a silly, senseless affectation of squeezing their feet till they bear no proportion to their bodies; so that the feet of a woman at thirty must still be as small as they would be naturally when four years old. But in order to see the true measure of their understanding in the clearest light, let us look, not at women, or the vulgar, but at the nobility, the wisest, the politest part of the nation. Look at the mandarins, the glory of the empire, and see any, every one of them at his meals, not deigning to use his own hands, but having his meat put into his mouth by two servants, planted for that purpose, one on his right hand, the other on his left! O the deep understanding of the noble lubber that sits in the midst, and

Hiat, ceu pullus hirundinis!

“Gapes, as the young swallow, for his food.”

Surely an English ploughman, or a Dutch sailor, would have too much sense to endure it. If you say, “Nay, the mandarin would not endure it, but that *it is a custom*;” I answer, Undoubtedly it is; but how came it to be a custom? Such a custom could not have begun, much less have become general, but through a general and marvellous want of common sense.

What their learning is now, I know not; but notwithstanding their boast of its antiquity, it was certainly very low and contemptible in the last century, when they were so astonished at the skill of the French Jesuits, and honoured them as almost more than human, for calculating eclipses! And whatever progress they may have made since, in the knowledge of astronomy, and other curious, rather than useful, sciences, it is certain they are still utterly ignorant of what it most of all concerns them to know: they know not God, any more than the Hottentots; they are all idolaters to a man; and so tenacious are they of their national idolatry, that even those whom the French missionaries called converts, yet continued one and all to worship Confucius and the souls of their ancestors. It is true, that when this was strongly represented at Rome by an honest Dominican who came from thence, a bull was issued out and sent over into China, forbidding them to do it any longer. But the good fathers kept it privately among themselves, saying, the Chinese were not able to bear it.

Such is their religion with respect to God. But are they not eminent for all social virtues, all that have place between man and man? Yes, according to the accounts which some have given. According to these, they are the glory of mankind, and may be a pattern to all Europe. But have not we some reason to doubt if these accounts are true? Are pride and laziness good ingredients of social virtue? And can all Europe equal either the laziness or pride of the Chinese nobility and gentry, who are too stately or too indolent even to put the meat into their own mouths? Yet they are not too proud or too indolent to oppress, to rob, to defraud, all that fall into their hands. How flagrant instances of this may any

one find even in the account of Lord Anson's voyage! exactly agreeing with the accounts given by all our countrymen who have traded in any part of China; as well as with the observation made by a late writer in his "Geographical Grammar:" "Trade and commerce, or rather, cheating and overreaching, is the natural bent and genius of the Chinese. Gain is their god; they prefer this to every thing besides. A stranger is in great danger of being cheated, if he trusts to his own judgment; and if he employs a Chinese broker, it is well if he does not join with the merchant to cheat the stranger.

"Their laws oblige them to certain rules of civility in their words and actions; and they are naturally a fawning, cringing generation; but the greatest hypocrites on the face of the earth."

5. Such is the boasted virtue of those who are, beyond all degrees of comparison, the best and wisest of all the Heathens in Asia. And how little preferable to them are those in Europe! rather how many degrees beneath them! Vast numbers of these are within the borders of Muscovy; but how amazingly ignorant! How totally void both of civil and sacred wisdom! How shockingly savage, both in their tempers and manners! Their idolatry is of the basest and vilest kind. They not only worship the work of their own hands, but idols of the most horrid and detestable forms that men or devils could devise. Equally savage, (or more so, if more can be,) as is well known, are the natives of Lapland: and, indeed, of all the countries which have been discovered to the north of Muscovy or Sweden. In truth, the bulk of these nations seem to be considerably more barbarous, not only than the men near the Cape of Good Hope, but than many tribes in the brute creation.

Thus have we seen what is the present state of the Heathens in every part of the known world; and these still make up, according to the preceding calculation, very near two thirds of mankind. Let us now calmly and impartially consider what manner of men the Mohammedans in general are.

6. An ingenious writer, who, a few years ago, published a pompous translation of the Koran, takes great pains to give us a very favourable opinion both of Mohammed and his followers; but he cannot wash the Ethiop white. After all, men who have but a moderate share of reason cannot but observe in his Koran, even as polished by Mr. Sale, the most gross and impious absurdities. To cite particulars is not now my business: it may suffice to observe, in general, that human understanding must be debased, to an inconceivable degree, in those who can swallow such absurdities as divinely revealed. And yet we know the Mohammedans not only condemn all who cannot swallow them to everlasting fire,—not only appropriate to themselves the title of Musselmen, or True Believers,—but even anathematize, with the utmost bitterness, and adjudge to eternal destruction, all their brethren of the sect of Hali, all who contend for a figurative interpretation of them.

That these men, then, have no knowledge or love of God is undeniably manifest, not only from their gross horrible notions of him, but from their not loving their brethren. But they have not always so weighty a cause to hate and murder one another as difference of opinion. Mohammedans will butcher each other by thousands, without so plausible a plea as this. Why is it that such numbers of Turks and Persians have stabbed

one another in cool blood? Truly, because they differ in the manner of dressing their head. The Ottoman vehemently maintains, (for he has unquestionable tradition on his side,) that a Musselman should wear a round turban; whereas the Persian insists upon his liberty of conscience, and will wear it picked before. So, for this wonderful reason, when a more plausible one is wanting, they beat out each other's brains from generation to generation!

It is not therefore strange that, ever since the religion of Mohammed appeared in the world, the espousers of it, particularly those under the Turkish emperor, have been as wolves and tigers to all other nations, rending and tearing all that fell into their merciless paws, and grinding them with their iron teeth; that numberless cities are razed from the foundation, and only their name remaining; that many countries, which were once as the garden of God, are now a desolate wilderness; and that so many once numerous and powerful nations are vanished away from the earth! Such was, and is at this day, the rage, the fury, the revenge, of these destroyers of human kind.

7. Proceed we now to the Christian world. But we must not judge of Christians in general from those who are scattered through the Turkish dominions, the Armenian, Georgian, Mengrelian Christians; nor indeed from any others of the Greek communion. The gross, barbarous ignorance, the deep, stupid superstition, the blind and bitter zeal, and the endless thirst after vain jangling and strife of words, which have reigned for many ages in the Greek Church, and well nigh banished true religion from among them, make these scarce worthy of the Christian name, and lay an insuperable stumbling block before the Mohammedans.

8. Perhaps those of the Romish communion may say, "What wonder that this is the case with heretics? with those who have erred from the Catholic faith, nay, and left the pale of the Church?" But what is the case with them who have not left that Church, and who retain the Roman faith still? yea, with the most zealous of all its patrons, the inhabitants of Italy, of Spain, and Portugal? Wherein do they excel the Greek Church, except in Italianism, received by tradition from their Heathen fathers, and diffused through every city and village? They may, indeed, praise chastity, and rail at women as loudly as their forefather, Juvenal; but what is the moral of all this?—

Nonne putas melius, quod tecum pusio dormit?

This, it must be acknowledged, is the glory of the Romish Church. Herein it does excel the Greek.

They excel it, likewise, in Deism. Perhaps there is no country in the world, at least in that part of it which bears the Christian name, wherein so large a proportion of the men of education are absolute Deists, if not Atheists, as Italy. And from hence the plague has spread far and wide; through France in particular. So that, did not temporal motives restrain, no small part of the French nobility and gentry would pay no more regard to the Christian Revelation, than do the mandarins in China.

They excel still more in murder, both private and public. Instances of the former abound all over Italy, Spain, and Portugal; and the frequency of shedding blood has taken away all that horror which otherwise might attend it. Take one instance of a thousand: An English gentleman was, some years ago, at an entertainment in Brescia, when one

who was near him whispered a few words in his ear, which he did not well understand. He asked his host, "What did that gentleman mean by these words?" and was answered, "That he will murder you: and an Italian is never worse than his word in this. You have no way but to be beforehand with him." This he rejected with abhorrence. But his host, it seems, being not of so tender a conscience, sent a stranger to him in the morning, who said, "Sir, look out of your window;—I have done his business. There he lies. You will please to give me my pay." He pulled out a handful of money, in great disorder, and cried, "There, take what you will." The other replied, "Sir, I am a man of honour; I take only my pay;" took a small piece of silver, and retired.

This was a *man of honour* among the Christians of the Romish Church! And many such are to be found all over Italy, whose trade it is to cut throats; to stab for hire, in cool blood. They have *men of conscience* too. Such were two of the Catholic soldiers, under the famous duke of Alva, who broke into the house of a poor countryman in Flanders, butchered him and his wife, with five or six children; and after they had finished their work, sat down to enjoy the fruit of their labour. But in the midst of their meal conscience awakened. One of them started up in great emotion, and cried out, "O Lord! what have I done? As I hope for salvation, I have eaten flesh in Lent!"

The same sort of conscience undoubtedly it was, which constrained the late Most Christian King, in defiance of the most solemn treaties, yea, of all ties, divine and human, most graciously to murder so many thousands of his quiet unresisting subjects; to order his dragoons, wherever they found the Protestants worshipping God, to fall in upon them, sword in hand, without any regard to sex or age. It was conscience, no question, which induced so many of the dukes of Savoy, notwithstanding the public faith engaged over and over, to shed the blood of their loyal subjects, the Vaudois, like water, to ravage their fields, and destroy their cities. What but conscience could move the good Catholics of a neighbouring kingdom, in the last century, to murder (according to their own account) two hundred and fifteen thousand Protestants in six months? A costly sacrifice this! What is a hecatomb, a hundred oxen, to two hundred thousand men? And yet what is even this to the whole number of victims who have been offered up in Europe since the beginning of the Reformation; partly by war, partly by the Inquisition, and a thousand other methods of Romish cruelty? No less, within forty years, if the computation of an eminent writer be just, than five-and-forty millions!

Such is the conscience, such the religion, of Romish Christians! Of their Inquisition (the House of Mercy, as it is most unfortunately called) I should give some account, but that it has been largely described by others. Yet it may not be improper to give a specimen of that mercy which they show to those under their care. At the Act of Faith, so called, which was celebrated some years ago, when Dr. Geddes was in Portugal, a prisoner, who had been confined nine years, was brought out to execution. Looking up, and seeing, what he had not seen for so long a time, the sun in the midst of heaven, he cried out, "How can any one, who sees that glorious creature, worship any but the God that made it?" The father who attended immediately ordered a gag to be run through his lip, that he might speak no more.

See the Christians, who have received all the advantages of education, all the helps of ancient and modern learning! “Nay, but we have still greater helps than them. We are reformed from the errors of Popery; we protest against all those novel corruptions, with which the Church of Rome has polluted ancient Christianity. The enormities, therefore, of Popish countries are not to be charged upon us: we are Protestants, and have nothing to do with the vices and villanies of Romish nations.”

9. Have we not? Are Protestant nations nothing concerned in those melancholy reflections of Mr. Cowley?—“If twenty thousand naked Spaniards, how is it possible for one honest man to defend himself against twenty thousand knaves, who are all furnished *cap-à-piè* with the defensive arms of worldly prudence, and the offensive too of craft and malice? He will find no less odds than this against him, if he have much to do in human affairs. Do you wonder, then, that a virtuous man should love to be alone? It is hard for him to be otherwise. He is so when he is among ten thousand. Nor is it so uncomfortable to be alone, without any other creature, as it is to be alone in the midst of wild beasts. Man is to man all kinds of beasts, a fawning dog, a roaring lion, a thieving fox, a robbing wolf, a dissembling crocodile, a treacherous decoy, and a rapacious vulture. The civilest, methinks, of all nations, are those whom we account the most barbarous. There is some moderation and good nature in the Toupinambaltions, who eat no men but their enemies; while we, learned and polite and Christian Europeans, like so many pikes and sharks, prey upon every thing that we can swallow.”

Are Protestant nations nothing concerned in that humorous, but terrible picture, drawn by a late eminent hand?—“He was perfectly astonished (and who would not, if it were the first time he had heard it?) at the historical account I gave him of our affairs during the last century; protesting it was only a heap of conspiracies, rebellions, murders, massacres; the very worst effects that avarice, faction, hypocrisy, perfidiousness, cruelty, rage, madness, hatred, envy, lust, malice, and ambition, could produce. Even in times of peace, how many innocent and excellent persons have been condemned to death or banishment, by great ministers practising upon the corruption of judges, and the malice of factions! How many villains have been exalted to the highest places of trust, power, dignity, and profit! By what methods have great numbers, in all countries, procured titles of honour and vast estates! Perjury, oppression, subornation, fraud, panderism, were some of the most excusable; for many owed their greatness to sodomy or incest; others, to the prostituting of their own wives or daughters; others, to the betraying of their country, or their prince; more, to the perverting of justice to destroy the innocent.” Well might that keen author add, “If a creature pretending to reason can be guilty of such enormities, certainly the corruption of that faculty is far worse than brutality itself.”

Now, are Popish nations only concerned in this? Are the Protestants quite clear? Is there no such thing among them (to take one instance only) as “perverting of justice,” even in public courts of judicature? Can it not be said in any Protestant country, “There is a society of men among us, bred up from their youth in the art of proving, according as they are paid, by words multiplied for the purpose, that

white is black, and black is white? For example: If my neighbour has a mind to my cow, he hires a lawyer to prove that he ought to have my cow from me. I must hire another to defend my right, it being against all rules of law that a man should speak for himself. In pleading, they do not dwell on the merits of the cause, but upon circumstances foreign thereto. For instance: They do not take the shortest method to know what title my adversary has to my cow; but whether the cow be red or black, her horns long or short; whether the field she grazes in be round or square, and the like. After which, they adjourn the cause from time to time; and in ten or twenty years' time they come to an issue. This society, likewise, has a peculiar cant and jargon of their own, in which all their laws are written. And these they take special care to multiply; whereby they have so confounded truth and falsehood, right and wrong, that it will take twelve years to decide, whether the field, left me by my ancestors for six generations, belong to me or to one three hundred miles off."

Is it in Popish countries only that it can be said, "It does not appear that any one perfection is required toward the procurement of any one station among you; much less, that men are ennobled on account of their virtue; that priests are advanced for their piety or learning, judges for their integrity, senators for the love of their country, or counsellors for their wisdom?"

10. But there is a still greater and more undeniable proof that the very foundations of all things, civil and religious, are utterly out of course in the Christian as well as the Heathen world. There is a still more horrid reproach to the Christian name, yea, to the name of man, to all reason and humanity. There is war in the world! war between men! war between Christians! I mean, between those that bear the name of Christ, and profess to "walk as he also walked." Now, who can reconcile war, I will not say to religion, but to any degree of reason or common sense?

But is there not a cause? O yes: "The causes of war," as the same writer observes, "are innumerable. Some of the chief are these: The ambition of princes; or the corruption of their ministers: difference of opinion; as, whether flesh be bread, or bread be flesh; whether the juice of the grape be blood or wine; what is the best colour for a coat, whether black, white, or grey; and whether it should be long or short, whether narrow or wide. Nor are there any wars so furious as those occasioned by such difference of opinions.

"Sometimes two princes make war to decide which of them shall dispossess a third of his dominions. Sometimes a war is commenced, because another prince is too strong; sometimes, because he is too weak. Sometimes our neighbours want the things which we have, or have the things which we want: so both fight, until they take ours, or we take theirs. It is a reason for invading a country, if the people have been wasted by famine, destroyed by pestilence, or embroiled by faction; or to attack our nearest ally, if part of his land would make our dominions more round and compact.

"Another cause of making war is this: A crew are driven by a storm they know not where; at length they make the land, and go ashore; they are entertained with kindness. They give the country a new name; set up a stone or rotten plank for a memorial; murder a dozen of the natives, and bring away a couple by force. Here commences a new right of dominion:

ships are sent, and the natives driven out or destroyed. And this is done to civilize and convert a barbarous and idolatrous people."

But, whatever be the cause, let us calmly and impartially consider the thing itself. Here are forty thousand men gathered together on this plain. What are they going to do? See, there are thirty or forty thousand more at a little distance. And these are going to shoot them through the head or body, to stab them, or split their skulls, and send most of their souls into everlasting fire, as fast as possibly they can. Why so? What harm have they done to them? O, none at all! They do not so much as know them. But a man, who is king of France, has a quarrel with another man, who is king of England. So these Frenchmen are to kill as many of these Englishmen as they can, to prove the king of France is in the right. Now, what an argument is this! What a method of proof! What an amazing way of deciding controversies! What must mankind be, before such a thing as war could ever be known or thought of upon earth? How shocking, how inconceivable a want must there have been of common understanding, as well as common humanity, before any two governors, or any two nations in the universe, could once think of such a method of decision! If, then, all nations, Pagan, Mohammedan, and Christian, do, in fact, make this their last resort, what farther proof do we need of the utter degeneracy of all nations from the plainest principles of reason and virtue! of the absolute want, both of common sense and common humanity, which runs through the whole race of mankind?

In how just and strong a light is this placed by the writer cited before!—"I gave him a description of cannons, muskets, pistols, swords, bayonets; of sieges, attacks, mines, countermines, bombardments; of engagements by sea and land; ships sunk with a thousand men, twenty thousand killed on each side, dying groans, limbs flying in the air; smoke, noise, trampling to death under horses' feet, flight, pursuit, victory; fields strowed with carcasses, left for food to dogs and beasts of prey; and, farther, of plundering, stripping, ravishing, burning, and destroying. I assured him, I had seen a hundred enemies blown up at once in a siege, and as many in a ship, and beheld the dead bodies drop down in pieces from the clouds, to the great diversion of the spectators."

Is it not astonishing, beyond all expression, that this is the naked truth? that, within a short term of years, this has been the real case in almost every part of even the Christian world? And meanwhile we gravely talk of the "dignity of our nature" in its present state! This is really surprising, and might easily drive even a well-tempered man to say, "One might bear with men, if they would be content with those vices and follies to which nature has entitled them. I am not provoked at the sight of a pickpocket, a gamester, a politician, a suborner, a traitor, or the like. This is all according to the natural course of things. But when I behold a lump of deformity and diseases, both in body and mind, smitten with pride, it breaks all the measures of my patience; neither shall I ever be able to comprehend how such an animal and such a vice can tally together."

And surely all our declamations on the strength of human reason, and the eminence of our virtues, are no more than the cant and jargon of pride and ignorance, so long as there is such a thing as war in the world.

Men in general can never be allowed to be reasonable creatures, till they know not war any more. So long as this monster stalks uncontrolled, where is reason, virtue, humanity? They are utterly excluded; they have no place; they are a name, and nothing more. If even a Heathen were to give an account of an age wherein reason and virtue reigned, he would allow no war to have place therein. So Ovid of the golden age:—

*Nondum præcipites cingebant oppida fossæ ;
Non galeæ, non ensis erat. Sine militis usu
Mollia securæ peragebant otia gentes.*

“Steep ditches did not then the town surround,
Nor glittering helm, nor slaughtering sword was found;
Nor arms had they to wield, nor wars to wage,
But peace and safety crown'd the blissful age.”

11. How far is the world at present from this state! Yet, when we speak of the folly and wickedness of mankind, may we not except our own country, Great Britain and Ireland? In these we have such advantages for improvement, both in knowledge and virtue, as scarce any other nation enjoys. We are under an excellent constitution, which secures both our religious and civil liberty. We have religion taught in its primitive purity, its genuine, native simplicity. And how it prospers among us, we may know with great ease and certainty; for we depend not on hearsay, on the report of others, or on subtle and uncertain reasonings; but may see every thing with our own eyes, and hear it with our own ears. Well, then, to make all the allowance possible, we will suppose mankind in general to be on a level, with regard to knowledge and virtue, even with the inhabitants of our fortunate islands; and take our measure of them from the present undeniable state of our own countrymen.

In order to take a thorough survey of these, let us begin with the lowest, and proceed upward. The bulk of the natives of Ireland are to be found in or near their little cabins throughout the kingdom, most of which are their own workmanship, consisting of four earthen walls, covered with straw, or sods, with one opening in the side wall, which serves at once for door, window, and chimney. Here, in one room, are the cow and pig, the woman with her children, and the master of the family. Now, what knowledge have these rational animals? They know to plant and boil their potatoes, to milk their cow, and to put their clothes on and off, if they have any besides a blanket; but other knowledge they have none, unless in religion. And how much do they know of this? A little more than the Hottentots, and not much. They know the names of God, and Christ, and the Virgin Mary. They know a little of St. Patrick, the pope, and the priest; how to tell their beads, to say *Ave Maria* [Hail Mary] and *Pater Noster*; [Our Father;] to do what penance they are bid, to hear mass, confess, and pay so much *for the pardon of their sins*. But as to the nature of religion, the life of God in the soul, they know no more (I will not say, than the priest, but) than the beasts of the field.

And how very little above these are the numerous inhabitants of the northern parts of Scotland, or of the islands which lie either on the west or the north side of that kingdom! What knowledge have these, and what religion? Their religion usually lies in a single point, in implicitly

believing the head of their clan, and implicitly doing what he bids.* Meantime they are, one and all, as ignorant of rational, Scriptural religion, as of algebra; and altogether as far from the practice as from the theory of it.

“But it is not so in England: the very lowest of the people are here better instructed.” I should be right glad to find it so; but I doubt a fair trial will show the contrary. I am afraid we may still say of thousands, myriads of peasants, men, women, and children, throughout our nation,—

“Wild as the untaught Indian’s brood,
The Christian savages remain;
Strangers, yea, enemies to God,
They make thee spill thy blood in vain.”

The generality of English peasants are not only grossly, stupidly, I had almost said, brutishly ignorant as to all the arts of this life, but eminently so with regard to religion and the life to come. Ask a countryman, What is faith? What is repentance? What is holiness? What is true religion? and he is no more able to give you an intelligible answer, than if you were to ask him about the north-east passage. Is there, then, any possibility that they should practise what they know nothing of? If religion is not even in their heads, can it be in their hearts or lives? It cannot. Nor is there the least savour thereof, either in their tempers or conversation. Neither in the one nor the other, do they rise one jot above the pitch of a Turk or a Heathen.

Perhaps it will be said, “Whatever the clowns in the midland counties are, the people near the sea coasts are more civilized.” Yes; great numbers of them are, in and near all our ports; many thousands there are civilized by smuggling. The numbers concerned herein, upon all our coasts, are far greater than can be imagined. But what reason, and what religion, have these that trample on all laws, divine and human, by a course of thieving, or receiving stolen goods, of plundering their king and country? I say king and country; seeing, whatever is taken from the king, is in effect taken from the country, who are obliged to make up all deficiencies in the royal revenue. These are, therefore, general robbers. They rob you and me, and every one of their countrymen; seeing, had the king his due customs, a great part of our taxes might be spared. A smuggler, then, (and in proportion, every seller or buyer of uncustomed goods,) is a thief of the first order, a highwayman or pick-pocket of the worst sort. Let not any of those prate about reason or religion. It is an amazing instance of human folly, that every government in Europe does not drive these vermin away into lands not inhabited.

We are all indebted to those detachments of the army which have cleared some of our coasts of these public nuisances; and indeed many of that body have, in several respects, deserved well of their country. Yet, can we say of the soldiery in general, that they are men of reason and religion? I fear not. Are not the bulk of them void of almost all knowledge, divine and human? And is their virtue more eminent than their knowledge? But I spare them. May God be merciful to them! May he be glorified by their reformation, rather than their destruction!

Is there any more knowledge or virtue in that vast body of men, (some

* By a late act of parliament, there is a happy alteration made in this particular.

hundred thousands,) the English sailors? Surely no. It is not without cause that a ship has been called, "a floating hell." What power, what form, of religion is to be found in nine out of ten, shall I say, or ninety-nine out of a hundred, either of our merchantmen or men-of-war? What do the men in them think or know about religion? What do they practise? either sailors or marines? I doubt whether any Heathen sailors, in any country or age, Greek, Roman, or Barbarian, ever came up to ours, for profound ignorance, and barefaced, shameless shocking impiety. Add to these, out of our renowned metropolis, the whole brood of porters, draymen, carmen, hackney-coachmen, and I am sorry to say, noblemen and gentlemen's footmen, (together making up some thousands,) and you will have such a collection of knowing and pious Christians as all Europe cannot exceed!

"But all men are not like these." No; it is pity they should. And yet how little better are the retailers of brandy or gin, the inhabitants of blind alehouses, the oyster women, fish wives, and other good creatures about Billingsgate, and the various clans of pedlars and hawkers that patrol through the streets, or ply in Rag-fair, and other places of public resort? These, likewise, amount to several thousands, even within the Bills of Mortality. And what knowledge have they? What religion are they of? What morality do they practise?

"But these have had no advantage of education, many of them scarce being able to write or read." Proceed we, then, to those who have had these advantages, the officers of the excise and customs. Are these, in general, men of reason, who think with clearness and connection, and speak pertinently on a given subject? Are they men of religion; sober, temperate, fearing God and working righteousness; having a conscience void of offence toward God and toward man? How many do you find of this kind among them? men that fear an oath; that fear perjury more than death; that would die rather than neglect any part of that duty which they have sworn to perform; that would sooner be torn in pieces, than suffer any man, under any pretence, to defraud his majesty of his just right? How many of them will not be deterred from doing their duty either by fear or favour, regard no threatenings in the execution of their office, and accept no bribes, called presents? These only are wise and honest men. Set down all the rest as having neither religion nor sound reason.

"But surely tradesmen have." Some of them have both; and in an eminent degree. Some of our traders are an honour to the nation. But are the bulk of them so? Are a vast majority of our tradesmen, whether in town or country, I will not say religious, but honest men? Who shall judge whether they are or no? Perhaps you think St. Paul is too strict. Let us appeal then to Cicero, an honest Heathen. Now, when he is laying down rules of honesty between man and man, he proposes two cases:—

1. Antisthenes brings a ship-load of corn to Rhodes, at a time of great scarcity. The Rhodians flock about him to buy. He knows that five other ships laden with corn will be there to-morrow. Ought he to tell the Rhodians this, before he sells his own corn? "Undoubtedly he ought," says the Heathen; "otherwise, he makes a gain of their ignorance, and so is no better than a thief or a robber."

2. A Roman nobleman comes to a gentleman to buy his house, who tells him, "There is another going to be built near it, which will darken the windows," and, on that account, makes a deduction in the price. Some years after, the gentleman buys it of him again. Afterward he sues the nobleman for selling it without telling him first that houses were built near, which darkened the windows. The nobleman pleads, "I thought he knew it." The judge asks, "Did you tell him or not?" and, on his owning he did not, determines, "This is contrary to the law, *ne quid dolo malo fiat*, Let nothing be done fraudulently," and sentences him immediately to pay back part of the price.

Now, how many of our tradesmen come up to the Heathen standard of honesty? Who is clear of *dolus malus*, [fraud,] such fraud as the Roman judge would immediately have condemned? Which of our countrymen would not have sold his corn, or other wares, at the highest price he could? Who would have sunk his own market, by telling his customers there would be plenty the next day? Perhaps scarce one in twenty. That one the Heathen would have allowed to be an honest man; and every one of the rest, according to his sentence, is "no better than a thief or a robber."

I must acknowledge, I once believed the body of English merchants to be men of the strictest honesty and honour. But I have lately had more experience. Whoever wrongs the widow and fatherless, knows not what honour or honesty means. And how very few are there that will scruple this? I could relate many flagrant instances.

But let one suffice: a merchant dies in the full course of a very extensive business. Another agrees with his widow, that provided she will recommend him to her late husband's correspondents, he will allow her yearly such a proportion of the profits of the trade. She does so; and articles are drawn, which she lodges with an eminent man. This eminent man positively refuses to give them back to her; but gives them to the other merchant, and so leaves her entirely at his mercy. The consequence is, the other says, there is no profit at all; so he does not give her a groat. Now, where is the honesty or honour, either of him who made the agreement, or him who gave back the articles to him?

That there is honour, nay, and honesty, to be found in another body of men, among the gentlemen of the law, I firmly believe, whether attorneys, solicitors, or counsellors. But are they not thinly spread? Do the generality of attorneys and solicitors in chancery love their neighbour as themselves, and do to others what (if the circumstances were changed) they would have others do to them? Do the generality of counsellors walk by this rule, and by the rules of justice, mercy, and truth? Do they use their utmost endeavours, do they take all the care which the nature of the thing will allow, to be assured that a cause is just and good before they undertake to defend it? Do they never knowingly defend a bad cause, and so make themselves accomplices in wrong and oppression? Do they never deliver the poor into the hand of his oppressor, and see that such as are in necessity have not right? Are they not often the means of withholding bread from the hungry, and raiment from the naked, even when it is their own, when they have a clear right thereto, by the law both of God and man? Is not this effectually done in many cases by protracting the suit from year to year? I

have known a friendly bill preferred in chancery by the consent of all parties; the manager assuring them, a decree would be procured in two or three months. But although several years are now elapsed, they can see no land yet; nor do I know that we are a jot nearer the conclusion than we were the first day. Now, where is the honesty of this? Is it not picking of pockets, and no better? A lawyer who does not finish his client's suit as soon as it can be done, I cannot allow to have more honesty (though he has more prudence) than if he robbed him on the highway.

“But whether lawyers are or no, sure the nobility and gentry are all men of reason and religion.” If you think they are all men of religion, you think very differently from your Master, who made no exception of time or nation when he uttered that weighty sentence, “How difficultly shall they that have riches enter into the kingdom of heaven!” And when some who seem to have been of your judgment were greatly astonished at his saying, instead of retracting or softening, he adds, “Verily I say unto you, It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God.” You think differently from St. Paul, who declares, in those remarkable words, verified in all ages, “Not many rich men, not many noble are called,” and obey the heavenly calling. So many snares surround them, that it is the greatest of all miracles, if any of them have any religion at all. And if you think they are all men of sound reason, you do not judge by fact and experience. Much money does not imply much sense; neither does a good estate infer a good understanding. As a gay coat may cover a bad heart, so a fair peruke may adorn a weak head. Nay, a critical judge of human nature avers, that this is generally the case. He lays it down as a rule,

*Sensus communis in illâ
Fortunâ rarus.*

“Common sense is rarely found in men of fortune.” “A rich man,” says he, “has liberty to be a fool. His fortune will bear him out.” *Stultitiam patiuntur opes*: but, *Tibi parvula res est*: “You have little money, and therefore should have common sense.”

I would not willingly say any thing concerning those whom the providence of God has allotted for guides to others. There are many thousands of these in the established Church; many among Dissenters of all denominations. We may add, some thousand of Romish priests, scattered through England, and swarming in Ireland. Of these, therefore, I would only ask, “Are they all moved by the Holy Ghost to take upon them that office and ministry?” If not, they do not “enter by the door into the sheep fold;” they are not sent of God. Is their “eye single?” Is it their sole intention, in all their ministrations, to glorify God, and to save souls? Otherwise, “the light which is in them is darkness.” And if it be, “how great is that darkness!” Is their “heart right with God?” Are their “affections set on things above, not on things of the earth?” Else, how will they themselves go one step in the way wherein they are to guide others? Once more: “Are they holy in all manner of conversation, as He who hath called them is holy?” If not, with what face can they say to the flock, “Be ye followers of me, as I am of Christ?”

12. We have now taken a cursory view of the present state of mankind in all parts of the habitable world, and seen, in a general way, what is their real condition, both with regard to knowledge and virtue. But because this is not so pleasing a picture as human pride is accustomed to draw; and because those who are prepossessed with high notions of their own beauty, will not easily believe that it is taken from the life; I shall endeavour to place it in another view, that it may be certainly known whether it resembles the original. I shall desire every one who is willing to know mankind, to begin his inquiry at home. First, let him survey himself; and then go on, step by step, among his neighbours.

I ask, then, First, Are you thoroughly pleased with yourself? Say you, Who is not? Nay, I say, Who is? Do you observe nothing in yourself which you dislike, which you cannot cordially approve of? Do you never think too well of yourself? think yourself wiser, better, and stronger than you appear to be upon the proof? Is not this pride? And do you approve of pride? Was you never angry without a cause, or farther than that cause required? Are you not apt to be so? Do you approve of this? Do not you frequently resolve against it, and do not you break those resolutions again and again? Can you help breaking them? If so, why do you not? Are not you prone to "unreasonable desires," either of pleasure, praise, or money? Do not you catch yourself desiring things not worth a desire, and other things more than they deserve? Are all your desires proportioned to the real, intrinsic value of things? Do not you know and feel the contrary? Are not you continually liable to "foolish and hurtful desires?" And do not you frequently relapse into them, knowing them to be such; knowing that they have before "pierced you through with many sorrows?" Have you not often resolved against these desires, and as often broke your resolutions? Can you help breaking them? Do so; help it, if you can; and if not, own your helplessness.

Are you thoroughly pleased with your own life? *Nihilne vides quod nolis?* "Do you observe nothing there which you dislike?" I presume you are not too severe a judge here; nevertheless, I ask, Are you quite satisfied, from day to day, with all you say or do? Do you *say* nothing which you afterward wish you had not said? *do* nothing which you wish you had not done? Do you never speak any thing contrary to truth or love? Is that right? Let your own conscience determine. Do you never do any thing contrary to justice or mercy? Is that well done? You know it is not. Why, then, do you not amend? *Moves, sed nil promoves.* You resolve, and resolve, and do just as you did before.

Your *wife*, however, is wiser and better than you. Nay, perhaps you do not think so. Possibly you said once,—

"Thou hast no faults, or I no faults can spy;
Thou art all beauty, or all blindness I."

But you do not say so now: she is not without faults; and you can see them plain enough. You see more faults than you desire, both in her temper and behaviour: and yet you cannot mend them; and she either cannot or will not. And she says the very same of you. Do your parents or her's live with you? And do not they, too, exercise your patience? Is there nothing in their temper or behaviour that gives you pain? nothing which you wish to have altered? Are you a parent your-

self? Parents in general are not apt to think too meanly of their own dear offspring. And, probably, at some times you admire yours more than enough; you think there are none such. But do you think so upon cool reflection? Is the behaviour of all your children, of most, of any of them, just such as you would desire, toward yourself, toward each other, and toward all men? Are their tempers just such as you would wish; loving, modest, mild, and teachable? Do you observe no self will, no passion, no stubbornness, no ill nature or surliness among them? Did you not observe more or less of these in every one of them, before they were two years old? And have not those seeds ever since grown up with them, till they have brought forth a plentiful harvest?

Your servants, or apprentices, are probably older than your children. And are they wiser and better? Of all those who have succeeded each other for twenty years, how many were good servants? How many of them did their work "unto the Lord, not as pleasing man, but God?" How many did the same work, and in as exact a manner, behind your back as before your face? They that did not were knaves; they had no religion; they had no morality. Which of them studied your interest in all things, just as if it had been his own? I am afraid, as long as you have lived in the world you have seen few of these black swans yet.

Have you had better success with the journeymen and labourers whom you occasionally employ? Will they do the same work if you are at a distance, which they do while you are standing by? Can you depend upon their using you, as they would you should use them? And will they do this, not so much for gain as for conscience' sake? Can you trust them as to the price of their labour? Will they never charge more than it is fairly worth? If you have found a set of such workmen, pray do not conceal so valuable a treasure; but immediately advertise the men, and their places of abode, for the common benefit of your countrymen.

Happy you who have such as these about your house! And are your neighbours as honest and loving as they? They who live either in the same, or in the next house; do these love you as themselves? and do to you, in every point, as they would have you do to them? Are they guilty of no untrue or unkind sayings, no unfriendly actions toward you? And are they, (as far as you see or know,) in all other respects, reasonable and religious men? How many of your neighbours answer this character? Would it require a large house to contain them?

But you have intercourse, not with the next neighbours only, but with several tradesmen. And all very honest; are they not? You may easily make a trial. Send a child, or a countryman to one of their shops. If the shopkeeper is an honest man, he will take no advantage of the buyer's ignorance. If he does, he is no honest man than a thief. And how many tradesmen do you know who would scruple it?

Go a little farther. Send to the market for what you want. "What is the lowest price of this?" "Five shillings, sir," "Can you take no less?" "No, upon my word. It is worth it, every penny." An hour after he sells it for a shilling less. And it is really worth no more. Yet is not this the course (a few persons excepted) in every market throughout the kingdom? Is it not generally, though not always, "Cheat that cheat can: sell as dear as you can, and buy as cheap?" And what are they who steer by this rule better than a company of *Newgate birds*?

Shake them all together; for there is not a grain of honesty among them.

But are not your own tenants, at least, or your landlord, honest men? You are persuaded they are. Very good; remember, then, an honest man's word is as good as his bond. You are preparing a receipt, or writing, for a sum of money, which you are going to pay or lend to this honest man. *Writing!* what need of that? You do not fear he should die soon. You did not once think of it. But you do not care to trust him without it; that is, you are not sure but he is a mere knave. What, your landlord, who is a justice of peace; it may be, a judge; nay, a member of parliament; possibly a peer of the realm! And cannot you trust this honourable, if not right honourable, man, without a paltry receipt? I do not ask whether he is a whoremonger, an adulterer, a blasphemer, a proud, a passionate, a revengeful man; this, it may be, his nearest friends will allow; but do you suspect his honesty too?

13. Such is the state of the Protestant Christians in England. Such their virtue, from the least to the greatest; if you take an impartial survey of your parents, children, servants, labourers, neighbours; of tradesmen, gentry, nobility. What then can we expect from Papists? what from Jews, Mohammedans, Heathens?

And it may be remarked, that this is the plain, glaring, apparent condition of human kind. It strikes the eye of the most careless, inaccurate observer, who does not trouble himself with any more than their outside. Now, it is certain, the generality of men do not wear their worst side outward. Rather, they study to appear better than they are, and to conceal what they can of their faults. What a figure, then, would they make, were we able to touch them with Ithuriel's spear! What a prospect would there be, could we anticipate the transactions of the great day! could we "bring to light the hidden things of darkness, and make manifest the thoughts and intents of the heart!"

This is the plain, naked fact, without any extenuation on the one hand, or exaggeration on the other. The present state of the moral world is as conspicuous as that of the natural. Ovid said no more concerning both, near two thousand years since, than is evidently true at this day. Of the natural world he says, (whether this took place at the fall of man, or about the time of the deluge,)

*Jupiter antiqui contraxit tempora veris,
Perque hyemes, æstusque, et inæquales autumnos,
Et breve ver, spatiis exegit quatuor annum.*

"The God of nature, and her sovereign King,
Shorten'd the primitive perennial spring:
The spring gave place, no sooner come than past,
To summer's heat, and winter's chilling blast,
And autumn sick, irregular, and uneven:
While the sad year, through different seasons driven,
Obey'd the stern decree of angry Heaven."

And a man may as modestly deny, that spring and summer, autumn and winter, succeed each other, as deny one article of the ensuing account of the moral world:—

*Irrupit venæ peioris in ævum
Omne nefas: Fugere pudor, verumque, fidesque;
In quorum subiere locum, fraudesque, dolique,
Insidiæque, et vis, et amor sceleratus habendi.*

“ A flood of general wickedness broke in
 At once, and made the iron age begin :
 Virtue and truth forsook the faithless race,
 And fraud and wrong succeeded in their place.
 Deceit and violence, the dire thirst of gold,
 Lust to possess, and rage to have and hold.”

What country is there now upon earth, in Europe, Asia, Africa, or America, be the inhabitants Pagans, Turks, or Christians, concerning which we may not say?—

*Vivitur ex rapto : Non hospes ab hospite tutus :
 Filius ante diem patrios inquit in annos ;
 Victa jacet pietas ; et Virgo cœde madentes
 Ultima caelestum terras Astræa reliquit.*

“ They live by rapine. The unwary guest
 Is poison'd at the inhospitable feast.
 'The son, impatient for his father's death,
 Numbers his years, and longs to stop his breath :
 Extinguish'd all regard for God and man ;
 And Justice, last of the celestial train,
 Spurns the earth drench'd in blood, and flies to heaven again.”

14. Universal misery is at once a consequence and a proof of this universal corruption. Men are unhappy, (how very few are the exceptions!) because they are unholy. *Culpam pœna premit comes* : “ Pain accompanies and follows sin.” Why is the earth so full of complicated distress? Because it is full of complicated wickedness. Why are not you happy? Other circumstances may concur, but the main reason is, because you are not holy. It is impossible, in the nature of things, that wickedness can consist with happiness. A Roman Heathen tells the English Heathens, *Nemo malus felix* : “ No vicious man is happy.” And if you are not guilty of any gross outward vice, yet you have vicious tempers ; and as long as these have power in your heart, true peace has no place. You are proud ; you think too highly of yourself. You are passionate ; often angry without reason. You are self-willed ; you would have your own will, your own way, in every thing ; that is, plainly, you would rule over God and man ; you would be the governor of the world. You are daily liable to unreasonable desires : some things you desire that are noway desirable ; others which ought to be avoided, yea, abhorred, at least as they are now circumstanced. And can a proud or a passionate man be happy ! O no ! experience shows it is impossible. Can a man be happy who is full of self-will ? Not unless he can dethrone the Most High. Can a man of unreasonable desires be happy ? Nay, they “ pierce ” him “ through with many sorrows.”

I have not touched upon envy, malice, revenge, covetousness, and other gross vices. Concerning these it is universally agreed, by all thinking men, Christian or Heathen, that a man can no more be happy while they lodge in his bosom, than if a vulture was gnawing his liver. It is supposed, indeed, that a very small part of mankind, only the vilest of men, are liable to these. I know not that ; but certainly this is not the case with regard to pride, anger, self-will, foolish desires. Those who are not accounted bad men are by no means free from these. And this alone (were they liable to no other pain) would prevent the generality of men, rich and poor, learned and unlearned, from ever knowing what happiness means.

15. You think, however, you could bear yourself pretty well ; but you have such a husband or wife, such parents and children, as are intolerable ! One has such a tongue, the other so perverse a temper ! The language of these, the carriage of those, is so provoking ; otherwise you should be happy enough. True ; if both you and they were wise and virtuous. Meanwhile, neither the vices of your family, nor your own, will suffer you to rest.

Look out of your own doors : “ Is there any evil in the city, and ” sin “ hath not done it ? ” Is there any misfortune or misery to be named, whereof it is not either the direct or remote occasion ? Why is it that the friend or relation for whom you are so tenderly concerned is involved in so many troubles ? Have not you done your part toward making them happy ? Yes, but they will not do their own : one has no management, no frugality, or no industry ; another is too fond of pleasure. If he is not what is called scandalously vicious, he loves wine, women, or gaming. And to what does all this amount ? He might be happy ; but sin will not suffer it.

Perhaps you will say, “ Nay, he is not in fault ; he is both frugal and diligent ; but he has fallen into the hands of those who have imposed upon his good nature. ” Very well ; but still sin is the cause of his misfortunes ; only it is another’s, not his own.

If you inquire into the troubles under which your neighbour, your acquaintance, or one you casually talk with, labours, still you will find the far greater part of them arise from some fault, either of the sufferer or of others ; so that still sin is at the root of trouble, and it is unholiness which causes unhappiness.

And this holds as well with regard to families, as with regard to individuals. Many families are miserable through want. They have not the conveniences, if the necessaries of life. Why have they not ? Because they will not work : were they diligent, they would want nothing. Or, if not idle, they are wasteful ; they squander away, in a short time, what might have served for many years. Others, indeed, are diligent and frugal too ; but a treacherous friend, or a malicious enemy, has ruined them ; or they groan under the hand of the oppressor ; or the extortioner has entered into their labours. You see, then, in all these cases, want (though in various ways) is the effect of sin. But is there no rich man near ? none that could relieve these innocent sufferers, without impairing his own fortune ? Yes ; but he thinks of nothing less. They may rot and perish for him. See, more sin is implied in their suffering.

But is not the family of that rich man himself happy ? No ; far from it ; perhaps farther than his poor neighbours. For they are not content ; their “ eye is not satisfied with seeing, nor ” their “ ear with hearing. ” Endeavouring to fill their souls with the pleasures of sense and imagination, they are only pouring water into a sieve. Is not this the case with the wealthiest families you know ? But it is not the whole case with some of them. There is a debauched, a jealous, or an ill-natured, husband ; a gaming, passionate, or imperious wife ; an undutiful son ; or an imprudent daughter,—who banishes happiness from the house. And what is all this but sin in various shapes ; with its sure attendant, misery ?

In a town, a corporation, a city, a kingdom, is it not the same thing still ? From whence comes that complication of all the miseries incident

to human nature,—war? Is it not from the tempers “which war in the soul?” When nation rises up against nation, and kingdom against kingdom, does it not necessarily imply pride, ambition, coveting what is another’s; or envy, or malice, or revenge, on one side, if not on both? Still, then, sin is the baleful source of affliction; and, consequently, the flood of miseries which covers the face of the earth,—which overwhelms not only single persons, but whole families, towns, cities, kingdoms,—is a demonstrative proof of the overflowing of ungodliness in every nation under heaven.

PART II.

THE SCRIPTURAL METHOD OF ACCOUNTING FOR THIS DEFENDED.

I. 1. THE fact then being undeniable, I would ask, How is it to be accounted for? Will you resolve it into the prevalence of custom, and say, “Men are guided more by example than reason?” It is true: they run after one another, like a flock of sheep, (as Seneca remarked long ago,) *Non qua evulvum est, sed qua itur*: “Not where they ought to go, but where others go.” But I gain no ground by this; I am equally at a loss to account for this custom. How is it (seeing men are reasonable creatures, and nothing is so agreeable to reason as virtue) that the custom of all ages and nations is not on the side of virtue rather than vice? If you say, “This is owing to bad education, which propagates ill customs;” I own, education has an amazing force, far beyond what is commonly imagined. I own, too, that as bad education is found among Christians as ever obtained among the Heathens. But I am no nearer still; I am not advanced a hair’s breadth toward the conclusion. For how am I to account for the almost universal prevalence of this bad education? I want to know when this prevailed first; and how it came to prevail. How came wise and good men (for such they must have been before bad education commenced) not to train up their children in wisdom and goodness; in the way wherein they had been brought up themselves? They had then no ill precedent before them: how came they to make such a precedent? And how came all the wisdom of after ages never to correct that precedent? You must suppose it to have been of ancient date. Profane history gives us a large account of universal wickedness, that is, universal bad education, for above two thousand years last past. Sacred history adds the account of above two thousand more: in the very beginning of which (more than four thousand years ago) “all flesh had corrupted their ways before the Lord!” or, to speak agreeably to this hypothesis, were very corruptly educated. Now, how is this to be accounted for, that, in so long a tract of time, no one nation under the sun has been able, by wholesome laws, or by any other method, to remove this grievous evil; so that, their children being well educated, the scale might at length turn on the side of reason and virtue?

These are questions which I conceive will not easily be answered to the satisfaction of any impartial inquirer. But, to bring the matter to a short issue: the first parents who educated their children in vice and folly, either were wise and virtuous themselves, or were not. If they

were not, their vice did not proceed from education ; so the supposition falls to the ground : wickedness was antecedent to bad education. If they were wise and virtuous, it cannot be supposed but they would teach their children to tread in the same steps. In no wise, therefore, can we account for the present state of mankind from example or education.

2. Let us then have recourse to the oracles of God. How do they teach us to account for this fact,—that “all flesh corrupted their way before God,” even in the antediluvian world ; that mankind was little, if at all, less corrupt, from the flood to the giving of the law by Moses ; that from that time till Christ came, even God’s chosen people were a “faithless and stubborn generation,” little better, though certainly not worse, than the Heathens who knew not God ; that when Christ came, both “Jews and Gentiles” were “all under sin ; all the world was guilty before God ;” that, even after the Gospel had been preached in all nations, still the wise and virtuous were a “little flock ;” bearing so small a proportion to the bulk of mankind, that it might yet be said, “The whole world lieth in wickedness ;” that, from that time, “the mystery of iniquity” wrought even in the Church, till the Christians were little better than the Heathens ; and, lastly, that at this day “the whole world,” whether Pagan, Mohammedan, or nominally Christian, (little, indeed, is the flock which is to be excepted,) again “lieth in wickedness ;” doth not “know the only true God ;” doth not love, doth not worship him as God ; hath not “the mind which was in Christ,” neither “walketh as he walked ;” doth not practise justice, mercy, and truth, nor do to others as they would others should do to them ;—how, I say, do the oracles of God teach us to account for this plain fact ?

3. They teach us, that “in Adam all die ;” 1 Cor. xv, 22, compared with Genesis ii, and iii ; that “by” the first “man came” both natural and spiritual “death ;” that “by” this “one man sin entered into the world, and death” in consequence of sin ; and that from him “death passed upon all men, in that all have sinned,” Rom. v, 12.

But you aver, that “no evil but temporal death came upon men in consequence of Adam’s sin.”* And this you endeavour to prove by considering the chief scriptures which are supposed to relate thereto.

The first you mention is Genesis ii, 17 : “But of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it ; for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die.”

On this you observe : “Death was to be the consequence of his disobedience. And the death here threatened can be opposed only to that life God gave Adam when he created him.” (p. 7.) True ; but how are you assured that God, when he created him, did not give him spiritual as well as animal life ? Now, spiritual death is opposed to spiritual life. And this is more than the death of the body.

“But this is pure conjecture, without a solid foundation ; for no other life is spoken of before.” Yes, there is ; “the image of God” is spoken of before. This is not, therefore, pure conjecture ; but is grounded upon a solid foundation, upon the plain word of God.

Allowing then that “Adam could understand it of no other life than

* Dr. Taylor’s “Doctrine of Original Sin,” Part i, to whom I address myself in what follows. What is quoted from him, generally in his own words, is inclosed in commas.

that which he had newly received ;” yet would he naturally understand it of the life of God in his soul, as well as of the life of his body.

“ In this light, therefore, the sense of the threatening will stand thus : ‘ Thou shalt surely die ;’ as if he had said, I have ‘ formed thee of the dust of the ground, and breathed into thy nostrils the breath of lives ;’ ” (Third Ed. p. 8 ;) both of animal life, and of spiritual life ; and in both respects thou “ art become a living soul.” “ But if thou eatest of the forbidden tree, thou shalt cease to be a living soul. For I will take from thee” the lives I have given, and thou shalt die spiritually, temporally, eternally.

But “ here is not one word relating to Adam’s posterity. Though it be true, if he had died immediately upon his transgression, all his posterity must have been extinct with him.” It is true ; yet “ not one word” of it is expressed. Therefore, other consequences of his sin may be equally implied, though they are no more expressed than this.

4. The second scripture you cite is Gen. iii, from verse 7 to 24. (pp. 9, 10.)

On this you observe : here “ we have some consequences of our first parents’ sin before God judged them ; some appointed by his judicial sentence ; and some which happened after that sentence was pronounced.” (p. 11.)

“ Immediately upon their transgression, they were seized with shame and fear. Guilt will always be attended with shame. And a state of guilt is often in Scripture expressed by being naked. Moses ‘ saw that the people were naked ; for Aaron had made them naked to their shame among their enemies,’ Exod. xxxii, 25.” Certainly, naked does not mean guilty here ; but either stripped of their ornaments, (xxiii, 5, 6,) or of their swords, or their upper garment. “ Thy nakedness shall be uncovered ; yea, thy shame shall be seen,” Isaiah xlvii, 3. (p. 12.) Here also nakedness does not mean guilt ; but is to be taken literally, as manifestly appears from the words immediately preceding : “ Make bare the leg, uncover the thigh, pass over the rivers,” verse 2. And, “ blessed is he that watcheth and keepeth his garments, lest he walk naked, and they see his shame,” Rev. xvi, 15. The plain meaning is, lest he lose the graces he has received, and so be ashamed before men and angels.

“ Their fear is described : ‘ Adam and his wife hid themselves from the presence of the Lord God among the trees of the garden,’ Gen. iii, 8. They had no such fear while they were innocent ; but now they were afraid to stand before their Judge.” (p. 13.)

This is all you can discern in the Mosaic account, as the consequence of our first parents’ sin, before God judged them. Mr. Hervey discerns something more. I make no apology for transcribing some of his words :

“ Adam violated the precept, and, as the nervous original expresses it, ‘ died the death.’ He before possessed a life incomparably more excellent than that which the beasts enjoy. He possessed a divine life, consisting, according to the Apostle, ‘ in knowledge, in righteousness, and true holiness.’ This, which was the distinguishing glory of his nature, in the day that he ate the forbidden fruit was extinct.

“ His understanding, originally enlightened with wisdom, was clouded with ignorance. His heart, once warmed with heavenly love, became alienated from God his maker. His passions and appetites, rational and regular

before, shook off the government of order and reason. In a word, the whole moral frame was unhinged, disjointed, broken.

“The ignorance of fallen Adam was palpable. Witness that absurd attempt to hide himself from the eye of Omniscience among the trees of the garden. His aversion to the all gracious God was equally plain; otherwise, he would never have fled from his Maker, but rather have hastened on the wings of desire, into the place of the Divine manifestation.

“A strange variety of disorderly passions were evidently predominant in his breast. Pride; for he refuses to acknowledge his guilt, though he cannot but own the fact. Ingratitude; for he obliquely upbraids the Creator with his gift, as though it had been a snare rather than a blessing: ‘The woman thou gavest me.’ The female criminal acts the same unhumiliated part. She neither takes shame to herself, nor gives glory to God, nor puts up a single petition for pardon.

“As all these disasters ensued upon the breach of the commandment, they furnish us with the best key to open the meaning of the penalty annexed. They prove beyond any argument, that spiritual death and all its consequences were comprised in the extent of the threatening.” (*Theron and Aspasio*, Dial. 11.)

5. However, “no other could in justice be punishable for that transgression, which was their own act and deed only.” (p. 13.) If no other was justly punishable, then no other was punished for that transgression. But all were punished for that transgression, namely, with death. Therefore, all men were justly punishable for it.

By punishment I mean suffering consequent upon sin, or pain inflicted because of sin preceding. Now, it is plain, all mankind suffer death; and that this suffering is consequent upon Adam’s sin. Yea, and that this pain is inflicted on *all men* because of his sin. When, therefore, you say, “Death does descend to us in consequence of his transgression,” (*Doctrine of Original Sin*, p. 20,) you allow the point we contend for; and are very welcome to add, “Yet it is not a punishment for his sin.” You allow the thing. Call it by what name you please.

But “punishment always connotes guilt.” (p. 21.) It always connotes sin and suffering; and here are both. Adam sinned; his posterity suffer; and that, in consequence of his sin.

But “sufferings are benefits to us.” Doubtless; but this does not hinder their being punishments. The pain I suffer as a punishment for my own sins may be a benefit to me, but it is a punishment nevertheless.

But “as they two only were guilty of the first sin, so no other but they two only could be conscious of it as their sin.” (p. 14.) No other could be conscious of it as their sin, in the same sense as Adam and Eve were; and yet others may “charge it upon themselves” in a different sense, so as to judge themselves “children of wrath” on that account.

To sum up this point in Dr. Jennings’s words: “If there be any thing in this argument, that Adam’s posterity could not be justly punishable for his transgression, because it was his personal act and not theirs, it must prove universally, that it is unjust to punish the posterity of any man for his personal crimes. And yet most certain it is, that God has in other cases actually punished men’s sins on their posterity. Thus the posterity of Canaan, the son of Ham, is punished with slavery for his sin: Gen. ix, 25, 27. Noah pronounced the curse under a divine afflatus, and God confirmed it by his providence. So we do in fact suffer for Adam’s sin, and that too by the sentence inflicted on our first parents. We suffer death in consequence of their transgression. Therefore we are, in some sense, guilty of

their sin. I would ask, What is guilt, but an obligation to suffer punishment for sin? Now since we suffer the same penal evil which God threatened to, and inflicted on, Adam for his sin; and since it is allowed, we suffer this for Adam's sin, and that by the sentence of God, appointing all men to die, because Adam sinned; is not the consequence evident? Therefore we are all some way guilty of Adam's sin." (*Jennings's Vindication.*)

6. "The consequences appointed by the judicial sentence of God are found in that pronounced on the serpent, or the woman, or the man." (p. 15.)

"The serpent is cursed, Gen. iii, 14, 15. And those words in the fifteenth verse: 'I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed: he' (so the Hebrew) 'shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel,' imply, that God would appoint his only-begotten Son to maintain a kingdom in the world opposite to the kingdom of Satan, till he should be born of a woman, and by his doctrine, example, obedience, and death, give the last stroke, by way of moral means, to the power and works of the devil." (p. 16.)

I do not understand that expression, "By way of moral means." What I understand from the whole tenor of Scripture is, that the eternal, almighty Son of God, "who is over all, God blessed for ever," having reconciled us to God by his blood, creates us anew by his Spirit, and reigns till he hath destroyed all the works of the devil.

"Sentence is passed upon the woman, (verse 16,) that she should bring forth children with more pain and hazard than otherwise she would have done." (p. 17.) How? With "more pain and hazard" than otherwise she would have done! Would she otherwise have had any pain at all? or have brought forth children with any hazard? Hazard of what? Certainly, not of death. I cannot comprehend this.

"Lastly, the sentence upon the man (verses 17-19) first affects the earth, and then denounces death upon himself.

"After sentence pronounced, God, having clothed Adam and Eve, drove them out of Paradise." (p. 18.)

Here, "observe (1.) A curse is pronounced on the serpent and on the ground; but no curse upon the woman and the man." (p. 19.) But a curse fell upon them in that very moment wherein they transgressed the law of God. For, "cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are" contained "in the law to do them." Vainly, therefore, do you subjoin, "Though they are subjected to sorrow, labour, and death, these are not inflicted under the notion of a curse." Surely they are; as the several branches of that curse which he had already incurred; and which had already not only "darkened and weakened his rational powers," but disordered his whole soul.

"Observe, (2.) Here is not one word of any other death, but the dissolution of the body." Nor was it needful. He felt in himself that spiritual death, which is the prelude of death everlasting. "But the words, 'Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return,' restrain this death to this dissolution alone." (p. 20.) "This dissolution alone" is expressed in those words. But how does it appear that nothing more is implied? 'The direct contrary appears from your own assertions; for if these words refer clearly to those, "And the Lord God formed man out of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of lives;" and if "the judicial act of condemnation clearly implieth the depriving him of that life which God then breathed into him;" it undeniably follows, that this judicial act implieth a deprivation of spiritual life

as well as temporal ; seeing God breathed into him both one and the other, in order to his becoming " a living soul."

It remains, that the death expressed in the original threatening, and implied in the sentence pronounced upon man, includes all evils which could befall his soul and body ; death temporal, spiritual, and eternal.

7. You next cite 1 Cor. xv, 21, 22 : " Since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." (p. 22.)

On this you observe, (1.) " The Apostle is in this chapter proving and explaining the resurrection. It is this fact or event, and no other, which he here affirms and demonstrates." (p. 23.)

If you mean, " The resurrection of the body to that life which it enjoyed in this world is the only thing which the Apostle speaks of in this chapter," your assertion is palpably false ; for he speaks therein of " that glorious life" both of soul and body, which is not, cannot be, enjoyed in this world.

You observe, (2.) " It is undeniable, that all mankind ' die in Adam ;' all are mortal, in consequence of his sin." (p. 24.) (3.) " It is equally clear, that ' by Christ came the resurrection of the dead : ' ' That, in Christ,' all who die in Adam, that is, all mankind, ' are made alive.' " It is neither clear nor true, that St. Paul affirms this, in either of the texts before us : for in this whole chapter he speaks only of the resurrection of the just, of " them that are Christ's." (verse 23.) So that from hence it cannot be inferred at all, that all mankind will be " made alive." Admitting then, " that ' the resurrection of the dead,' and being ' made alive,' are expressions of the same signification ;" this proves nothing ; since the Apostle affirms neither one nor the other, of any but of those " who are fallen asleep in Christ." (verse 18.) It is of these only that he here asserts, their death came by the first, their resurrection by the second, Adam ; or, that in Adam they all died ; in Christ, they all are made alive. Whatever life they all lost by means of Adam, they all recover by means of Christ.

" From this place we cannot conclude that any death came upon mankind in consequence of Adam's sin, beside that death from which mankind shall be delivered at the resurrection." (p. 25.)

Nay, from this place we cannot conclude, that mankind in general shall be delivered from any death at all ; seeing it does not relate to mankind in general, but wholly and solely to " them that are Christ's."

But from this place we may firmly conclude that more than the mere death of the body came even upon these by man, by Adam's sin ; seeing the resurrection which comes to them by man, by Christ, is far more than the mere removal of that death : therefore their dying in Adam implies far more than the bare loss of the bodily life we now enjoy ; seeing their " being made alive in" Christ implies far more than a bare recovery of that life.

Yet it is true, that whatever death came on them by one man, came upon all mankind ; and that in the same sense wherein they " died in Adam," all mankind died likewise. And that all mankind are not " made alive in" Christ, as they are, is not God's fault, but their own.

I know not therefore what you mean by saying, that after Dr. Jennings has proved this whole chapter, and consequently the two verses in question, to relate wholly and solely to the resurrection of the just, " he

leaves you in full possession of your argument." Surely if he proves this, he wrests your whole argument out of your hands. He leaves you not one shred of it.

8. "We come now," you say, "to the most difficult scripture which speaks of this point:—

"As by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; *even* 'so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned.

"For until the law sin was in the world; but sin is not imputed when there is no law.

"Nevertheless death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression, who is the figure of him that was to come.

"But not as the offence, so also is the free gift. For if through the offence of one many be dead, much more the grace of God, and the gift by grace, which is by one man, Jesus Christ, hath abounded unto many.

"And not as it was by one that sinned so is the gift; for the judgment was by one' offence 'to condemnation, but the free gift is of many offences unto justification.

"For if by one man's offence death reigned by one; much more they who receive the abundance of grace, and of the gift of righteousness, shall reign in life by one, Jesus Christ.

"Therefore as by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life.

"For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous,' Romans v, 12-19." (p. 26.)

On this you observe: (1.) That this passage "speaks of temporal death, and no other." (p. 28.) That it speaks of temporal death is allowed; but not that it speaks of no other. How prove you this? Why thus: "He evidently speaks of that death which 'entered into the world' by Adam's sin; that death which is common to all mankind; which 'passed upon all men;' that death which 'reigned from Adam to Moses;' that whereby the 'many,' that is, all mankind, 'are dead.'" He does so; but how does it appear that the death which "entered into the world by" Adam's sin; which is common to all mankind; which "passed upon all men;" which "reigned from Adam to Moses;" and whereby the many, that is, all mankind, are dead; how, I say, does it appear, from any or all of these expressions, that this is temporal death only? Just here lies the fallacy: "No man," say you, "can deny that the Apostle is here speaking of that death." True; but when you infer, "Therefore he speaks of that only," we deny the consequence.

9. You affirm: (2.) "By judgment to condemnation, (verses 16, 18,) he means the being adjudged to the forementioned death; for the 'condemnation' inflicted by the 'judgment' of God (verse 16) is the same thing with 'being dead,' verse 15." (p. 27.) Perhaps so; but that this is merely the death of the body still remains to be proved; as, on the other hand, that "the gift, or free gift," opposed thereto, is merely deliverance from that death.

You add: "In all the Scriptures there is recorded but one 'judgment to condemnation;' one sentence, one judicial act of condemnation, which 'came upon all men.'" (p. 29:) Nay, in this sense of the word, there is not one; not one formal sentence, which was explicitly and judicially pronounced upon "all mankind." That which you cite, (Gen. iii, 17,

19,) was not; neither does all that sentence, in fact, “come upon all men.” “Unto dust shalt thou return,” does come upon all; but that other part does not,—“In sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life.” This was formally pronounced, and actually fulfilled upon Adam; but it is not fulfilled upon all his posterity.

10. You affirm: (3.) “These words in the 19th verse, ‘As by one man’s disobedience many were made sinners,’ mean the same as those in the 18th,—‘As by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation.’” (p. 30.) Not exactly the same. The being “made sinners” is different from the being judged, condemned, or punished as such. You subjoin: “But these words, ‘By the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation’ answer in sense to those, (verse 17,) ‘By one man’s offence death reigned by one.’” (*Ib.*) Neither is this exactly true. “Condemnation” came first; and in consequence of this “death reigned.” You add: “And by ‘death’ most certainly is intended no other than temporal death.” Most certainly this cannot be proved. Therefore it does not follow, “that these words, ‘By one man’s disobedience many were made sinners,’ mean no more than, ‘By one man’s disobedience’ mankind were made subject to temporal death.” “Review,” you say, “this reasoning, and see if you can find any flaw in it.” There are several; but the grand flaw lies in the very first link of the chain. You have not yet proved that “death throughout this passage means only the death of the body.”

This flaw is not amended by your observing that St. Paul was a Jew, and wrote to Jews as well as Gentiles; that he often uses Hebrew idioms; and that “the Hebrew word which signifies to be a sinner, in *Hiphil* signifies to condemn, or make (that is, declare) a man a sinner by a judicial sentence;” that you can, by the help of your Concordance “produce fifteen Hebrew texts, in which the word is so taken:” (pp. 31, 32:) for if it would follow from hence, that, “By the offence of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation,” is just equivalent with, “By one man’s disobedience many were made sinners;” still this does not prove that the death in question is no other than temporal death.

But indeed it does not follow, that two expressions are just equivalent, because one Hebrew word may contain them both; nor can it, therefore, be inferred from hence, that, “Many were made sinners,” is just equivalent with, “Judgment came upon all men to condemnation.” Rather, the former expression answers to “All have sinned;” the latter, to, “Death passed upon all men.” Sin is the cause of their condemnation, and not the same thing with it.

You go on: “Besides all this, it is here expressly affirmed, that the many are ‘made sinners’ by the disobedience of another man.” (p. 33.) It is expressly affirmed; and by an inspired Apostle; therefore I firmly believe it. “But they can be made sinners by the disobedience of another in no other sense than as they are sufferers.” (p. 34.) How is this proved? We grant the Hebrew words for sin and iniquity are often used to signify suffering. But this does not prove that the phrase, “Were made sinners,” signifies only, they were made sufferers.

“So ‘Christ was made sin for us.’” (p. 35.) No; not so; but as he was “made an offering for sin.” “He suffered on account of the sins of men, and so he ‘was made sin.’” Yes, “a sin-offering.” But

it is never said, he was made a sinner; therefore the expressions are not parallel. But he need not have been made sin at all, if we had not been made sinners by Adam. "And men suffer on account of Adam's sin, and so they are made sinners." Are they made sinners so only? That remains to be proved.

"It seems then confirmed, beyond all doubt, that 'by one man's disobedience many were made sinners,' meaneth only, By Adam's sin, the many, that is, all mankind, 'were made subject to death.'" He that will believe it (taking death in the common sense) may; but you have not confirmed it by one sound argument.

11. You affirm, (4.) "The Apostle draws a comparison between Adam and Christ; between what Adam did, with the consequences of it, and what Christ did, with the consequences of that. And this comparison is the main thing he has in view." (p. 36.)

This is true. "The comparison begins at the twelfth verse: 'Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin,'—there he stops awhile, and brings an argument to prove, that death came on mankind through Adam's transgression." (pp. 37, 38.) He does so; but not before he had finished his sentence, which literally runs thus: "As by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin, even so death passed upon all men, in that all had sinned." The comparison, therefore, between Adam and Christ begins not at the twelfth but the fourteenth verse. Of this you seem sensible yourself, when you say, "Adam is the 'pattern of Him that was to come.'" Here a new thought starts into the Apostle's mind." (p. 39.) For it was not a new thought starting into his mind here, if it was the same which he began to express at the twelfth verse.

You proceed: "The extent of the free gift in Christ answers to the extent of the consequences of Adam's sin; nay, abounds far beyond them. This he incidentally handles, verses 15-17, and then resumes his main design, verses 18, 19, half of which he had executed in the twelfth verse." Not one jot of it. That verse is a complete sentence, not half of one only. And the particle *therefore*, prefixed to the eighteenth verse, shows, that the discourse goes straight forward; and that this, as well as the nineteenth verse, is closely connected with the seventeenth.

Allowing, then, that "the Apostle draws a comparison between the 'disobedience' of Adam, by which all men are 'brought under condemnation,' and the 'obedience of Christ,' by which all men are, in some sense, 'justified unto life;'" (p. 40;) still it does not appear either that this condemnation means no more than the death of the body, or that this justification means no more than the resurrection of the body.

12. You affirm, (5.) "The whole of the Apostle's argument stands upon these two principles, that, by the 'offence of one,' death passed upon all men; and, by the 'obedience of one,' all are justified."

This is allowed. But I cannot allow your interpretation of "Sin is not imputed, where there is no law;" or, as you would oddly, and contrary to all precedent, translate it, "where law is not in being." "The sins of mankind," say you, "were not imputed, were not taxed with the forfeiture of life, because the law which subjects the transgressor to death was not then in being; for it was abrogated upon Adam's transgression, and was not again in force till revived by Moses." (p. 41.)

On this I would ask, (1.) Where is it written, that "the law which subjected the transgressor to death was abrogated by Adam's transgression?" I want a clear text for this. (2.) Suppose it was, how does it appear that it was not again in force till revived by Moses? (3.) Did not that law, "Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed," "subject the transgressor to death?" And was it "not in force" after Adam's transgression, and before Moses? (4.) What do you mean by that ambiguous expression, "Were not taxed with the forfeiture of life?" Your argument requires that it should mean, "Were not punished or punishable with death." But is this true? Were not the sins of the men of Sodom, and, indeed, the whole antediluvian world, punished with death during that period? (5.) Was not every wilful, impenitent transgressor, during this whole time, subject to death everlasting?

Neither can I allow that unnatural interpretation of, "Them who had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression;" "Had not sinned against law, making death the penalty of their sin, as Adam did." (p. 42.) Do not the words obviously mean, "Had not sinned by any actual sin, as Adam did?"

Nay, "the Sodomites and antediluvians are no objection to this." That is strange indeed! But how so? "Because extraordinary interpositions come under no rule, but the will of God." What is that to the purpose? Their sins were actually punished with death, "during that space, wherein," you say, "mankind were not subject to death for their transgression." They *were* subject to death for their transgressions, as God demonstrated by those extraordinary interpositions.

You add, "That law, 'Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed,' makes death the penalty of murder." (p. 43.) It does; and thereby overthrows your whole assertion. "No; for, (1.) It was not enacted till the year of the world 1657." Well, and if it had been enacted only the year before Moses was born, it would still have destroyed your argument. But, (2.) "It is given as a rule for magistrates in executing justice, and not as a declaration of the penalty of sin to be inflicted by God himself." What then? What does it matter, whether the penalty annexed by God were inflicted by God or man? However, I suppose this punishment on the antediluvians, and on Sodom and Gomorrah, was "inflicted by God himself." But, (3.) "None of these were made mortal by those sins." Certainly, infallibly true! And yet the case of any of these abundantly proves, that the law was in force from Adam to Moses, even according to your own definition of it: "A rule of duty, with the penalty of death annexed, as due to the transgressor from God."

13. You affirm, (6.) "The consequences of Adam's sin answer those of Christ's obedience; but not exactly: 'Not as the offence, so is the free gift. For if through the offence of one many be dead, much more the grace' (or favour) 'of God, and the gift' (the benefits that are) 'by grace, which is by one man Jesus Christ, hath abounded unto many.' (Verse 15.) That is, he hath in Christ bestowed benefits upon mankind, far exceeding the consequences of Adam's sin; in erecting a new dispensation, furnished with a glorious fund of light and truth, means and motives." (pp. 43, 44.) This is true; but how small a part of the truth? What a poor, low account of the Christian dispensation!

You go on: “‘Not as it was by one that sinned, so is the gift: for the judgment was by one offence to condemnation; but the free gift is of many offences unto justification;’ (ver. 16;) that is, the grace of God in Christ discharges mankind from the consequences of Adam’s one offence.” Does it entirely discharge them from these consequences? from sorrow, and labour, and death, which you affirmed a while ago to be the *only* consequences of it that affect his posterity? It “also sets them quite to rights with God, both as to a conformity to the law, and eternal life.”

Is not this allowing too much? Is it well consistent with what you said before? “In the 19th verse, the Apostle concludes the whole argument: ‘As by one man’s disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous.’” (p. 29, *et seq.*) “Were made sinners,” you aver means only, “were made mortal.” If so, the counterpart, “made righteous,” can only mean, “made immortal.” And that you thought so then, appears from your citing as a parallel text, “In Christ shall all be made alive;” which you had before asserted to mean only, “shall be raised from the dead.”

14. “Hence it followeth, First, That the abounding of God’s grace, and the blessing by that grace, doth not respect the consequences of Adam’s sin, hath no reference to his transgression, but to the grace of God, and the obedience of Christ.” (p. 45.) “The abounding of God’s grace,” you inform us, “has reference to the grace of God.” Most sure: but this does not prove that it has no reference to the consequences of Adam’s sin. If we gain more blessing by Christ than we lost by Adam, it is doubtless abounding grace. But still it has a reference to Adam’s transgression, and the consequences of it. It is over these that it abounds; therefore it has a manifest respect to them.

“It followeth, Secondly, that in the 18th and 19th verses the Apostle considers the effects of Christ’s obedience only so far as they answer to, and reverse the consequences of, Adam’s disobedience; the additional benefits flowing therefrom having been mentioned apart in the 15th, 16th, and 17th verses.” (p. 46.) In those verses the Apostle does undoubtedly show how the blessing by Christ abounded over the curse by Adam. But what then? How does this prove that the 18th and 19th verses do not respect all the benefits mentioned before? Without question they do: they are a general conclusion, not from one, but all the preceding verses.

“Again observe, that the ‘justification to life’ is such a justification as comes upon all men.” (p. 47.) It may in some sense; but does it in fact? According to your sense of it, it comes upon none. For if it means, “the discharging men from the consequences of Adam’s sin; and if the only consequences of that sin are sorrow, labour, and death;” it is manifest, no man upon earth is justified to this day.

But you go on: “As *justification to life* comes upon all men.” No; not in the proper Scripture sense of justification. That term is never once in the Bible used for the resurrection, no more than for heaven or hell.

It may be proper here, once for all, to observe, that what St. Paul says of abounding grace is simply this: (1.) The condemnation came by “one offence” only; the acquittal is from “many offences.” (2.) They

who receive this shall enjoy a far higher blessing by Christ than they lost by Adam. In both these respects, the consequences of Christ's death abound over the consequences of Adam's sin. And this whole blessing by Christ is termed, in the 18th verse, "justification;" in the 19th, 'being made righteous.'

"Farther, the phrase, 'being made righteous,' as well as 'being made sinners,' is a Hebrew way of speaking." (p. 49.) I do not allow that. Both the phrases, *καθιστασθαι δικαιοι*, or *αμαρτωλοι*, are pure and good Greek. That, therefore, there is any Hebraism at all in these expressions, cannot be admitted without proof. If, then, the same Hebrew word does signify to "make righteous," and to "acquit in judgment," it does not follow that the Greek word here translated, "made righteous," means only "being acquitted." You yourself say the contrary. You but now defined this very gift, "the benefits that are by grace;" (p. 44;) and, in explaining those very words, "The free gift is of many offences unto justification," affirmed, That is, "the grace of God in Christ not only discharges mankind from the consequences of Adam's sin, but also sets them quite to rights with God, both as to a conformity to the law, and as to eternal life." And is this no more than "acquitting them in judgment," "or reversing the sentence of condemnation?"

Through this whole passage, it may be observed that "the gift," "the free gift," "the gift by grace," mean one and the same thing, even the whole benefit given by the abounding grace of God, through the obedience of Christ; abounding both with regard to the fountain itself, and the streams: abundant grace producing abundant blessings.

If, then, these verses are "evidently parallel to those 1 Cor. xv, 21-22," it follows even hence, that "dying," and "being made alive," in the latter passage, do not refer to the body only; but that "dying" implies all the evils, temporal and spiritual, which are derived from Adam's sin; and "being made alive," all the blessings which are derived from Christ, in time and in eternity.

Whereas, therefore, you add, "It is now evident, surely beyond all doubt," (strong expressions!) "that the consequences of Adam's sin here spoken of are no other than the 'death' which comes upon all men:" (p. 50:) I must beg leave to reply, It is not evident at all; nay, it is tolerably evident, on the contrary, that this "death" implies all manner of evils, to which either the body or soul is liable.

15. You next reconsider the 12th verse, which you understand thus: "Death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned," namely, in Adam. "'All have sinned;' that is, are subjected to death through that one offence of his." (p. 51.)

You said before, "'Death passed upon all men,' means, all were by a judicial sentence made subject to death." And here you say, "'All have sinned,' means, all have been subjected to death." So the Apostle asserts, "All were subjected to death, because all were subjected to death!" Not so; sin is one thing, death another; and the former is here assigned as the cause of the latter.

Although the criticism on *εφ' ω* (p. 52) is liable to much exception, yet I leave that and the Hebrew citations as they stand; because, though they may cause many readers to admire your learning, yet they are not to the point.

“Seeing then the phrase, ‘All are made sinners,’ hath been demonstrated to signify, all are subjected to death by a judicial sentence; and seeing the Apostle’s whole argument turns on this point, that all men die through the one offence of Adam; who can doubt but, ‘all have sinned,’ means the same with ‘all are made sinners?’” (pp. 53, 54.) I do not doubt it; but I still deny that either phrase means no more than, “All are in a state of suffering.”

16. In order fully to clear this important text, I shall here subjoin some of Dr. Jennings’s remarks: “The Apostle having treated in the preceding chapter of the cause and manner of a sinner’s justification before God, namely, through the merits of Christ, and by faith in his blood, and having spoken of the fruits of justification in the former part of this chapter, he proceeds, in the verses before us, to illustrate our salvation by Christ, by comparing it with our ruin by Adam. He compares Adam with Christ, and shows how what we lost by the one is restored by the other with abundant advantage. He makes Adam to be a figure or type of Christ; considering them both as public persons, representing, the one, all his natural descendants; the other, all his spiritual seed; the one, Adam, all mankind, who are ‘all guilty before God;’ the other, Christ, all those ‘who obtain the righteousness of God, which is by faith to all them that believe.’

“Concerning the consequences of Adam’s sin upon his posterity, we have here the following particulars:—

“(1.) That by one man sin entered into the world; that the whole world is some way concerned in Adam’s sin. And this indeed is evident, because,—

“(2.) Death, which is ‘the wages of sin,’ and the very punishment threatened to Adam’s first transgression, ‘entered by sin, and passed upon all men,’ is actually inflicted on all mankind. Upon which it is asserted in the next words,—

“(3.) That all have sinned: ‘Even so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned.’ All men then are deemed sinners in the eye of God, on account of that one sin, of which alone the Apostle is here speaking. And,—

“(4.) Not only after, but before, and ‘until the law,’ given by Moses, ‘sin was in the world;’ and men were deemed sinners, and accordingly punished with death, through many generations. Now, ‘sin is not imputed where there is no law; nevertheless, death reigned from Adam to Moses;’ plainly showing, that all mankind, during that whole period, had sinned in Adam, and so died in virtue of the death threatened to him; and death could not then be inflicted on mankind for any actual sin, because it was inflicted on so many infants, who had neither eaten of the forbidden fruit, nor committed any actual sin whatever, and therefore had not sinned in any sense, ‘after the similitude of Adam’s transgression.’ Therefore,—

“(5.) It was ‘through the offence of one that many are dead.’ (Verse 15.) ‘By one offence death reigned by one.’ (Verse 17.) And seeing the sin of Adam is thus punished in all men, it follows,—

“(6.) That they were all involved in that sentence of condemnation which God passed upon him. ‘The judgment was by one to condemnation.’ (Verse 16.) ‘By one offence judgment came upon all men to condemnation.’ (Verse 18.) And, since it is so plain that all men are actually punished for Adam’s sin, it must needs follow,—

“(7.) That they ‘all sinned in Adam. By one man’s disobedience many were made sinners.’ They were so constituted sinners by Adam’s sinning, as to become liable to the punishment threatened to his transgression.

“Between Adam and Christ, the type and the antitype, St. Paul draws the parallel in the following particulars:—

“(1.) Both have done something by which many others are affected, who either lose or gain by what they did: ‘Through the offence of one many are dead; by one, the gift of grace hath abounded to many.’ (Verse 15.)

“(2.) That which the first Adam did, by which many, that is, all men receive hurt, was sin, offence, and disobedience: they all suffer by one that sinned. (Verse 16.) ‘By the offence of one, by one man’s disobedience.’ (Verses 18, 19.) That which the second Adam did, by which many, that is, all who believe, receive benefit, is righteousness and obedience: ‘By the righteousness of one, by the obedience of one.’ (Verses 18, 19.)

“(3.) The detriment which all men receive through Adam is, that they ‘are made sinners;’ that ‘judgment is come upon them to condemnation;’ in consequence of which, death, the wages of sin, is inflicted on every one of them. The benefit which all believers receive through Christ is grace, or the favour of God, justification, righteousness or sanctification, and eternal life: ‘The grace of God, and the gift by grace, hath, by one man, Jesus Christ, abounded to many. By the righteousness of one, the free gift came upon all men’ who receive it ‘to justification of life. By the obedience of one, many are made righteous.’ (Verses 15, 18, 19.)

“Thus the Apostle shows the parity between the effects of Adam’s sin, and of Christ’s righteousness. Only in two instances he shows that the effect of the latter vastly exceeds the effect of the former:—

“(1.) It removes many sins, besides that one sin of Adam, which so affected all his posterity: ‘If through one offence many be dead, much more the grace of God by Jesus Christ hath abounded to many. The judgment was by one to condemnation; but the free gift is of many offences unto justification.’ (Verses 15, 16.)

“(2.) Christ raises believers to a far happier state than that which Adam enjoyed in paradise: ‘Much more they who receive abundance of grace, and of the gift of righteousness, shall reign in life by one, Jesus Christ.’ (ver. 17.)” (*Jennings’s Vindication.*)

17. Your paraphrase on the text, (*Taylor’s Doctrine, &c.*, pp. 55–64,) being only a repetition of what you had said over and over before, does not require any separate consideration. Only I must observe a few mistakes which have not occurred before: (1.) “The resurrection is the first and fundamental step in the Gospel salvation.” (p. 64.) No; “He shall save his people from their sins;” this is the first and fundamental step. (2.) You have very grievously mistaken the meaning of four texts in John vi: “This is the Father’s will, that, of all which he hath given me, I should lose nothing, but should raise it up again at the last day.” (Verse 39.) “This is the will of Him that sent me, that every one that seeth the Son, and believeth on him, should have everlasting life: and I will raise him up at the last day.” (Verse 40.) “No man can come to me except the Father draw him: and I will raise him up at the last day.” (Verse 44.) “Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day.” (ver. 54.) Now, you cite all these texts as relating to the general resurrection, whereas not one of them relates to it at all. They are all promises made to true believers only; and relate wholly and solely to the resurrection of the just.

18. It remains then, all that has been advanced to the contrary notwithstanding, that the only true and rational way of accounting for the general wickedness of mankind, in all ages and nations, is pointed out in those words: in Adam all die. In and through their first parent, all his posterity died in a spiritual sense; and they remain wholly “dead in trespasses and sins,” till the second Adam makes them alive. By this “one man sin entered into the world, and passed upon all men:” and through the infection which they derive from him, all men are and ever

were, by nature, entirely "alienated from the life of God; without hope, without God in the world."

(1.) Your Appendix to the first part of your book is wholly employed in answering two questions: "One is, How is it consistent with justice, that all men should die by the disobedience of one man? The other, How shall we account for all men's rising again, by the obedience of another man, Jesus Christ?" (p. 65.)

You may determine the former question as you please, since it does not touch the main point in debate. I shall therefore take no farther pains about it, than to make a short extract of what Dr. Jennings speaks on the head:—

"(2.) As to the first question, Dr. Taylor gets rid of all difficulty that may arise from the consideration of God's justice, by ascribing it wholly to his goodness, that 'death passed upon all men.' 'Death,' he tells us, 'is upon the whole a benefit.' It is certain that believers in Christ receive benefit by it. But this gentleman will have death to be an 'original benefit, and that to all mankind; merely intended to increase the vanity of all earthly things, and to abate their force to delude us.' He afterward displays the benefit of shortening human life to its present standard: 'That death being nearer to our view, might be a powerful motive to regard less the things of a transitory world.' But does the 'nearer view of death,' in fact, produce this effect? Does not the common observation of all ages prove the contrary? Has not covetousness been the peculiar vice of old age! As death is nearer to the view, we plainly see that men have more and more regard for the things of a transitory world. We are sure, therefore, that death is no such benefit to the generality of men. On the contrary, it is the king of terrors to them, the burden of their lives, and bane of their pleasures. To talk, therefore, of death's being a benefit, an original benefit, and that to all mankind, is to talk against the common sense and experience of the whole world.

"It is strange, death should be originally given by God as a benefit to man, and that the shortening of man's life afterward should be designed as a farther benefit; and yet that God should so often promise his peculiar people long life as the reward of obedience, and threaten them with death as a punishment of disobedience!

"'But the Scripture,' he says, 'affirms that sufferings are the chastisements of our heavenly Father, and death in particular.' But does not every chastisement suppose a fault? Must he not be a cruel father who will chasten his children for no fault at all? If then God does but chasten us for Adam's sin, the fault of it must some way lie upon us; else we suppose God's dealings with his children to be unreasonable and unrighteous." (*Vindication*, p. 36, &c.)

(3.) I would only add two or three obvious questions: (i.) Did God propose death as a benefit in the original-threatening? (ii.) Did he represent it as a benefit in the sentence pronounced on Adam: "Dust thou art, and unto dust thou shalt return?" (iii.) Do the inspired writers speak of God's "bringing a flood on the world of the ungodly, as a benefit, or a punishment?" (iv.) Do they mention the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah as designed for a benefit to them? (v.) Is it by way of benefit that God declares, "The soul that sinneth it shall die?" Certainly this point is not defensible. Death is properly not a benefit, but a punishment.

(4.) The other question is, "How shall we account for all men's rising again, by the obedience of another man, Jesus Christ?" (*Taylor's Doctrine*, &c, p. 70.)

“To set this in a clear light, I ask another question: what was it that gave the glorious Personage, emblemized by ‘the Lamb,’ (Rev. v, 1, &c,) his superior worthiness, his prevailing interest in God, beyond all others in heaven and earth? It was his being slain; that is, his obedience to God, and good will to men: it was his consummate virtue. ‘Thou art worthy:’—Why! Because thou hast exhibited to God such an instance of virtue, obedience, and goodness. Thou hast sacrificed thy life in the cause of truth, and ‘hast redeemed us’ by that act of the highest obedience.” (pp. 71, 72.)

With what extreme wariness is this whole paragraph worded! You do not care to say directly, “Jesus Christ is either a little God, or he is no God at all.” So you say it indirectly, in a heap of smooth, laboured, decent circumlocutions. Yet permit me to ask, Was “that act of obedience, the original and sole ground” of his prevailing interest in God, and of his worthiness, not only “to open the book,” but “to receive” from all the armies of heaven “the power, and the riches, and the wisdom, and the strength, and the honour, and the glory, and the blessing?” Rev. v, 12. And is this act the original and the sole ground, why “all men” must “honour him even as they honour the Father?” Yea, and why “every creature which is in the heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and on the sea, and all that are in them, say, To him that sitteth upon the throne and to the Lamb, is the blessing, and the honour, and the glory, and the power, for ever and ever?” verse 13.

“To Him that sitteth on the throne and to the Lamb:”—does that mean, to the great God and the little God? If so, when all “creatures in heaven and earth,” all throughout the universe, thus “honour him even as they honour the Father,” are they not doing him too much honour? “My glory,” saith the Lord, “I will not give to another.” How comes it then to be given to the Lamb?

(5.) You proceed: “The worthiness of Christ is his consummate virtue, obedience to God, and benevolence to his creatures.” Is this the only ground of his worthiness to be “honoured even as the Father?” Is it on this ground alone, that “all the angels of God” are to “worship him?” Or rather, because “in the beginning,” from everlasting, he “was with God, and was God?”

“Virtue is the only price which purchaseth every thing with God. True virtue, or the right exercise of reason, is true worth, and the only valuable consideration which prevails with God.” (p. 73.)

Do you then conceive this to be the exact meaning of St. Paul, when he says, “Ye are bought with a price?” and that where he speaks of “the Church of God which he hath purchased with his own blood,” he means with his own virtue? Agreeable to which, “Thou hast redeemed us by thy blood,” must mean, by the *right exercise of thy reason?* Well, then, might Father Socinus say, *Tota redemptionis nostræ per Christum metaphora*: “The whole metaphor of our redemption by Christ.” For on this scheme there is nothing real in it.

“It was not the mere natural power or strength of the Lamb, but his most excellent character.”—Sir, do “you honour the Son, even as you honour the Father?” If you did, could you possibly talk of him in this strain?

However, all this does not affect the question; but it still remains an unshaken truth, that all men’s dying in Adam is the grand cause why “the whole world lieth in wickedness.”

NEWINGTON, January 18, 1757.

1. In your Second Part you profess to “examine the principal passages of Scripture, which divines have applied in support of the doctrine of original sin; particularly those cited by the Assembly of Divines in their Larger Catechism.” (pp. 87, 88.) To this I never subscribed; but I think it is in the main a very excellent composition, which I shall therefore cheerfully endeavour to defend, so far as I conceive it is grounded on clear Scripture.

But I would first observe in general, with Dr. Jennings, that there are two kinds of texts in the ensuing collection: some that directly prove, others that properly illustrate, the doctrine of original sin. And there are so many in which it is either directly spoken of, or evidently implied, that the author might well have spared his observation, “The Scripture speaks very sparingly of the consequences of Adam’s sin upon us, because as these are freely reversed to mankind by Christ, we are not so much concerned to know them.” (p. 50.) The fact here affirmed is equally true with the reason assigned for it.

2. The first proposition in the Catechism, which relates to original sin, is this:—

“The covenant being made with Adam as a public person, not for himself only, but for his posterity, all mankind descending from him by ordinary generation, sinned with him, and fell with him, in that first transgression.

“‘God hath made of one blood all nations of men,’ Acts xvii, 26.” (pp. 91, 92.)—I believe Dr. Jennings’s remark here will suffice:—

“This is quoted to prove that all mankind descend from Adam. But Dr. Taylor adds, ‘That is, hath made all the nations of the world of one species, endowed with the same faculties.’” (*Jennings’s Vindication*, p. 49, &c.) And so they might have been, if all men had been created singly and separately, just as Adam was; but they could not then, with any propriety of language, have been said to be of one blood. This Scripture, therefore, is very pertinently quoted to prove what it is brought for. That ‘Adam was a public person, including all his posterity, and, consequently, that all mankind, descending from him by ordinary generation, sinned in him, and fell with him in his first transgression,’ the Assembly have proved very methodically and substantially: First, from Gen. ii, 16, 17, where death is threatened to Adam in case of his sinning; then from Romans v, 12–20, and 1 Cor. xv, 21, 22, where we are expressly told that “all men die in Adam;” and that, “by his offence, judgment is come upon all men to condemnation.”

Proposition. “All mankind sinned in him, and fell with him in that first transgression.” Which they prove by Gen. ii, 16, 17, compared with Romans v, 12–20.

On this you remark, “The threatening, ‘Thou shalt surely die,’ is addressed to Adam personally; and therefore nothing can be concluded thence, with regard to Adam’s posterity.” (pp. 93, 94.) Is this consequence good? Was not the sentence also grounded on this threatening, “Unto dust thou shalt return,” personally directed to him? And is this nothing to his posterity? Nay, does it not from this very consideration appear, that all his posterity were concerned in that threatening, because they are all partakers of the death which was so threatened to Adam?

“But we cannot gather from Romans v, or 1 Cor. xv, ‘that all man-

kind sinned in Adam,' if we understand sinned as distinguished from suffering." It has been largely proved that we can; and that sinning must necessarily be understood there, as distinguished from suffering.

"But the Apostle says, 'The offence of one' brought death into the world; whereas, had all mankind sinned in Adam when he sinned, then that offence would not have been 'the offence of one,' but of millions." (p. 95.) It might be, in one sense, the offence of millions, and in another, "the offence of one."

"It is true, Adam's posterity so fell with him in that first transgression, that if the threatening had been immediately executed, he would have had no posterity at all." *The threatening!* What was the threatening to them? Did not you assure us, in the very last page, "The threatening is addressed to Adam personally; and therefore nothing can be concluded from thence with regard to his posterity?"

And here you say, Their very "existence did certainly fall under the threatening of the law, and into the hands of the Judge, to be disposed of as he should think fit." *As he should think fit.* Then he might, without any injustice, have deprived them of all blessings; of being itself, the only possible ground of all! And this, for the sin of another.

You close the article thus: "We cannot from those passages conclude, that mankind, by Adam's offence, incurred any evil but temporal death." Just the contrary has been shown at large.

3. Their Second proposition is, "The fall brought mankind into a state of sin and misery." (p. 96.)

To prove this, they cite Romans v, 12; a proof which all the art of man cannot evade; and Romans iii, 23, "All have sinned, and come short of the glory of God." "But this," you say, "means only, Jews as well as Gentiles, men of all nations, have sinned." (p. 97.) Nay, it is most certain, as Dr. Jennings observes, that he "means all men of all nations; or he means nothing to the purpose of his conclusion and his inferences, verses 19-22. The Apostle concludes from the view he had given before of the universal corruption of mankind, that 'every mouth must be stopped, and all the world become guilty before God,' verse 19. From whence he draws two inferences: (1.) 'Therefore by the works of the law there shall no flesh be justified.' (2.) The only way of justification for all sinners is, 'by faith in Jesus Christ.' For there is no difference, as to the way of justification; 'for all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God.' And, therefore, whoever they are whom Dr. Taylor excludes from this 'all,' ('all have sinned,') he must likewise exclude from having any need of justification by Christ." (*Jennings's Vindication*, p. 50, &c.)

Be this as it may, it is certain, (1.) That mankind are now in a state of sin and suffering. (2.) That they have been so in all ages, nearly from the time that Adam fell. Now, if this fall did not bring them into that state, I would be glad to know what did.

4. Their Third proposition is, "Sin is any want of conformity to, or transgression of, the law of God, given as a rule to the reasonable creature." "This," you say, "has no immediate relation to our present design." (*Taylor's Doctrine*, &c, p. 98.) But it had to theirs; which was to illustrate the preceding assertion: "That the fall of Adam brought mankind into a state of sin," in both these senses of the word.

5. Their Fourth proposition is, "The sinfulness of that state into which man fell consists in the guilt of Adam's first sin; the want of that righteousness wherein he was created; and the corruption of his nature, whereby he is utterly indisposed, disabled, and made opposite to all that is spiritually good, and wholly inclined to evil, and that continually; which is commonly called original sin, and from which do proceed all actual transgressions.

On the first article of this you say, "Adam's first sin was attended with consequences which affect all his posterity. But we could not, on account of his sin, become obnoxious to punishment." (p. 99.) By *punishment* I mean *evil*, suffered on account of sin. And are we not obnoxious to any evil on account of Adam's sin?

To prove the rest of the proposition, they cite first, Rom. iii, 10-20. On which you remark, "The Apostle is here speaking of Jews and Gentiles, not in a personal, but in a national, capacity. 'The mouth,' says he, of all sorts of people is 'stopped,' and both Jews and Gentiles are brought in guilty; for I have proved that there are transgressors among the Jews, as well as among the Gentiles." (p. 102.) Not at all. If he proved no more than this, not one person would "become guilty before God." Not one "mouth" of Jew or Gentile would "be stopped," by showing, "there were Jewish as well as Heathen transgressors."

I proceed to your observations:—

(1.) "In this whole section there is not one word of Adam." There is enough in the next chapter but one. The Apostle first describes the effect, and afterward points out the cause.

(2.) "He is here speaking, not of all men, but of the Jews; of those alone who were 'under the law,' verse 19, and proving from their own writings that there were great corruptions among them as well as other people." (p. 103.)

He is speaking of them chiefly; but not of them only, as appears from the ninth verse: "We have before proved both Jews and Gentiles, that they are all under sin: as it is written, There is none righteous," (neither among the Jews nor Gentiles,) "no, not one." Does this respect them in their national only, not personal, capacity? Does it prove no more than, that there were great corruptions among the Jews, as well as other people?

(3.) "The section consists of several quotations out of the Old Testament; but, (i.) None of them, taken separately, speaks of any depravity of nature; but of habits of wickedness, which men had themselves contracted." (p. 103.) They do speak of habits which men had contracted themselves; but do they speak of these only? The way to know this is, not to "take them separately;" not to consider the precise meaning, wherein they were occasionally spoken by David, Solomon, or Isaiah; but to take them conjointly, as they are here put together by the Holy Ghost, to form the character of all mankind.

On one of them, "separately taken," you say, "How could God look down from heaven, to see if there were any that did seek God, if he knew all mankind were naturally disabled from seeking him?" Why not, if, whatever they were by nature, the grace of God was more or less given to all? Though they were wholly inclined to all evil by nature, yet by grace they might recover all goodness.

You affirm, (ii.) "In none of these places does God speak strictly of every individual Jew under David or Solomon. Very many were bad; but some were good." (p. 104.) They were; though by grace, not nature. But among all those of whom God speaks by St. Paul, "there" was "none" good or "righteous, no, not one;" every individual, whether Jew or Heathen, was guilty before God.

"I conclude, therefore, (i.) That none of those texts refer to any corruption common to all mankind." (p. 106.) Perhaps they do not, as spoken by David; but they do as spoken by St. Paul. "I conclude, (ii.) Such a general corruption as admits of no exception was not necessary to the Apostle's argument." (p. 107.) Absolutely necessary; had it not included every individual person, no person's "mouth" would have been "stopped."

These texts, therefore, do "directly and certainly prove" that, at the time when the Apostle wrote, every individual Jew and Gentile (excepting only those who were "saved by grace") "were all under sin;" "that there was none" of them "righteous, no, not one; none that understood or that sought after" God. This was the fact: and who can find out a more rational way of accounting for this universal wickedness, than by a universal corruption of our nature, derived from our first parent?

6. The next proof is, Eph. ii, 1-3: "And you hath he quickened, who were dead in trespasses and sins; wherein, in time past, ye walked according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience; among whom, also, we all had our conversation in times past, in the desires of our flesh, fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind; and were by nature the children of wrath, even as others." (p. 108.)

(1.) "Nothing is here intimated of any ill effects of Adam's sin upon us." No! Not if we are "children of wrath by nature?"

(2.) "The Ephesians were Gentiles converted to the faith." Yea, and Jews also. In this very passage the Apostle speaks of both; first, the Gentile, then the Jewish, converts.

(3.) "In these verses he is describing their wretched state, while they were in Gentile darkness,"—and while they were in Jewish darkness; the Jews having been just as wicked before their conversion as the Heathens. Both the one and the other had "walked," till then, "in the vanity of their mind; having their understanding darkened," being equally "dead in trespasses and sins," equally "alienated from the life of God, through the blindness of their heart:"—a very lively description, not so much of a wicked life, as of an evil nature.

(4.) "When he saith, they were 'dead in trespasses and sins,' he speaks of their personal iniquities." (p. 109.) True, both of heart and life. I must make some variation in the rest of your paraphrase. "Wherein," saith he, "in times past, ye," Heathens particularly, "walked;" inwardly and outwardly, "according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now" (still) "worketh in the children of disobedience; among whom we Jews also had our conversation;" being as "dead in trespasses and sins" as you.

"Therefore, (5.) When he adds, 'And were by nature the children of wrath, even as others,' he cannot mean, they were liable to wrath, by that nature which they brought into the world." (p. 110.) Why not?

This does not follow from any thing you have said yet. Let us see how you prove it now: "This nature is now no other than God's own work. The nature of every man comes out of the hands of God." The same may be said of those who are still "dead in trespasses and sins." Their original nature came from God, and was no other than God's own work; yet the present corruption of their nature came not from God, and is not his work. "Consequently, the nature of every person, when brought into being, is just what God sees fit it should be." This is true of the original nature of mankind, when it was first "brought into being;" but it is not true of our present corrupt nature. This is not "what God sees fit it should be." "It is his power alone that forms it." Yes, that forms us men; but not that forms us sinful men. "To say, The nature he gives is the object of his wrath, is little less than blasphemy." As he gave it, it is not the object of his wrath; but it is, as it is defiled with sin. "Far was it from the Apostle to depreciate our nature." True, our original nature; but never did man more deeply depreciate our present corrupt nature. "His intent is to show the Ephesians they were children of wrath, through the sins in which they walked." Yea, and through "the desires of the flesh and the mind," mentioned immediately before; "through the vanity of their mind;" through "the blindness of their hearts, past feeling, alienated from the life of God." Is he "not here speaking of their nature, but of the vicious course of life they had led?" (p. 111.) "He well understood the worth of the human nature;"—he did, both in its original and in its present state;"—"and elsewhere shows it was endowed, even in the Heathens, with light and power sufficient to know God, and obey his will." In what Heathens, in Europe, Asia, Africa, or America, is nature now endowed with this light and power? I have never found it in any Heathen yet; and I have conversed with many, of various nations. On the contrary, I have found one and all deeply ignorant of the very end of their existence. All of them have confirmed what a Heathen *Meeko* (or Chief) told me many years ago: "He that sitteth in heaven knoweth why he made man; but we know nothing."

"But St. Paul says, 'When the Gentiles, which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, they are a law to themselves.' This supposes, they might have done them 'by nature,' or their natural powers." But how does it appear, that, "by nature," here means, By their mere "natural powers?" It is certain they had not the written law; but had they no supernatural assistance? Is it not one God "who works in" us and in them, "both to will and to do?" They who, by this help, do the things contained in the law, we grant, "are not the objects of God's wrath."

"Again: He affirms, the Gentiles had light sufficient to have seen God's eternal power and Godhead:" Rom. i, 19–21. They had; but how does it appear that this was the merely natural light of their own unassisted reason? If they had assistance from God, and did not use it, they were equally without excuse. "Nay, if their nature was corrupt, and therefore they did not glorify God, they had a fair excuse." (p. 112.) True, if God had not offered them grace to balance the corruption of nature: but if he did, they are still without excuse; because they might have conquered that corruption, and would not. Therefore we are not

obliged to seek any other sense of the phrase, "By nature," than, "By the nature we bring into the world."

However, you think you have found another: "*By nature*, may signify *really* and *truly*. Thus St. Paul calls Timothy, *γνησίον τέκνον*, 'his own genuine son in the faith;' not to signify he was the child of the Apostle, but that he was a real imitator of his faith. In like manner he calls the Ephesians, *φύσει τέκνα*, 'genuine children of wrath;' not to signify they were related to wrath by their natural birth, but by their sin and disobedience." (p. 113.)

This is simply begging the question, without so much as a shadow of proof; for the Greek word in one text is not the same, nor any way related to that in the other. Nor is there the least resemblance between the Apostle's calling Timothy his "own son in the faith," and his affirming that even those who are now "saved by grace," were "by nature children of wrath."

To add, therefore, "Not as they came under condemnation by the offence of Adam," is only begging the question once more; though, it is true, they had afterward inflamed their account by "their own trespasses and sins."

You conclude: "'By nature,' therefore, may be a metaphorical expression, and consequently is not intended" (*may be* in the premiss, *is not* in the conclusion! A way of arguing you frequently use) "to signify nature in the proper sense of the word; but to mean, they were really and truly children of wrath." (p. 114.) But where is the proof? Till this is produced, I must still believe, with the Christian Church in all ages, that all men are "children of wrath by nature," in the plain, proper sense of the word.

7. The next proof is Rom. v, 6: "While we were yet without strength, in due time Christ died for the ungodly." You answer, (1.) "The Apostle is here speaking, not of mankind in general, but of the Gentiles only; as appears by the whole thread of his discourse, from the beginning of the Epistle." (p. 115.) From the beginning of the Epistle to the 6th verse of the 5th chapter is the Apostle speaking of the Gentiles only? Otherwise it cannot appear, "by the whole thread of his discourse from the beginning of the Epistle." "But it appears especially from chap. iii, 9: 'What then? Are we, Jews, 'better than they,' Gentiles?'" (p. 116, &c.) Nay, from that very verse he speaks chiefly of the Jews. And you yourself a few pages ago, roundly affirmed that "he there spoke of the Jews only."

And will you affirm that, in the 4th chapter likewise, "he is speaking of the Gentiles only?" Is it not manifest, that he does not speak of them at all in a considerable part of that chapter? How then does it appear, by "the whole thread of his discourse from the beginning of the Epistle, that he is here speaking, not of mankind in general, but of the Gentiles only?"

However, you boldly go on: "Having established the point, that the Gentiles have as good a title to God's favour as the Jews." (p. 116.) How? Is this the only, or the chief point, which St. Paul establishes in the 4th chapter? Is not his main point throughout that chapter to prove, that both Jews and Gentiles were "justified by faith?" or, is he "speaking this, not of mankind in general, but of the Gentiles only?" "He

proceeds: chap. v, 1: 'Therefore, being justified by faith, we,' Gentiles, 'have peace with God.' " In the same manner you thrust in the word Gentiles into each of the following verses. Had then the Gentiles only "peace with God?" You might with more colour have inserted Jews in every verse; for of them chiefly the Apostle had been speaking. To say that "he principally speaks of and to the Gentiles, to the end of the 6th chapter," (p. 117,) is another assertion which cannot be proved. It is therefore by no means true, that "he is in this verse speaking of the Gentiles, in contradistinction to the Jews."

You affirm, (2.) "By the same argument, he here considers the Gentiles only in a body, as distinguished from the body of the Jews; for so he does all along in the four first chapters." No, not in one of them. If he had, the "mouth" of no one individual person had been "stopped." On the contrary, he speaks both here, and all along, of every individual, that every one might believe in Him "who died for" every one of "the ungodly."

You affirm, (3.) "In this verse he describes the condition of the converted Gentiles when in their Heathen state, in which they were 'without strength,' unable to recover themselves; they were 'ungodly,' yea, 'sinners,' and 'enemies to God.'" (p. 118.) And were not the unconverted Jews also "sinners," and "enemies to God, ungodly," and "without strength" to recover themselves? These four characters, therefore, are no proof at all, "that the Gentiles only are here spoken of."

"Their sin, and enmity, and ungodliness, consisted in their wicked works." Primarily, in their wicked tempers. But how came all men, Jews and Gentiles, to have those wicked tempers, and to walk in those wicked works? How came they all, till converted, to be "dead in sin," and "without strength" to recover from it, unless "in Adam all died," in a deeper sense than you are willing to allow?

You sum up your argument thus: "The Apostle is not speaking here of all mankind's being corrupted in Adam, but of the Gentiles being corrupted by the idolatry and wickedness into which they had plunged themselves, and out of which they were unable to recover themselves, without the extraordinary interposal of divine grace." (p. 120.)

If this was the case with the Heathens only, then the Jews were not "without strength," but were able to recover themselves from their wickedness, without any such interposal! But with regard to the Heathens, I ask, (1.) Was this the state of all the Heathen nations, or of some only? (2.) If of some only, which were they that were not corrupted? (3.) If it was the state of all Heathen nations, how came it to be so? How was it that there was not one uncorrupted nation on earth? (4.) How could any Heathen nation be in this state; "without strength; unable to recover themselves" from sin, without the extraordinary interposal of the divine grace? since you are clear in this, "that all the Gentiles are endowed with light and power sufficient to know God, and perform obedience to his will, by their natural powers of reason and understanding." (p. 111.) If you say, "They were once endowed with these powers, but now they had cast them away;" I am not satisfied still. What, did all nations cast away their natural powers of reason and understanding? Surely not. But if not, how came they all to plunge themselves into this dreadful corruption?

8. Another proof is, "The carnal mind is enmity against God; for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be. So then they that are in the flesh cannot please God," Rom. viii, 7, 8.

On this you observe, (1.) "Here is not one word of Adam, or any consequence of his sin upon us."

The whole passage speaks of that corruption of our nature, which is the consequence of Adam's sin.

The plain and obvious sense of it is this: "What the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh," (too weak to contend with our corrupt nature,) God hath done: "Sending his own Son," he hath "condemned" that "sin" which was "in our flesh;" verse 3; hath given sentence that it should be destroyed: "That the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit;" verse 4; who are guided in all our thoughts, words, and actions, not by corrupt nature, but by the Spirit of God. "They that are after the flesh"—who are still guided by corrupt nature—"mind the things of the flesh;" have their thoughts and affections fixed on such things as gratify corrupt nature; "but they that are after the Spirit"—who are under his guidance—"mind the things of the Spirit;" verse 5; think of, relish, love the things which the Spirit hath revealed; which he moves us to, and promises to give us. "For to be carnally minded"—to mind the things of the flesh, of our corrupt nature—"is death;" the sure mark of spiritual death, and the way to death everlasting: "but to be spiritually minded"—to mind the things of the Spirit—"is life;" verse 6; the sure mark of spiritual life, and the way to life everlasting; and attended with the "peace" of God, and peace *with* God, which otherwise can have no place. "Because the carnal mind"—the mind, taste, inclination, the whole bias of our evil nature—"is enmity against God; for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be;" verse 7; being as opposite thereto as hell to heaven. "So then they that are in the flesh"—still unrenewed by the Spirit, still following the bent of corrupt nature—"cannot please God," verse 8. Every man may see now whether this passage does not strongly illustrate the depravity of our nature.

9. The last proof of this part of the proposition is: "God saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually," Gen. vi, 5. And below: "The earth was corrupt before God, and the earth was filled with violence," verse 11. (p. 122.)

"Mankind," you say, "was universally debauched into lust and sensuality, rapine and violence." And how came this universal wickedness, if all mankind were quite upright by nature? You answer, "They had corrupted themselves: so the text, (verse 12,) 'All flesh had corrupted his way upon the earth.'" This expression does not necessarily imply any more than that all flesh, all men, were corrupted. But taking it literally, I ask, How came all flesh to corrupt themselves? O, "by Seth's posterity intermarrying with the Cainites." But how came all the Cainites to corrupt themselves; and all the Sethites to follow, not reform, them? If the balance was even, if nature leaned neither way, there ought to have been as many good as bad still; and the Sethites ought to have reformed as many of the children of Cain, as the

Cainites corrupted of the children of Seth. How came it, then, that "only Noah was a just man?" And does one good man, amidst a world of the ungodly, prove that the "nature of mankind in general is not corrupted;" or, rather, strongly prove that it is? It does not prove that Noah himself was not naturally inclined to evil; but it does, that the world was.

"But if the corruption of nature was the reason why the old world was destroyed, it is a reason for the destruction of the world at any time." (p. 123.) This alone was never supposed to be the reason; but their actual wickedness added thereto.

You add: "It may be urged, that God said, 'I will not again curse the ground for man's sake; for the imagination of man's heart is evil from his youth,' Gen. viii, 21. But the Hebrew particle *וְ* sometimes signifies *although*." That does not prove that it signifies so here. But what, if it does? What, if the text be rendered, *Though* "the imagination of man's heart is evil from his youth?" Even thus rendered, it implies as strongly as it did before, that "man's heart" is naturally inclined to evil.

The Hebrew word, translated *youth*, (p. 124,) is always applied to *childhood* or *tender age*; (Isaiah vii, 16;) *וְעַרְוֹתָיִם* signifies *a little child*: and none of the texts you have cited prove the contrary. Hebrau, the author of the eighty-eighth Psalm, was doubtless "afflicted from his youth," or childhood. The Babylonians (mentioned Isaiah xlvii, 12) may well be supposed to have been trained up in the way of their fathers, from their earliest childhood: and the plain meaning of Jeremiah, (iii, 24, 25,) "Shame hath devoured the labour of our fathers from our youth: we lie down in our shame; for we have sinned against the Lord our God, we and our fathers from our youth," is,—Ever since we began to think or act, we have gone astray from God.

10. The preceding texts were brought to prove (and they do abundantly prove it) that our nature is deeply corrupted, inclined to evil, and disinclined to all that is spiritually good; so that, without supernatural grace, we can neither will nor do what is pleasing to God. And this easily accounts for the wickedness and misery of mankind in all ages and nations; whereby experience and reason do so strongly confirm this Scriptural doctrine of original sin.

Yet it will not "follow, that men are no moral agents." (p. 125.) If you ask, "Why, how are they capable of performing duty?" I answer, By grace; though not by nature. And a measure of this is given to all men.

Nor does it follow, "that we can by no means help or hinder that sin which is natural to us." Yes, we can. Anger, for instance, is natural to me; yea, irregular, unreasonable anger. I am naturally inclined to this, as I experience every day. Yet I can help it, by the grace of God; and do so, as long as I watch and pray.

Dr. Jennings answers this assertion more at large: "'If sin be natural, then it is necessary.' If by sin is meant the corrupt bias of our wills, that indeed is natural to us, as our nature is corrupted by the fall; but not as it came originally out of the hand of God. Therefore it is improperly compared to the appetites of hunger and thirst, which might be in our original nature. Now, this bias of the will is certainly evil and sinful, and hateful to God; whether we have contracted it ourselves, or whether we derive it from Adam,

makes no difference. A proud or passionate temper is evil, whether a man has contracted it himself, or derived it from his parents. Therefore the inference, 'If natural and' (in some sense) 'necessary, then no sin,' does by no means hold.

"But if by sin be meant sinful actions, to which this corrupt bias of the will inclines us; it remains to be proved, that a corrupt bias of the will makes the actions necessary, and, consequently, not sinful. And, indeed, if a corrupt bias makes sin to be necessary, and, consequently, to be no sin, then the more any man is inclined to sin, the less sin he can commit; and as that corrupt bias grows stronger, his actual sinning becomes more necessary: and so the man, instead of growing more wicked, grows more innocent." (*Jennings's Vindication*, p. 68, &c.)

11. That this doctrine has been long "held in the Church of Rome," (*Taylor's Doctrine*, &c. p. 126,) is true. But so it has in the Greek Church also; and, so far as we can learn, in every Church under heaven; at least from the time that God spake by Moses.

From this infection of our nature (call it original sin, or what you please) spring many, if not all, actual sins. And this St. James (i, 14) plainly intimates, even according to your paraphrase on his words: "'Every man is tempted,' is overcome by temptation, 'when he is drawn away by his own lust,'—his own irregular desire; where the Apostle charges the wickedness of men on its proper cause,—their 'own lust.'" Very true. And irregular desire is (not so much a fruit as a) part of original sin. For to say, "Eve had irregular desires before she sinned," (p. 127,) is a contradiction; since all irregular desire is sin.

12. Another proof that actual sins spring from original is, "Out of the heart proceed evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false witness, blasphemies," Matt. xv, 19.

"But what has this text to do with Adam's sin?" It has much to do with the point it is brought to prove; namely, that actual sin proceeds from original; evil works, from an evil heart. Do not, therefore, triumph over these venerable men, (as you have done again and again,) because a text cited in proof of one clause of a proposition does not prove the whole.

But "neither of those texts proves that all our wickedness proceeds from our being corrupted by Adam's sin." (p. 128.) But they both prove what they were brought to prove,—that all outward wickedness proceeds from inward wickedness. Those pious men, therefore, did not mix "the forgery of their own imagination with the truth of God."

But "if all actual transgressions proceed from Adam's sin, then he is the only guilty person that ever lived. For if his sin is the cause of all ours, he alone is chargeable with them."

True; if all our transgressions so proceed from his sin, that we cannot possibly avoid them. But this is not the case; by the grace of God we may cast away all our transgressions: therefore, if we do not, they are chargeable on ourselves. We *may* live; but we *will* die.

Well, but "on these principles all actual sins proceed from Adam's sin; either by necessary consequence, or through our own choice; or partly by one, and partly by the other." (p. 129.) Yes; partly by one, and partly by the other. We are inclined to evil antecedently to our own choice. By grace we may conquer this inclination; or we may choose to follow it, and so commit actual sin.

13. Their Fifth proposition is, "Original sin is conveyed from our first parents to their posterity by natural generation, so as all that proceed from them in that way are conceived and born in sin." (p. 130.)

In proof of this they urge: "Behold, I was shapen in iniquity; and in sin did my mother conceive me, Psalm li, 5." (p. 131.)

On this you observe: "The word which we translate 'shapen,' signifies to *bring forth*, or *bear*. So here it means, 'Behold, I was brought forth, or born, in iniquity.'"

Suppose it does, (which is not plain; for you cannot infer from its meaning so sometimes, that it means so here,) what have you gained? If David was born in iniquity, it is little different from being "shapen" therein.

That the Hebrew word does not always mean "to be born," but rather to be "shapen, formed, or made," evidently appears from Psalm xc, 2; where it is applied to the formation of the earth: and in this very text, the Seventy render it by *επλασθη*,—a word of the very same import. It is therefore here very properly rendered "shapen:" nor can it be more exactly translated.

But "the word *יָחַם* properly signifies, *warmed me*." You should say, *literally* signifies. But it signifies *conceived me*, nevertheless. And so it is taken, Gen. xxx, 38, 39, 41, &c; xxxi, 10. "Nay, it signifies there the *act of copulation*. So several translators render it." (pp. 132, 133.) And several render it otherwise: so this does not determine the point either way.

It must therefore be determined by the sense. Now, for what end did Jacob put the "pilled rods before the cattle?" That the lambs might be marked as the rods were. And when is it that females of any kind mark their young? Not in that act; but some time after, when the fœtus is either forming or actually formed. Throw a plum or a pear at a woman before conception, and it will not mark the fœtus at all; but it will if thrown while she is conceiving, or after she has conceived; as we see in a thousand instances. This observation justifies our translators in rendering the word by *conceiving* in all those places.

And indeed you own, "David could not apply that word to his mother, in the sense wherein you would apply it to the cattle." You therefore affirm, "It means here, to nurse." (p. 134.) You may as well say it means to roast. You have as much authority from the Bible for one interpretation as for the other. Produce, if you can, one single text, in which *יָחַם* signifies to nurse, or any thing like it.

You stride on: (1.) "The verse means, 'In sin did my mother nurse me:?' (2.) That is, 'I am a sinner from the womb:?' (3.) That is, 'I am a great sinner:?' (4.) That is, 'I have contracted strong habits of sin.'"

By this art you make the most expressive texts mean just any thing or nothing.

"So Psalm lviii, 3: 'The wicked are estranged from the womb; they go astray as soon as they are born, telling lies.' That is, 'My unjust persecutors in Saul's court, are exceedingly wicked.'" If this was all David meant, what need of *יָחַם*, "are alienated?" and that from the "bowels" of their mother? Nay, but he means as he speaks. They

“are alienated from the life of God,” from the time of their coming into the world. From the time of their birth, they “knew not the way of truth;” neither can, unless they are “born of God.”

You cite as a parallel text, “‘Thou wast called a transgressor from the womb;’ that is, set to iniquity by prevailing habits and customs.” Nay, the plain meaning is, The Israelites in general had never kept God’s law since they came into the world.

Perhaps the phrase, “from the womb,” is once used figuratively, namely, Job xxxi, 18. But it is manifest, that it is to be literally taken, Isaiah xlix, 1: “The Lord hath called me from the womb; from the bowels of my mother hath he made mention of my name.” For, (1.) This whole passage relates to Christ; these expressions in particular. (2.) This was literally fulfilled, when the angel was sent while he was yet in the womb, to order that his “name” should be “called Jesus.” This is not therefore barely “a hyperbolical form of aggravating sin;” but a humble confession of a deep and weighty truth, whereof we cannot be too sensible.

“But you have no manner of ground to conclude, that it relates to Adam’s sin.” (p. 136.)

Whether it relates to Adam’s personal sin or no, it relates to a corrupt nature. This is the present question; and your pulling in Adam’s sin only tends to puzzle the reader.

But how do you prove (since you *will* drag this in) that it does not relate to Adam’s sin?

Thus: “(1.) In the whole Psalm there is not one word about Adam, or the effects of his sin upon us.”

Here, as usual, you blend the two questions together; the ready way to confound an unwary reader. But first, to the first: “In the whole Psalm there is not one word about Adam; therefore it relateth not to him.” Just as well you may argue, “In the whole Psalm there is not one word about Uriah; therefore it relateth not to him.” The second assertion, “There is not one word of the effects of his sin,” is a fair begging the question.

“(2.) The Psalmist is here charging himself with his own sin.” He is; and tracing it up to the fountain.

“(3.) But according to our version, he does not charge himself with his sin, but some other person. He throws the whole load of his sin from off himself, on God who shaped him, and his mother who conceived him.”

What you say might have had weight, if he had offered this in excuse of his sin, or even in extenuation of it. But does he do this? Does he, in fact, “throw the whole blame, or any part of it, from off himself?” Just the reverse. He acknowledges and bewails his own total iniquity; not to excuse but to abase himself the more before God, for his inward as well as outward wickedness.

And yet he might, in perfect consistency with this, when God had caused “the bones which had been broken to rejoice,” cry out, “I will praise thee, O God; for I am fearfully and wonderfully made;” yea, and repeat all that follows in the same Psalm; which proves so much, and no more, that every fetus in the womb is formed by the power and

wisdom of God. Yet does it not follow, that the sin transmitted from the parent "must be attributed to God." (p. 137.)

"But how could he with pleasure reflect upon his formation, or praise God for it?" As I can at this day; though I know I was "conceived in sin, and shapen in iniquity." But "where sin abounds, grace does much more abound." I lose less by Adam than I gain by Christ.

This also perfectly consists with the following verse: "Behold thou desirest truth," or, It is thy will that we should have truth, "in the inward parts;" (p. 138;) thou art willing to remove all that "iniquity" wherein "I was shapen;" to "give me a clean heart, and renew a right spirit within me;" and in the hidden part thou hast made me to know wisdom; thou hast "shown me what was good." So that I am every way without excuse; I knew thy will, and did it not.

"But if, after all, you will adhere to the literal sense of this text, why do you not adhere to the literal sense of that text: 'This is my body,' and believe transubstantiation?" (*Ib.*) For those very reasons you suggest: (1.) Because it is grossly absurd, to suppose that Christ speaks of what he then held in his hands, as his real natural body. But it is no way absurd, to suppose the Psalmist was "conceived in sin." (2.) The sense of "This is my body," may be clearly explained by other Scriptures, where the like forms of speech are used; but there are no other Scriptures where the like forms with this of David are used in any other sense. (3.) Transubstantiation is attended with consequences hurtful to piety; but the doctrine of original sin, and faith grounded thereon, is the only foundation of true piety.

14. The next proof is, "Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? Not one," Job xiv, 4.

On this you observe: "Job is here speaking of the weakness of our nature; not with regard to sin, but to the shortness and afflictions of life." (p. 139.) Certainly, with regard both to the one and the other. For though, in the first and second verses, he mentions the shortness and troubles of life, yet even these are mentioned with a manifest regard to sin. This appears from the very next verse: (p. 140:) "And dost thou open thy eyes upon such a one;" to punish one already so wretched? "And bringest me into judgment with thee;" by chastising me still more? It then immediately follows, "Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? Not one." It does therefore by no means appear, that "Job is here speaking only with regard to the shortness and troubles of life."

Part of the following verses too run thus: "Now thou numberest my steps: dost thou not watch over my sin? My transgression is sealed up in a bag, and thou sewest up mine iniquity." (Verses 16, 17.) Let any one judge then, whether Job in this chapter does not speak of "the sinfulness, as well as the mortality, of human nature."

Not that he "urges his natural pravity as a reason why he should not be 'brought into judgment;'" (p. 141;) no more than David urges his being "shapen in wickedness," as an excuse for that wickedness. Rather, Job (as well as David) humbly acknowledges his total sinfulness; confessing that he deserved the judgment, which yet he prays God not to inflict.

15. Another proof is, "What is man that he should be clean? and he that is born of a woman, that he should be righteous?" Job xv, 14.

On this you observe: "'Born of a woman,' signifies no more than a man." Often it does not; but here it is emphatical. "The phrase indeed includes frailty and imperfection." (p. 142.) How can that be? Was Adam made frail and imperfect? And have you forgot that every man is now born in as good a state as Adam was made at first? "But it is not to be understood as the reason why man is unclean and unrighteous." From the placing of the words, one would really judge it was; and how do you prove it is not? Why, "Job and his friends use this manner of speech in other places of this book: 'Shall mortal man be more just than God? Shall a man be more pure than his Maker?' iv, 17." Nay, this is not the manner of speech which is in question; so you are here quite wide of the mark. "However that is, 'How can man be justified with God? or how can he be clean that is born of a woman?' xxv, 4."

And does not this point at original sin? You say, No: for "if Job and his friends had known that the reason of our uncleanness and imperfection was our receiving a corrupted nature from Adam, they ought to have given this reason of it." And do they not in the very words before us? You say, "No; they turn our thoughts to a quite different reason; namely, the uncleanness of the best of creatures in his sight." This is not a different reason, but falls in with the other; and the natural meaning of these texts is, "How can he be clean that is born of a woman;" and so conceived and born in sin? "Behold, even to the moon, and it shineth not," compared with God; "yea, the stars are not pure in his sight!" How "much less man that is a worm!" xxv, 6. In how much higher and stricter sense is man impure, that carries about with him his mortality, the testimony of that unclean nature which he brought with him into the world?

"'Shall mortal man be more just than God? Shall a man be more pure than his Maker?' Job iv, 17, &c." (p. 143.) Shall man dare to arraign the justice of God; to say God punishes him more than he deserves? "Behold, he puts no trust in his servants; and his angels he charged with folly." Many of these left their first estates; even their wisdom was not to be depended on: "How much less in them that dwell in houses of clay;" whose bodies, liable to pain, sickness, death, are standing monuments of the folly and wickedness which are deep rooted in their souls!

"What is man, that he should be clean; and he which is born of a woman, that he should be righteous? Behold, he putteth no trust in his holy ones;" yea, the heavens "are not pure in his sight." His holy angels have fallen, and the highest creatures are not pure in comparison of him. "How much more abominable and filthy," in the strictest sense, "is man;" every man born into the world: "Who drinketh iniquity like water;" Job xv, 16, &c; iniquity of every kind; so readily, so naturally, as being so thoroughly agreeable to the "desires of" his "flesh and of" his "mind!"

You conclude the head thus: "Man, in his present weak and fleshly state, cannot be clean before God." Certainly as clean as the moon and stars at least; if he be as he was first created. He was "made

but a little lower than the angels ;” consequently, he was then far higher and more pure than these, or the sun itself, or any other part of the material creation. You go on : “ Why cannot a man be clean before God ? because he is conceived and born in sin ! No such thing. But because, if the purest creatures are not pure in comparison of God, much less a being subject to so many infirmities as a mortal man.” *Infirmities!* What then, do innocent infirmities make a man unclean before God ? Do labour, pain, bodily weakness, or mortality, make us “ filthy and abominable ?” Surely not. Neither could they make a man pure from sin, less pure than the moon and stars. Nor can we conceive Adam, as he came out of the hands of God, to have been, in any sense, less clean than these. All these texts, therefore, must refer to that sinful impurity which every man brings into the world.

You add : “ Which is a demonstration to me that Job and his friends were wholly strangers to this doctrine.” A demonstration of a peculiar kind ! I think neither mathematical nor logical.

16. The last proof is, “ ‘ That which is born of the flesh is flesh ; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit,’ John iii, 6.” (p. 144.)

“ Here, by ‘ flesh,’ Dr. Taylor understands nothing else but the mere parts and powers of a man ; and by ‘ being born of the flesh,’ the being ‘ born of a woman,’ with the constitution and natural powers of a man.” (*Jennings’s Vindication*, p. 78, &c.) Now, let us suppose that human nature is not at all corrupted ; and let us try what sense we can make of other scriptures where the word flesh is used in opposition to Spirit, as it is here : “ There is no condemnation to them who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit,” Rom. viii, 1 ; that is, not after the pure, uncorrupted constitution and powers of man. Again : “ They that are in the flesh cannot please God ;” verse 8 ; that is, they that have the parts and powers of a man. Again : “ If ye live after the flesh, ye shall die ;” that is, if ye live suitably to the constitution and powers of your nature. Once more : how shall we understand, “ The flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh,” Gal. v, 17 ; if flesh means nothing but the pure and uncorrupted powers of human nature ?

“ But this text (John iii, 3) is,” according to Dr. Taylor, “ so far from implying any corruption of our nature, that, ‘ on the contrary, it supposes we have a nature susceptible of the best habits, and capable of being born of the Spirit.’” (p. 145.) And who ever denied it ? Who ever supposed that such a corruption of nature, as for the present disables us for spiritual good, renders us incapable of being “ born of the Spirit ?”

“ But if natural generation is the mean of conveying a sinful nature from our first parents to their posterity, then must itself be a sinful and unlawful thing.” I deny the consequence. You may transmit to your children a nature tainted with sin, and yet commit no sin in so doing.

“ Again : We produce one another only as the oak produces the acorn. The proper production of a child is from God. But if God produces a fœtus which has sinful dispositions, he produces those dispositions.” (p. 146.) Your argument proves too much. It would prove God to be the author of all actual as well as original sin. For “ it is the power of God, under certain laws and established rules,” which produces not only the fœtus, but all the motion in the universe. It is his power which so violently expands the air, on the discharge of a pistol or can-

non. It is the same which produces muscular motion, and the circulation of all the juices in man. But does he therefore produce adultery or murder? Is he the cause of those sinful motions? He is the cause of the motion; (as he is of the fœtus;) of the sin, he is not. Do not say, "This is too fine a distinction." Fine as it is, you must necessarily allow it: otherwise, you make God the direct author of all the sin under heaven. To apply this more directly to the point: God does produce the fœtus of man, as he does of trees; empowering the one and the other to propagate each after its kind; and a sinful man propagates, after his kind, another sinful man. Yet God produces, in the sense above mentioned, the man, but not the sin.

17. Their Sixth Proposition is, "The fall brought upon mankind the loss of communion with God, his displeasure and curse; Gen. iii, 8, 10, 24; so as 'we are by nature children of wrath,' Eph. ii, 2, 3, bond slaves to Satan, and justly liable to all punishments, 2 Tim. ii, 26, in this world, and that which is to come, Gen. ii, 17; Rom. vi, 23."

In proof of the first clause of this proposition, they cite Gen. iii, 8, 10, 24. On this you observe: "Adam and Eve by their sin did forfeit communion with God. But God did not take the forfeiture." (p. 147.) Surely he did, when "they were afraid, and hid themselves from his presence." "But afterward they had frequent communion with him." This does not prove they did not lose it before.

"But their posterity did not. Abel had communion with him, and so had the patriarchs and prophets; and so have we at this day. So that, as we could not justly have lost this communion by Adam's sin, it is true, in fact, that we have not lost it: we still have 'fellowship with the Father and the Son.'" (p. 148.)

Could we not justly, by Adam's sin, have lost our very existence? And if we had not existed, could we have had communion with God? "But we have not lost it, in fact. We still have 'fellowship with the Father and with the Son.'" Who have? all men born into the world? all Jews, and Turks, and Heathens? Have all that are called Christians? Have the generality of Protestants "fellowship with the Father and with the Son?" What fellowship? Just as much as light has with darkness; as much as Christ has with Belial. The bulk of mankind, Christians as well as Heathens, Protestants as well as Papists, are at this day, and have been ever since they were born, "without God,"—*ἄθεοι*, *Atheists*, "in the world."

We need not therefore say, "Their fellowship with God is owing to his mercy, through a Redeemer." They have none at all: no fellowship with "the only true God, and" with "Jesus Christ whom he hath sent." Indeed they have no great need of Jesus Christ, according to your account; seeing, "all that God's grace doeth for us in Christ, to repair what we lost in Adam, is, raising us up at the last day!" You add, "And therefore communion with God is either the same grace which was vouchsafed to Adam, continued to us;" (to every man born into the world, as naturally as seeing or hearing!) "or, if there be any thing extraordinary in it," (which you judge can hardly be allowed!) "it belongs to the redundancy of grace, which has no relation to any thing we lost by Adam." (p. 149.) That that whole passage has relation to what we lost in Adam, has been shown already. But what con-

ception you have of communion with God is easily seen by this wonderful account of it.

“However, this text gives no intimation that Adam’s posterity lost communion with God for his sin.” It shows that Adam did so; and all his posterity has done the same. Whence is this, unless from his sin?

“So he drove out the man; and he placed at the east of the garden of Eden, cherubims, and a flaming sword which turned every way, to keep the way of the tree of life,” Gen. iii, 24.

Although God is equally present in every place, yet this was a clear token that man had not now that near communion with him which he had enjoyed before his sin.

18. Proposition. “The fall brought upon mankind God’s displeasure and curse, so as we are ‘by nature the children of wrath.’

“The text on which this is grounded, Eph. ii, 2, 3, we have considered before.” (p. 150.) And those considerations have been answered at large.

You add: “How mankind could be justly brought under God’s displeasure for Adam’s sin, we cannot understand: on the contrary, we do understand, it is unjust. And, therefore, unless our understanding or perception of truth be false, it must be unjust. But understanding must be the same in all beings, as far as they do understand. Therefore, if we understand that it is unjust, God understands it to be so too.” (p. 151.)

Plausible enough. But let us take the argument in pieces: “How mankind could be justly brought under God’s displeasure for Adam’s sin, we cannot understand.” I allow it. I cannot understand, that is, clearly or fully comprehend, the deep of the divine judgment therein; no more than I can, how “the whole” brute “creation,” through his sin, should have been “made subject to vanity,” and should “groan together,” in weakness, in various pain, in death, “until this day.” “On the contrary, we do understand, it is unjust.” I do not understand it is. It is quite beyond my understanding. It is a depth which I cannot fathom. “Therefore, unless our understanding or perception of truth be false, it must be unjust.” Here lies the deceit. You shift the terms, and place as equivalent those which are not equivalent. Our perception of truth cannot be false; our understanding or apprehension of things may. “But understanding must be the same in all beings.” Yes, in the former sense of the word, but not the latter. “Therefore, if we understand (apprehend) it is unjust, God understands it so too.” Nay, verily: “As the heavens are higher than the earth, so are his thoughts higher than our thoughts.”

“What a God must he be, who can curse his innocent creatures before they have a being! Is this thy God, Oh Christian?” Bold enough! So Lord B——, “Is Moses’s God your God?” He is mine, although he said, “Cursed be Canaan,” including his posterity before they had a being; and although he now permits millions to come into a world which every where bears the marks of his displeasure. And he permits human souls to exist in bodies which are (how we know not, but the fact we know) “conceived and born in sin;” by reason whereof, all men coming into the world are “children of wrath.” But he has provided a Saviour for them all; and this fully acquits both his justice and mercy.

19. "So as we are by nature bond slaves to Satan: 'And that they may recover themselves out of the snare of the devil, who are taken captive at his will,' 2 Tim. ii, 26." (p. 152.)

But you say, "The Apostle speaks this of the unconverted Gentiles, who were slaves to Satan, not through Adam, but through their own fault." Both one and the other. But how does it appear, that he speaks this of the Gentiles only?

Without offering at any proof of this, you go on: "The clause, 'Taken captive by him,' is spoken, not of the devil, but of 'the servant of the' Lord; for thus the place should be rendered: 'That they may awake out of the snare of the devil, being revived by him;' that is, the servant of the Lord, to his, that is, God's will." (p. 153.)

Well, the proof. "The word ζῳργεω signifies, *to revive*; and so here, to restore men to life and salvation." As a proof of this sense of the word, you cite Luke v, 10. But this rather proves the contrary; for there it has nothing to do with reviving. We read, in the verse before, of the "fishes which they had taken;" alluding to which, Jesus "said unto Simon, From henceforth thou shalt catch men;" take them captive in the Gospel net. Although, therefore, it were allowed, (which cannot be done,) that *his* related, not to the word immediately preceding, but to another which stands three verses off, yet even this would avail nothing; since the sense which you impose upon ζῳργεω is what it will by no means bear.

You say, indeed, "It always means, *to take alive, or save alive.*" (p. 154.) It does mean, *to take alive*. But you bring not one authority to prove that it ever means, *to save alive*. It therefore "suits the devil and his snare" admirably well; for he does not take therein those who are free among the dead; but those who are alive in a natural, though dead in a spiritual, sense.

"But, however this be, they were not led captive through Adam's sin, but their own wickedness." (p. 155.) They were "bond slaves to Satan," (which was the point to be proved,) through Adam's sin, and their own wickedness.

"Yea, but what an inconsistency must that be in the divine dispensations and in the Scriptures, if it can be made appear from them, that God hath, for no fault of ours, but only for Adam's one sin, put us all into the hands of the devil; when he hath been, in all ages, providing means to preserve or rescue mankind from him?" (p. 156.) What can be made appear from the Scriptures is this: that from "Adam sin passed upon all men;" that hereby all men, being by nature "dead in sin," cannot of themselves resist the devil; and that, consequently, all who will not accept of help from God are "taken captive by Satan at his will." And there is no inconsistency between this and any of the divine dispensations.

Proposition. "And justly liable to all punishments in this world, and that which is to come."

That all men are liable to these for Adam's sin alone, I do not assert; but they are so, for their own outward and inward sins, which, through their own fault, spring from the infection of their nature. And this, I think, may fairly be inferred from Rom. vi, 23: "The wages of sin is

death;" (pp. 157, 158;) its due reward; death, temporal, spiritual, and eternal. God grant we may never feel it so!

20. You conclude this Part: "I cannot see that we have advanced one step farther than where we were at the conclusion of the First Part: namely, That the consequences of Adam's first sin upon us are labour, sorrow, and mortality, and no other." (p. 162.)

The contrary to this having been so largely proved, instead of repeating those proofs over again, I shall close this Part with that beautiful description of the present state of man, which Mr. Hervey gives us from Mr. Howe's "Living Temple." "Only," says he, "let me hint, that it considers the human soul as originally a habitation of God through the Spirit:"—

"That he hath withdrawn himself, and left this his temple desolate, we have many sad and plain proofs before us. The stately ruins are visible to every eye, and bear in their front (yet extant) this doleful inscription: 'Here God once dwelt.' Enough appears of the admirable structure of the soul of man to show the divine presence did sometime reside in it; more than enough of vicious deformity to proclaim, He is now retired and gone. The lamps are extinct; the altar overturned; the light and love are now vanished, which did the one shine with so heavenly brightness, the other burn with so pious fervour. The golden candlestick is displaced, to make room for the throne of the prince of darkness. The sacred incense, which sent up its rich perfumes, is exchanged for a poisonous hellish vapour. The comely order of this house is all turned into confusion; the beauties of holiness into noisome impurities; the house of prayer into a den of thieves: thieves of the worst kind; for every lust is a thief, and every theft is sacrilege. The noble powers which were designed and dedicated to divine contemplation, and delight in God, are alienated to the service of the most despicable idols, and employed in the vilest embraces: to behold and admire lying vanities; to indulge and cherish lust and wickedness.

"There is not now a system, an entire table, of coherent truths to be found, or a frame of holiness; but some shivered parcels. And if any with great toil and labour apply themselves to draw out here one piece, and there another, and set them together; they serve rather to show, how exquisite the divine workmanship was in the original composition, than to the excellent purposes for which the whole was at first designed. Some pieces agree, and own one another; but how soon are our inquiries nonplussed and superseded! How many attempts have been made, since that fearful fall and ruin of this fabric, to compose again the truths of so many several kinds into their distinct orders, and make up frames of science or useful knowledge! And after so many ages, nothing is finished in any kind. Sometimes truths are misplaced; and what belongs to one kind is transferred to another, where it will not fitly match; sometimes falsehood inserted, which shatters or disturbs the whole frame. And what with much fruitless pains is done by one hand, is dashed in pieces by another; and it is the work of a following age, to sweep away the fine-spun cobwebs of a former. And those truths which are of greatest use, though not most out of sight, are least regarded; their tendency and design are overlooked, or they are so loosened and torn off, that they cannot be wrought in, so as to take hold of the soul, but hover as faint, ineffectual notions that signify nothing.

"Its very fundamental powers are shaken and disjointed, and their order toward one another confounded and broken; so that what is judged considerable, is not considered; what is recommended as lovely and eligible, is not loved and chosen. Yea, 'the truth which is after godliness' is not so much disbelieved, as hated, or 'held in unrighteousness;' and shines with too feeble a light in that malignant darkness which 'comprehends it not.'

You come, amidst all this confusion, into the ruined palace of some great prince, in which you see, here the fragments of a noble pillar, there the shattered pieces of some curious imagery, and all lying neglected and useless, among heaps of dirt. He that invites you to take a view of the soul of man gives you but such another prospect, and doth but say to you, 'Behold the desolation!' All things rude and waste. So that, should there be any pretence to the Divine presence, it might be said, 'If God be here, why is it thus!' The faded glory, the darkness, the disorder, the impurity, the decayed state in all respects of this temple, too plainly show, 'the Great Inhabitant is gone!'"

NEWINGTON, Jan. 21.

In your Third Part you propose, First, to answer some objections and queries; and then to consider the connection of the doctrine of original sin with other parts of religion.

"Objection 1. Are we not in worse moral circumstances than Adam was before he fell? I answer:—

"(1.) If by moral circumstances you mean, the state of religion and virtue, it is certain the greatest part of mankind ever were and still are very corrupt. But this is not the fault of their nature, but occasioned by the abuse of it, in prostituting reason to appetite, whereby, in process of time, they have sunk themselves into the most lamentable degrees of ignorance, superstition, idolatry, injustice, debauchery." (p. 168.)

But how came this? How came all nations thus to "abuse their nature," thus to "prostitute reason to appetite?" How came they all to sink into this "lamentable ignorance, superstition, idolatry, injustice, debauchery?" How came it, that half of them, at least, if their nature was uncorrupt, did not use it well? submit appetite to reason, and rise while the other sunk? "Process of time" does not help us out at all; for if it made the one half of mankind more and more vicious, it ought, by the same degrees, to have made the other half more and more virtuous. If men were no more inclined to one side than the other, this must absolutely have been the event. Turn and wind as you please, you will never be able to get over this. You will never account for this fact, that the bulk of mankind have, in all ages, "prostituted their reason to appetite," even till they sunk into "lamentable ignorance, superstition, idolatry, injustice, and debauchery," but by allowing their very nature to be in fault, to be more inclined to vice than virtue.

"But if we have all a corrupt nature, which as we cannot, so God will not, wholly remove in this life, then why do we try to reform the world?" Why? Because, whether the corrupt nature be wholly removed or no, men may be so far reformed as to "cease from evil," to be "renewed in the spirit of their mind, and by patient continuance in well-doing," to "seek," and find, "glory, and honour, and immortality."

"I answer: (2.) If by moral circumstances you mean, provision and means for spiritual improvement, those given us through Christ are far greater than Adam had before he sinned." (p. 169.) To those who believe in Christ they are. But above four-fifths of the world are Mohammedans or Pagans still. And have these (immensely the greater part of mankind, to say nothing of Popish nations) greater provision and means for spiritual improvement than Adam before he sinned?

"But if, (3.) by moral circumstances you mean moral" (rather natural) "abilities, or mental powers;" (a consideration quite foreign to the

question;) "I answer, The Scriptures no where compare our faculties with Adam's. Nor know I how we can judge, but by comparing the actions of Adam in innocence with what men have performed since." (p. 170.)

Yes, we can judge thus: There could be no defect in Adam's understanding, when he came first out of the hands of his Creator; but there are essential defects in mine and yours, and every man's whom we know. Our apprehension is indistinct, our judgment false, our reasoning wrong in a thousand instances. So it always was; and so it is still, after all the care we can possibly take: therefore, "our faculties are not as sound and fit for right action as Adam's were before he sinned."

"But any man of common understanding might have dressed and kept the garden as well as he." I can neither affirm nor deny this; for we know not how he dressed and kept it.

"Nor doth it appear, that in giving names to all the creatures, he showed any extraordinary penetration into their natures; for that the names he gave truly expressed the several qualities of them is a mere fiction, without any foundation in Scripture history, or the names of animals in the original Hebrew." (p. 171.)

This is really strange! that any man of learning should be so hardy as to affirm this, after the numberless instances which have been produced of Hebrew names expressing the most essential property of each animal.

And is this supposition likewise "without any foundation in Scripture history?" What is that? "And the Lord God brought every beast of the field, and every fowl of the air, unto Adam, to see what he would call them;" to make proof of his understanding. "And whatsoever Adam called every living creature, that was the name thereof," Gen. ii, 19. Now, whether those names were Hebrew or no, (which you affect to doubt,) can it be supposed that God would have permitted them to stand, if they had not suited the nature of each creature? It is bold therefore to affirm, that "many of his posterity could have given names to them as well as he; and that therefore this is not a proof that he had any capacity superior to us." (p. 172.)

You proceed: "Surely his eating the forbidden fruit is no evidence of superior abilities." (p. 173.) And it is no evidence of the contrary; "seeing," as you yourself observe, "what his special temptation was, we do not know." Therefore, neither do we know whether any of his posterity could have overcome it; much less, that "many of his posterity have overcome temptations more violent than his." All this is talking in the dark, "not knowing what we say, neither whereof we affirm."

"And now let any man see whether there be any ground in revelation for exalting Adam's nature as divines have done, who have affirmed that all his faculties were eminently perfect, and entirely set to the love and obedience of his Creator." (p. 175.) "And yet these same suppose him to have been guilty of the vilest act that ever was committed." (p. 176.)

They suppose Adam to have been created holy and wise, like his Creator; and yet capable of falling from it. They suppose farther, that through temptations, of which we cannot possibly judge, he did fall from that state; and that hereby he brought pain, labour, and sorrow on

himself and all his posterity; together with death, not only temporal, but spiritual, and (without the grace of God) eternal. And it must be confessed, that not only a few divines, but the whole body of Christians in all ages, did suppose this, till after seventeen hundred years a sweet-tongued orator arose, not only more enlightened than silly Adam, but than any of his wise posterity, and declared that the whole supposition was folly, nonsense, inconsistency and blasphemy!

“Objection 2. But do not the Scriptures say, Adam was created after God’s own image? And do his posterity bear that image now?”

“The Scriptures do say, ‘God created man in his own image,’ Gen. i, 27. But whatever that phrase means here, it doubtless means the same in Gen. ix, 6: ‘Whoso sheddeth man’s blood, by man shall his blood be shed: for in the image of God made he man.’” (p. 177.) Certainly it has the same meaning in both places; for the latter plainly refers to the former. And thus much we may fairly infer from hence, that “the image of God,” wherein “man was” at first “created,” whereinsoever it consisted, was not utterly effaced in the time of Noah. Yea, so much of it will always remain in all men, as will justify the punishing murderers with death. But we can in nowise infer from hence, that that entire image of God, in which Adam was at first created, now remains in all his posterity.

The words of Genesis v, 3, rendered literally, are, “He begat in his likeness, according to his image.” “Adam,” says Mr. Hervey, “was created ‘in the image of God.’ After his fall, the sacred historian varies his style, and, with a remarkable peculiarity, as well as propriety, says, ‘Adam begat a son in his own likeness;’—so it must be translated, according to all the rules of grammar, Adam being the nearest antecedent. That every reader may advert to this melancholy but important truth, it is enforced by a very emphatical repetition: ‘After his own image,’ as contradistinguished from that ‘image of God,’ mentioned in the preceding verse; which expressions are evidently intended to denote the difference between the state in which Adam was created and Seth begotten.”

“The two following texts are brought by the Assembly, to show what the image of God was in which Adam was made:

“‘And have put on the new man, which is renewed in knowledge, after the image of Him that created him.’ Col. iii, 10.

“‘Put on the new man, which after the image of God is created in righteousness and true holiness,’ Eph. iv, 24. (p. 178.)

“I answer. These texts are parallel. ‘The old man, means a wicked life; ‘the new man,’ a good life; to which they were formed and ‘created’ by the Gospel dispensation. And this ‘new man,’ this new life, is, ‘after the image,’ that is, agreeable to the nature, ‘of God.’” (p. 179.)

As you advance no proof of this perfectly new interpretation, I leave it to shift for itself.

To disprove the common interpretation, you add, “Adam could not be originally created in righteousness and true holiness; because habits of holiness cannot be created without our knowledge, concurrence, or consent. For holiness in its nature implies the choice and consent of a moral agent, without which it cannot be holiness.” (p. 180.)

What is holiness? Is it not essentially love? the love of God, and of all mankind! love producing “bowels of mercies, humbleness of mind,

meekness, gentleness, long suffering?" And cannot God shed abroad this love in any soul without his concurrence, antecedent to his knowledge or consent? And supposing this to be done, will love change its nature? Will it be no longer holiness? This argument can never be sustained, unless you would play upon the word *habits*. Love is holiness wherever it exists. And God could create either men or angels, endued from the very first moment of their existence with whatsoever degree of love he pleased.

You "think, on the contrary, it is demonstration that we cannot be righteous or holy, we cannot observe what is right, without our own free and explicit choice." I suppose you mean, *practise* what is right. But a man may be righteous before he does what is right; holy in heart before he is holy in life. The confounding these two, all along, seems to be the ground of your strange imagination, that Adam "must choose to be righteous, must exercise thought and reflection, before he could be righteous." Why so? "Because righteousness is the right use and application of our powers." Here is your capital mistake. No, it is not; it is the right state of our powers. It is the right disposition of our soul, the right temper of our mind. Take this with you, and you will no more dream that "God could not create man in righteousness and true holiness;" or that "to talk of wanting that righteousness in which Adam was created, is to talk of nothing we want." (p. 181.)

On Rom. ii, 14, you observe: "This text clearly proves that natural reason and understanding is a rule of action to all mankind, and that all men ought to follow it. This, therefore, overthrows the whole doctrine of original sin." (p. 183.)

How do you prove the consequence? May not men have some reason left, which in some measure discerns good from evil, and yet be deeply fallen, even as to their understanding as well as their will and affections?

On Ecces. vii, 29, "God hath made man upright; but they have found out many inventions," you say,—

"'Man' here means all mankind; 'upright,' endued with powers to know and perform their duty." (pp. 184, 185.) You offer no proof for either of these assertions; and without it I cannot receive them.

Again: "'They,'" you say, "means mankind in general." I rather believe it means our first parents, who are by Moses likewise comprehended under the common name of man, or rather, אָדָם "Adam." So Gen. v, 2: "God called their name Adam in the day when they were created." And in the day that they fell, whoever reads Genesis iii, will see, "they found out," not one, but "many inventions." This text, therefore, in its obvious meaning, teaches both the original uprightness and subsequent fall of man.

From all these texts it manifestly appears, (1.) That man was created in the image of God. (2.) That this image consisted, not only in his rational and immortal nature, and his dominion over the creatures, but also in knowledge, actual knowledge, both of God and of his works; in the right state of his intellectual powers, and in love, which is true holiness.

Objection 3. But do we not derive from Adam a moral taint and infection, whereby we have a natural propensity to sin?

I answer: We have many natural appetites and passions which, if

they grow irregular, become sinful. But this does not amount to a natural propensity to sin." (p. 186.) But is not pride sin? Is not idolatry sin? And is it not idolatry, to "love the creature more than the Creator?" Is not revenge sin? Is it not sin to "look upon a woman," so as "to lust after her?" And have not all men a natural propensity to these things? They have all, then, a natural propensity to sin. Nevertheless, this propensity is not necessary, if by necessary you mean irresistible. We can resist and conquer it too, by the grace which is ever at hand.

This propensity to pride, to revenge, to idolatry, (call it taint or any thing,) cannot be pleasing to God, who yet in fact does permit that it should descend from Adam to his latest posterity. And "we can neither help nor hinder" its descending to us. Indeed we can heap up plausible arguments to prove the impossibility of it: but I feel it and the argument drops. Bring ever so many proofs that there can be no such thing as motion: I move, and they vanish away.

"But nature cannot be morally corrupted, but by the choice of a moral agent." (p. 187.) You may play upon words as long as you please; but still I hold this fast: I (and you too, whether you will own it or no) am inclined, and was ever since I can remember, antecedently to any choice of my own, to pride, revenge, idolatry. If you will not call these moral corruptions, call them just what you will; but the fact I am as well assured of, as that I have any memory or understanding.

"But some have attempted to explain this intricate affair." (p. 188.) I do not commend their wisdom. I do not attempt to explain even how I, at this moment, stretch out my hand, or move my finger.

One more of your assertions I must not pass over: "It is absurd to say, infection is derived from Adam, independent of the will of God; and to say, it is by his will, is to make him the author of the pollution." (p. 189.)

We answer: It is not derived from Adam, independent of the will of God; that is, his permissive will. But our allowing this, does not make him the author of the pollution.

"Objection 4. But do not the vices of parents often infect their children?" (pp. 190, 191.)

I think we cannot deny it.

"Objection 5. How can we account for children's beginning so soon to sin, but by supposing they have a natural propensity to it?"

"I answer: Who can tell how soon they begin?" (p. 192.) Then they begin, when they first show wrong tempers; such as plain, undeniable frowardness, revenge, self will, which is as soon as they have any exercise of reason. So that the use of reason, and the abuse, generally commence and grow up together. As soon as their faculties appear at all, they appear to be disordered; the wrong state of their powers being easily inferred from their continual wrong application of them.

"But if parents were wise and virtuous themselves, and then endeavoured to bring up their children virtuously, there would be less wickedness in the world." There would: but this does not reach the point; nor, that "undisciplined children contract bad habits." I have known wise and virtuous parents who did earnestly labour to bring up their

children virtuously, there would be less wickedness in the world." There would: but this does not reach the point; nor, that "undisciplined children contract bad habits." I have known wise and virtuous parents who did earnestly labour to bring up their children virtuously; and disciplined them with all possible care, from the very first dawn of reason; yet these very children showed bad tempers before it was possible they should "contract bad habits." They daily evidenced the wrong state of all their faculties, both of their understanding, will, and affections; just contrary both to the examples and instructions of all that were round about them. Here, then, these wrong tempers were not owing to "the fault of careless or ungodly parents;" nor could be rationally accounted for, but by supposing those children to have a natural propensity to evil.

It is indeed a general rule, "Train up a child in the way he should go: and when he is old, he will not depart from it:" Prov. xxii, 6: and there is much truth in that observation, "Foolishness is bound in the heart of a child; but the rod of correction shall drive it far from him:" (Verse 15:) that is, prudent correction is the most probable means which you can use to remove that foolishness. Yet this no way contradicts, what is matter of daily experience, that we have a natural propensity to evil. Nay, the latter of these texts strongly confirms it; for if there be no such propensity, how comes "foolishness" (that is, wickedness, in the language of Solomon) to be "bound in the heart of a child?" of every child, of children in general, as the phrase manifestly imports? It is not from education here: it is supposed to be antecedent to education, whether good or bad. "O, foolishness means only strong appetite." (p. 193.) Yes, strong appetite to evil; otherwise it would not call for "the rod of correction," or need to be "driven far from him."

"Objection 6. Might not Adam's posterity be said to sin in him. as Levi is said to 'pay tithes in Abraham?' Heb. vii, 9."

If the querist means, not to prove a doctrine already proved, but only to illustrate one expression by another, your answer, that "it is a bold figure," (p. 195,) does not at all affect him. It is so; but still it may be pertinently cited to illustrate a similar expression.

"Objection 7. 'But there is a law in our members which wars against the law of our minds, and brings us into captivity to the law of sin and death,' Rom. vii, 23. And does not this prove, that we come into the world with sinful propensities?" (p. 199.)

You answer, (1.) "If we come into the world with them, they are natural; but if natural, necessary; and if necessary, then no sin." (p. 200.)

If the consequence were good, with regard to what is so natural and necessary as to be irresistible, yet certainly it is not good with regard to those propensities which we may both resist and conquer.

You answer, (2.) "The Apostle does not in this chapter speak of any man as he comes into the world, but as he is afterward depraved and corrupted by his own wicked choice."

Where is the proof? How does it appear that he does not speak of men corrupted both by choice and by nature?

You answer, (3.) "He does not speak of himself, or any regenerate man, but of a Jew under the power of sin." (*Ib.*) Nay, your argument proves, he does not speak of any Jew; for in order to prove, "the Apostle

does not speak of himself," you say, "The persons of whom he speaks were, 'before the commandment came,' that is, before they came under the law, 'once without the law.' But the Apostle never was 'without the law.'" No, nor any Jew. "For he was born and continued 'under the law' till he was a Christian." So did all the Jews as well as he,— "and therefore it cannot be true, that he," or any Jew whatever, "was 'without the law' before he came under it." So you have clearly proved, that the Apostle does not in this passage speak of any Jew at all.

But why do you think he does speak of Jews? nay, of them only? It "appears," you say, "from verse 1, 'I speak to them that know the law.' For the Gentiles never were 'under the law.'" Yes, they were: all the Gentiles who were "convinced of sin" were "under the law" in the sense here spoken of, under the condemning power of the law "written in their hearts;" for transgressing which they were under the wrath of God. And this whole chapter, from verses 7 to 24, describes the state of all those, Jews or Gentiles, who saw and felt the wickedness both of their hearts and lives, and groaned to be delivered from it.

Many passages in your paraphrase on the former part of this chapter are liable to much exception; but as they do not immediately touch the point in question, I pass on to the latter part:—

"Verse 14: I am 'carnal, sold under sin.' He means a willing slavery." (p. 216.) Quite the contrary; as appears from the very next words: "For that which I do, I allow not: for what I would, I do not; but what I hate, that I do." "What I hate;" not barely, "what my reason disapproves;" but what I really detest and abhor, yet cannot help.

"Verse 17: 'Now, then, it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me.' It is my sinful propensities, my indulged appetites and passions." (p. 217.) True; but those propensities were antecedent to that indulgence.

"But the Apostle cannot mean, that there is something in man which makes him sin whether he will or no; for then it would not be sin at all." Experience explains his meaning. I have felt in me, a thousand times, something which made me transgress God's law, whether I would or no. Yet I dare not say, that "transgression of the law" was "no sin at all."

Verse 18: "For I know that in me, that is, in my flesh," (not my "fleshly appetites" only, but my whole nature while unrenewed,) "dwelleth no good thing. For to will" indeed "is present with me;" not barely "that natural faculty, the will," but an actual will to do good; as evidently appears from the following words: "But how to perform that which is good I find not:" I have the desire, but not the power.

Verse 19: "For the good that I would,"—that I desire and choose,—"I do not; but the evil which I would not,"—which I hate,— "that I do."

Verse 20: "Now if I do that I would not, it is no more I, but sin that dwelleth in me;" but "the prevalency of sensual affections," (p. 218,) yea, sinful tempers of every kind, "settled and ruling in my heart," both by nature and habit.

Verse 21: "I find then that when I would do good," when I choose and earnestly desire it, I cannot; "evil is present with me;" as it were, gets in between.

“Verse 22 : ‘For I delight in the law of God, after the inward man :’ my mind, my conscience approves it.

“Verse 23 : ‘But I see another law in my members, which warreth against the law in my mind :’ another principle of action, which fights against my reason and conscience, ‘and bringeth me into captivity to the law of sin which is in my members :’ which captivates and enslaves me to the principle of wickedness.” (p. 219.) (Strange language for you to use!) “Seated in the lusts of the flesh :” seated indeed in all my tempers, passions, and appetites, which are the several members of “the old man.”

“O wretched man that I am ! who shall deliver me from the body of this death ?” (Verse 24.) He is under the power of such passions as his own reason disapproves, but is too weak to conquer ; and, N. B., being a Jew, he stands condemned to eternal death by the law. How shall such a wretched Jew be delivered from sinful lusts, and the curse of the law ? Did, then, none but a Jew ever cry out, under the burden of sin, “Wretched man that I am ?” Are none but Jews “under the power of such passions as their own reason disapproves, but is too weak to conquer ?” And does the law of God condemn to eternal death no sinners beside Jews ! Do not Christians also (in the wide sense of the word) groan to be delivered “from the body of this death ?” With what truth, with what sense, can you restrain this passage to a Jew any more than to a Turk ?

I cannot but observe, upon the whole, the question is, Does not Rom. vii, 23, show that we come into the world with sinful propensities ? (This is all that is pertinent in the objection awkwardly proposed, page 199.) But instead of keeping to this, you spend above twenty pages in proving that this chapter does not describe a regenerate person ! It may, or it may not ; but this does not touch the question : do not men come into the world with sinful propensities ?

We have, undoubtedly, an additional proof that they do, in the words of Jeremiah : “‘The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked ; who can know it ?’ xvii, 9.” (p. 224.) On this you descant : (one instance of a thousand of your artful manner of declaiming, in order to forestal the reader’s judgment, and “deceive the hearts of the simple :”) “Christians, too generally neglecting the study of the Scripture, content themselves with a few scraps, which, though wrong understood, they make the test of truth, in contradiction to the whole tenor of Revelation. Thus this text has been misapplied to prove that every man’s heart is so desperately wicked, that no man can know how wicked his heart is.” O what *πειθανολογια*, “persuasiveness of speech !” After reading this, I was much inclined to believe, without going a step farther, that this text had been “generally misunderstood.” I thought, Probably it has been misapplied, and does not assert that every man’s “heart is desperately wicked.” But no sooner did I read over the very verses you cite, than the clear light appeared again. “‘Cursed be the man that trusteth in man, and whose heart departeth from the Lord,’ verse 5.” (p. 225.) That *man*, whom we are not to trust in, means man in general, cannot be denied. After repeating the intermediate verses, you yourself add, “He subjoins a reason, which demonstrates the error of trusting in man : ‘The heart is deceitful above all things, and despe-

rately wicked ; who can know it ?" (Verse 9.) This text, therefore, does not mean, "Who can know his own heart, but another's?" Whether it means one or both, it positively asserts, that "the heart" of man, of men in general, of every man, is "desperately wicked." Therefore, as to the main point contained therein, "Christians do not understand it wrong;" (p. 224;) neither misapply it at all.

When I say, "I feel I have a 'wicked heart,'" (another thing which you do not understand,) "I mean this: I feel much pride remaining in my heart, much self-will, much unbelief." (p. 225.) Now, I really believe pride, and self-will, and unbelief to be essentially wicked tempers. Therefore, in whatever heart they remain, (and they remain in yours as well as mine,) that is a "wicked heart."

After a long pause, you return to the seventh of the Romans, and affirm: "We cannot, from any thing in that chapter, infer, that we came into the world with sinful dispositions derived from Adam; for the Apostle says nothing about Adam." (p. 229.) He had said enough in the fifth chapter of the cause: here he only describes the effect; the state of those who are now "brought to the birth;" but "there is not" yet "strength to bring forth."

"Nor can we infer from hence, that any man sins through a principle which it was never in his power to command; for then it would be no sin." Upon this I would only ask, Are you assured that no man transgresses God's law (whether you will call it sin or not) through a principle which it was never in his power to command; at least, not for any time together? Every passionate man can confute you in this. He has sad experience of the contrary.

To those objections which you have, in some sort, answered, you subjoin the following questions:—

"1. Is not the doctrine of original sin necessary to account for the being of so much wickedness in the world?"

You answer, "Adam's nature, it is allowed, was not sinful; and yet he sinned. Therefore this doctrine is no more necessary to account for the wickedness of the world than to account for Adam's sin." (p. 231.) Yes, it is. I can account for one man's sinning, or a hundred, or even half mankind, suppose they were evenly poised between vice and virtue, from their own choice, which might turn one way or the other: but I cannot possibly, on this supposition, account for the general wickedness of mankind in all ages and nations.

Again: "If men were never drawn into sin any other way than as Adam was, namely, by temptations offered from without, there might be something in this answer; but there are numberless instances of men sinning, though no temptation is offered from without. It is necessary, therefore, some other account should be given of their sinning, than of Adam's. And how to account for the universal spread of sin over the whole world without one exception, if there were no corruption in their common head, would be an insurmountable difficulty." (*Jennings's Vindication*, p. 110.)

"2. How, then, are we born into the world?"

You answer, "As void of actual knowledge as the brutes?" (*Taylor's Doctrine*, &c. p. 232.)

And can you really imagine that text, "Vain man would be wise," (evidently spoken of man in general,) "though a man be born like a

wild ass's colt," Job xi, 12, implies no more than, "Men are born void of actual knowledge?" Do we need inspiration to make this discovery, that a new-born child has no actual knowledge? Is man compared to a "wild ass," of all animals the most stupid, to teach us no more than this? yea, "a wild ass's colt?" Does not this intimate any thing of untractableness, sullenness, stubbornness, perverseness? "How keenly is the comparison pointed! Like the 'ass;' an animal stupid even to a proverb: like the 'ass's colt;' which must be still more egregiously stupid than its dam: like the 'wild ass's colt;' which is not only blockish, but stubborn and refractory; neither has valuable qualities by nature, nor will easily receive them by discipline. The image in the original is yet more strongly touched. The particle 'like' is not in the Hebrew, 'Born a wild ass's colt;' or, as we should say in English, a mere 'wild ass's colt.'" (*Theron and Aspasio*, Dial. 13.)

Yes, "we are born with many sensual appetites and passions; but every one of these are in themselves good." I grant all the appetites and passions originally implanted in our nature were good in themselves: but are all that now exist in us good? "If not, they become evil only by excess or abuse." First, this may be doubted. I do not know that love of praise, of power, of money, become evil only by abuse. I am afraid these and other passions, which we have had from our infancy, are evil "in themselves." But be that as it may, in how few do we find even the more innocent passions and appetites clear of excess or abuse! "But all that is wrong in them is from habit." This cannot be allowed as universally true. The little children of wise and pious parents have not yet contracted ill habits; yet before they can go alone, they show such passions as are palpably excessive, if not evil in themselves.

But whatever they are in themselves, here is the "grand difficulty, of which you give us no manner of solution: Whence comes it to pass, that those appetites and passions which, no doubt, were at first kindly implanted in our nature by a holy God are now become so excessive or irregular, that no one man, from the beginning of the world, has so resisted them as to keep himself pure and innocent?"

"But without these appetites and passions, our nature would be defective, sluggish, or unarmed. Nor is there any one of them which we can at present spare." We could very well spare the excess and irregularity of them all; and, possibly, some of the passions themselves, as love of praise, and love of revenge: the love of God would more than supply the place of both. Neither does it suffer us to be sluggish or inactive; nor does calm Christian fortitude leave us unarmed against any danger which can occur. "But our reason would have nothing to struggle with." (p. 233.) O yes; not only all our reason, but all the grace we have received, has enough to struggle with, even when we do not "wrestle with flesh and blood." We are still abundantly "exercised" by "principalities, and powers, and spiritual wickedness in high places."

"On the other hand, we are born with rational powers which grow gradually capable of the most useful knowledge. And we under the Gospel have clear ideas of the divine perfections; we see our duty, and the most cogent reasons to perform it." This sounds well. But will knowledge balance passion? Or are rational powers a counterpoise to

sensual appetites? Will clear ideas deliver men from lust or vanity? or seeing the duty to love our enemies, enable us to practise it? What are cogent reasons opposed to covetousness or ambition? A thread of tow that has touched the fire. "But the Spirit of God is promised for our assistance." Nay, but what need of him, upon your scheme? Man is sufficient for himself. "He that glorieth," on this hypothesis, must "glory" in himself, not "in the Lord."

3. "How far is our present state the same with that of Adam in Paradise?"

I suppose "our mental capacities are the same as Adam's; only that some are above, some below, his standard. Probably there are many in the world much below Adam in rational endowments; but possibly the force and acuteness of understanding was much greater in our Sir Isaac Newton than in Adam." (p. 235.)

I do not apprehend this requires any answer. He that can believe it, let him believe it.

"We are next to inquire upon what true grounds those parts of religion stand, which the Schoolmen have founded upon the doctrine of original sin, particularly the two grand articles of *Redemption* and *Regeneration*."

In what century did the Schoolmen write? how long before St. Augustine,—to go no higher? A sad specimen this of "the honesty and impartiality with which you deliver your sentiments!"

1. REDEMPTION.

"Our fall, corruption, and apostasy in Adam, has been made the reason why the Son of God came into the world, and 'gave himself a ransom' for us."

And undoubtedly it is the reason. Accordingly, the very first promise of the Redeemer was given presently after the fall; and given with a manifest reference to those evils which came on all men through Adam's transgression. Nor does it appear from any scripture, that he would have come into the world at all, had not "all men died in Adam."

You yourself allow, "the Apostle affirms, (Rom. v, 18, 19,) that by 'the righteousness and obedience of Christ,' all men are delivered from the condemnation and sentence they came under through Adam's disobedience; and that thus far the redemption by Christ stands in connection with Adam's transgression." (p. 238.)

"But the redemption by Christ extends far beyond the consequences of Adam's transgression." It does. Men receive far greater blessings by Christ, than those they lost by Adam. But this does not prove, that our fall in Adam is not the ground of our redemption by Christ.

Let us once more consider the text itself: "But not as the offence, so is the free gift. For if through the offence of one many be dead, much more the grace of God, and the gift by grace," (the blessing which flows from the mere mercy of God,) "which is by one man, Jesus Christ, hath abounded unto many," Rom. v, 15. "For not as it was by one that sinned, so is the gift; for the judgment was by one offence to condemnation; but the free gift is of many offences unto justification," verse 16. In this respect, First, the free gift by Christ "hath abounded much more" than the loss by Adam. And in this, Secondly, "If by one man's offence, *death*" spiritual and temporal, lead

ing to death eternal, "*reigned* by one" over his whole posterity; "much more they who receive the abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness," the free gift of justification and sanctification, "shall *reign* in life" everlasting, "by one, Jesus Christ," verse 17. Let any one who calmly and impartially reads this passage, judge if this be not the plain, natural meaning of it.

But let us now observe your comment upon it: "Here the Apostle asserts a grace of God, which already 'hath abounded,' beyond the effects of Adam's sin upon us." (p. 239.) It has, upon them that are justified and sanctified; but not upon all mankind. "And which has respect, not to his 'one offence,'"—(not to that only,)—"but also to the 'many offences' which men have personally committed: not to the '*death*' which '*reigned*' by him." Yes, verily; but over and above the removal of this, it hath also respect "to the '*life*' in which 'they who receive' the 'abounding grace' shall '*reign*' with him for ever."

Thus far you have proved just nothing. But you go on: "The death consequent on Adam's sin is reversed by the redemption in Christ. But this is not the whole end of it by far. The grand reason and end of redemption is, 'the grace of God, and the gift by grace.'" (p. 239.) Infallibly it is; but this is not a different thing, but precisely the same with the "free gift." Consequently, your whole structure raised on the supposition of that difference is a mere castle in the air. But if "the gift by grace," and "the free gift," are the very same thing, and if "the gift by grace" is "the grand reason and end of redemption," then our fall in Adam, to which you allow "the free gift" directly refers, is "the reason of Christ's coming into the world."

"But the Scriptures of the New Testament (excepting Rom. v, 12-19, and 1 Cor. xv, 21, 22) always assign the actual wickedness of mankind as the reason of Christ's coming into the world." (p. 240.) They generally do assign this,—their outward and inward wickedness. But this does not exclude the wickedness of their nature, springing from their fall in Adam. Rather this, which is expressed in those two places at least, is presupposed in all places; particularly in the beginning of the Epistle to the Romans, where he describes the enormous wickedness both of the Jews and Gentiles. It is true, "he begins his discourse with an account of the actual transgressions of the idolatrous Gentiles." (p. 166, &c.) Afterward, (chap. iii,) he treats of the depravity and corruption of all mankind; and then proceeds (chap. v) to show, that we are all "made sinners by Adam," and that "by his offence judgment is come upon all men to condemnation." The Apostle's method is clear and natural. He begins with that which is most obvious, even actual sin; and then proceeds to speak of original sin, as the joint cause of the necessity of redemption for all men. But which way can we infer, that because he begins with the mention of actual sins, in order to demonstrate the necessity of redemption, therefore he excludes original out of the account? Neither can we infer, that because "it is not expressly mentioned in other texts, therefore it is not implied." (p. 241.)

"'But the Redeemer himself saith not one word of redeeming us from the corruption of nature derived from Adam. And seeing he spake exactly according to the commission which the Father gave him, we may safely conclude, it was no part of his commission to preach the doctrine of original

sin.' (p. 242.) Just as safely may we conclude, that it was no part of his commission to teach and make known to men the 'many things' which he 'had to say to' his Apostles before his death, which they 'could not' then 'bear;' John xvi, 12: but which, according to his promise, he afterward taught them by his Spirit, and by them to the world. It makes no difference as to the ground of our faith, whether a doctrine was delivered by Christ himself, or by his Apostles; and whether it be written in any of the four Gospels, or of the divine Epistles. There is only this difference: The Epistles were wrote after the resurrection and ascension of Christ; therefore, after the full commencement of the Gospel dispensation; whereas the discourses of Christ recorded in the Gospels were delivered before the Gospel dispensation was properly begun; therefore we are to look for the peculiar doctrines of Christ rather in the Epistles than in the Gospels. However, Christ did speak of this, and referred to it more than once, during his personal ministry, particularly in his discourse with Nicodemus, and Matt. xxiii. But it is not surprising that he did not speak so largely of redeeming us from sin, original or actual, by the price of his blood, before that price was actually paid, as the Apostles did afterward. He considered the littleness of their knowledge, with the violence of their prejudices; therefore we have no cause to be surprised that no more is said on this head in those discourses which Christ delivered before his death. But to us he has told it plainly, and we do find the doctrines of original sin, and redemption from it by Jesus Christ, distinguished emphatically in almost every page of the inspired Epistles." (*Jennings's Vindication*, p. 116, &c.)

To sum up this: 1. Christ speaks very sparingly of many things, whereof his Apostles have spoken largely. 2. Yet he does speak of the corruption of our nature, (which St. Paul expressly tells us is derived from Adam,) particularly in the 23d of St. Matthew, and the 3d of St. John. 3. Wherever he speaks of "saving that which was lost," he in effect speaks of this; especially Matt. xviii, 11, where he mentions "little children" as lost; which could not be by actual sin. 4. There was the less need of our Lord's speaking much on this head, because it was so fully declared in the Old Testament, and was not questioned by any of those false teachers against whom he was chiefly concerned to warn his disciples.

You add: "It has been delivered as a fundamental truth, that no man will come to Christ, the Second Adam, who is not first thoroughly convinced of the several things he lost in the first Adam." (*Taylor's Doctrine*, &c, p. 243.) This is a fundamental truth; none will come to Christ as a Redeemer, until he is thoroughly convinced he wants a Redeemer. No man will ever come to him as a Saviour, till he knows and feels himself a lost sinner. None will come to the "Physician" but "they that are sick," and are thoroughly sensible of it; that are deeply convinced of their sinful tempers, as well as sinful words and actions. And these tempers they well know, were antecedent to their choice, and came into the world with them. So far "every man who comes to Christ is first convinced of the several things he lost by Adam;" though he may not clearly know the source of that corruption which he sees and feels in his own heart and life. "But why does our Lord never mention Adam, or the corruption of our nature through him?" He does mention this corruption, and he presupposes it in all his public discourses. He does not mention it largely and explicitly, for the reasons above recited. "But the Apostles are wholly silent on this head, in their sermons recorded in the Acts, and in their Epistles too." (pp. 243,

244.) Are they wholly silent in their Epistles? This is a violent mistake. And as to their sermons, it may be observed, 1. That we have not one whole sermon of any one Apostle recorded in the Acts; nor, it may be, the twentieth part of one. 2. That it was not needful for them to prove what none of their hearers denied: no, not even the Heathens; even these allowed the corruption of human nature. Even these received it as an undeniable fact,

Vitiis nemo sine nascitur :

“No man is born without vices.”

These acknowledged, (as Seneca expresses,) *Omnia in omnibus vitia sunt*: “All vices are in all men.” These saw there were hardly any good men to be found upon the face of the earth; and openly testified it.

Rari quippe boni ; numero vic sunt totidem quot

Thebarum portæ, vel divitis ostia Nili :

“The good lie scatter’d in this barren soil,

Few as the gates of Thebes, or mouths of Nile.”

They had also among them some faint account of the cause of that overflowing corruption. So Horace, immediately after he had asserted the fact,—

Audax omnia perpeti

Gens humana ruit per vetitum nefas,—

“Lawless and unrestrain’d, the human race

Rushes through all the paths of daring wickedness,”—

glances at the cause of it, in their fabulous manner:—

Audax Japeti genus

Ignem fraude malâ gentibus intulit ;

Post ignem æthereâ domo

Subductum, macies, et nova febrim

Terris incubuit cohors :

Semotique prius tarda necessitas

Lethi corripuit gradum.

“Prometheus first provok’d the heavenly Sire,

Purloining Jupiter’s authentic fire:

Evil, from hence derived, and brooding pain,

And strange disease, with all the ghastly train,

Pour’d in upon the wretched sons of men:

While hasty Fate quicken’d the lingering pace

Of distant death, unveil’d the monster’s face,

And gave into his hands our whole devoted race.”

I observe, 3. It was neither needful nor proper for an Apostle, in his first sermon to a congregation wholly unawakened, to descant upon original sin. No man of common sense would do it now. Were I to preach to a certain congregation at Norwich, I should not say one word of Adam, but endeavour to show them that their lives, and therefore their hearts, were corrupt and abominable before God.

You conclude this head: “Guilt imputed is imaginary guilt, and so no object of redemption.” I dare not say so as to my own particular. I pray God, of his tender mercy, to free me from this and all other guilt, “through the redemption which is in Jesus Christ!”

II. REGENERATION.

“Why must we be ‘born again?’” (p. 245.) You subjoin the common, but, as you suppose, absurd, answer: “Because we are ‘born in sin;’ nature is averse to all good, and inclined to all evil: therefore we must be born again, before we can please God.”

In order to confute this, you assert, "Then it cannot be our duty to be born again; nor, consequently, our fault if we are not; because it is not in our power." It is, by grace; though not by nature: by this we may all be born again. Therefore it is our duty; and if we fall short herein, it is our own fault.

"But being born again does really signify, the gaining those habits of virtue which make us children of God." (p. 246.) Then St. Paul ought to have said, not, "Ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus;" but, "Ye are all the children of God" by gaining habits of virtue!

Nay, but, according to the whole tenor of Scripture, the being born again does really signify the being inwardly changed by the almighty operation of the Spirit of God; changed from sin to holiness; renewed in the image of Him that created us. And why must we be so changed? Because "without holiness no man shall see the Lord;" and because, without this change, all our endeavours after holiness are ineffectual. God hath indeed "endowed us with understanding, and given us abundant means:" but our understanding is as insufficient for that end, as are the outward means, if not attended with inward power.

You proceed to explain yourself at large: "Christ informs us, that 'except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God;' " (p. 246;) "and thereby teaches us,—

"1. That God hath erected a kingdom, united in and under him, for his glory, and men's mutual happiness." (p. 247.)

"2. He will finally admit none into it who are not disposed to relish and promote the happiness of it." (p. 247.)

(Both these propositions I willingly allow.)

"3. All wickedness is quite contrary to the nature and end of this kingdom; therefore no wicked men can be fit members of it, unless there be a full persuasion, that reverence, love, and obedience are due to God:" (I add, and unless it be actually paid him; otherwise that persuasion but increases our condemnation;) "Unless his favour is preferred before all other enjoyments whatsoever; unless there be a delight in the worship of God, and in converse with him; unless every appetite be brought into subjection to reason;" (add, and reason to the word of God;) "how can any man be fit to dwell with God, or to do him service in his kingdom?" (p. 248.)

"4. It is one thing to be born into God's creation, another to be born into his peculiar kingdom. In order to an admittance into his peculiar kingdom, it is not enough for an intelligent being to exist." (pp. 250, 251.) I do not know that. Perhaps it is not possible for God to create an intelligent being, without creating it duly subject to himself, that is, a subject of his peculiar kingdom. It is highly probable, the holy angels were subjects of his peculiar kingdom from the first moment of their existence. Therefore, the following peremptory assertion, and all of the like kind, are wholly groundless: "It is absolutely necessary, before any creature can be a subject of this, that it learn to employ and exercise its powers suitably to the nature of them." It is not necessary at all. In this sense, surely God "may do what he will with his own." He may bestow his own blessings as he pleases. "Is thine eye evil, because he is good?"

The premises then being gone, what becomes of the conclusion: "So that the being 'born' into God's peculiar kingdom depends upon a right use and application of our life and being, and is the privilege only of those wise men whose spirits attain to a habit of true holiness?"

This stands without any proof at all. At best, therefore, it is extremely doubtful. But it must appear extremely absurd to those who believe, God can create spirits both wise and holy; that he can stamp any creature with what measure of holiness he sees good, at the first moment of its existence.

The occasion of your running into this absurdity seems to be, that you stumbled at the very threshold. In the text under consideration, our Lord mentions two things,—the "new birth," and the "kingdom of God." These two your imagination blended into one; in consequence of which you run on with "born into his kingdom," (a phrase never used by our Lord, nor any of his Apostles,) and a heap of other crude expressions of the same kind, all betraying that confusedness of thought which alone could prevent your usual clearness of language.

Just in the same manner you go on: "Our first parents in Paradise were to form their minds to an habitual subjection to the law of God, without which they could not be received into his spiritual kingdom." (pp. 252, 253.) This runs upon the same mistaken supposition, that God could not create them holy. Certainly he could and did; and from the very moment that they were created, their minds were in subjection to the law of God, and they were members of his spiritual kingdom.

"But if Adam was originally perfect in holiness," (say, perfectly holy, made in the moral image of God,) "what occasion was there for any farther trial?" That there might be room for farther holiness and happiness. Entire holiness does not exclude growth; nor did the right state of all his faculties entitle him to that full reward which would have followed the right use of them.

"Upon the whole, regeneration, or gaining habits of holiness, takes in no part of the doctrine of original sin." (p. 254.) But regeneration is not "gaining habits of holiness;" it is quite a different thing. It is not a natural, but a supernatural, change; and is just as different from the gradual "gaining habits," as a child's being born into the world is from his growing up into a man. The new birth is not, as you suppose, the progress, or the whole, of sanctification, but the beginning of it; as the natural birth is not the whole of life, but only the entrance upon it. He that "is born of a woman," then begins to live a natural life; he that is "born of God," then begins to live a spiritual. And if every man "born of a woman" had spiritual life already, he would not need to be "born of God."

"However, I allow the Spirit of God assists our endeavours; but this does not suppose any natural pravity of our minds." (p. 255.) Does not his "quickenings," then, suppose we were dead; his "opening our eyes" suppose we were blind; and his "creating us anew" imply something more than the assisting our endeavours? How very slender a part in sanctification will you allow to the Spirit of God! You seem very fearful of doing him too much honour, of taking from man the glory due to his name!

Accordingly, you say, "His aids are so far from supposing the pre-

vious inaptitude of our minds" (to the being born again,) "that our previous desire of the Spirit's assistance is the condition of our receiving it." But who gave us that desire? Is it not God "that worketh in us to will," to desire, as well as "to do?" His grace does accompany and follow our desires: but does it not also prevent, go before, them? After this we may ask and seek farther assistance; and, if we do, not otherwise, it is given.

I cannot but add a few words from Dr. Jennings: "Dr. Taylor believes, 'the influence of the Spirit of God, to assist our sincere endeavours, is spoken of in the Gospel, but never as supposing any natural pravity of our minds.' But certain it is, that Christ opposeth our being 'born of the Spirit,' to our being 'born of the flesh:' 'That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit,' John iii, 6. Therefore, the influence of the Spirit in regeneration supposeth something that we are 'born' with; which makes such an influence necessary to our being 'born again.' And if this be not some natural pravity, let our author tell us what it is. It is plain it is not any ill habit afterward acquired; for it is something that we are born with. And if to be 'born of the flesh,' means only 'to have the parts and powers of a man;' and if these parts and powers are all 'pure and uncorrupted,' we have no need of any such influence of the Spirit to be superadded to our natural powers. Without this, our own sincere endeavours will suffice for attaining all habits of virtue." (*Jennings's Vindication*, p. 125.)

I proceed to your conclusion: "Is it not highly injurious to the God of our nature, whose hands have formed and fashioned us, to believe our nature is originally corrupted?" (*Taylor's Doctrine*, &c, p. 256.) It is; but the charge falls not on us, but you. We do not believe "our nature is originally corrupted." It is you who believe this; who believe our nature to be in the same state, moral and intellectual, as it originally was! Highly injurious indeed is this supposition to the God of our nature. Did he originally give us such a nature as this? so like that of a wild ass's colt; so stupid, so stubborn, so intractable; so prone to evil, averse to good? Did his hands form and fashion us thus? no wiser or better than men at present are? If I believed this,—that men were originally what they are now,—if you could once convince me of this, I could not go so far as to be a Deist; I must either be a Manichee or an Atheist. I must either believe there was an evil God, or that there was no God at all.

"But to disparage our nature is to disparage the work and gifts of God." (p. 257.) True; but to describe the corruption of our nature as it is, is not disparaging the work of God. For that corruption is not his work. On the other hand, to say it is; to say God created us as corrupt as we are now, with as weak an understanding and as perverse a will; this is disparaging the work of God, and God himself, to some purpose!

"But doth not this doctrine teach you to transfer your wickedness and sin to a wrong cause? Whereas you ought to blame yourself alone, you lay the whole blame upon Adam." (p. 258.) I do not: I know God is willing to save me from all sin, both original and actual. Therefore, if I am not saved, I must lay the whole blame upon myself.

"But what good end does this doctrine promote?" The doctrine, that we are by nature "dead in sin," and therefore "children of wrath," promotes repentance, a true knowledge of ourselves; and thereby leads to faith in Christ, to a true knowledge of Christ crucified. And faith

worketh love ; and, by love, all holiness both of heart and life. Consequently, this doctrine promotes (nay, and is absolutely, indispensably necessary to promote) the whole of that religion which the Son of God lived and died to establish.

“ We are told, indeed, that it promotes humility ; but neither our Lord nor his Apostles, when inculcating humility, say a word about natural corruption.” Supposing (not granting) that they did not, yet it cannot be, in the very nature of the thing, that any whose nature is corrupt should be humble, should know himself, without knowing that corruption.

“ But what can be more destructive to virtue, than to represent sin as altogether unavoidable ?” (p. 259.) This does not follow from the doctrine. Corrupt as we are, through Almighty grace we may avoid all sin.

But it is destructive of virtue. For “ if we believe we are by nature worse than the brutes, what wonder if we act worse than brutes ?” Yea, if we are so, what wonder if we act so ? And this it is absolutely certain men do, whether they believe one way or the other ; for they who do not believe this, live no better than those that do. Therefore, if “ the generality of Christians have been the most wicked, lewd, bloody, and treacherous of all mankind,” it is not owing to this belief. But, in truth, they have not been so ; neither are they at this day. The generality of Christians, so called, are perhaps but little better, yet surely they are no worse, either in tempers or actions, than the rest of mankind. The generality of Jews, yea, of Turks and Pagans, are full as “ lewd, bloody, and treacherous” as they.

You go on : “ It is surprising that Christians” (you mean those of them who believe original sin) “ have lost even a sense of the beneficence of God, in giving them a rational nature.” (p. 260.) Nay, surely Christians have lost that rational nature itself, or they retain it to very little purpose, if “ the generality of them are the most wicked, lewd, bloody, and treacherous of all mankind !” They ought “ to be humbled” for yielding to those evil propensities, which, through the grace of God, they may conquer. And they who do conquer, ought to be continually “ thanking God” for this and all his benefits.

With great decency you proceed : “ Who can believe that to be a revelation from God, which teacheth so absurd a doctrine ? I make no doubt, this, with other like principles, have filled our land with infidels.” However, the gentlemen who disclaim these absurd principles, of original sin, redemption, and regeneration, may very easily convert those infidels ; since there is scarce any room for contention left between them.

“ Is not this doctrine hurtful to the power of godliness, as it diverts men from the heavenly and substantial truths of religion ?” (p. 261.) Just the reverse. There is no possibility of the power of godliness without it. The power of godliness consists in the love of God and man ; this is heavenly and substantial religion. But no man can possibly “ love his neighbour as himself,” till he loves God ; and no man can possibly love God, till he truly believes in Christ ; and no man truly believes in Christ, till he is deeply convinced of his own sinfulness, guiltiness, and helplessness. But this no man ever was, neither can be, who does not know he has a corrupt nature.

This doctrine, therefore, is the “ most proper” of all others “ to be

instilled into a child:" that is by nature a "child of wrath," under the guilt and under the power of sin; that it can be saved from wrath only by the merits, and sufferings, and love of the Son of God; that it can be delivered from the power of sin only by the inspiration of his Holy Spirit; but that by his grace it may be renewed in the image of God, perfected in love, and made meet for glory.

But "must it not lessen the due love of parents to children, to believe they are the vilest creatures in the world?" (pp. 262, 263.) Far from it; if they know how God loves both them and theirs, vile and sinful as they are. And it is a certain fact, that no parents love their children more tenderly, than those who firmly believe this doctrine; and that none are more careful to "bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord."

But "how can young people 'remember' their 'Creator' without horror, if he has given them life under such deplorable circumstances?" They can remember him with pleasure, with earnest thankfulness, when they reflect "out of" what a "pit" he hath "brought them up;" and that if "sin abounded," both by nature and habit, "grace" did "much more abound."

You conclude: "Why should we subject our consciences to tales and fables, invented by priests and monks?" (p. 264.) This fable, as you term it, of original sin, could not be invented by Romish priests or monks, because it is by many ages older than either; yea, than Christianity itself.

I have now weighed, as my leisure would permit, all the arguments advanced in your Three Parts. And this I have done with continual prayer, that I might know "the truth as it is in Jesus." But still I see no ground to alter my sentiments, touching the general corruption of human nature. Nor can I find any better or any other way of accounting for that general wickedness which has prevailed in all nations, and through all ages, nearly from the beginning of the world to this day.

LEWISHAM, JANUARY 25, 1757.

PART III.

AN ANSWER TO DR. TAYLOR'S SUPPLEMENT.

YOU sujoin to your book a very large Supplement, in answer to Dr. Jennings and Dr. Watts. All that they have advanced, I am not engaged to defend; but such parts only as affect the merits of the cause.

You divide this part of your work into eight sections. The first treats

OF IMPUTED GUILT.

And here you roundly affirm, "No action is said in Scripture to be imputed to any person for righteousness or condemnation, but the proper act and deed of that person." (*Supplement*, p. 7.)

Were, then, the iniquities and sins which were put upon the scape-goat, his own "proper act and deed?" You answer, "Here was no imputation of sin to the goat. It was only a figurative way of signifying the removal of guilt from the penitent Israelites, by the goat's going into the wilderness." But how could it be a figure of any such thing, if no guilt was imputed to him?

“Aaron is commanded to put the iniquities of Israel upon the scape-goat; (Lev. xvi, 21;) and this goat is said to bear the iniquities of the people. (Verse 22.) This was plainly an imputation. Yet it could not possibly be an imputation of any thing done by the animal itself. The effects also which took place upon the execution of the ordinance indicate a translation of guilt; for the congregation was cleansed, but the goat was polluted: the congregation so cleansed, that their iniquities were borne away, and to be found no more; the goat so polluted, that it communicated defilement to the person who conducted it into a land not inhabited.” (*Theron and Aspasio*.)

In truth, the scape-goat was a figure of Him “on whom the Lord laid the iniquities of us all,” Isaiah liii, 6. “He bore our iniquity,” verse 11. “He bare the sin of many,” verse 12. The Prophet uses three different words in the original; of which the first does properly signify *the meeting together*; the last, the *lifting up* a weight or burden. This burden it was which made him “sweat as it were great drops of blood falling to the ground.” “But *iniquity* and *sin* sometimes signify *sufferings*.” (*Supplement*, pp. 8, 9.) Yes, suffering for sin; the effect being put for the cause. Accordingly, what we mean by, “Our sins were imputed to him,” is, He was punished for them: ‘He was wounded for our transgressions; he was bruised for our iniquities.’ He, ‘who knew no sin,’ but what was thus imputed, ‘was made sin,’ a sin-offering, ‘for us.’ “It pleased the Lord” (your own words) “to bruise him, in order to the expiation of our sins.” (pp. 10, 11.)

“But with regard to parents and their posterity, God assures us, children ‘shall not die for the iniquity of their fathers.’” No, not eternally. I believe none ever did, or ever will, die eternally, merely for the sin of our first father.

“But the Scripture never speaks of imputing any sin to any person, but what is the act of that person.” (pp. 13, 14.) It was but now you yourself observed, that, by, “Our sins were imputed to Christ,” we mean, “He suffered for them.” Our sins, then, were imputed to Christ; and yet these sins were not the act of the person that suffered. He did not commit the sin which was thus imputed to him.

But “no just constitution can punish the innocent.” (p. 15.) This is undoubtedly true; therefore God does not look upon infants as innocent, but as involved in the guilt of Adam’s sin; otherwise death, the punishment denounced against that sin, could not be inflicted upon them.

“It is allowed, the posterity of Ham and Gehazi, and the children of Dathan and Abiram, suffered for the sins of their parents.” It is enough. You need allow no more. All the world will see, if they suffered for them, then they were punished for them. Yet we do not “confound punishment with suffering, as if to suffer, and to be punished were the same thing.” Punishment is not barely suffering, but suffering for sin: to suffer, and to be punished, are not the same thing; but to suffer for sin, and to be punished, are precisely the same.

If, therefore, the children of Dathan and Abiram suffered for the sins of their parents, which no man can deny, then they were punished for them. Consequently, it is not true that, “in the instances alleged, the parents only were punished by the sufferings of the children.” (pp. 17, 18.) If the children suffered for those sins, then they were punished for them. Indeed, sometimes the parents too were punished, by the

sufferings of their children ; which is all that your heap of quotations proves ; and sometimes they were not. But, however this were, if the children suffered for their sins, they were punished for them.

It is not therefore “ evident, that, in all these cases, children are considered, not as criminals involved in guilt, but as the enjoyments of their parents, who alone are punished by their sufferings.” (p. 18.) On the contrary, it is very evident that the children of Canaan were punished for the sin of Ham ; and that the children of Dathan and Abiram were punished with death, as “ involved in the guilt of their parents.”

“ On the other hand, the virtues of an ancestor may convey great advantages to his posterity. But no man’s posterity can be rewarded for their ancestor’s virtue.” (p. 21.) The point here in dispute between Dr. Watts and you is, whether the thing, concerning which you are agreed, should be expressed by one term or another. You both agree, (and no man in his senses can deny,) that, in all ages, God has, on account of pious ancestors, given many blessings to their offspring. But he thinks these blessings should be termed rewards ; (and so do all the world ;) you say they should not. The fact is plain either way : God does continually, and did in all ages, give numberless blessings to the children, on account of the piety of their fathers ; and, it is certain, blessings given on account of virtue have been hitherto termed *rewards*, both by God and man.

You conclude this section : “ Thus, it appears, the distinction between personal sin and imputed guilt is without any ground in Scripture.” (p. 22.) Just the contrary appears, namely, that guilt was imputed to the scape-goat, to the children of wicked parents, and to our blessed Lord himself, without any personal sin. The distinction, therefore, is sound and Scriptural.

SECTION II.

OF THE NATURE AND DESIGN OF OUR AFFLICTIONS AND MORTALITY.

THAT God designs to bring good out of these is certain. But does this prove, they have not the nature of punishments ? Did Adam himself suffer any affliction, any toil or pain ? Doubtless he did, long before he returned to dust. And can we doubt but he received spiritual good from that pain ? Yet it was a punishment still ; as really such, as if it had consigned him over to everlasting punishment. This argument, therefore, is of no weight : “ God draws good out of punishments ; therefore they are no punishments at all.” However, then, the sufferings wherein Adam’s sin has involved his own posterity may “ try and purify us, in order to future and everlasting happiness,” (p. 23,) this circumstance does not alter their nature ; they are punishments still.

Let “ afflictions, calamities, and death itself, be means of improving in virtue,” (p. 24,) of healing or preventing sin, this is no manner of proof that they are not punishments. Was not God able to heal or prevent sin, without either pain or death ? Could not the Almighty have done this as easily, as speedily, and as effectually, without these, as with them ? Why, then, did he not ? Why did Adam’s sin bring these on his whole posterity ? Why should one man suffer for another man’s

fault? If you say, "To cure his own;" I ask, 1. What necessity was there of any suffering at all for this? If God intended only to cure his sin, he could have done that without any suffering. I ask, 2. Why do infants suffer? What sin have they to be cured thereby? If you say, "It is to heal the sin of their parents, who sympathize and suffer with them;" in a thousand instances this has no place; the parents are not the better, nor any way likely to be the better, for all the sufferings of their children. Their sufferings, therefore, yea, and those of all mankind, which are entailed upon them by the sin of Adam, are not the result of mere mercy, but of justice also. In other words, they have in them the nature of punishments, even on us and on our children. Therefore, children themselves are not innocent before God. They suffer; therefore, they deserve to suffer.

And here another question arises, What benefit accrues to the brute creation from the sufferings wherein their whole race is involved through the sin of the first man? The fact cannot be denied; daily experience attests what we read in the oracles of God, that "the whole creation groaneth together, and travaileth in pain to this day;" a considerable part of it groans to God, under the wantonness or cruelty of man. Their sufferings are caused, or at least greatly increased, by our luxury or inhumanity; nay, and by our diversions! We draw entertainment from the pain, the death, of other creatures;—not to mention several entire species, which at present have such natural qualities, that we are obliged to inflict pain, nay, perhaps death, upon them, purely in our own defence. And even those species which are out of the reach of men, are not out of the reach of suffering. "The lions do lack and suffer hunger," though they are, as it were, sovereigns of the plain. Do they not acknowledge this when, "roaring for their prey," they "seek their meat from God?" And what shall we say of their helpless prey? Is not their lot more miserable still? Now, what benefits, I say, have these from their sufferings? Are they also "tried and purified thereby?" Do sufferings "correct their inordinate passions, and dispose their minds to sober reflections?" Do they "give them opportunity of exercising kindness and compassion in relieving each other's distresses?" That I know not; but I know by this and a thousand proofs, that when man, the lord of the visible creation, rebelled against God, every part of the creation began to suffer on account of his sin. And to suffering on account of sin, I can give no properer name than that of punishment.

"It was to reclaim offenders that an extraordinary power was exercised, either immediately by our Lord himself, or by his Apostles, of inflicting bodily distempers, and, in some cases, death itself." (p. 25.) I do not remember any more than one single case, wherein one of the Apostles "inflicted death." I remember no instance recorded in Scripture, of their "inflicting bodily distempers;" (the blindness inflicted on Elymas cannot be so termed, without great impropriety;) and certain I am, that our Lord himself inflicted neither one nor the other.

The citations in the next page prove no more than that we may reap benefit from the punishments of others. (p. 26.) But though either we or they reap benefit from them, yet they are punishments still.

"We do not here consider death and suffering as they stand in the threatening of the law." (p. 27.) You are sensible, if we did, all man-

kind must acknowledge them to be punishments. And this is the very light wherein we do and must consider them in the present question. We consider death and suffering as they stand in that threatening, "Thou shalt surely die." That this was denounced to all mankind, we know, because it is executed on all. Therefore, considering suffering and death as so threatened and executed, we cannot deny that they are punishments,—punishments not on Adam only, but on all that in fact do either die or suffer.

To sum up this point: Although the wisdom and mercy of God do "bring good out of evil;" although God designs to extract blessings from punishments, and does it in numberless instances; yet this does not alter the nature of things, but punishments are punishments still: still this name properly belongs to all sufferings which are inflicted on account of sin; and, consequently, it is an evident truth, that the whole animate creation is punished for Adam's sin.

SECTION III.

THE ARGUMENT TAKEN FROM THE CALAMITIES AND SINFULNESS OF MANKIND CONSIDERED.

"THE subject of our present inquiry is threefold: 1. Whether mankind be under God's displeasure, antecedently to their actual sins. 2. Whether our nature be corrupt from the beginning of life. And, 3. Whether these propositions can be proved from the calamities and sinfulness of mankind." (pp. 30, 31.)

Whether they can or no, they have been fully proved from Scripture. Let us now inquire if they may not be proved from the state of the world.

But you think Dr. Watts "has here laid too great stress on supposition and imagination." In proof of which you cite from him the following words: "Can we suppose that the blessed God would place his innocent creatures in such a dangerous habitation? Can we suppose, that, among the roots, and the herbs, and the trees, which are good for food, the great God would have suffered deadly poison to spring up here and there? Would there have been any such creatures in our world as bears and tigers? Can we ever imagine the great and good God would have appointed men to be propagated in such a way as would necessarily give such exquisite pain and anguish to the mothers that produce them, if they had been all accounted in his eyes a race of holy and sinless beings?" (p. 31.)

I answer, It is not true, "that too great stress," or any stress at all, is "here laid on mere supposition and imagination." Your catching at those two words, *suppose* and *imagine*, will by no means prove it; for the meaning of them is plain. "Can we *suppose* the blessed God would do this?" is manifestly the same with, "How can we reconcile it with his essential attributes?" In like manner, "Can we ever *imagine*?" is plainly equivalent with, "Can we possibly conceive?" So that the occasional use of these words does not infer his laying any stress on supposition and imagination. When, therefore, you add, "Our suppositions and imaginations are not a just standard by which to measure the Divine

dispensations," (p. 32,) what you say is absolutely true, but absolutely foreign to the point.

Some of the questions which you yourself ask, to expose his, it is not so easy to answer: "Would innocent creatures have been thrust into the world in so contemptible circumstances, and have been doomed to grow up so slowly to maturity and the use of reason? Would they, when grown up, have been constrained to spend so much time in low and servile labour? Would millions have been obliged to spend all their days, from early morn until evening, in hewing stone, sawing wood, heaving, rubbing, or beating the limb of an oak, or a bar of iron?" (p. 33.) I really think they would not. I believe all this toil, as well as the pain and anguish of women in child birth, is an evidence of the fall of man, of the sin of our first parents, and part of the punishment denounced and executed, first on them, and then on all their posterity.

You add: "He doth not consider this world as a state of trial, but as if it ought to have been a seat of happiness." (pp. 34, 35.) There is no contrariety between these: it might be a state of trial and of happiness too. And such it certainly was to Adam in paradise; whether he was holy or no, he was undoubtedly happy. A state of trial, therefore, does not necessarily imply any kind or degree of natural evil; and, accordingly, the Creator himself assures us, there was none originally in his creation. For so I read at the conclusion of it: "And God saw every thing that he had made, and, behold, it was very good," Gen. i, 31.

"But natural evil may be mixed with a state of trial; consequently this world could not be built for a seat of happiness." Admirable drawing of consequences! It may be; therefore, it could not be otherwise. Whatever may be, God himself here tells us what was. And from his own declaration, it is infallibly certain, there was no natural evil in the world, until it entered as the punishment of sin.

"Neither doth he take a future state into his representation." (p. 36.) No, nor is there any need he should, when he is representing the present state of the world as a punishment of Adam's sin. "Nor doth he take into his argument the goodness of God." (p. 37.) Not into this argument; that is of after consideration. So the texts you have heaped together on this head also are very good; but what do they prove?

"He supposes our sufferings to be mere punishments." I suppose they are punishments mixed with mercy. But still they are punishments; they are evils inflicted on account of sin.

"We find, in fact, that the best of men may be made very unhappy, by calamities and oppressions." (p. 39.) It cannot be. The best of men cannot be made unhappy by any calamities or oppressions whatsoever; for they "have learned in every" possible "state, therewith to be content." In spite of all calamities, they "rejoice evermore, and in every thing give thanks."

"From punishments inflicted on particular persons, he infers that all men are under the wrath of God. But to infer the state of the whole from the case of some is not a fair way of arguing." (p. 40.) No. The punishments inflicted on particular persons prove nothing, but with regard to those on whom they are inflicted. If, therefore, some men only suffer and die, this proves nothing with regard to the rest. But if the whole of mankind suffer and die, then the conclusion reaches all men.

“He is not quite just, in pronouncing the present form of the earth ‘irregular, abrupt, and horrid;’ and asking, ‘Doth it not bear strongly on our sight, the ideas of ruin and confusion, in vast broken mountains, dreadful cliffs, and precipices, immense extents of waste and barren ground?’ If this be the case, how can ‘the invisible things of God’ be ‘clearly seen from’ such a ruined ‘creation?’” (p. 41.) Perfectly well. “His eternal power and Godhead,” the existence of a powerful and eternal Being, may still be inferred from these his works, grand and magnificent, though in ruin. Consequently, these leave the Atheist without excuse. And whatever objections he might form (as Lucretius actually does) from these palpable blemishes and irregularities of the terraqueous globe, the Scriptural account of natural, flowing from moral, evil, will easily and perfectly solve them; all which is well consistent with the words of the Psalmist: “O Lord, how manifold are thy works! In wisdom hast thou made them all; the earth is full of thy riches!” (p. 42.) So undoubtedly it is, though it bears so visible signs of ruin and devastation.

“We have no authority from Scripture to say, that the earth, in its present constitution, is at all different from what it was at its first creation.” Certainly we have, if the Scripture affirms that God “said,” after Adam sinned, “Cursed is the ground for thy sake; thorns and thistles shall it bring forth to thee;” and, that “the earth was of old, standing out of the water, and in the water,” till God destroyed it for the sin of its inhabitants.

You go on: “I cannot agree, ‘that disease, anguish, and death have entered into the bowels and veins of multitudes, by an innocent and fatal mistake of pernicious plants and fruits for proper food.’” (p. 43.) Why not? Doubtless, multitudes also have perished hereby, if we take in the account of all ages and nations; multitudes, also, have been the living prey of bears and tigers, wolves and lions; and multitudes have had their flesh and bones crushed and churned between the jaws of panthers and leopards, sharks and crocodiles. And would these things have come upon mankind, were it not on account of Adam’s sin?

Yet you think, we have “now a more extensive dominion over all creatures, than Adam had even in his innocence, because we have the liberty of eating them, which Adam never had.” (p. 44.) This will not prove the point. That I have liberty to eat a lamb, does not prove that I have dominion over a lion. Certainly I have not dominion over any creature which I can neither govern nor resist; yea, and if the dread of me is on every beast and fowl, this does not prove that I have any dominion over them. I know, on the contrary, that not only a tiger or a bear, but even a dove, will not stoop to my dominion.

“However, we have no authority to say, man himself was cursed, though the ground was.” (pp. 45, 46.) Yes, we have,—the authority of God himself: “Cursed is every man that continueth not in all things” which God hath commanded. The moment, therefore, that he sinned, Adam, fell under this curse. And whether the toil and death to which he and his posterity were sentenced, and the pain of child birth, be termed curses or no, sure it is, they are punishments, and heavy ones too; though mercy is often mixed with judgment. (pp. 47–50.)

The main argument follows, taken from the state of mankind in

general, with regard to religion. But you say, "It is impossible we should make a just estimate of the wickedness of mankind." (p. 51.) Yes, an exactly just estimate of the precise degree of wickedness in the whole world; but it is very possible, nay, very easy, to make an estimate in the gross, with such a degree of justness as suffices for the present question.

Indeed you "think we carry our censures of the Heathens too far." I dare not carry them so far as to say, no Heathen shall be saved. But this I say; I never knew a Heathen yet (and I have personally known many out of various nations) who was not a slave to some gross vice or other. Bad, therefore, as nominal Christians are, I cannot yet place them on a level with the Heathens; not even with the mild, courteous, conversable Heathens who border on Georgia and Carolina. Much less would I say, "Possibly the Heathens may be less vicious than the Christian world in general." If I believed this, I should bid adieu to Christianity, and commence Heathen without delay.

"But if we allow mankind to be ever so wicked, suppose there is not one upon earth who is truly righteous, it will not follow that men are naturally corrupt; for a sinful action does not infer a sinful nature. If it does, then Adam brought a sinful nature with him into the world. But if we cannot infer from Adam's sin, that his nature was originally corrupt, neither can we infer from the wickedness of all mankind, be it ever so great, that they have a sinful nature." (pp. 52, 53.)

The consequence is not good: "If one man's committing a sin does not prove that he was naturally inclined to evil, then the wickedness of all mankind for six thousand years will not prove that they are naturally inclined to evil." For we may easily account for one man's committing sin, though he was not naturally inclined to evil; but not so easily, for "all flesh corrupting themselves," for the wickedness of all mankind in all ages. It is not possible rationally to account for this, for the general wickedness of mankind; for such a majority of men, through all generations, being so corrupt; but on the supposition of their having a corrupt nature. Sin in one or a few cases, does not prove a sinful nature; but sin overspreading the earth, does. Nor is your argument drawn from the sin of the angels, (pp. 54, 55,) of any more force than that drawn from the sin of Adam, unless you can prove that as great a majority of angels as of men have rebelled against their Creator.

"Again: If our first parents felt fear and shame, and yet their nature was not originally corrupt, then it will not follow that ours is so, notwithstanding our uneasy and unruly passions." Empty sound! Had any one said to Adam "Your nature was originally corrupt, for you feel uneasy and unruly passions;" would he not readily have answered, "But these began at such an hour; till then my nature was without either pain or corruption." Apply this to any child of Adam; and if he can answer in like manner, "Till such an hour no uneasy or unruly passion had any place in my breast;" we will then grant, these passions no more prove a corrupt nature in the sons than in their first father. But no man can answer thus. You, and I, and every man, must acknowledge, that uneasy and unruly passions are coëval with our understanding and memory at least, if not with our very being.

"Again: Adam by his sin brought sufferings on himself and his

posterity. Yet it does not follow, that his nature was corrupt. Therefore, though others by their sins bring sufferings on themselves and their posterity, it will not follow that their nature is corrupt, or under the displeasure of God." Two very different things are here blended together. The corruption of their nature is one thing, the displeasure of God another. None affirms that those sufferings which men by their sins bring on themselves or posterity prove that their nature is corrupt. But do not the various sufferings of all mankind prove that they are under the displeasure of God? It is certain no suffering came upon Adam till he was under the displeasure of God.

Again: "If our first parents, by their sin, brought suffering both on themselves and others, and yet their nature was not originally corrupt, nor under the displeasure of God, it clearly follows that the nature of those who suffer purely in consequence of their sin is not originally corrupt, nor are they under God's displeasure." This argument is bad every way. For, 1. At the time when Adam brought the sentence of suffering both on himself and others, his nature was corrupt, and he was under the actual displeasure of God. But, 2. Suppose it were otherwise, all you could possibly infer, with regard to his posterity, is, that their suffering does not prove their corruption, or their being under the displeasure of God. How could you think their suffering would prove them not corrupt, not under God's displeasure? Therefore, neither this nor the preceding argument (seeing both are utterly inconclusive) "take off any thing that Dr. Watts has said," touching the present state of the world, as a proof of God's displeasure, and the natural corruption of man. So far, therefore, is "his argument from the sinfulness and misery of mankind from being altogether insufficient in every part," that it is strong and conclusive, any thing you have advanced to the contrary notwithstanding.

You add: "Suffering may happen where there is no sin; as in the case of brutes and infants; or where there is the most perfect innocence; as in the case of our blessed Lord." Absolutely true; that is, where there is no personal sin, but only sin imputed. There was no personal sin in our blessed Lord; there can be none either in brutes or infants. He suffered, therefore, for the sins of others, which were thus imputed to him; as is the sin of Adam to infants, who suffer death through him; and, in some sense, to the whole creation; which was "made subject to vanity, not willingly," but on account of his transgression. But where there is no sin, either personal or imputed, there can be no suffering.

"I may add, from the present state of things, a directly opposite argument may be taken: from the enjoyments and comforts, the good things and blessings, which abound in the world, I might ask, Are these creatures, so well provided for, under God's displeasure? Are they not the care of his goodness? Does he not love them, and delight to do them good?" (pp. 58-61.) I answer, God does still give us many good things, many enjoyments, comforts, and blessings. But all these are given through "the Seed of the woman;" they are all the purchase of his blood. Through him we are still the care of the Divine goodness, and God does delight to do us good: but this does not at all prove, either that we have not a sinful nature, or that we are not, while sinful, under his displeasure.

SECTION IV.

SOME CONSEQUENCES OF THE DOCTRINE OF ORIGINAL SIN.

“By this doctrine some have been led to maintain, 1. That men have not a sufficient power to perform their duty. But if so, it ceases to be their duty.” (pp. 63–69.) I maintain, that men have not this power by nature; but they have or may have it by grace; therefore it does not cease to be their duty. And if they perform it not, they are without excuse.

“Hence some maintain, 2. That we have no reason to thank our Creator for our being.” (pp. 70–73.) He that will maintain it, may. But it does by no means follow from this doctrine; since, whatever we are by nature, we may by grace be children of God, and heirs of the kingdom of heaven.

“But unthankfulness is a natural consequence of this doctrine, which greatly diminishes, if not totally excludes, the goodness and mercy of God.” (p. 74.) St. Paul thought otherwise. He imagined the total ungodliness and impotence of our nature to be the very thing which most of all illustrated the goodness and mercy of God: “For a good man,” says he, “peradventure one would even dare to die. But God commendeth,” unspeakably, inconceivably, beyond all human precedent, “his love to us; in that while we were yet without strength, Christ died for the ungodly.” Here is the ground, the real and the only ground, for true Christian thankfulness: “Christ died for the ungodly that were without strength;” such as is every man by nature. And till a man has been deeply sensible of it, he can never truly thank God for his redemption; nor, consequently, for his creation; which is, in the event, a blessing to those only who are “created anew in Christ Jesus.”

“Hence, 3. Some have poured great contempt upon human nature: whereas God himself does not despise mankind, but thinks them worthy of his highest regards.” (p. 75.) To describe human nature as deeply fallen, as far removed both from virtue and wisdom, does not argue that we despise it. We know by Scripture, as well as by sad experience, that men are now unspeakably foolish and wicked. And such the Son of God knew them to be, when he laid down his life for them. But this did not hinder him from loving them, no more than it does any of the children of God.

You next consider what Dr. Watts observes with regard to infants. “Mankind,” says he, “in its younger years, before it is capable of proper moral action, discovers the principles of iniquity and the seeds of sin. What young ferments of spite and envy, what native malice and rage, are found in the little hearts of infants, and sufficiently discovered by their little hands and eyes, and their wrathful countenances, even before they can speak!” You answer, “Our Lord gave us different ideas of them, when he taught his Apostles to become ‘as little children.’” (pp. 77–82.) Not at all. They may be imitable in some respects, and yet have all the tempers above described. And it is certain they have; as any impartial observer will be convinced by his own eyes. Nor is this any way contradicted by St. Paul’s words: “In wickedness,” *κακια*, “be ye children,” 1 Cor. xiv, 20,—untaught, unex-

perienced; or by those of David, "My soul is even as a weaned child," Psalm cxxxii, 2.

"But we discover in them also the noble principles of reason and understanding, with several tempers which are capable of improvement, whereby they may be trained up in a good way; and numbers in all ages of the world have risen to very considerable degrees of excellence." All this is true; but it is not at all inconsistent with the account of them given above; by which it clearly appears, that they are strongly inclined to evil, long before any ill habits can be contracted.

SECTION V.

A GENERAL ARGUMENT TAKEN FROM WHAT GOD HAS DECLARED CONCERNING MANKIND AT THE RESTORATION OF THE WORLD AFTER THE DELUGE.

"THERE are three passages from which divines infer the excellency of Adam's state and nature above ours: 1. 'And God blessed them, and said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth,' Gen. i, 28." (p. 84.) With this I have nothing to do; for I infer nothing from it, with regard to the present question. "2. 'Have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth.' 3. 'God created man in his own image; in the image of God created he him,' verse 27. From these three particulars they deduce the superiority of Adam's nature above ours. But the very same marks of excellency are more expressly pronounced by God upon the human nature, when the race of mankind was to be propagated anew from Noah and his sons." (p. 85.)

1. "And God blessed Noah and his sons," Gen. ix, 1. With regard to this whole passage, I must observe, that God did not pronounce any blessing at all, either on him or them, till Noah had "built an altar unto the Lord, and" had "offered burnt-offerings on the altar." Then it was that "the Lord smelled a sweet savour;" accepted the sacrifice which implied faith in the promised Seed; and for His sake restored, in some measure the blessing which he had given to Adam at his creation; "and said, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth."—On this, I need only observe, had Adam stood, or had not his fall affected his posterity, there would have been no need of this; for they would have "multiplied and replenished the earth," in virtue of the original blessing.

3. Verse 2. "The fear of you, and the dread of you shall be upon every beast of the earth, and upon every fowl of the air, and upon all that moveth upon the earth; into your hands they are delivered: every moving thing that liveth shall be meat for you; even as the green herb have I given you all things." On this likewise I would observe, What need was there of any such power over the creatures to be given to man, if he had not forfeited his former power? Had man remained subject to God, the creatures would have remained subject to him, by virtue of God's original constitution. And why was it, but because man had lost this power, that God here in some degree restores it?

But hence you "infer that all that power is restored, yea, more than all; that we have a more extensive dominion granted to us over the brutal world than was originally given to Adam." (p. 86.) It has been

commonly thought, that Adam had full dominion over the creatures, subject to him by a kind of instinct; whereas we have only so far power over them, that by labour and vigilance we may use or subdue them. But how do you prove that we have a fuller dominion than he had? By those words: "The fear and the dread of you shall be upon all: into your hands they are delivered; even as the green herb have I given you all things." Nay, "the fear and the dread of you shall be upon them," does not imply any dominion at all. A wolf may fear me, who yet does not obey me. I dread a viper; but I do not obey it. And those words, "Into your hands they are delivered," are plainly equivalent with, "I have given you all things, even as the green herb;" namely, "for food;" you may feed on any of them. So far therefore is the text from expressly pronouncing "a more extensive dominion given to Noah over the brutal world than was originally given to Adam," that it does not express any proper dominion at all.

3. Verse 6. "Whoso sheddeth men's blood, by man shall his blood be shed. For in the image of God made he man;" namely, at the creation. And some remains of the natural image of God, as we are spiritual and immortal beings, are even now to be found in every man, sufficient to justify the putting a murderer to death. St. James alludes to the same scripture, when he says, "Therewith bless we God, and curse men, who were made" (*τὸς γεγενοτάς*, not *are made*) "after the similitude of God," iii, 9. But what does all this prove? that the being "created in the image of God," "is more expressly pronounced upon Noah and his sons, than it was originally on Adam?" I think no man of sense will say this in cool blood.

Of "the three particulars," then, which you brought to prove the superiority of Noah over Adam in innocence, the First proves no more than that God gave to both the blessing of fruitfulness; the Second, far from proving that Noah had a more extensive dominion over the brute creation than Adam, hardly proves that he had any dominion over them at all; and the Third proves only this,—that the image of God, wherein man was made at first, is not totally lost now.

Yet you say, "These three particulars contain all the privileges conferred on Adam at first. And every one of these is expressly repeated, and more emphatically and extensively pronounced upon man, after the judgment passed on Adam had come upon his posterity." (p. 87.) *Expressly, more emphatically, more extensively!* Where? I am sure not in the Bible.

However, you pompously add, (*sicut tunc est mos,*) [as your custom is,] "This is to me a clear and undoubted demonstration,—

"1. That 'the judgment which came upon all men to condemnation,' did no ways alter the primary relation in which God stood to man, and man to God." Certainly it was altered thus far, God was a condemner, and man was condemned. And though "God is still the God and Father of mankind," yet it cannot be said that he is so to unregenerate men,—men who are as yet "dead in sin, and children of wrath,"—"as much," or in the same sense, "as he was to Adam in innocence." Adam then was surely "the son of God" as no other man is, till "born of the Spirit." The power to become the sons of God is now given to none till they "believe on his name."

“2. That the love, regards, and providence of God toward mankind in general are still the very same as to man at his first formation.” (p. 88.)

His providence is still over all his works: but he cannot regard or delight in sinful man, in the very same manner wherein he delighted in him when innocent.

“3. That our nature, as derived from Noah, has just the same endowments, natural and moral, with which Adam was created.” This does not follow from any thing that has yet been said. If it stands of itself, it may.

“4. That whatever came upon us from ‘the judgment to condemnation,’ came no farther than was consistent with that blessing, pronounced upon Noah as well as Adam, ‘Be fruitful and multiply.’” This is undoubtedly true; otherwise, the human species could not have been continued. “So that ‘the condemnation which came upon all men,’ cannot infer the ‘wrath’ of God upon mankind;” (it may, notwithstanding that they “increase and multiply;” it must, if they are “by nature children of wrath;”) “but only as subjecting us to such evils as were perfectly consistent with his blessing, declared to Adam as soon as he came out of his Maker’s hands;” (p. 89;) (namely, with the blessing, “Increase and multiply;”) “and, consequently, to such evils as God might justly have subjected mankind to, before Adam sinned.” Whether God could justly have done this, or not, what a consequence is this!—“If God gave that blessing, ‘Increase and multiply,’ to men in general, as well as he did to Adam, then men in general are not ‘children of wrath’ now, any more than Adam was at his creation!”

“5. It is no less evident, that when St. Paul says, ‘By the disobedience of one many,’ or all, ‘were made sinners,’ he cannot mean they ‘were made sinners’ in any sense inconsistent with the blessing pronounced on man in innocence.” True; not in any sense inconsistent with that blessing, “Increase and multiply.” But this blessing is no way inconsistent with their being “by nature children of wrath.”

“From all which I conclude, that our state with regard to the blessing of God, and the dignity and faculties of our nature, unless debased by our own sins, is not inferior to that in which Adam was created.” (pp. 90–93.) Be this so or not, it cannot be concluded from any thing that has gone before. But we may still believe, that men in general are “fallen short of the glory of God;” are deprived of that glorious image of God wherein man was originally created.

SECTION VI.

THE NOTION OF ADAM’S BEING A FEDERAL HEAD OR REPRESENTATIVE OF MANKIND CONSIDERED. (p. 94.)

MY reason for believing he was so, in some sense, is this: Christ was the representative of mankind, when God “laid on him the iniquities of us all, and he was wounded for our transgressions.” But Adam was a type or figure of Christ; therefore, he was also, in some sense, our representative; in consequence of which, “all died” in him, as “in Christ all shall be made alive.”

But as neither representative, nor federal head, are Scripture words,

it is not worth while to contend for them. The thing I mean is this : The state of all mankind did so far depend on Adam, that, by his fall, they all fell into sorrow, and pain, and death, spiritual and temporal. And all this is no ways inconsistent with either the justice or goodness of God, provided all may recover through the second Adam, whatever they lost through the first ; nay, and recover it with unspeakable gain ; since every additional temptation they feel, by that corruption of their nature which is antecedent to their choice, will, if conquered by grace, be a means of adding to that “ exceeding and eternal weight of glory.”

This single consideration totally removes all reflections on the divine justice or mercy, in making the state of all mankind so dependent on the behaviour of their common parent ; for not one child of man finally loses thereby, unless by his own choice ; and every one who “ receives the grace of God in Christ,” will be an unspeakable gainer. Who then has any reason to complain, even of having a nature inclined to evil ? seeing the more opportunities he has of fighting, the more of conquering ; and seeing, the greater is the difficulty of obtaining the victory, the brighter is the crown of glory.

But if Adam and Christ did not stand or fall, obey and suffer, for mankind, how can the death of others be the consequence of Adam's offence ; the life of others, the consequence of Christ's obedience ? How could all men be, in any sense, constituted sinners by the one, or constituted righteous by the other ?

To explain this a little farther in Mr. Hervey's words : “ By *federal head*, or *representative*, I mean, what the Apostle teaches, when he calls Christ, ‘ the Second Man,’ and ‘ the last Adam,’ 1 Cor. xv, 47. *The last !* How ! Not in a numerical sense ; not in order of time : but in this respect,—that, as Adam was a public person, and acted in the stead of all mankind, so Christ, likewise, was a public person, and acted in behalf of all his people ; that as Adam was the first general representative of mankind, Christ was the second and the last ; (there never was, and never will be, any other ;) that what they severally did in this capacity, was not intended to terminate in themselves, but to affect as many as they severally represented.

“ This does not rest on a single text, but is established again and again in the same chapter. The divinely wise Apostle, foreseeing the prejudices which men would entertain against this doctrine, as lying quite out of the road of reason's researches, has inculcated and re-inculcated this momentous point : ‘ Through the offence of one, many are dead ;—the judgment was by one to condemnation ;—by one man's offence death reigned by one ;—by the offence of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation ;’ and that there may remain no possibility of mistaking his meaning, or eluding his argument, he adds, ‘ By one man's disobedience many were made sinners.’ All these expressions demonstrate, that Adam (as well as Christ) was a representative of all mankind ; and that what he did in this capacity did not terminate in himself, but affected all whom he represented.”

After vehemently cavilling at the terms, you yourself allow the thing. You say, “ If what was lost by ‘ the disobedience of one’ person might afterward be recovered by ‘ the obedience’ of another, then matters would have stood upon an equal footing.” (p. 113.) And this is, indeed, the truth. For “ all that was lost to us by Adam's ‘ disobedience’ is fully recovered by Christ's ‘ obedience ;’ however we denominate the relation in which the one and the other stands to us.”

In this we agree ; but not in what follows : “ By *law*, in the fifth of

the Romans, as in several other places, the Apostle does not mean, barely a rule of duty; but such a rule, with the penalty of death threatened to every transgression of it. Such was the law given by Moses; that is, "a rule, to every transgression of which the penalty of death was threatened." (pp. 114, 115.) Not so; there were a thousand transgressions of it, to which death was not threatened. Observe: By *death*, we now mean *temporal death*, according to the whole tenor of your argument. "But is it not said, 'Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things written in the law to do them?'" It is. But whatever this curse implied, it did not imply temporal death. For a man might neglect to do many "things written in the law," and yet not be punishable with death.

Neither can I agree with your interpretation of Rom. vii, 9: "'I was alive without the law once;' namely, before the giving of the law at Mount Sinai. The Jew was then alive; that is, because he was not then under the law, he was not slain by his sin. His sin was not so imputed to him as to subject him to death. 'But when the commandment came,' with the penalty of death annexed, 'sin revived,'—acquired full life and vigour,"—(How so? One would have expected just the contrary!) "'and I died;' that is, was a dead man in law, upon the first transgression I committed." (p. 116.) Beside many other objections to this strange interpretation, an obvious one is this: it supposes every transgression punishable with death. But this is a palpable mistake: therefore, all that is built on this foundation falls to the ground at once.

Upon the whole: whatever objections may lie against Dr. Watts's method of explaining it, it appears, from clear Scripture, and from your own words, that Adam was the representative of mankind.

SECTION VII.

OF THE FORMATION OF OUR NATURE IN THE WOMB. (p. 129.)

BEFORE I say any thing on this head, I must premise, that there are a thousand circumstances relating to it, concerning which I can form no conception at all, but am utterly in the dark. I know not how my body was fashioned there; or when or how my soul was united to it: and it is far easier, in speaking on so abstruse a subject, to pull down, than to build up. I can easily object to any hypothesis which is advanced; but I cannot easily defend any.

And if you ask me, how, in what determinate manner, sin is propagated; how it is transmitted from father to son: I answer plainly, I cannot tell; no more than I can tell how man is propagated, how a body is transmitted from father to son. I know both the one and the other fact; but I can account for neither.

Thus much, however, is plain: That "God is the maker of every man who comes into the world." (p. 138.) For it is God alone who gives man power to propagate his species. Or rather, it is God himself who does the work by man as an instrument; man (as you observed before) having no other part in producing man, than the oak has in producing an acorn. God is really the producer of every man, every animal, every vegetable in the world; as he is the true *primum*

mobile, [first mover,] the spring of all motion throughout the universe. So far we agree. But when you subsume, "If it is the power of God whereby a sinful species is propagated, whereby a sinful father begets a sinful son, then God is the author of sin; that sinfulness is chargeable upon him." Here we divide; I cannot allow the consequence, because the same argument would make God chargeable with all the sinful actions of men. For it is the power of God whereby the murderer lifts up his arm, whereby the adulterer perpetrates his wickedness; full as much as it is his power whereby an acorn produces an oak, or a father a son. But does it follow, that God is chargeable with the sin? You know it does not follow. The power of God, vulgarly termed *nature*, acts from age to age, under its fixed rules. Yet He who this moment supplies the power by which a sinful action is committed is not chargeable with the sinfulness of that action. In like manner, it is the power of God which, from age to age, continues the human species; yet He who this moment supplies the power whereby a sinful nature is propagated (according to the fixed rules established in the lower world) is not chargeable with the sinfulness of that nature. This distinction you must allow, as was observed before, or charge God with all the sin committed under heaven. And this general answer may suffice any sincere and modest inquirer, without entangling himself in those minute particulars which are beyond the reach of human understanding.

"But does not God create the nature of every man that comes into the world?" He does not, in the proper sense of the word create. The Scripture plainly affirms the contrary: "On the seventh day he rested from all his work which God created and made," Gen. ii, 2, 3. "The works" which God created "were finished from the foundation of the world." And as soon as they were finished, "God ceased from his work," Heb. iv, 3, 10; namely, from his work of creating. He therefore now (not creates, but) produces the body of every man, in the same manner as he produces the oak; only by supplying the power whereby one creature begets another, according to what we term *the laws of nature*. In a higher sense he is the Creator of all souls. But how or when he does or did create them, I cannot tell. Neither can I give any account how or when he unites them to the body. Likewise, how we are conceived in sin, I know not; but I know that we are so conceived. God hath said it; and I know he will be "justified in his saying, and clear when he is judged."

It is certain that God is the Maker of every man. But it is neither certain nor true, that he "makes every man in the womb, both soul and body, as immediately as he made Adam;" and that, therefore, "every man comes out of the hands of God as properly as Adam did." (p. 140.) To interpret any scriptures as affirming this is to make them flatly contradict other scriptures. God made Adam by immediate creation: he does not so make every man, or any man beside him. Adam came directly out of the hands of God, without the intervention of any creature. Does every man thus come out of the hands of God? Do no creatures now intervene?

"But if God produces the nature of every man in the womb, he must produce it with all the qualities which belong to that nature, as it is then and so produced." So, if God produces the action of every man in the

world, he must produce it with all the qualities which belong to that action, as it is then and so produced. "For it is impossible God should produce our nature, and not produce the qualities it has when produced." For it is impossible God should produce an action, and yet not produce the qualities it has when produced. "No substance can be made without some qualities. And it must necessarily, as soon as it is made, have those qualities which the Maker gives it, and no other." No action can be produced without some qualities. And it must necessarily, as soon as it is produced, have those qualities which the producer gives it, and no other. You see what this argument would prove, if it proved any thing at all.

We will trace it a little farther: "If God produces the nature of every man in the womb, with all its qualities, then, whatever those qualities are, they are the will and the work of God." So, if God produces the action of every man in the world, with all its qualities, then, whatever those qualities are, they are the will and the work of God. Surely, no. God does (in the sense above explained) produce the action which is sinful; and yet (whether I can account for it or no) the sinfulness of it is not his will or work. He does also produce the nature which is sinful; (he supplies the power by which it is produced;) and yet (whether I can account for this or no) the sinfulness of it is not his will or work. I am as sure of this, as I am that there is a God; and yet, impenetrable darkness rests on the subject. Yet I am conscious my understanding can no more fathom this deep, than reconcile man's free will with the foreknowledge of God.

"Consequently, those qualities cannot be sinful." This consequence cannot hold in one case, unless it holds in both; but, if it does, there can be no sin in the universe.

However, you go on: "It is highly dishonourable to God, to suppose he is displeased at us for what he himself has infused into our nature." (p. 142.) It is not allowed that he has "infused sin into our nature;" no more than that he infuses sin into our actions; though it is his power which produces both our actions and nature.

I am aware of the distinction, that man's free will is concerned in the one case, but not the other; and that on this account God cannot be charged with the sinfulness of human actions: but this does by no means remove the difficulty. For, 1. Does not God know what the murderer or adulterer is about to do? what use he will make of that power to act, which he cannot have but from God? 2. Does he not at the instant supply him with that power whereby the sinful action is done? God, therefore, produces the action which is sinful. It is his work, and his will, (for he works nothing but what he wills,) and yet the sinfulness of the action is neither his work nor will.

"But can those passions or propensities be sinful, which are neither caused nor consented to by me?" I answer, Spite, envy, and those other passions and tempers which are manifestly discernible even in little children, are certainly not virtuous, not morally good, whether you term them sinful or not; and it is as certain, these exist before they are consented to, much less caused by, those that feel them. "But sin, if it is unavoidable, is no sin." (p. 143.) Whether you term it sin or not, it is contrary to the nature of God, and a transgression of his holy and good law.

"But a natural moral evil is a contradiction; for if it be natural, it

cannot be moral." That tempers contrary to the nature and the law of God are natural, is a point of daily experience; but if you do not choose to call these morally evil, call them what you please. All I aver is, that such tempers do exist in us antecedent to our choice.

"But if the actual sins of men proceed from a corrupt nature, they are unavoidable, and consequently no sins at all." (p. 144.) Actual sins may proceed from a corrupt nature, and yet not be unavoidable; but if actions contrary to the nature of God were unavoidable, it would not follow that they were innocent.

To the question, "How comes it to pass, that our passions and appetites are now so irregular and strong, that not one person has resisted them so as to keep himself pure and innocent?" you answer by another question, "How came Adam not to keep himself pure and innocent?" (p. 145.) There is no parity between the one case and the other. I can account for any one man's committing sin, supposing him to be naturally upright, as easily as for Adam's committing it. Any one person, as well as Adam, though naturally inclined to neither, might choose either good or evil; and, on this supposition, he would be as likely to choose one as the other. But the case is extremely different, if you place Adam on one side, and all mankind on the other. It is true, "the nature of sin is not altered by its being general." But the case is very widely altered. On this or that man it may "come, just as it came upon Adam, by his own choice and compliance with temptation." But how comes it, that all men under the sun should choose evil rather than good? How came all the children of Adam, from the beginning of the world till now, to comply with temptation? How is it, that, in all ages, the scale has turned the wrong way, with regard to every man born into the world? Can you see no difficulty in this? And can you find any way to solve that difficulty, but to say with the Psalmist, We were "shapen in iniquity, and in sin did our mothers conceive" us?

SECTION VIII.

OF ORIGINAL RIGHTEOUSNESS.

"ORIGINAL righteousness is said to be, 'that moral rectitude in which Adam was created. His reason was clear; and sense, appetite, and passion, were subject to it. His judgment was uncorrupted, and his will had a constant propensity to holiness. He had a supreme love to his Creator, a fear of offending him, and a readiness to do his will.' When Adam sinned, he lost this moral rectitude, this image of God in which he was created; in consequence of which all his posterity come into the world destitute of that image." (pp. 147-149.)

In order to remove this mistake, you reconsider some of the texts on which it is grounded: "Lie not one to another, seeing ye have put off the old man with his deeds; and have put on the new man, which is renewed in knowledge, after the image of him that created him," Col. iii, 9, 10. "That ye put off concerning the former conversation the old man, which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts; and be renewed in the spirit of your mind; and put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness," Ephesians iv, 22-24.

On this, you affirm: "'The old' and 'new man,' here, do not signify

a course of life ; but the ‘ old man ’ signifies the Heathen, the ‘ new man,’ the Christian, profession.” (pp. 150, 151.)

This you prove, 1. From Eph. ii, 15 : “ Christ abolished the enmity, to make” (or create) “ in himself of twain one new man.” Does this only mean one new profession ? It evidently means one Church, both of Jews and Gentiles.

You prove it, 2. From Col. iii, 8–12 ; where “ the Apostle tells the Colossian Christians, that ‘ now ’ they were obliged to ‘ put off anger,’ and ‘ to put on bowels of mercies ;’ to admit the Christian spirit into their hearts, and to practise Christian duties ; for this reason, because they ‘ had put off the old man,’ and ‘ had put on the new.’ This shows ‘ the new man ’ was something they might have ‘ put on,’ and yet be defective in personal, internal holiness.” True ; defective so far, as still to want more ; more “ bowels of mercies, meekness, long-suffering.” But this does not show that the “ new man ” does not mean the principle both of internal and external holiness. The consciousness of having received this is a strong motive both to depart from evil, and to labour after a continual increase of every holy and heavenly temper ; therefore, here likewise, “ the putting off the old and the putting on the new man ” does not mean an outward profession, but a real, inward change ; a renewal of soul “ in righteousness and true holiness.”

You prove it, 3. From Eph. iv, 22, 24 : “ Here,” you say, “ he considers ‘ the putting off the old ’ and ‘ putting on the new man ’ as a duty. They had done it by profession, and therefore were obliged to do it effectually.” They had done it effectually. So the whole tenor of the Apostle’s words implies : “ Ye have not so learned Christ ; if so be,” rather, seeing that, “ ye have been taught by him ;—that ye put off the old man ;—and be renewed in the spirit of your mind ;—and that ye put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness,” Eph. iv, 20–24. The Apostle here manifestly speaks, not of a lesson they had not learned, but of one which God had taught them already ; and thence exhorts them to walk worthy of the blessing they had received, to be “ holy in all manner of conversation.”

But, 4. “ ‘ The putting on the new man ’ is one thing, and ‘ the creating him ’ is another. He must first be created, and then put on.” (p. 152.) No ; he is created and put on at the same time ; the former word more directly referring to God, who creates, the latter to man, who is created. “ But God,” you say, “ ‘ created the new man,’ when he erected the Gospel dispensation, as appears from Eph. ii, 15, 19–22.” I answer : (1.) If those latter verses are explanatory of that expression, “ one new man,” in the 15th, then it does not mean one outward profession, but the one Church of living believers in Christ. (2.) The expression in the 15th verse is not the same with that we are now considering. Neither is the meaning of that and this expression the same : “ One new man means one Church, and nothing else ;” “ the new man ” means quite another thing,—the work of God in every individual believer.

You say, 5. “ ‘ The old man and the new,’ and the ‘ new man’s being renewed and created,’ and the ‘ renewing ’ of the Ephesians, all refer, not to any corruption of nature, but to their late wicked life.” (p. 153.) What ? Does their being “ renewed in the spirit of their mind ” refer only to their wicked life ? If you had not affirmed this, I should really

wonder at your affirming quickly after, "In all other places of Scripture, except 2 Cor. iv, 16, 'renewing' relates only to a vicious course of life;" (p. 154;) seeing you immediately confute yourself by both the following citations:—"Be not conformed to this world, but be ye transformed by the renewal of your mind," Rom. xii, 2: Unless the mind be only another expression for "a vicious course of life." "We ourselves also were sometimes foolish, disobedient, deceived, serving divers lusts and pleasures; living in malice and envy, hateful, and hating one another," Titus iii, 3-5. Do these words imply nothing but "a vicious course of life?" no inward corruption at all! "But after that the loving kindness and love of God our Saviour toward man appeared,—He saved us by the renewing of the Holy Ghost." From what? from a vicious course of life only? Nay, but from "foolishness" of heart also; from error, from malice, hatred, envy, evil desire; all which are inward corruptions.

You add: "From all this we may gather, that 'God's creating a new man after his own image in righteousness and true holiness,' means his erecting the Christian Church with a view to promote righteousness and holiness among men. For 'we are God's workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works.'" (p. 155.) Surely you do not cite this verse also to prove, that the "renewing of our mind" implies no inward change! It must be something more than an outward profession, or the reforming a vicious course of life, by reason of which we are said to be "God's workmanship, created anew in Christ Jesus."

These texts, therefore, do manifestly refer to personal, internal holiness; and clearly prove, that this is the chief part of that "image of God" in which man was originally created.

The other text which you re-consider, is Eccles. vii, 29: "God hath made man upright; but they have sought out many inventions." (pp. 156-160.) But this, you say, does not mean, that God made man righteous; but that he made him right, as having those powers, means, and encouragements, by a due use of which he may become righteous. In order to prove that this is the true meaning of the words, you affirm, 1. "That man here is not to be understood of Adam, but of all mankind." This cannot be granted without full proof. You affirm, 2. "This appears from the latter part of the sentence: '*They* sought out many inventions.'" Adam and Eve did so, in and after their fall. This, therefore, proves nothing. You affirm, 3. "The word *jashar*" (which we translate *upright*) "does not always imply uprightness or righteousness." But this is its proper meaning, as will appear to any who seriously considers the following texts: 1. "When thou shalt do that which is right in the sight of the Lord," Deut. xii, 25. It is taken in the very same sense, verse 28; xiii, 18, and xxi, 9. In all these texts, it undeniably implies *morally good*, or *righteous*. 2. "A God of truth and without iniquity; just and right is he," Deut. xxxii, 4. "Good and upright is the Lord," Psalm xxv, 8. 3. "The word of the Lord is right," Psalm xxxiii, 4. "The ways of the Lord are right," Hosea xiv, 9. 4. "Be glad and rejoice, ye righteous," Psalm xxvii, 11. "Rejoice in the Lord, O ye righteous," Psalm xxxiii, 1. In the very same sense it occurs in numberless places. As the word is therefore properly applied to God himself, to his word, his providences, and his

people, (in all which cases it must necessarily mean righteous,) we cannot lightly depart from this its proper signification.

But you think there is a necessity of departing from it here ; because “to say, God created Adam righteous, is to affirm a contradiction, or what is inconsistent with the very nature of righteousness. For a righteousness wrought in him without his knowledge or consent, would have been no righteousness at all.” (p. 161.) You may call it by any name you like better. But we must use the old name still ; as being persuaded that the love of God, governing the senses, appetites, and passions, however or whenever it is wrought in the soul, is true, essential righteousness.

Nay, “righteousness is right action.” Indeed it is not. Here (as we said before) is your fundamental mistake. It is a right state of mind, which differs from right action, as the cause does from the effect. Righteousness is, properly and directly, a right temper or disposition of mind, or a complex of all right tempers.

For want of observing this you say, “Adam could not act before he was created. Therefore he must exist, and use his intellectual powers, before he could be righteous.” “But, according to this reasoning,” as Dr. Jennings observes, “Christ could not be righteous at his birth.” You answer, “He existed before he was made flesh.” I reply, He did,—as God. But the man Christ Jesus did not. Neither, therefore, did he use his intellectual powers. According to your reasoning, then, the man Christ Jesus could not be righteous at his birth.

The Doctor adds : “Nay, according to this reasoning, God could not be righteous from eternity ; because he must exist before he was righteous.” (*Jennings’s Vindication*.) You answer : “My reasoning would hold even with respect to God, were it true that he ever did begin to exist. But neither the existence nor the holiness of God was prior to each other.” (*Taylor’s Supplement*, p. 162.) Nay, but if his existence was not prior to his holiness, if he did not exist before he was holy, your assertion, that every being must exist before it is righteous, is not true.

Besides, (to pursue your reason a little farther,) if “God did always exist,” yet unless you can prove that he always acted, it will not clear your argument. For let him exist millions of ages, he could not be righteous (according to your maxim) before he acted right.

One word more on this article : You say, “My reasoning would hold good, even with respect to God, were it true that he ever did begin to exist.” Then I ask concerning the Son of God, Did he ever begin to exist? If he did not, he is the one, eternal God ; (for there cannot be two eternals ;) if he did, and your reasoning hold good, when he began to exist he was not righteous.

“But St. John saith, ‘He that doeth righteousness is righteous.’” Yes, it appears he is, by his doing or practising “righteousness.” “But where doth the Scripture speak one word of a righteousness infused into us?” Where it speaks of “the love of God” (the essence of righteousness) “shed abroad in our hearts.”

And cannot God, by his almighty power, infuse any good tempers into us? You answer, “No ;—no being whatever can do for us that which cannot be at all if it be not our own choice, and the effect of our

own industry and exercise. But all good tempers are the effect of our own industry and exercise; otherwise they cannot be at all."

Nay, then, it is certain they cannot be at all. For neither lowliness, meekness, long suffering, nor any other good temper, can ever be the effect of my own industry and exercise. But I verily believe they may be the effect of God's Spirit, working in me whatsoever pleaseth him. See Isaiah xxvi, 12.

You add: "The thing cannot exist, unless we choose; because our choosing to do what is right, is the very thing which is to exist." No; the thing which is to exist is, a right state of mind. And it is certain, God can give this to any creature, at the very first moment of its existence. Nay, it may be questioned, whether God can create an intelligent being in any other state.

"But a habit is gained by repeated acts. Therefore, habits of righteousness could not be created in man." Mere playing upon words! He could be, he was, created full of love. Now, whether you call this a habit or no, it is the sum of all righteousness.

"But this love is either under the government of my will, or it is not." It is. The love of God which Adam enjoyed was under the government of his will. "But if so, it could be righteous only so far as applied to right action in heart and life." (pp. 164, 165.) Stop here. The love of God is righteousness, the moment it exists in any soul; and it must exist before it can be applied to action. Accordingly, it was righteousness in Adam the moment he was created. And yet he had a power either to follow the dictates of that love, (in which case his righteousness would have endured for ever,) or to act contrary thereto; but love was righteousness still, though it was not irresistible.

"I might add, Adam's inclination to sin (for he could not sin without a sinful inclination) must be so strong as to overcome his (supposed) inbred propensity to holiness; and so malignant, as to expel that principle at once, and totally. Consequently, the supposed original righteousness was consistent with a sinful propensity, vastly stronger and more malignant than ever was or can be in any of his posterity; who cannot sin against such resistance, or with such dreadful consequences. Thus, original righteousness in Adam proves far worse than original sin in his posterity." (p. 166.)

I have set down your argument at large, that it may appear in its full strength. Now, let us view it more closely: "Adam could not sin without a sinful inclination." The sentence is ambiguous. Either it may mean, "Adam could not choose ill, without some sinful temper preceding;" and in this sense it is false; or, "He could not commit outward sin, without first inclining, that is, choosing so to do." 2. "This his sinful inclination (or temper) was so strong as to overcome his inbred propensity to holiness." It was not any sinful inclination (in this sense) which overcame his propensity to holiness; but strong temptation from without: how strong we know not, and the circumstances of it we know not. 3. "This his sinful inclination was so malignant, as to expel that principle at once, and totally." Not by any sinful inclination, but by yielding to temptation, he did lose the love and image of God. But that this was totally and at once, we have no authority to affirm. 4. "Consequently, original righteousness in Adam was consistent with a sinful propensity, vastly stronger, and more malignant, than ever was

or can be in any of his posterity." It was consistent with no sinful propensity at all, but barely with a power of yielding to temptation. It declined in the same proportion, and by the same degrees, as he did actually yield to this. And when he had yielded entirely and eaten the fruit, original righteousness was no more. Therefore, the Fifth proposition, "Thus original righteousness proves to be far worse than original sin," is flourish. What a figure does this fair argument make, now it is turned inside out!

From all this it may appear, that the doctrine of original righteousness (as well as that of original sin) hath a firm foundation in Scripture, as well as in the attributes of a wise, holy, and gracious God.

As you do not offer any new argument in your conclusion, I need not spend any time upon it.

You subjoin Remarks on Dr. Watts's Additions to his book. Some of these deserve a serious consideration:—

1. Either the new-created man loved God supremely, or not. If he did not, he was not innocent; since the very law and light of nature require such a love to God. If he did, he stood disposed for every act of obedience. And this is true holiness of heart.

You answer, (in many words,) "The new-created man did not love God supremely. For, before he could love God, the powers of his mind must have been quite finished, and actually exercised." (p. 186.) And, doubtless, the very moment he was created, they were quite finished, and actually exercised too. For man was not gradually formed by God, as a statue is by a human artificer; but "He spake the word, and they were made; he commanded, and they were created." And as light and heat were not subsequent to the creation of the sun, but began to exist with it, so that the moment it existed it shone; so spiritual light and heat, knowledge and love, were not subsequent to the creation of man, but they began to exist together with him. The moment he existed, he knew and loved.

2. If the new-made creature had not a propensity to love and obey God, but was in a state of mere indiffereñce to good or evil, then his being put into such a union with flesh and blood, among a thousand temptations, would have been an overbalance on the side of vice. But our reason can never suppose, that God, the wise, just, and good, would have placed a new-made creature in such a situation.

This argument cannot be answered, unless it can be showed, either, (1.) That in such a situation, there would not have been an overbalance on the side of vice; or, (2.) That to place a new-made creature in a situation where there was such an overbalance, was consistent with the wisdom, justice, and goodness of God.

But, instead of showing, or even attempting to show, this, you feebly say, "I do not think the reason of man by any means sufficient to direct God, in what state to make moral agents." (O that you had always thought so! How much vain, yea, mischievous, reasoning had then been spared!) "But, however Adam's propensities and temptations were balanced, he had freedom to choose evil as well as good." (pp. 187, 188.) He had. But this is no answer to the argument, which, like the former, remains in its full force. How could a wise, just, and good God place his creature in such a state as that the scale of evil should pre-

ponderate? Although it be allowed, he is, in a measure, free still; the other scale does not “fly up, and kick the beam.”

3. Notwithstanding all the cavils which have been raised, yet if those two texts (Eph. iv, 24; Col. iii, 10) are considered together, their obvious meaning will strike an honest and unbiassed reader, the new man, or the principle of true religion in the heart, is created by God after his moral image, in that righteousness and true holiness wherein man was at first created.

You answer, “I have endeavoured to prove the contrary; and he does not offer to point out any one mistake in my interpretations.” (p. 189.) I have pointed out more than one.

4. If these are the qualifications with which such a new-made creature should be endued; and these the circumstances, wherein, from the wisdom, justice, and goodness of God, we should expect him to be situated; then, by a careful survey of what man is now, compared with what he should be, we may easily determine, whether man is at present such a creature as the great and blessed God made him at first.

You answer, in abundance of words, the sum of which is this: “Our circumstances are, on the whole, far better than Adam’s were; for he was under that severe law, ‘Transgress and die.’” (p. 190.) He was so; but this does not prove the point still; balancing this single disadvantage (if such it was; for even that may be disputed) with the numerous advantages he was possessed of, with the holiness and happiness which he enjoyed, and might have enjoyed for ever, it does by no means appear that the present circumstances of mankind in general are better than Adam’s were.

5. God did not give Noah dominion over the brute creatures in so ample a manner as he did to Adam. Fear indeed fell on the brutes; but this does not sufficiently preserve man from their outrage. In the innocent state, no man would have been poisoned or torn by serpents or lions as now.

You answer: “The second grant runs,—‘The fear of you and the dread of you shall be upon every beast of the field, and upon every fowl of the air, and upon all that moves on the earth, and upon all the fishes of the sea: into your hands they are delivered. Every moving thing that liveth shall be meat for you: even as the green herb I have given you all things.’ Now, this grant is more extensive than the first.” (p. 191.) It is, as to food; but not as to dominion. The liberty of eating an animal does not necessarily imply any dominion over it at all. “But the ‘fear’ and ‘dread’ of every beast are the effects of dominion in man, and the subjection in brutes.” Nay, neither does *fear* necessarily imply dominion. I may fear what has not dominion over me, and what I am not subject to. And those animals may fear me, over which, nevertheless, I have not dominion, neither are they subject to me. I fear every viper, yea, every poisonous spider; and they fear me: yet neither has dominion over the other. Fear, therefore, and dread may be in a high degree; and yet no dominion at all. But they are “‘all delivered into our hands.’” Yes; “for meat;” as the very next words explain that expression. Whatever therefore it may “import in other Scriptures,” the meaning of it here is plain and certain.

6. Would God have exposed the pure and innocent works of his hands to such unavoidable perils and miseries as arise from bears, tigers, serpents, precipices, volcanoes, &c?

You answer: "He did expose innocent Adam to a peril and misery greater than all these put together, even to a tempting devil." (pp. 191, 192.) I reply, (1.) This did not imply any unavoidable misery at all. (2.) It implied no more peril than God saw was needful, as a test of his obedience. Therefore this is no parallel case: so this argument also stands unanswered.

7. It has been said, indeed, "If Adam fell into sin though he was innocent, then among a million of creatures every one might sin, though he was as innocent as Adam." (pp. 194, 195.) I answer, There is a possibility of the event; but the improbability of it is as a million to one. I prove it thus: If a million of creatures were made in an equal probability to stand or fall; and if all the numbers, from one to one million inclusively, were set in a rank, it is plainly a million to one, that just any single proposed number of this multitude should fall. Now, the total sum is one of these numbers, that is, the last of them. Consequently, it is a million to one against the supposition, that the whole number of men should fall. And this argument will grow still ten thousand times stronger, if we suppose ten thousand millions to have lived since the creation.

Your argument stood thus: "If we cannot infer from Adam's transgression, that his nature was originally corrupt, neither can we infer from the transgressions of all mankind, that their nature is originally corrupt." It is answered, *If a million of creatures were made in an equal probability to stand or fall, it is a million to one they should not all fall.* You reply, "This is no answer to my argument." (p. 196.) Surely it is; and a direct answer. That one man sinned, does not prove he had a corrupt nature. Why? Because (supposing him free to choose good or evil) it was as probable he should sin, as not, there being no odds on one side or the other; but that all men should sin, does prove they have a corrupt nature; because it is not as probable, that all men should sin, as that one man should; the odds against it being as a million, or rather ten thousand millions, to one. Either, therefore, we must allow that mankind are more inclined to evil than to good, or we must maintain a supposition so highly improbable as comes very near a flat impossibility.

And thus much you yourself cannot but allow: "The reasoning may hold good, where all circumstances agree to make the probability equal with regard to every individual in this supposed million." And how can the probability be other than equal, if every individual be as wise and as good as Adam? "But be it equal or no," you say, "the case is not to be estimated by the laws of equal probability, but of infection. For when sin is once entered into a body of men, it goes on, not according to the laws of chance," (is this precisely the same with equal probability?) "but the laws, as I may say, of infection." But how came sin to enter into a body of men? That is the very question. Supposing, first, a body of sinners, sin "may assume the nature of a contagion." But the difficulty lies against supposing any body of sinners at all. You say, indeed, "One sinner produces another, as the serpent drew in Eve: the first sin and sinner being like a 'little leaven which leavens the whole lump.'" All this I can understand, supposing our nature is inclined to evil. But if not, why does not one good man produce another, as naturally as one sinner produces another? And why does not righteousness spread as fast and as wide among mankind as wickedness? Why does not this "leaven, leaven the whole lump," as frequently, as

readily, and as throughly, as the other? These laws of infection, so called, will therefore stand you in no stead. For, to bring the matter still more to a point, suppose Adam and Eve newly infected by sin; they had then none to infect, having no child. Afterward they repented, and found mercy. Then Cain was born. Now, surely neither Adam nor Eve would infect him, having suffered so severely for their own sin; which, therefore, they must needs guard him against! How, then, came he to be a sinner? "O, by his own choice; as Seth was righteous." Well; afterward, both wicked Cain and good Seth begat sons and daughters.

Now, was it not just as probable, one should infect his children with goodness, as the other with wickedness? How came, then, Cain to transmit vice, any more than Seth to transmit virtue? If you say, "Seth did transmit virtue; his posterity was virtuous until they mixed with the vicious offspring of Cain," I answer, (1.) How does that appear? How do you prove that all the posterity of Seth were virtuous? But, (2.) If they were, why did not this mixture amend the vicious rather than corrupt the virtuous? If our nature is equally inclined to virtue and vice, vice is no more contagious than virtue. How, then, came it totally to prevail over virtue, so that "all flesh had corrupted themselves before the Lord?" Contagion and infection are nothing to the purpose; seeing they might propagate good as well as evil.

Let us go one step farther: Eight persons only were saved from the general deluge. We have reason to believe that four, at least, of these were persons truly virtuous.

How then came vice to have a majority again among the new inhabitants of the earth? Had the nature of man been inclined to neither, virtue must certainly have had as many votaries as vice. Nay, suppose man a reasonable creature, and supposing virtue to be agreeable to the highest reason, according to all the rules of probability, the majority of mankind must in every age have been on the side of virtue.

§ 8. Some have reckoned up a large catalogue of the instances of divine goodness, and would make this as evident a proof that mankind stands in the favour of God, as all the other instances are of a universal degeneracy of man, and the anger of God against them. But it is easy to reply, The goodness of God may incline him to bestow a thousand bounties upon criminals; but his justice and goodness will not suffer him to inflict misery in such a universal manner, where there has been no sin to deserve it either in parents or children.

You answer: "There is more than enough sin among mankind, to deserve all the sufferings God inflicts upon them. And the Scriptures represent those sufferings as disciplinary, for correction and reformation." What, all the sufferings of all mankind? This can in no wise be allowed. Where do the Scriptures say, that all sufferings, those of infants in particular, are purely disciplinary, and intended only "for correction and reformation?" Neither can this be reconciled to matter of fact. How did the sufferings of Grecian or Roman infants tend to their correction and reformation? Neither do they tend to the correction or reformation of their parents, or of any other persons under heaven. And even as to adults: If universal suffering is a proof of universal sin, and universal sin could not take place unless men were naturally prone to evil, then the present sufferings of mankind are a clear and strong evidence that their nature is prone to evil.

9. Notwithstanding all God's provision for the good of man, still the Scripture represents men while they are in their fallen state, as destitute of God's favour, and without hope.

You answer : " How can men be destitute of God's favour, when he has vouchsafed them a Redeemer ?" (p. 207.) By destitute of God's favour, we mean, children of wrath, objects of God's displeasure ; and, because they were so, the Redeemer was given, to reconcile them to God by his own blood ; but, notwithstanding this, while we and they were in our fallen state, we were all objects of God's displeasure.

" But how can they be without hope, when he ' hath given them the hope of eternal life ?" All men who are not born again, born of God, are without hope at this day. God, indeed, " hath given," but they have not accepted, " the hope of eternal life." Hence the bulk of mankind are still as void of this hope, as are the beasts that perish. And so (the Scripture declares) are all men by nature, whatever difference grace may make. " By nature" all are " children of wrath, without hope, without God in the world."

10. Doth that man write the sincere sense of his own mind and conscience, who charges the expression, " Adam was on trial for us all," with this inference, " That we are none of us in a state of trial now, but Adam alone was upon trial for us all ?" We have owned and granted, that men are now in a state of trial ; but this is upon the foot of a new covenant.

You answer, " What can be more evident, than that, according to this scheme, Adam alone was to be upon trial for us all, and that none of Adam's posterity are upon personal trial ?" (p. 209.) Do you not see the ambiguity in the word *alone* ? Or do you see and dissemble it ? Dr. Watts supposes, that Adam alone, that is, this single person, was on trial for all men. Does it follow from hence, that Adam alone, that is, no other person, was ever in a state of trial ? Again : if no person but Adam was upon trial for all men, will it follow, " No person but Adam was upon trial at all ?" It is really hard to think, that you here " speak the sincere sense of your own mind and conscience."

You go on : " He supposes all mankind are still under the original covenant with Adam, according to which he alone was upon trial for us all, and none of his posterity are upon personal trial." He does not suppose any man to be so under that covenant, as to supersede his being upon personal trial. Yourself add : " I knew he owned we are upon personal trial, and that all mankind are now under the covenant of grace ; but how can either of these consist with the scheme ?" Both of them consist with it perfectly well. (1.) Adam alone, or single, was, in some sense, on trial for all mankind, according to the tenor of the old covenant, " Do this and live." (2.) Adam fell, and hereby the sentence of death came on him and all his posterity. (3.) The new covenant was given, whereby all mankind were put into a state of personal trial ; yet, still, (4.) Death, the penalty of the old covenant, came (more or less) on all mankind. Now, all this is well consistent with itself, as well as with the tenor of Scripture.

11. Mankind is represented as one collective body in several verses of the 5th chapter to the Romans.

You answer : " St. Paul always distinguishes between Adam, and all men, his posterity, and does not consider Adam with all men, as one creature." (p. 211.)

What then? This does not prove that he does not represent mankind (Adam's posterity) as one collective body.

12. All that is contained in the blessing given to Noah is consistent with the curse which came on all men by the first sin. But that curse is not consistent with the original blessing which was given to Adam.

You answer: "The blessing given to Noah was the very same which was given to Adam." (p. 212.) This is palpably false. The blessing which was given to Adam included, (1.) Freedom from pain and death. (2.) Dominion over the whole brute creation. But that given to Noah did not include either. Yet you affirm, "It is renewed to Noah, without any manner of alteration, after pain and death were introduced into the world!" And do pain and death then make no manner of alteration?

13. The dominion over the brutes given to Adam was not given to Noah.

You answer: "Our killing and feeding upon them is the highest instance of dominion over them." (p. 213.) It is no instance of it at all. I may shoot a bear, and then eat him; yet I have no dominion, unless it be over his carcass.

PART IV.

EXTRACTS FROM DR. WATTS AND MR. HEBDEN.

I HAVE now considered what is material in your "Doctrine of Original Sin," with the "Supplement, and Reply to Dr. Watts." And this I purposely did, before I read the Doctor's book. But how was I surprised on reading it, to observe the manner wherein you have treated it, of which I could not be a judge before! The frame which he had so beautifully and strongly connected, you have disjointed and broken in pieces, and given us nothing but mangled fragments of it, from which it is impossible to form any judgment of the whole. In order, therefore, to do justice to that great and good man, as well as to his argument, I subjoin an extract of so much of that work as directly affects the main question.

I the rather subjoin this, and the following extracts, for these two reasons: 1. Because what has gone before, being purely argumentative, is dry, and less profitable to the generality of readers: 2. Because they contain one uniform, connected scheme of the great doctrine which I have been hitherto defending; and which, after the objections have been removed out of the way, may be more clearly understood and firmly embraced.

INTRODUCTION.

"MAN is a creature made up of an animal body and a rational mind, so united as to act in a mutual correspondence, according to certain laws appointed by his Creator. Now, suppose the blessed God, who is perfect in wisdom and power, in justice and goodness, were to form such a new creature, with what qualifications may we conceive such a creature would be endowed, by a Being of such goodness, justice, and wisdom?" (*Ruin and Recovery of Mankind*, p. 1.)

"1. We cannot but conceive, he must have a perfection of natural powers, both of body and spirit, as, united together, suited to his present circumstances." (p. 2.)

“Not that we need conceive, man would be made so perfect a being as God could make him: for the wisdom of God plainly designed to display itself in the different ranks and orders of his creation. Nor is it reasonable to suppose, man would be made at first with such sublime perfections, as he himself might afterward arrive at, by a wise improvement of his powers. But still the creature which was designed to bear the nearest likeness of his Maker in this lower world must have powers perfectly sufficient for his present well-being, and acting in that station wherein God had placed him. All his senses must be clear and strong, his limbs vigorous and active, his body healthy in all the inward and outward parts of it, and every natural power in its proper order.” (p. 3.) “For God would surely form such a creature in a state of perfect ease, without any original malady of nature, to give him pain or sorrow. Nor could there be any tendency in his body to pain or disease while he remained without sin.” (p. 4.)

“And as the powers of his body must be thus perfect, so the faculties of his soul must have their perfection too.

“His understanding must have that knowledge both of God and his creatures, which was needful for his happiness. Not that he was formed with all knowledge in arts and sciences, but with such as was requisite to his peace and welfare. His reason must be clear, his judgment uncorrupted, and his conscience upright and sensible.

“This leads me to speak of his moral perfection. A rational creature thus made must not only be innocent, as a tree, but must be formed holy. His will must have an inward bias to virtue; he must have an inclination to please that God who made him, a supreme love to his Creator, a zeal to serve him, and a tender fear of offending him.” (p. 5.)

“For either the new-created man loved God supremely, or not; if he did not, he was not innocent, since the law of nature requires a supreme love to God; if he did, he stood ready for every act of obedience: and this is true holiness of heart. And, indeed, without this, how could a God of holiness love the work of his own hands!

“There must be also in this creature a regular subjection of the inferior powers to the superior. Sense, and appetite, and passion, must be subject to reason. The mind must have a power to govern these lower faculties, that he might not offend against the law of his creation.

“He must also have his heart inlaid with love to the creatures, especially those of his own species, if he should be placed among them; and with a principle of honesty and truth in dealing with them; and if many of these creatures were made at once, there would be no pride, malice, or envy, no falsehood, no brawls or contentions among them, but all harmony and love.” (p. 6.)

“This universal righteousness, which is the moral image of God, is far the noblest part of that image in which Moses represents man to have been originally created. The same writer assures us, that when God surveyed all his works, he pronounced them ‘very good!’ agreeably to what Solomon assures us, that God ‘made man upright.’” (p. 7.)

“It is true, the natural image of God in which man was created, consisted in his spiritual, intelligent, and immortal nature; and his political image, (if I may so speak,) in his being lord of this lower creation. But the chief, the moral, part of his image, we learn from St. Paul, to have been the rectitude of man’s nature; who, in his Epistle to the Ephesians, (iv, 24,) says, that the image of God in which man is to be renewed, and, consequently, in which he was made, consists ‘in righteousness and true holiness.’

“2. From the justice and goodness of God we may infer, that though man was made free, with a power to choose either evil or good, that he might be put into a state of probation, yet he had a full sufficiency of power to preserve himself in love and obedience to his Creator, and to guard himself against every temptation.” (p. 8.)

“3. It is highly probable from the goodness of God, that such a creature

would be made immortal: it is true, the great God, as sovereign Lord of his creatures, might take away all that he had given; but it is hard to suppose, that he ever would have destroyed an intelligent creature who had continued to serve and please him." (p. 9.)

"It is also probable that he was endued with power to arrive at higher degrees of excellency and happiness than those in which he was formed at first; and hereby he was greatly encouraged, both to watch against every sin, and to use all zeal and diligence in improving the powers he had received.

"4. We may add, that the habitation in which a God of infinite goodness would place such an innocent and holy creature, would be furnished with all the necessities and conveniences of life, and prepared for his delight as well as safety. And so Moses tells us, that the first created pair were placed in Eden, a garden of pleasure, and were made lords of all therein, of all the creatures, animal and vegetable, that were round about them." (p. 10.)

"Neither can we conceive that any thing destructive or hurtful could be found in this delightful habitation, but what man would have sufficient notice of, with sufficient power to oppose or avoid it.

"5. And if this creature had power to propagate its kind, the child must be innocent and holy, and equally capable of persevering in virtue and happiness." (p. 11.)

"Now, if we may judge from the wisdom, justice, and goodness of God, that these are the qualifications with which such a new-made creature would be endued, these the circumstances in which he would be situated; then, by a careful survey of what mankind is now, we may easily judge whether man is now such a creature as the great and blessed God made him at first. And this is the subject of the ensuing inquiry."

QUESTION I.

"Is man, in his present circumstances, such a creature as he came out of the hands of God, his Creator?"

"We may derive a full answer to this inquiry from the following considerations." (p. 12.)

"1. This earth, which was designed for the habitation of man, carries evident tokens of ruin and desolation, and does not seem to be ordained, in its present form and circumstances, for the habitation of innocent beings; but is apparently fit for the dwelling place of creatures who are degenerate, and fallen from God.

"It is granted that the beauty and order of this lower world, even in its present constitution, and the wonderful texture, composition, and harmony of the several parts of it, both in air, earth, and sea, do still illustriously display the power, wisdom, and goodness of their Creator. Yet it must be confessed also, that there are glaring proofs of the terrors of his justice, and the execution of his vengeance." (p. 13.)

"Is not the present shape of our earth, in its divisions of seas and shores, rude and irregular, abrupt and horrid! Survey a map of the world, and say, does the form of it strike our eyes with any natural beauty and harmony? Rather, does it not strongly bear on our sight the ideas of ruin and confusion? Travel over the countries of this globe, or visit several parts of this island,—what various appearances of a ruined world! What vast, broken mountains hang over the heads of travellers! What stupendous cliffs and promontories rise,—high and hideous to behold! What dreadful precipices,—which make us giddy to look down, and are ready to betray us into destruction! What immense extents are there in many countries of waste and barren ground! What vast and almost impassable deserts! What broad and faithless morasses, which are made at once both deaths and graves to unwary travellers! What huge ruinous caverns, deep and wide, big enough to bury whole cities!" (p. 14.)

"What resistless deluges of water, in a season of great rains, come rolling down the hills, bear all things before them, and spread spacious desolation!

What roaring and tremendous waterfalls in several parts of the globe! What burning mountains, in whose caverns are lakes of liquid fire ready to burst upon the lower lands! or they are a mere shell of earth, covering prodigious cavities of smoke, and furnaces of flame; and seem to wait a Divine command, to break inward, and bury towns and provinces in fiery ruin." (p. 15.)

"What active treasures of wind are pent up in the bowels of the earth, ready to break out into wide and surprising mischief! What huge torrents of water rush and roar through the hollows of the globe we tread! What dreadful sounds and threatening appearances from the reign of meteors in the air! What clouds charged with flame, ready to burst on the earth, and discompose and terrify all nature!

"When I survey such scenes as these, I cannot but say within myself, 'Surely this earth, in these rude and broken appearances, this unsettled and dangerous state, was designed as a dwelling for some unhappy inhabitants, who did or would transgress the laws of their Maker, and merit desolation from his hand. And he hath here stored up his magazines of divine artillery against the day of punishment.'" (p. 16.)

"How often have the terrible occurrences of nature in the air, earth, and sea, and the calamitous incidents in several countries, given a strong confirmation of this sentiment!

"What destructive storms have we and our fathers seen even in this temperate island of Great Britain! What floods of water and violent explosions of fire do we read of in the histories of the world! What shocking convulsions of the globe, stretching far and wide under the affrighted nations! What huge disruptions of the caverns of the earth, with tremendous bellowings, which have filled its inhabitants with terror and astonishment, and made wide devastations! Would a good and gracious Being have originally so formed the inanimate parts of this lower world, as to produce such deadly concussions therein, and such desolating appearances, had he not designed it for the habitation of such creatures as he foresaw would deserve these strokes of his indignation!" (p. 17.)

"And thus both Moses and St. Peter suppose God to have laid up stores of ruin and destruction within the bowels of the earth, that he might break open his dreadful treasures of flood and fire at proper seasons, to drown and to burn the world, together with the sinful inhabitants thereof." (pp. 18, 19.)

"Now, the great God, who appointed such prodigious quantities both of water and fire to be reserved in the bowels of the earth, and among the clouds of heaven, for such a foreseen day of general destruction, did also doubtless prepare the materials of all the lesser storms and hurricanes, earthquakes and floods, and convulsions of nature; and treasured up for these purposes his magazines of wind, and flood, and fire, in the earth. And is this a habitation prepared for the residence of pure and holy beings! Is this such a peaceful place as a kind Creator would have formed for innocent creatures! It is absurd to imagine this of a God so wise, so righteous, and so merciful!" (p. 20.)

"2. Let us take a survey of the vegetables which grow out of the earth, with the brute animals which are found on the surface of it; and we shall find more reasons to conclude that man, the chief inhabitant, is not such as he came first out of his Maker's hand.

"It must be granted here again, that the wisdom and goodness of the Creator are amazingly displayed in the animal and the vegetable world, beyond the utmost reach of our thoughts or praises. But still we may have leave to inquire, whether, if man had continued innocent, among the numerous herbs and flowers fitted for his support and delight, any plants or fruits of a malignant, mortal nature would have grown out of the earth, without some plain mark or caution set upon them." (p. 21.)

"Can we suppose that among the roots, herbs, and trees, good for food, the great God would have suffered mischief, malady, and deadly poison, to

spring up here and there, without any sufficient distinction, that man might know how to avoid them? This is the case in our present world; disease, anguish, and death, have entered into the bowels and veins of multitudes by an innocent and fatal mistake of these pernicious things for proper food.

"There was indeed 'the tree of knowledge' in Paradise; but man was expressly cautioned against it. And certainly had he continued holy, no poisonous plant would have been suffered to grow on the earth, without either some natural mark set upon it, or some divine caution to avoid it!" (p. 22.)

"Proceed to the animal world: There are many creatures, indeed, which serve the use or pleasure of man. But are there not many other sorts which he is neither able to govern nor to resist; and by which all his race are exposed, whenever they meet them, to wounds, and anguish, and death." (p. 23.)

"If man had not sinned, would there have been in the world any such creatures as bears and tigers, wolves and lions, animated with such fierceness and rage, and armed with such destructive teeth and talons? Would the innocent children of men have ever formed to be the living prey of these devourers? Were the life and limbs of holy creatures made to become heaps of agonizing carnage? Or would their flesh and bones have been given up to be crushed and churned between the jaws of panthers and leopards, sharks and crocodiles? Let brutes be content to prey on their fellow brutes, but let man be their lord and ruler.

"If man were not fallen, would there have been so many tribes of the serpent kind, armed with deadly venom? Would such subtle and active mischiefs have been made and sent to dwell in a world of innocents? And would the race of all these murderers and destructive animals have been propagated for six thousand years, in any province of God's dominion, had not its rational inhabitants been in rebellion against God?" (p. 24.)

"What are the immense flights of locusts which darken the sky, and lay the fields desolate? What are the armies of hornets or musquitoes that frequently make a pleasant land almost intolerable? If they are found in the heats of Afric, and of the East and West Indies, one would think they should not infest the Polar regions, if the Creator had not designed them for a scourge to the nations on all sides of the globe.

"What are the innumerable host of caterpillars, but so many messengers of the anger of God against a sinful race? And since we can neither resist nor subdue them, we may certainly infer, that we are not now such favourites of Heaven as God at first made us." (p. 25.)

"The troublesome and pernicious tribes of animals, both of large and smaller size, which are fellow commoners with us on this great globe, together with our impotence to prevent or escape their mischiefs, is a sufficient proof that we are not in the full favour and love of the God that made us; and that he has quartered his armies, his legions, among us, as princes do in a rebellious province.

"It is true, all these are trials for man during his state of probation. But a state of probation for innocent man would not have included death; much less a violent and bloody, or a lingering and painful death." (p. 26.) "Accordingly, our return to dust is mentioned by Moses as a curse of God for the sin of man. And when once life is forfeited by all mankind, then a painful death may properly become a part of the farther trial of such creatures as are to rise again; and any pious sufferers may be rewarded by a happy resurrection. But a painful death could never be made a part of the trial of innocent creatures, who had never forfeited life, nor were ever legally subjected to death." (p. 27.)

"Upon the whole, therefore, such noxious and destructive plants and animals could not be made to vex and disturb, to poison and destroy, a race of innocent intellectual beings.

"3. The manner of our entrance into life is another proof of universal sin." (p. 29.) "Would the great and good God have appointed intellectual

animals, had they been sinless, to be propagated in such a way as should necessarily give such exquisite pain and anguish to the mothers who bring them forth? And if the contagion had not been universal, why should such acute pangs attend almost every female parent? Are not the multiplied sorrows with which the daughters of Eve bring forth, an evident token that they are not in their original state of favour with that God who created them, and pronounced a blessing upon them in their propagation?*

“Moses informs us, that God blessed the first pair, and bid them, ‘be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it:’ and soon after tells us that these ‘multiplied sorrows’ in child-birth are a curse from an offended God. Surely the curse is not as old as the blessing; but sin and sorrow came in together, and spread a wide curse over the birth of man, which before stood only under a divine benediction. Not that the blessing is now quite taken away, though the pains of child-bearing are added to it: And daily experience proves, this curse is not taken away by the blessing repeated to Noah.” (p. 29.)

“4. Let us consider, in the next place, how the generality of mankind are preserved in life. Some few have their food without care or toil: But the millions of human creatures, in all the nations of the earth, are constrained to support a wretched life by hard labour. What dreadful risks of life or limbs do multitudes run, to purchase their necessary food! What waste of the hours of sweet repose, what long and slavish and painful toils by day, do multitudes sustain, in order to procure their daily nourishment! It is ‘by the sweat of their brows’ they obtain ‘their bread:’ It is by a continual exhausting their spirits, that many of them are forced to relieve their own hunger, and to feed their helpless offspring.” (p. 30.)

“If we survey the lower ranks of mankind even in England, in a land of freedom and plenty, a climate temperate and fertile, which abounds with corn and fruits, and rich variety of food; yet what a hard shift do ten thousand families make to support life! Their whole time is devoured by bodily labour, and their souls almost eaten up with gnawing cares, to answer that question, What shall I eat, and what shall I drink? even in the poorest and coarsest manner? But if we send our thoughts to the sultry regions of Africa, the frost and snows of Norway, the rocks and deserts of Lapland and northern Tartary,—what a frightful thing is human life! How is the rational nature lost in slavery, and brutality, and incessant toils, and hardships! They are treated like brutes by their lords, and they live like dogs and asses, among labours and wants, hunger and weariness, blows and burdens without end. Did God appoint this for innocents?” (p. 31.)

“Is the momentary pleasure of eating and drinking a recompense for incessant labour? Does it bear any proportion to the length of toil, pain, and hazard wherewith the provisions of life are procured? Moses thought not. When he speaks of man’s ‘eating bread in the sweat of his brow,’ he acknowledges this to be another of the curses of God for the sin of man.” (p. 32.)

“It is strange that any man should say, ‘In this sentence of God, no curse is pronounced upon either Adam’s body, soul, or posterity; that the sorrow of child-bearing is not inflicted as a curse; that the labours of life were increased, but not as a curse; that death was not a curse.’ I would fain ask, What is a curse, if some natural evil pronounced and executed upon a person, or thing, be not so, especially when it is pronounced on account of sin, and by God himself, as supreme Governor and Judge? And even the curse on the ground falls properly on the person who tills it.

“It is granted, God can turn curses into blessings. Yet these evils were

* “The author has been censured here for not dropping a tear over the fair sex, under their sorrows and acute pains. But he imagines he has been dropping tears in every page, and that over every part of mankind.” Undoubtedly he has; and if so, how unjust, how cruel, is that censure!

originally pronounced and inflicted as a curse or punishment of sin; as it is written, 'Cursed is every one who continueth not in all things.' And that death was designed as a curse on man for sin is evident; for Christ 'suffered' that 'curse for us.'

"5. Consider the character of mankind in general, with regard to religion and virtue, and it will be hard to believe they bear the image of their common Father in knowledge and holiness. Some, I grant, are renewed in his image; but the bulk of the world are of another stamp, and sufficiently show, there is some fatal contagion spread through this province of God's dominion. So St. John tells us, that, except the few who are 'born of God, the whole world lieth in wickedness.'" (p. 33.)

"And can we think of that gross and stupid ignorance of God, which reigns through vast tracts of Asia, Africa, and America, and the thick darkness which buries all the Heathen countries, and reduces them almost to brutes; can we think of the abominable idolatries, the lewd and cruel rites of worship, which have been spread through whole nations; the impious and ridiculous superstitions which are now practised among the greatest part of the world; and yet believe the blessed God would put such wretched, polluted workmanship out of his pure hands?" (p. 34.)

"Can we survey the desperate impiety and profaneness, the swearing, and cursing, and wild blasphemy, that is practised, day and night, among vast multitudes of those who profess to know the true God; can we behold that almost universal neglect of God, of his fear, his worship, and the obedience due to him, which is found even among them who are called Christians; and yet imagine, that these bear that image of God in which they were created?"

"Nor have men forgot God only, but they seem also to have abandoned their duties to their fellow creatures also. Hence the perpetual practices of fraud and villany in the commerce of mankind, the innumerable instances of oppression and cruelty which run through the world; the pride and violence of the great; the wrath, ambition, and tyranny of princes, and the endless iniquities and mischiefs that arise from malice, envy, and revenge, in lower people. If we add to these the impure scenes of lust and intemperance, which defy the day and pollute the darkness; with the monstrous barbarities which are continually committed by the Heathen savages in Africa and America, (some of whom kill and roast their fellow creatures, and eat up men as they eat bread,) and by the Christian savages in the inquisition established in Asia, as well as in many parts of Europe; can we still imagine that mankind abide in that state, wherein they came from the hands of their Maker?" (p. 35.)

"That far the greatest number of men are evil, was the known sentiment of the wiser Heathens." (p. 37.) "They saw and bewailed the undeniable fact, though they knew not how to account for it. *Οι πλειονες κακοι*, 'Most men are wicked,' was a common observation among them. Even the poets could not but see this obvious truth. So Virgil brings in Anchises, telling his son, 'Few are happy in the other world:—

Pauci læta arva tenemus.

And in this life, Horace remarks of men in general,—

Nitimur in vitium semper, cupimusque negata.

'We are always desiring and pursuing forbidden things.' Nay, he says,—

Vitiis nemo sine nascitur.

'No man is born without vices;' and gives this character of young men in general,—

Cercus in vitium flecti, monitoribus asper.

Seneca says just the same,—

Pejora juvenes facile præcepta audiunt.

‘Young men readily hearken to evil counsels: they are soft as wax to be moulded into vice, but rough and rugged to their best monitors.’” (p. 38.)

“Juvenal abounds with the same account of human nature:—

Quæ tam festa dies, ut cesset prodere furem?

Ad mores natura recurrit

Damnatos, fixa et mutari nescia.

*Quisnam hominum est, quem tu contentum videris uno
Flagitio?*

Dociles imitandis

*Turpibus et pravis omnes sumus.**

“6. And not only they of riper age, but even those of tender years, discover the principles of iniquity and seeds of sin. What young ferments of spite and envy, what native wrath and rage, are found in the little hearts of infants, and sufficiently discovered by their hands, and eyes, and countenances, before they can speak, or know good from evil! What additional crimes of lying and deceit, obstinacy and perverseness proceed to blemish their younger years!” (pp. 39, 41.)

“How little knowledge or thought of God, their Creator and Governor, is found in children when they can distinguish good and evil!” (p. 42.) “What an utter disregard of Him that made them, and of the duties they owe to him! And when they begin to act according to their childish age, how little sense have they of what is morally right and good! How do evil passions or irregular appetites continually prevail in them! Even from their first capacity of acting as moral creatures, how are they led away to practise falsehood and injury to their play fellows, perhaps with cruelty or revenge! How often are they engaged in bold disobedience to their parents or teachers! And whence does this arise! What is the root, that brings forth such early bitter fruit?” (p. 43.)

“It cannot be imputed to custom, education, or example; for many of these things appear in children before they can take any notice of ill examples, or are capable of imitating them. And even where there are only good examples about them, and where the best and earliest instructions are given them, and inculcated with the utmost care, yet their hearts run astray from God. The far greatest part of them visibly follow the corrupt influences of sense, appetite, passion, and manifest very early the evil principles of stubbornness, pride, and disobedience.” (p. 44.)

“To give a still fuller confirmation of this truth, that mankind have a corrupt nature in them, let it be observed, that where persons have not only had all possible helps of education from their parents, but have themselves taken a religious turn betimes, what perpetual hinderance do they find within themselves!” (p. 45.) “What inward oppositions work in their heart, and, perhaps, interrupt their holy course of life! What vanity of mind, what irregular appetites, what forgetfulness of God, what evil thoughts and tendencies of heart rise up in contradiction to their best purposes! Inasmuch, that ‘there is not a just man upon earth, who,’ through his whole life, ‘doeth good and sinneth not.’” (p. 46.)

“To sum up the three last considerations: if the bulk of mankind are grossly sinful, and if every individual, without exception, is actually a sinner against the law of his Creator; if sinful propensities appear even in our most tender years, and every child becomes an actual sinner almost as soon as it becomes a moral agent; then we have just reason to conclude, that there is some original taint spread through the whole race of men from their birth.

“7. It has been said, indeed, that ‘if the first man fell into sin, though he was innocent and perfect, then among a million of men, every one might sin, though he was as innocent and perfect as Adam.’” (p. 47.)

[*What day is so sacred as not to disclose some thief?

Nature, fixed and incapable of change, recurs to condemned habits. Whom have you ever seen content to stop at a single crime?

In imitating what is base and wicked we are all apt scholars.]

“ I answer, There is a bare possibility of the event; but the improbability of it is in the proportion of a million to one.

“ And I prove it thus: If a million of creatures were made in an equal probability to stand or fall; and if all the numbers, from one to one million inclusively, were set in a rank, it is a million to one that just any single proposed number of all these should fall by sin. Now, the total sum is one of these numbers, that is, the last of them; consequently, it is a million to one against the supposition that the whole number of men should fall.

“ And yet farther, if they were all made (as the goodness of God seems to require) in a greater probability of standing than falling, then it is abundantly more than a million to one, that all should sin without exception. And the argument grows still ten thousand times stronger, if we suppose ten thousand millions to have lived since the creation.” (p. 48.)

“ 8. That man is a fallen creature, appears farther from hence: no man is able by his present natural powers to perform that law of his Creator which is still written upon his heart.” (p. 49.)

“ Does not this law require us to love God with all our heart, to do to others as we would they should do to us, and to govern our senses, appetites, and passions by the rules of reason? Does it not require that these things, whether they regard God, ourselves, or others, should be done perfectly, without defect? Doth it not demand, that we should fear, honour, and trust the great God, and obey all his will in a perfect manner? Doth it not prescribe constant justice, truth, and goodness, toward our neighbour, without one covetous wish, one act of the will, or tongue, or hand, contrary to truth or love? Does it not demand that every sense, appetite, and passion, should be perfectly subject to reason? Now, is there a man on earth, who can say, ‘ I am able by my natural powers to do this?’ ” (p. 50.)

“ Even the outward temptations to which man is exposed, are evidently too strong to be effectually and constantly resisted by his now enfeebled reason and conscience; while at the same time, his will, his appetites, and passions, have a powerful propensity to comply with them.” (p. 51.)

“ Now, would a just, a wise, and a merciful God have formed intellectual creatures in such a wretched state, with powers and capacities so much below their duties, that they break his law daily and continually, and are not able to help it!” (p. 52.)

“ Should it be said, ‘ God cannot require more than we are able to perform:’ you have an answer in your own bosom; for you know and feel God does require this, even by the law he has written in your heart; yet you feel you are not able to perform it, untie or cut the knot how you may.

“ Should it be said again, ‘ God pities and pardons feeble creatures:’ I answer, (1.) According to the covenant of grace, he does, but not according to the law of creation. But, (2.) Did God make some of his noblest creatures so feeble in their original state, as continually to offend, and want pardon? Did he give them such a law as should never, never be fulfilled by any one of them? Would a God, who adjusts the proportions of all things with the exactest wisdom, give a law to his creatures so disproportionate to their original powers, that, even in the state of their creation, they are under a necessity of breaking it, and stand in need of daily forgiveness? Does not this single consideration prove, that man is now a degenerate being, and not such as he was at first created, by the wise, the righteous, the merciful God!” (p. 54.)

“ If you, who are most unwilling to acknowledge the fall of man, would but look into yourself daily, and observe all the sinful and irregular turns of your own heart; how propense you are to folly, in greater or less instances; how soon appetite and passion oppose reason and conscience; how frequently you fall short of the demand of the perfect law of God; how thoughtless and forgetful you are of your Creator; how cold and languishing your affection to Him; how little delight you have in virtue, or in communion with God: could you think you are such an innocent and holy creature as God at first created you? and that you have been such even from your childhood? Surely

a more accurate observation of your own heart must convince you, that you yourself are degenerated from the first rectitude of your nature." (p. 55.)

"9. Another proof of the degeneracy of mankind is this: they are evidently under the displeasure of God, which could not be in their primeval state. As we have taken a short view of the sins of men, let us also briefly survey the miseries of mankind, and see how these consist with their being in the favour of God." (p. 56.)

"Think on the thousands of rational creatures descending hourly to the grave: a few, by some sudden stroke; but far the greater part by painful and slow approaches. The grave! A dark and shameful prison! which would never have been made for creatures persisting in innocence, and abiding in the favour of Him that gave them life and being. Death is the wages of sin; and from this punishment of sin, none of mankind can claim a discharge.

"Had they stood, can we think any of them would have died; much less every one of them? And, especially, that half the human race should have been doomed to die before seven years old? before they reach the tenth part of the present age of man, or have done any thing in life worth living for?" (p. 57.)

"But let us proceed to other miseries that attend us, and hasten us down to the grave:—

"Think next of the multitudes that are racked day and night by the gout and stone, the colic and rheumatism, and all manner of acute and painful diseases; and then say, Would a merciful God have contrived these torments for sinless creatures? Think of the dismal scenes of war and bloodshed that have by times overspread all nations! Cast your thought on a field of battle, where thousands of men are destroyed like brute beasts, and perish by sharp and bloody strokes, or by the fatal engines of death. See thousands more lie on the cold ground, with their flesh and limbs battered and torn, wounded and panting in extreme anguish, till the murmuring soul takes its flight. Are these the signals of their Maker's love, and of his image in which they were created?" (p. 58.)

"Think of the numbers that are swallowed up in the mighty waters, by the rage of stormy winds and seas; review the multitudes which have been swept away by the pestilence, or consumed by the tedious agonies of famine. Would famine and pestilence, with all the train of lingering horrors which attend them, have ever been made for innocent creatures, to have swept away whole nations of them, of every age and sex, men, women, and children, without distinction?" (p. 59.)

"Think yet again what numbers of men have been crushed into miseries and death, and buried by earthquakes; or have had their bones broken, their limbs disjointed, and their flesh painfully battered by the fall of houses; perhaps buried alive in the ruins of entire towns or villages, while their neighbours have been drowned in multitudes by the dismal eruptions of water, or destroyed by deluges of liquid fire bursting out of the earth: would a God of goodness and justice have treated innocent creatures in this manner?" (p. 60.)

"Carry your thoughts to the countries of those savages, where thousands of their conquered enemies, or prisoners of war, are offered in sacrifice to their idols, or tortured and roasted to death by slow fires! Add this to all the former miseries, and then let calm reflection say, whether this world does not look like a province half forsaken of its gracious Governor.

"Some, perhaps, will say, It is but a small part of mankind who are involved in these dreadful calamities; and they may suffer peculiar afflictions for their own personal iniquities." (p. 61.)

"I answer: Take a just survey of those who have suffered thus, and there is not the least reason to think they were sinners above others. Do not these calamities spread through whole countries, and involve the best and the worst of men together! Whole nations suffer by them at once. And, indeed, such is the corruption of human nature, that wherever they come they find none innocent. And it is the general situation of mankind, under the just displeasure of God, which exposes them to such destruction.

“But to proceed: Think of the innumerable common misfortunes that attend human life. What multitudes perish by these in one week! And how much larger a number do these accidents injure, and fill their lives with pain, though they are not brought immediately to the grave! Think of the mischiefs which one part of mankind, in every place, are continually contriving or practising against the other. Take a view of these extensive and reigning evils, and then say, whether this world be not a part of the creation of God, which bears plain marks of its Creator’s displeasure.” (p. 62.)

“Much is added to the heap of human miseries by the sorrows that arise from the daily loss of our dearest comforts. What groans and wailings of the living surround the pillows of dying friends or relations! What symptoms of piercing distress attend the remains when they are conveyed to the grave! By such losses, the comforts of future life lose their relish, and the sorrows are doubly embittered.” (p. 63.)

“In the civilized parts of the world, there is scarce one person sick or in pain, miserable or dying, but several others sustain a considerable share of misery, by the strong ties of nature or friendship. This diffuses a personal calamity through whole families. This multiplies human miseries into a new and endless number. Add to this, not only the unkindness or falsehood of those from whom we expected the tenderest affection, but the anguish which springs from all our own uneasy and unruly passions. Bring in here all the wrath and resentment in the hearts of men; all the envy and malice that burn within; all the imaginary fears, and the real terrors, of future distress coming upon us; all the rage and despair of lost blessings that were once within our hopes, and all the ferments of animal nature, which torment the spirit all day, and forbid our nightly repose. Would mankind be in such a condition as this, if they were still in the favour of their Maker?” (p. 64.)

“Yes; men may make miseries for themselves, and be punished by them. But compare the sorrows which any man necessarily suffers, with the comforts he enjoys, and the one will balance the other. Or if his sorrows outweigh his comforts, this may be necessary in a state of trial; and God will reward the overbalance of sufferings hereafter.’

“I answer: There is no reason to think the far greater part of mankind will have any reward hereafter; and if not, how shall we account for this overbalance of sufferings with regard to them! Therefore, we cannot reasonably impute their superior sorrows merely to their being in a state of probation; but rather to the displeasure of the righteous Creator and Governor of the world.” (pp. 65, 66.)

“10. To make this still clearer: not only those who are grown up in the practice of iniquity, who may be punished by their own sins, but all mankind, in their very infancy, bear the tokens of God’s displeasure.

“Before children are capable of committing sin, they are subject to a thousand miseries. What anguish and pain are they frequently exposed to, even as they are coming into the world, and as soon as they are entered into it! What agonies await their birth! What numerous and acute maladies are ready to attack them! What gripes, what convulsions, what inward torments, which bring some of them down to death within a few hours or days after they have begun to live! And if they survive a few months, what torture do they find in breeding their teeth, and other maladies of infancy, which can be told only by shrieks and tears, and that for whole days and nights together! What additional pains do they often sustain by the negligence of their mothers, or cruelty of their nurses! whereby many of them are brought down to the grave, either on a sudden, or by slow and painful degrees.” (p. 67.)

“And what shall we say of whole nations in elder times, and some even at this day, who, when they cannot, or will not, maintain them, expose their children in the woods to be torn and devoured by the next wild beast that passes by? Add to this the common calamities in which infants are involved by fire, earthquake, pestilence. And there are a thousand other accidents

which attend them, whereby their members, their natural powers, receive dismal injuries; so that, perhaps, they drag on life with blindness, deafness, lameness, or distortion of body or limbs. Sometimes they languish on to manhood, or even old age, under sore calamities, which began almost as soon as their being, and which are only ended by death." (p. 68.)

"Now as these sufferings cannot be sent upon them to correct their personal sins, so neither are they sent as a trial of their virtue; for they have no knowledge of good or evil. Yet we see multitudes of these little, miserable beings. And are these treated as innocent creatures; or rather, as under some general curse, involved in some general punishment?" (p. 69.)

"But may not these sufferings of children be for the punishment of the sins of their parents?"

"Not with any justice or equity, unless the sins of the parents are imputed to their children. Besides, many of the parents of these suffering children are dead or absent, so as never to know it. And how in these cases can it be a punishment for their parents' sin, any otherwise than as it is a general punishment for the sin of their first parent?" (p. 71.)

"But God recompenses them for these sufferings hereafter. Where does the Scripture affirm this? Besides, many of them grow up to manhood. And if they prove wicked, and are sent to hell at last, what recompense have they for their infant sufferings? Or will you say, God punished them before they had sinned, because he knew beforehand they would sin? Yet farther: What wise or good design can this their punishment answer, when no creature can know what they are punished for, if it be not for that which affects all mankind?"

"But how are such miseries reigning among his creatures consistent with the goodness of God? Perfectly well, if we consider mankind as a sinful, degenerate part of God's creation. It is most abundant goodness that they have any comforts left, and that their miseries are not doubled. Now, the inspired writers do consider mankind as fallen from God; and so his goodness is evident in a thousand instances; though it must be confessed there are also a thousand instances of his just hatred of sin, and his righteous punishments among all nations." (p. 73.)

"11. If we put together all these scenes of vice and misery, it is evident that creatures lying in such deplorable circumstances are not such as they came out of the hands of their Creator, who is wise, holy, and good. His wisdom, which is all harmony and order, would not suffer him to frame a whole race of beings, under such wild and innumerable disorders, moral as well as natural; his holiness would not permit him to create beings with innate principles of iniquity; nor his goodness to produce a whole order of creatures in such circumstances of pain, torment, and death." (p. 74.)

"Could the holy and blessed God originally design and frame a whole world of intelligent creatures in such circumstances, that every one of them, coming into being, according to the laws of nature, in a long succession of ages, in different climates, of different constitutions and tempers, and in ten thousand different stations and conditions of life; that every one of them should break the laws of reason, and more or less defile themselves with sin! that every one should offend his Maker! every one become guilty in his sight! every one expose himself to God's displeasure, to pain, and misery, and mortality, without one single exception! If men were such creatures as God at first made them, would not one man among so many millions have made a right use of his reason and conscience, and so have avoided sin and death! Would this have been the universal consequent of their original constitution, as framed by the hand of a wise, holy, merciful God! What can be more absurd to imagine than this! Surely God made man upright and happy; nor could all these mischiefs have come directly from our Creator's hand." (pp. 75, 76.)

"Is it objected, that 'still the greater part of men have more moral good than evil in them, and have more pleasure than pain; and therefore, on the whole, mankind is not sinful and miserable; and that even the best human

constitutions lay some innocent persons under unavoidable hardships? I answer, (1.) In order to pronounce a man miserable, he must have more pain than pleasure; but in order to pronounce a man a sinner, there is no need that his moral evil should exceed his good. If a man had a hundred virtues, one vice would make him a criminal in the sight of God; one transgression of the law of his Creator would lay him under his just displeasure. He that keeps the whole law, except in one point, affronts that authority which requires all obedience. All men, therefore, are under this condemnation; they are sinners, every one of them." (p. 77.)

"As to misery, let it be supposed, (though by no means granted,) that there are many whose pleasures exceed their uneasiness; yet it is certain there are more whose pains and uneasiness far exceed their pleasures; and it is hard to conceive how this should be, if all men were innocent and happy by nature." (p. 78.)

"I answer, (2.) Men are not able to frame such constitutions in every case, as shall secure happiness to all the innocent. Their narrow views of things do not enable them to provide against all future inconveniences. But it is not thus with the Creator and Governor of all things. He views at once all possibles and all futures. Therefore, he is well able to guard against any inconvenience that might befall innocent beings.

"I answer, (3.) Though the bulk of mankind were happy in the present constitution of things, this gives no manner of satisfaction to any one individual who is unhappy without any demerit: The advantage of the majority is no reason at all why any one innocent should suffer. If any one, therefore, man or child, and much more, if numbers of them, have more pain than pleasure, they must be involved in some guilt, which may give just occasion to their misery." (p. 79.)

"12. To enforce this, after the survey of these pains and sorrows, let us consider what are the pleasures of the bulk of mankind. Cast a glance at the sports of children, from five to fifteen years of age. What toys and fooleries are these! Would a race of wise and holy beings waste so many years of early life in such wretched trifles! And as for our manly years, what are the greatest part of the delights of men, but silly and irrational, if not grossly sinful! What are the pleasures even of the rich and great, to relieve them under the common sorrows of life! If they be not luxury and intemperance, are they not furniture and equipage, finery of dress and gay appearances! to shine in silks of various dye, and blaze in the splendour of gold and jewels! Now, would wise and holy creatures have made this the matter of their joy and pleasure: 'My coat is gayer than yours, and I have more glittering things about me than you have?'" (pp. 80, 81.)

"Others call for cards, or dice, to divert their trouble, and pass away their time. How inexpressibly trifling are these sports, if mere diversion be sought therein! But if the design be gain, how is the game mingled with uneasy fears, with the working of various passions, which, in case of disappointment and loss, often break out into wrath and fury!

"Again: What multitudes drench themselves in gross sensualities as their chief delight! They make a god of their belly, till they overload nature, and make haste to disease and death. They drown their cares and their senses together; or they bury them in sensual impurities." (p. 82.)

"Others release themselves from the troubles of life, by gadding abroad, and mixing with impertinent company. Some delight in wanton jests, in foolish merriment, in mean and trifling conversation; a little above the chattering of monkeys in a wood, or the chirping of crickets upon a hearth. Nay, perhaps it is their diversion to rail at their neighbours, to murder the reputation of the absent. This is their mirth and recreation; these their reliefs against the common miseries of human life!" (p. 83.)

"But would a race of innocent beings fly to such mean and foolish, or criminal, refuges from pain as these! Would they pursue such vain or vile delights! Would they become rivals to the beasts of the field, or sport

themselves, as devils do, in accusing their fellow creatures? Surely, if we survey the very pleasures, as well as the sorrows, of the bulk of mankind, we may learn from thence, that we are by no means such creatures as we were originally created.

"13. I need add but one more proof of the general ruin of human nature. We are all posting to the grave. Every one of us are succeeding our neighbours, into some unknown, invisible world. And we all profess to believe this. Yet how exceeding few are solicitous about this great and awful futurity! Though we are exposed to so many sins and miseries in this life, and are hastening visibly and hourly to the end of it, yet how few are there that make any careful preparation for a better state than this! What multitudes are daily running down into darkness, speeding to an endless duration in an unknown country, without any earnest inquiries about their manner of existence there! They walk over the busy stage of life, they toil and labour, or play and trifle awhile here, and then plunge into a strange unseen world, where they will meet with a just and holy God, whose wisdom will assign them a place and portion suited to their own character. Now, were men indeed wise and holy, could they remain so ignorant and thoughtless of that state into which they are all hastening? Or could a gracious God create a race of beings in such a stupid insensibility of their eternal interests, so unsuited to the felicities of an immortal spirit, and so negligent of all preparations for them?" (pp. 84, 85.)

"Upon this whole survey, reason must join in this mournful confession,—that there must be some spreading poison which has tainted our nature, made us so sinful and miserable, so thoughtless of the future, and unprepared for it. There must have been some general revolt of mankind from their Creator, whereby they have ruined their innocence and peace, and provoked the anger of their Maker; whereby they become exposed to such wretched circumstances, even in their infancy and childhood, as well as when they grow to years of ripe understanding." (p. 86.)

"And, methinks, when I take a just survey of this world, with all the inhabitants of it, I can look upon it no otherwise than as a grand and magnificent structure in ruins, wherein lie millions of rebels against their Creator, under condemnation to misery and death; who are at the same time sick of a mortal distemper, and disordered in their minds even to distraction. Hence proceed those numberless follies and vices which are practised here, and the righteous anger of an offended God visible in ten thousand instances. Yet are there proclamations of divine grace, health, and life, sounding among them; though very few take any notice thereof. Only here and there one attends to the call, and complies with the proposals of peace. His sins are pardoned and healed. And though his body goes down to the dust for a season, his soul is happy with God; while the bulk of those criminals, despising all the offers of mercy, perish in their own wilful madness." (pp. 89, 90.)

"What is the chief temptation that leads some men to deny so glaring a truth? Is it that they cannot give a satisfactory account of some of the difficulties that attend it? Nay, many even of the Heathen philosophers believed it, from their own experience, and their daily survey of mankind; though they were utterly at a loss how to account for it. And what, if we could not assign a sufficient and satisfactory reason for it, or show how this spreading degeneracy began, or how it came to take place so universally? What, if we were still at a loss to explain how all this guilt and misery came upon us,—must we therefore deny the things which we see, and hear, and feel, daily?" (p. 91.)

"Can we account for all the secret things in the creation of God? And must we deny whatever we cannot account for? Does any man refuse to believe that the infinite variety of plants and flowers, in all their beautiful colours and forms, grow out of the same earth, because he does not know all the springs of their vegetation? Do men doubt of a loadstone's drawing iron to itself, because they cannot find out the way of its operation? Are we not

sure that food nourishes our bodies, and medicines relieve our pains? Yet we know not all the ferments and motions of those atoms by which we are relieved and nourished. Why then should we deny that degeneracy of our nature which admits of so full and various proof, though we are not able to account for every circumstance relating to it, or to solve every difficulty that may attend it?" (p. 92.)

QUESTION II.

"How came vice and misery to overspread mankind in all nations, and in all ages!"

"Heathen philosophers could never answer this; but Christians may from the oracles of God." (p. 94.)

"These inform us, that the first man was a 'common head and representative of all mankind;' and that he, by sinning against his Maker, lost his own holiness and happiness, and exposed himself and his posterity (whom he naturally produced, and whom he legally represented) to the displeasure of his Maker, and so spread sin and misery through his whole offspring. (p. 102.)

"So St. Paul: 'As by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; even so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned,' Rom. v, 12. All are esteemed in some sort guilty before God, though they 'did not sin after the similitude of Adam's transgression.' 'They did not commit actual personal sin against a known law, as Adam did.'" (p. 104.)

"This may more fully appear from the following particulars:—

"1. It is plainly taught us in Scripture, that God at first created one man and woman, called Adam and Eve; and from them is derived the whole race of mankind. God 'hath made of one blood,' as the Apostle observes, 'all nations of men, to dwell on all the face of the earth.'" (p. 159.)

"2. God created man at first in a holy and happy state,—in his own likeness, and in his favour. 'And God said, Let us make man in our own image, after our own likeness,' Gen. i, 26. And that none of the brute creation might molest him, but all of them be for his service, he said, 'Let them have dominion over the fish, and the fowl, and the cattle.' 'So God created man in his own image.' And what this image consisted in, beside his spiritual and immortal nature, and his dominion over other creatures, we are told by St. Paul, where he speaks of 'the new man, which,' says he, 'after God,' that is, after the likeness of God, 'is created in righteousness and true holiness,' Eph. iv, 24. So Solomon assures us, God 'made man upright.' 'And Moses says, when God had finished all his creation, 'God saw every thing that he had made, and, behold, it was very good.' It was all according to his idea and his will, and wellpleasing in his sight. Man, the last of his creatures, as well as all the rest, 'was very good;' was holy and happy.'" (pp. 160, 161.)

"3. God originally appointed that Adam, when innocent, should produce an offspring in his own holy image; and, on the other hand, that if he sinned, he should propagate his kind in his own sinful image. The former is allowed. The latter may be gathered from Gen. v, 1-3, 5: 'In the day that God created man, in the likeness of God made he him:—and Adam lived a hundred and thirty years' after his loss of the image of God, 'and begat a son in his own likeness, after his image;' that is, his own sinful and mortal image.

"It is not to be supposed, that Moses, in this brief history of the first generations of men, should so particularly repeat 'the image and likeness of' God in which Adam was created, unless he had designed to set the comparison in a fair light, between Adam's begetting a son in his own *sinful and mortal image*, whereas he himself was created in God's *holy and immortal image*.'" (p. 162.)

"4. God was pleased to put the man whom he had made upon a trial of his obedience for a season. He placed him in a garden of Eden, (or pleasure,) and gave him a free use of all the creatures; only forbidding him to eat of the fruit of one tree,—the tree of the knowledge of good and evil."

‘For in the day,’ said he, ‘that thou eatest of it, thou shalt surely die.’ In which threatening were doubtless included all evils,—death spiritual, temporal, and eternal.” (p. 163.)

“5. As Adam was under a law whose sanction threatened death upon disobedience, so doubtless God favoured him with a covenant of life, and a promise of life and immortality upon his obedience.” (p. 164.)

“6. Adam broke the law of his Maker, lost his image and his favour, forfeited the hope of immortality, and exposed himself to the wrath of God, and all the punishment which he had threatened; in consequence of which he was now painfully afraid of Him in whom he before delighted, and foolishly endeavoured to ‘hide himself from the presence of the Lord.’” (p. 168.)

“7. Adam, after his sin, propagated his kind according to the law of nature;—not in the moral image or likeness of God; not ‘in righteousness and true holiness;’ but in his own sinful likeness; with irregular passions, corrupt appetites and inclinations. To this degeneracy Job manifestly refers in those expressions: ‘What is man that he should be clean, or the son of man that he should be righteous? Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? Not one.’ And David says the same thing: ‘Behold, I was shapen in iniquity; and in sin did my mother conceive me.’” (pp. 170, 171.)

“This is not a hyperbolic aggravation of David’s early sins, and propensity to evil from his childhood. But the text is strong and plain in asserting sin some way to belong to his very conception, and to be conveyed from his natural parents; which is a different idea from his actual sins, or propensity to sin in his infancy. It shows the cause both of this propensity, and of his actual sins, which operated before he was born. So that if original pravity be not so conveyed and derived as is here asserted, the words are not an exaggeration of what is, but a downright fiction of what is not.

“8. As Adam produced his offspring, like himself, destitute of the image of God, so he produced them destitute of the favour of God, under the same condemnation with himself. So Job: ‘Man that is born of a woman is of few days, and full of trouble;’ xiv, 1; that is, his short life, and his troubles, proceed from his very birth; his propagation from sinful and mortal parents: Otherwise, God would not have appointed his noblest creature in this world to have been ‘born to trouble;’ Yet this is the case; ‘man is born to trouble as the sparks fly upward;’ Job v, 7; naturally; for it is owing to his birth and his natural derivation from a sinful stock. We are a miserable race, springing from a corrupted and dying root, prone to sin, and liable to sorrows and sufferings.” (pp. 174, 175.)

“In proof of this sentence of condemnation and death coming upon all mankind for the sin of Adam, we need only read from the twelfth verse of the fifth chapter of St. Paul’s Epistle to the Romans; on which I observe,” (p. 176.)—

“1. Here Adam and Christ are set up as distinct heads or representatives of their several families. Adam was the head of all mankind, who became sinful and mortal through his sin;—Christ was the head of all believers, who obtain pardon and life through his righteousness. ‘To prove this headship of Adam, the Apostle says, ‘Until the law,’ (that is, from the creation till the law of Moses,) ‘sin was in the world; but sin is not imputed where there is no law;’ that is, where there is no law or constitution of duty or penalty at all. Yet saith he, ‘Death reigned from Adam to Moses:’ Yet sin was imputed and punished by death, even upon all mankind, both small and great, before the law given by Moses. The inference is, therefore, there was some law or constitution during all the time from Adam to Moses, in virtue of which sin was imputed to mankind, and death accordingly executed upon them. Now, what law or constitution could this be, beside that which said to Adam, as a representative of his whole posterity, ‘In the day thou sinnest thou shalt die?’” (pp. 177, 178.)

“2. The Apostle carries his argument yet farther: ‘Sin was imputed, and death reigned,’ or was executed ‘even upon those who had not sinned after

the similitude of Adam's transgression; who had not broken an express command, as Adam had done. This manifestly refers to infants;—death reigned over them; death was executed upon them. And this must be by some constitution which, in some sense, imputed sin to them who had not committed actual sin: For without such a constitution, sin would never have been imputed, nor death executed on children.

"Yet, 3. Death did not come upon them as a mere natural effect of their father Adam's sin and death, but as a proper and legal punishment of sin; for it is said, his sin brought 'condemnation' upon all men. (Verse 18.) Now, this is a legal term, and shows that death is not only a natural but a penal evil, and comes upon infants as guilty and condemned;—not for their own actual sins, for they had none; but for the sin of Adam, their legal head, their appointed representative." (p. 179.)

"In the eighteenth verse the expression is very strong: 'By the offence of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation.' All the children of Adam, young and old, are condemned for his one offence. But farther:—

"4. In the original it is not, 'By the offence of one;' but, 'By one offence.' By the single offence of Adam, when he stood as the head of all his offspring, and brought sin and death upon them by his disobedience; as in the following verse: 'By one man's disobedience many were made,' or constituted, 'sinners;' that is, became liable to guilt and death. And so, in the sixteenth verse, one single offence is represented as condemning through Adam, and stands in opposition to the 'many offences' which are pardoned through Christ.

"5. There is a yet farther proof in this chapter, that Adam conveyed sin and death to his posterity, not merely as a natural parent, but as a common head and representative of all his offspring. As Adam and Christ are here said to be the two springs of sin and righteousness, of death and life to mankind, so the one is represented as a 'type' and 'figure' of the other. In this very respect Adam was a 'figure or type of Christ.' (Verse 14.) And for this very reason Christ is called 'the second Man, the last Adam.' (1 Cor. xv, 47-45.) As one was the spring of life, so the other was the spring of death, to all his seed or offspring." (p. 181.)

"Now, Christ is a spring of life, not only as he conveys sanctification or holiness to his seed, but as he procures for them justification and eternal life by his personal obedience. And so Adam is a spring of death, not only as he conveys an unholy nature to his seed, to all men, but as he brings condemnation to eternal death upon them, by his personal disobedience. And this is the chief thing which the Apostle seems to have in his eye, throughout the latter part of this chapter; the conveyance of condemnation and death to the seed of Adam, of justification and eternal life to the seed of Christ, by the means of what their respective heads or representatives had done.

"But some object: 'All the blessings which God gave at first to Adam consisted in these three particulars: (1.) The blessing of propagation: (2.) Dominion over the brutes: (3.) The image of God. But all these three are more expressly and emphatically pronounced to Noah and his sons, than to Adam in Paradise.'" (p. 183.)

"I answer, If we review the history and context, we shall find, the blessing of Adam, and that of Noah, very widely differ from each other, in all the three particulars mentioned." (p. 186.)

"1. The blessing of Adam relating to propagation was without those multiplied pains and sorrows which, after the first sin, fell upon women in bearing children. It was also a blessing of sustentation or nourishment, without hard toil and the sweat of his brow. It was a blessing without a curse on the ground, to lessen or destroy the fruitfulness thereof. It was a blessing without death, without returning to dust; whereas the blessing of Noah did not exclude death, no, nor the pains of child-birth, nor the earning our bread by the sweat of our brow.

"2. To Adam was given 'dominion over the brutes.' To Noah it was only said, 'The fear of you and the dread of you shall be upon every beast.' But

notwithstanding this fear and dread, yet they frequently sting men to death, or bite and tear them in pieces. Whereas no such calamity could ever have befallen innocent Adam, or his innocent offspring." (p. 187.)

"The 'image of God,' in which Adam was created, consisted eminently in righteousness and true holiness. But that part of the 'image of God' which remained after the fall, and remains in all men to this day, is the natural image of God, namely, the spiritual nature and immortality of the soul; not excluding the political image of God, or a degree of dominion over the creatures still remaining. But the moral image of God is lost and defaced, or else it could not be said to be 'renewed.' It is then evident, that the blessing given to Adam in innocency, and that given to Noah after the flood, differ so widely, that the latter was consistent with the condemnation or curse for sin, and the former was not. Consequently, mankind does not now stand in the same favour of God, as Adam did while he was innocent." (pp. 188, 189.)

"Thus it appears that the Holy Scriptures, both in the Old and New Testaments, give us a plain and full account of the conveyance of sin, misery, and death, from the first man to all his offspring."

THE FIRST ESSAY.

DO THE PRESENT MISERIES OF MAN ALONE PROVE HIS APOSTASY FROM GOD?

SECTION I.

A GENERAL SURVEY OF THE FOLLIES AND MISERIES OF MANKIND.

"UPON a just view of human nature, from its entrance into life, till it retires behind the curtain of death, one would be ready to say concerning man, 'Is this the creature that is so superior to the rest of the inhabitants of the globe, as to require the peculiar care of the Creator in forming him? Does he deserve such an illustrious description, as even the Heathen poet has given us of him?'

*Sanctius his animal, mentisque capaxius altæ
Deerat adhuc, et quod dominari in cætera posset.
Natus homo est; sive hunc divino semine cretum
Ille opifex rerum mundi melioris origo
Finxit in effigiem moderantium cuncta deorum.
Pronaque cum spectent animalia cætera terram;
Os homini sublime dedit; calumque tueri
Jussit, et erectos ad sidera tollere vultus.*

'A creature of a more exalted kind
Was wanting yet; and then was man design'd:
Conscious of thought, of more capacious breast,
For empire form'd, and fit to rule the rest.
Whether with particles of heavenly fire
The God of nature did his soul inspire,
And, moulding up a mass in shape like ours,
Form'd a bright image of the' all-ruling powers.
And while the mute creation downward bend
Their sight, and to their earthly mother tend,
Man looks aloft, and with erected eyes
Beholds his own hereditary skies.'

"Now, if man was formed in the image of God, certainly he was a holy and a happy being. But what is there like holiness or happiness now found, running through this rank of creatures? Are there any of the brutal kind that do not more regularly answer the design of their creation? Are there any brutes that we ever find acting so much below their original character, on the land, in the water, or the air, as mankind does all over the earth? Or are there any tribes among them, through which pain, vexation, and

misery are so plentifully distributed as they are among the children of men?" (pp. 359, 360, 361.)

"Were this globe of earth to be surveyed from one end to the other by some spirit of a superior order, it would be found such a theatre of folly and madness, such a maze of mingled vice and misery, as would move the compassion of his refined nature to a painful degree, were it not tempered by a clear sight of that wise and just Providence which strongly and sweetly works in the midst of all; and will, in the end, bring good out of all evil, and justify the ways of God with man." (p. 362.)

SECTION II.

A PARTICULAR VIEW OF THE MISERIES OF MAN.

"But, to waive for the present the sins and follies of mankind, may we not infer from his miseries alone, that we are degenerate beings, bearing the most evident marks of the displeasure of our Maker?" (p. 363.)

"View the histories of mankind; and what is almost all history but a description of the wretchedness of men, under the mischiefs they bring upon themselves, and the judgments of the great God! The scenes of happiness and peace are very thin set among all the nations; and they are rather a transient glimpse, here and there, than any thing solid and durable. But if we look over the universe, what public desolations by plague and famine, by storms and earthquakes, by wars and pestilence! What secret mischiefs reign among men, which pierce and torture the soul! What smarting wounds and bruises, what pains and diseases, attack and torment the animal frame?" (p. 364.)

"Where is the family of seven or eight persons wherein there is not one or more afflicted with some troublesome malady, or tiresome inconvenience? These indeed are often concealed by the persons who suffer them, and by the families where they dwell. But were they all brought together, what hospitals or infirmaries would be able to contain them?" (p. 365.)

"What toils and hardships, what inward anxieties and sorrows, disappointments and calamities, are diffused through every age and country! Do not the rich feel them as well as the poor? Are they not all teased with their own appetites, which are never satisfied! And their impetuous passions give them no rest. What keen anguish of mind arises from pride, and envy, and resentment! What tortures does ambition, or disappointed love, or wild jealousy, infuse into their bosoms! Meanwhile the poor, together with inward vexations and corroding maladies of the mind, sustain likewise endless drudgeries in procuring their necessary subsistence. And how many of them cannot, after all, procure even food to eat and raiment to put on!" (p. 366.)

"Survey man through every stage. See, first, what a figure he makes, at his entrance into life! 'This animal,' says Pliny, 'who is to govern the rest of the creatures, how he lies bound hand and foot, all in tears, and begins his life in misery and punishment!' If we trace the education of the human race, from the cradle to mature age, especially among the poor, who are the bulk of all nations, the wretchedness of mankind will farther appear. How are they every where dragged up in their tender age, through a train of nonsense, madness, and miseries! What millions of uneasy sensations do they endure in infancy and childhood, by reason of those pressing necessities, which, for some years, they can tell only in cries and groans, and which their parents are either so poor they cannot relieve, or so savage or brutish that they will not! How wretchedly are these young generations hurried on through the folly and weakness of childhood, till new calamities arise from their own ungoverned appetites and impetuous passions! As youth advances, the ferments of the blood rise higher, and the appetites and passions grow much stronger, and give more abundant vexation to the race of

mankind than they do to any of the brutal creation. And whereas the all-wise God, for kind reasons, has limited the gratification of these appetites by rules of virtue; perhaps those very rules, through the corruption of our nature, irritate mankind to greater excesses." (pp. 368, 369.)

"Would the affairs of human life, in infancy, childhood, and youth, have ever been in such a sore and painful situation, if man had been such a being as God at first made him, and had continued in the favour of his Maker? Could Divine wisdom and goodness admit of these scenes, were there not a degeneracy through the whole race, which, by the just permission of God, exerts itself some way or other in every stage of life?" (p. 370.)

"Follow mankind to the age of public appearance upon the stage of the world, and what shall we find there, but infinite cares, labours, and toil, attended with fond hopes almost always frustrated with endless crosses and disappointments, through ten thousand accidents that are every moment flying across this mortal stage! As for the poor, how does the sultry toil exhaust their lives in summer, and what starving wretchedness do they feel in winter! How is a miserable life sustained among all the pains and fatigues of nature, with the oppression, cruelty, and scorn of the rich!" (p. 371.)

"Let us follow on the tract to the close of life. What a scene is presented us in old age! How innumerable and how inexpressible are the disasters and sorrows, the pains and aches, the groans and wretchedness, that meet man on the borders of the grave, before they plunge him into it!

"And, indeed, is there any person on earth, high or low, without such distresses and difficulties, such crossing accidents and perplexing cares, such painful infirmities in some or other part of life, as must pronounce mankind, upon the whole, a miserable being? Whatever scenes of happiness seem to attend him, in any shining hour, a dark cloud soon casts a gloom over them, and the pleasing vision vanishes as a dream.

"And what are the boasted pleasures which some have supposed to balance the sorrows of life! Are not most of them owing, in a good degree, to some previous uneasiness! It is the pain of hunger which makes food so relishing; the pain of weariness that renders sleep so refreshing. And as for the blessings of love and friendship, among neighbours and kindred, do they not often produce as much vexation as satisfaction; not, indeed, of themselves, but by reason of the endless humours and follies, errors and passions, of mankind." (p. 373.)

"Again: do not the very pleasures of the body prove the ruin of ten thousand souls! They may be used with innocence and wisdom; but the unruly appetites and passions of men continually turn into a curse what God originally designed for a blessing." (p. 374.)

"Think again how short and transient are the pleasures of life in comparison of the pains of it! How vanishing the sweetest sensations of delight! But, in many persons and families, how many are the days, the months, the years, of fatigue, or pain, or bitter sorrow! What pleasure of the animal frame is either as lasting, or as intense, as the pain of the gout or stone! How small is the proportion of sensible pleasure to that of pain, or trouble, or uneasiness! And how far is it overbalanced by the maladies or miseries, the fears or sorrows, of the greatest part of mankind!

"As for intellectual pleasures, how few are there in the world who have any capacity for them! and among those few, how many differences and contentions! How many crossing objections, bewildered inquiries, and unhappy mistakes, are mingled with the enjoyment! so that 'He who increaseth knowledge increaseth sorrow,' saith the wisest of men; and upon the whole computation, he writes on this also, 'Vanity and vexation of spirit.'

"To talk, then, of real happiness to be enjoyed in this life, (abstracted from the foretaste of another,) is contrary to all the common sense and experience of every thinking man. Without this 'taste of the powers of the world to come,' I know not what wise man would willingly come into

these scenes of mortality, or go through them with any patience." (pp. 376, 377.)

"What, to be trained up from infancy under so many unavoidable follies, prejudices, and wretched delusions, through the power of flesh and sense! to be sunk into such gross ignorance both of our souls, our better selves, and of the glorious Being that made us! to lie under such heavy shades of darkness, such a world of mistakes and errors, as are mingled with our little faint glimpses, and low notices of God our Creator! What, to be so far distant from God, and to endure such a long estrangement from the wisest and best of Beings, in this foolish and fleshly state, with so few and slender communications with or from him!

"What, to feel so many powerful and disquieting appetites, so many restless and unruly passions, which want the perpetual guard of a jealous eye, and a strong restraint over them; otherwise they will be ever breaking out into some new mischief!

"What, to be ever surrounded with such delights of sense as are constant temptations to folly and sin! to have scarce any joys, but what we are liable to pay dear for, by an excessive or irregular indulgence! Can this be a desirable state, for any wise being, who knows what happiness is, to be united to such a disorderly machine of flesh and blood with all its uneasy and unruly ferments!" (p. 378.)

"Add to this another train of inbred miseries which attend this animal frame. What wise spirit would willingly put on such flesh and blood as ours, with all the springs of sickness and pain, anguish and disease, in it? What, to be liable to the racking disquietudes of gout and stone, and a thousand other distempers! to have nature worn out by slow and long aches and infirmities, and lie lingering many years on the borders of death, before we can find a grave!

"Solomon seems to be much of this mind, when, after a survey of the whole scheme of human life, in its variety of scenes, (without the views of hereafter,) he declares, 'I praised the dead who were already dead, more than the living who are yet alive,' Eccles. iv, 2. And, indeed, it appears that the miseries of life are so numerous as to overbalance all its real comforts, and sufficiently to show, that mankind now lie under evident marks of their Maker's displeasure, as being degenerated from that state of innocence wherein they were at first created." (pp. 380, 381.)

SECTION III.

OBJECTIONS ANSWERED.

"But it is objected, 'If human life in general is miserable, how is it that all men are so unwilling to die?'

"I answer, I. Because they fear to meet with more misery in another life than they feel in this. So our poet,—

•The weariest and most loathed worldly life
That pain, age, penury, and imprisonment
Can lay on nature, 'tis a paradise
To what we fear of death.'

"And, in another place:—

•If by the sleep of death we could but end
The heart-ache and the thousand natural shocks
That flesh is heir to, 'twere a consummation
Devoutly to be wish'd. O who would bear
The oppressor's wrongs, the proud man's contumely,
The insolence of office, and the spurns
That patient merit of the unworthy takes,
With all the long calamities of life;
When he himself might his *quietus* make
With a bare bodkin? Who would bear such burdens,

And groan and sweat under a weary life,
 But that the dread of something after death—
 That undiscover'd country, from whose bourne
 No traveller returns—puzzles the will,
 And makes us rather bear those ills we have,
 Than fly to others which are all unknown.'

"If, you say, 'But the Heathens knew nothing of a future life; and yet they too, in all their generations, have been unwilling to die; nor would they put an end to their own life, were it never so miserable;' I answer, Most of the ancient, as well as the modern, Heathens, had some notions of an after state, and some fears of punishment in another life for sins committed in this. And in the politer nations, they generally supposed self-murderers in particular would be punished after death." (pp. 384, 385.)

*Proxima deinde tenent masti loca, qui sibi lethum
 Insontes peperere manu, lucemque perosi
 Projecere animas. Quam vellent aethere in alto
 Nive et pauperiem et duros perferre labores!
 Fata obstant: Duraque palus immabilis unda
 Alligat, et novies Styx interfusa coeret.*

'The next in place and punishment are they
 Who prodigally throw their lives away.
 Fools, who, repining at their wretched state,
 And loathing anxious life, have hurried on their fate.
 With late repentance now they would retrieve
 The bodies they forsook, and wish to live:
 All pain and poverty desire to bear,
 To view the light of heaven, and breathe the vital air.
 But fate forbids; the Stygian floods oppose,
 And with nine circling streams the captive souls inclose.'

"I answer, 2. Suppose this love of life and aversion to death are found even where there is no regard to a future state, this will not prove that mankind is happy; but only that the God of nature hath wrought this principle into the souls of all men, in order to preserve the work of his own hands: So that reluctance against dying is owing to the natural principle of self-preservation, without any formed and sedate judgment, whether it is best to continue in this life or no, or whether life has more happiness or misery." (p. 386.)

"It may be objected, Secondly, 'If brutes suffer nearly the same miseries with mankind, and yet have not sinned, how can these miseries prove that man is an apostate being!'" (p. 389.)

"7. I answer: It is by reason of man's apostasy that even brute animals suffer. 'The whole creation groaneth together' on his account, 'and travaileth together in pain to this day.' For the brute 'creation was made subject to vanity,' to abuse, pain, corruption, death, 'not willingly,' not by any act of its own, 'but by reason of him that subjected it;' of God, who, in consequence of Adam's sin, whom he had appointed lord of the whole lower world, for his sake pronounced this curse, not only on the ground, but on all which was before under his dominion.

"The misery, therefore, of the brute creation is so far from being an objection to the apostasy of man, that it is a visible standing demonstration thereof: If beasts suffer, then man is fallen." (p. 389.)

SECTION IV.

THE APOSTASY OF MAN PROVED BY SCRIPTURE AND REASON.

"BUT whether or no the miseries of mankind alone will prove their apostasy from God, it is certain these, together with the sins of men, are an abundant proof that we are fallen creatures. And this I shall now endeavour to show, both from the express testimony of Scripture, from the necessity of renewing grace, and from a survey of the Heathen world." (pp. 409, 410.)

“First. The Scripture testifies that a universal degeneracy and corruption is come upon all the sons and daughters of Adam. ‘Every imagination of the thoughts of the heart of man is only evil continually;’ Gen. vi, 5; yea, ‘evil from his youth,’ Gen. viii, 21. ‘The Lord looked down from heaven upon the children of men, to see if there were any that did understand and seek God. They are gone out of the way; there is none that doeth good, no, not one,’ Psalm xiv, 2, 3. ‘There is not a just man upon earth, who doeth good, and sinneth not,’ Eccles. vii, 20. ‘All we like sheep have gone astray, we have turned every one to his own way;’ Isaiah liii, 6; different wanderings, but all wanderers. ‘There is none righteous, no, not one; there is none that doeth good, no, not one. Every mouth is stopped, and all the world become guilty before God. All are fallen short of the glory of God, because all have sinned,’ Romans iii, 10, 12, 19, 23. ‘If one died for all, then were all dead;’ 2 Cor. v, 14; that is, spiritually dead; ‘dead in trespasses and sins.’

“Now, can we suppose that all God’s creatures would universally break his law, run into sin and death, defile and destroy themselves, and that without any one exception, if it had not arisen from some root of bitterness, some original iniquity, which was diffused through them all, from their very entrance into the world? It is utterly incredible, that every single person, among the millions of mankind, should be born pure and innocent, and yet should all, by free and voluntary choice, every one for himself, for near six thousand years together, rebel against Him that made them, if there were not some original contagion spread through them all at their entrance into life.

“Secondly. The same thing appears from the Scriptural doctrine of our recovery by divine grace. Let us consider in what manner the Scripture represents that great change which must be wrought in our souls, in order to our obtaining the favour and image of God, and future happiness. ‘Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God,’ John iii, 3, 6, 8. In other scriptures it is represented, that they ‘must be born of the Spirit;’ they must be ‘born of God;’ they must be ‘created anew in Christ Jesus unto good works;’ Eph. ii, 10; they must ‘be quickened,’ or raised again, from their ‘death in trespasses and sins;’ Eph. ii, 5; they must ‘be renewed in their spirit,’ or ‘created after the image of God in righteousness and true holiness;’ they must ‘be reconciled to God by Jesus Christ;’ they must be ‘washed from their sins in his blood.’ ‘Since all have sinned and come short of the glory of God,’ therefore, if ever they are saved, they must be ‘justified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus.’ Now, can any one suppose God to have made so many millions of creatures, as have come into the world from Adam till now, which have all entered the world, innocent and holy, and yet not one of them should retain his image in holiness, or be fit for his favour, without being born again, created anew, raised from the dead, redeemed, not with corruptible things, but with the blood of his own Son! Do not all these representations prove that every man is born with some original contagion, and under some criminal imputation in the sight of God! Else would not one among all these millions be fit to be made a partaker of his favour, without such amazing purifications as require the blood of the Son of God, and the almighty operation of his Spirit! Do not all these things show that mankind in their present generations are not such creatures as God at first made them?” (pp. 413, 414.)

“The same great truth we may learn. Thirdly, from even a slight survey of the Heathen nations. A few days ago I was viewing, in the map of the world, the vast Asiatic empires of Tartary and China, and a great part of the kingdom of the Mogul, with the multitude of islands in the East Indies. I went on to survey all the southern part of Afric, with the savage nations of America. I observed the thousands, or rather millions, who dwell on this globe, and walk, and trifle, and live and die there, under the heaviest cloud of ignorance and darkness, not knowing God, nor the way to his favour; who are drenched in gross impieties and superstitions, who are continually

guilty of national immoralities, and practise idolatry, malice, and lewdness, fraud and falsehood, with scarce any regret or restraint." (p. 415.)

"Then, sighing within myself, I said, It is not many years since these were all infants; and they were brought up by parents who knew not God, nor the path that leads to life and happiness. Are not these unhappy children born under difficulties almost unsurmountable? Are they not laid under almost an impossibility of breaking their way of themselves, through so much thick darkness, to the knowledge, the fear, and love of Him that made them? Dreadful truth indeed! Yet, so far as I can see, certain and incontestable. Such, I fear, is the case of those of the human race who cover at present the far greatest part of the globe." (p. 416.)

"Then I ran back in my thoughts four or five thousand years, and said within myself, What multitudes, in every age of the world, have been born in these deplorable circumstances! They are inured from their birth to barbarous customs and impious practices; they have an image of the life of brutes and devils wrought in them by their early education; they have had the seeds of wretched wickedness sown, planted, and cultivated in them, by the savage instructions of those that went before them; and their own imitation of such horrible examples has confirmed the mischief, long before they knew or heard of the true God, if they have heard of Him to this day. Scarce any of them have admitted one thoughtful inquiry, whether they follow the rules of reason, or whether they are in the way of happiness and peace, any more than their parents before them. As they are born in this gross darkness, so they grow up in the vile idolatries, and all the shameful abominations, of their country; and go on to death in the same course. Nor have they light enough, either from without or within, to make them ask seriously, 'Is there not a lie in my right hand! Am I not in the way of destruction!'" (p. 417.)

"St. Peter says indeed, that 'in every nation he that feareth God and worketh righteousness is accepted of him;' but if there were very few (among the Jews) who feared God, very few in those learned nations of the Gentiles; how much fewer, may we suppose, are in those barbarous countries, which have no knowledge either divine or human!" (p. 419.)

"But would this have been the case of those unhappy nations, both of the parents and their children, in a hundred long successions, had they been such a race of creatures as they came out of the hand of the Creator? If those children had been guiltless in the eye of God, could this have been their portion? In short, can we suppose the wise, and righteous, and merciful God would have established and continued such a constitution for that propagation of mankind which should naturally place so many millions of them so early in such dismal circumstances if there had not been some dreadful and universal degeneracy spread over them and their fathers, by some original crime, which met and seized them at the very entrance into life!" (p. 420.)

THE SECOND ESSAY.

A PLAIN EXPLICATION OF THE DOCTRINE OF IMPUTED SIN AND IMPUTED RIGHTEOUSNESS.

"THIS doctrine has been attended with many noisy controversies in the Christian world. Let us try whether it may not be set in so fair and easy a light as to reconcile the sentiments of the contending parties." (p. 427.)

"When a man has broken the law of his country, and is punished for so doing, it is plain that sin is imputed to him; his wickedness is upon him; he bears his iniquity; that is, he is reputed, or accounted guilty; he is condemned and dealt with as an offender." (p. 428.)

"On the other hand, if an innocent man, who is falsely accused, is acquitted by the court, sin is not imputed to him, but righteousness is imputed to him; or, to use another phrase, his 'righteousness is upon him.'

“Or if a reward be given a man for any righteous action, this righteous act is imputed to him.

“Farther: If a man has committed a crime, but the prince pardons him, then he is justified from it; and his fault is not imputed to him.” (p. 429.)

“But if a man having committed treason, his estate is taken from him and his children, then they ‘bear the iniquity of their father,’ and his sin is imputed to them also.

“If a man lose his life and estate for murder, and his children thereby become vagabonds, then the blood of the person murdered is said to be upon the murderer, and upon his children also. So the Jews: ‘His blood be on us and on our children;’ let us and our children be punished for it!

“Or if a criminal had incurred the penalty of imprisonment, and the state were to permit a friend of his to become his surety, and to be confined in his room, then his crime is said to be imputed to his surety, or to be laid upon him; he bears the iniquity of his friend, by suffering for him. Meantime the crime for which the surety now suffers, is not imputed to the real offender.” (p. 430.)

“And should we suppose the prince to permit this surety to exert himself in some eminent service, to which a reward is promised; and all this in order to entitle the criminal to the promised reward: then this eminent service may be said to be imputed to the criminal, that is, he is rewarded on the account of it. So in this case, both what his friend has done and suffered is imputed to him.

“If a man do some eminent service to his prince, and he with his posterity are dignified on account of it; then the service performed by the father is said to be imputed to the children also.” (p. 431.)

“Now, if, among the histories of nations, we find any thing of this kind, do we not easily understand what the writers say! Why then do we judge these phrases, when they are found in the inspired writers, to be so hard to be understood!

“But it may be asked, ‘How can the acts of the parent’s treason be imputed to his little child, since those acts were quite out of the reach of an infant, nor was it possible for him to commit them!’

“Or, ‘How can the eminent service performed by a father be imputed to his child, who is but an infant!’

“I answer: 1. Those acts of treason, or acts of service, are, by a common figure, said to be imputed to the children, when they suffer or enjoy the consequences of their father’s treason or eminent service; though the particular actions of treason or service could not be practised by the children. This would easily be understood, should it occur in a human history: and why not, when it occurs in the sacred writings!

“I answer: 2. Sin is taken either for an act of disobedience to a law, or for the legal result of such an act; that is, the guilt, or liability to punishment. Now, when we say, ‘The sin of a traitor is imputed to his children,’ we do not mean, that the act of the father is charged upon the child; but that the guilt, or liability to punishment, is so transferred to him, that he suffers banishment or poverty on account of it.” (pp. 432, 433, 434.)

“In like manner, righteousness is either particular acts of obedience to a law, or the legal result of those actions; that is, a right to the reward annexed to them.

“And so when we say, ‘The righteousness of him that has performed some eminent act of obedience is imputed to his children,’ we do not mean, that the particular act of the father is charged on the child, as if he had done it; but that the right to reward, which is the result of that act, is transferred to his children.

“Now, if we would but thus explain every text of Scripture wherein either imputed sin, or imputed righteousness, is mentioned, (whether in express words, or in the plain meaning of them,) we should find them all easy and intelligible.” (p. 435.)

“Thus we may easily understand how the obedience of Christ is imputed to all his seed; and how the disobedience of Adam is imputed to all his children.” (p. 436.)

“To confirm this, I would add these three remarks:—

“1. There are several histories in Scripture, where expressions of the same import occur.

“So Gen. xxii, 16: ‘Thy seed shall possess the gate of his enemies, because thou hast obeyed my voice.’ Here Abraham’s obedience, that is, the result of it, is imputed to his posterity.

“So Num. xxv, 13: ‘God gave to Phinehas and his seed after him the covenant of an everlasting priesthood, because he was zealous for his God,’ and slew the criminals in Israel. This was so imputed to his children, that they also received the reward of it.” (p. 437.)

“Thus the sin of Achan was so imputed to his children, that they were all stoned on account of it: Joshua vii, 24. In like manner, the covetousness of Gehazi was imputed to his posterity, (2 Kings v, 27,) when God by his prophet pronounced that the leprosy should cleave unto him and to his seed for ever.” (p. 438.)

“2. The Scriptures, both of the Old and New Testament, use the words *sin* and *iniquity*, (both in Hebrew and Greek,) to signify, not only the criminal actions themselves, but also the result and consequences of those actions; that is, the guilt or liability to punishment; and sometimes the punishment itself, whether it fall upon the original criminal, or upon others on his account.” (p. 439.)

“In the same manner, the Scriptures use the word *righteousness*, not only for acts of obedience, but also the result of them; that is justification, or right to a reward. A moderate study of some of those texts where these words are used may convince us of this.

“So Job xxxiii, 26: ‘God will render to a man his righteousness;’ that is, the reward of it. ‘Sow to yourselves in righteousness, till the Lord come and rain righteousness upon you.’ Hosea x, 12: That is, till he pour down the rewards, or fruits, of it upon you.

“I might add here, that, in several places of St. Paul’s Epistles, *righteousness* means *justification*, in the passive sense of the word.” (p. 440.)

“So Rom. x, 4: ‘Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth;’ that is, in order to the justification of believers. ‘With the heart man believeth unto righteousness;’ (verse 10;) that is, so as to obtain justification.

“‘If righteousness,’ that is, justification, ‘come by the law, then Christ is dead in vain,’ Gal. ii, 21. This particularly holds where the word *λογίζομαι*, or *impute*, is joined with righteousness. As Rom. iv, 3: Abraham ‘believed God, and it was imputed to him for righteousness.’ ‘His faith is counted to him for righteousness,’ Rom. iv, 5. It is not *αντι* or *υπερ*, *for* or *instead of* righteousness; but *εις δικαιοσυνην*, ‘in order to justification,’ or acceptance with God.

“And in other places of Scripture, a work, whether good or evil, is put for the reward of it: ‘The work of a man will he render unto him;’ Job xxxiv, 11; that is, the recompense of it. So St. Paul desires Philemon to impute any wrong he had received from Onesimus to himself; that is, not the evil action, but the damage he had sustained.

“Indeed, when sin or righteousness are said to be imputed to any man, on account of what himself hath done, the words usually denote both the good or evil actions themselves, and the legal result of them. But when the sin or righteousness of one person is said to be imputed to another, then, generally, those words mean only the result thereof; that is, a liability to punishment on the one hand, and to reward on the other.

“But let us say what we will to confine the sense of the imputation of sin and righteousness to the legal result,—the reward or punishment of good or evil actions; let us ever so explicitly deny the imputation of the actions

themselves to others ; still Dr. Taylor will level almost all his arguments against the imputation of the actions themselves, and then triumph in having demolished what we never built, and refuting what we never asserted." (p. 444.)

"3. The Scripture does not, that I remember, any where say, in express words, that the sin of Adam is imputed to his children ; or, that the sins of believers are imputed to Christ ; or, that the righteousness of Christ is imputed to believers : But the true meaning of all these expressions is sufficiently found in several places of Scripture." (p. 446.)

"Yet since these express words and phrases, of the imputation of Adam's sin to us, of our sins to Christ, and of Christ's righteousness to us, are not plainly written in Scripture, we should not impose it on every Christian, to use these very expressions. Let every one take his liberty, either of confining himself to strictly Scriptural language, or of manifesting his sense of these plain Scriptural doctrines, in words and phrases of his own." (p. 447.)

"But if the words were expressly written in the Bible, they could not reasonably be interpreted in any other sense, than this which I have explained by so many examples, both in Scripture, history, and in common life.

"I would only add, If it were allowed, that the very act of Adam's disobedience was imputed to all his posterity ; that all the same sinful actions which men have committed were imputed to Christ, and the very actions which Christ did upon earth were imputed to believers ; what greater punishments would the posterity of Adam suffer, or what greater blessings could believers enjoy, beyond what Scripture has assigned, either to mankind, as the result of the sin of Adam ; or to Christ, as the result of the sins of men ; or to believers, as the result of the righteousness of Christ ?"

PART V.

THE DOCTRINE OF ORIGINAL SIN.

I BELIEVE every impartial reader is now able to judge, whether Dr. Taylor has solidly answered Dr. Watts or no. But there is another not inconsiderable writer whom I cannot find he has answered at all, though he has published four several tracts professedly against Dr. Taylor ; of which he could not be ignorant, because they are mentioned in "The Ruin and Recovery of Human Nature ;"—I mean the Rev. Mr. Samuel Hebden, Minister at Wrentham, in Suffolk. I think it therefore highly expedient, to subjoin a short abstract of these also ; the rather, because the tracts themselves are very scarce, having been for some time out of print.

Lo, this only have I found, that God made man upright ; but they have sought out many inventions, Eccles. vii, 29.

"In the preceding verse Solomon had declared, how few wise and good persons he had found in the whole course of his life ; but lest any should blame the providence of God for this, he here observes, that these were not what God made man at first ; and that their being what they were not was the effect of a wretched apostasy from God. The original words stand thus : *Only see thou, I have found.*" (p. 3.)

"*Only* : This word sets a mark on what it is prefixed to, as a truth of great certainty and importance. *See, observe, thou.* He invites every hearer and reader, in particular, to consider what he was about to offer. *I have found* : I have discovered this certain truth, and assert it on the fullest evidence, 'that God made man upright ; but they have sought out many inventions.'" (p. 4.)

"The Hebrew word יָשָׁר which we render *upright*, is properly opposed to

crooked, irregular, perverse. It is applied to things, to signify their being straight, or agreeable to rule; but it is likewise applied both to God and man, with the words and works of both. As applied to God, the ways of God, the word of God, it is joined with *good*; Psalm xxv, 8; with *righteous*; Psalm cxix, 137; with *true and good*; Neh. ix, 13; where mention is made of 'right judgments, true laws, good statutes.' The uprightness with which God is said to minister judgment to the people, answers to *righteousness*: In a word,—God's uprightness is the moral rectitude of his nature, infinitely wise, good, just, and perfect. The uprightness of man, is his conformity, of heart and life, to the rule he is under; which is the law or will of God. Accordingly we read of uprightness of heart; Psalm xxxvi, 10; Job xxxiii, 3; and uprightness of way, or conversation; Psalm xxxvii, 14; and often elsewhere. 'The upright man,' throughout the Scripture, is a truly good man; a man of integrity, a holy person. In Job i, 1, 8, ii, 3, upright is the same with *perfect*, (as in Psalm xxxvii, 37, and many other places,) and is explained by, one 'who feareth God and escheweth evil.' In Job viii, 6, it is joined and is the same with pure. In the same sense it is taken, (to mention but a few out of many texts which might be produced,) Prov. x, 29: 'The way of the Lord is strength to the upright; but destruction shall be to the workers of iniquity.' 'The integrity of the upright shall guide them; but the perverseness of transgressors shall destroy them.' (xi, 3.) 'The righteousness of the upright shall deliver them; but transgressors shall be taken in their own naughtiness.' (Verse 6.) 'By the blessing of the upright the city is exalted.' (Verse 11.) 'The sacrifice of the wicked is an abomination to the Lord; but the prayer of the upright is his delight.' (xv, 8.) 'A wicked man hardeneth his face; but as for the upright, he directeth his way.' (xxi, 29.) From all these texts it manifestly appears, that uprightness, as applied to man, is the very same with righteousness, holiness, or integrity of heart and conversation." (pp. 5, 6.)

"When, therefore, Solomon says, God 'made man upright,' the plain, undeniable meaning is, God at first formed man righteous or holy; although 'they have sought out many inventions.' *They*,—this refers to Adam, which is both a singular and a plural noun: they, our first parents, and with them their posterity, have sought out many inventions; many contrivances, to offend God, and injure themselves. These 'many inventions' are opposed to the uprightness, the simplicity of heart and integrity, with which our first parents, and mankind in them, were originally made by God." (p. 7.)

"The doctrine of the text then is, that God, at his creation, 'made man upright,' or righteous; not only rational, and a free agent, but holy: therefore, to maintain, that 'man neither was, nor could be, formed holy, because none can be holy, but in consequence of his own choice and endeavour,' is bold indeed! To prove the contrary, and justify Solomon's assertion, I offer a few plain arguments." (p. 8.)

"1. Moses, in his account of the creation, writes, 'And God said, Let us make man in our own image.' Now, that righteousness or holiness is the principal part of this image of God, appears from Eph. iv, 22, 24, and Col. iii, 9, 10. On which passages I observe, (1.) By 'the old man' is not meant a heathenish life, or an ungodly conversation; but a corrupt nature. For the Apostle elsewhere speaks of our 'old man,' as 'crucified with Christ;' and here distinguishes from it their 'former conversation,' or sinful actions, which he calls 'the deeds of the old man.' (2.) By 'the new man' is meant, not a new course of life; (as the Socinians interpret it;) but a principle of grace, called by St. Peter, 'The hidden man of the heart,' and a 'divine nature.' (3.) 'To put off the old man' (the same as to 'crucify the flesh') is, to subdue and mortify our corrupt nature; to 'put on the new man' is, to stir up and cultivate that gracious principle, that new nature. 'This,' saith the Apostle, 'is created after God, in righteousness and true holiness.' *It is created*: which cannot properly be said of a new course of life; but may of a 'new nature.' It is 'created after God;' or, 'in his image and

likeness,' mentioned by Moses. But what is it to be 'created after God,' or 'in his image?' It is to be 'created in righteousness and true holiness;' termed 'knowledge,' the practical knowledge of God: Col. iii, 10. But if 'to be created after God,' or 'in his image and likeness,' is 'to be created in righteousness and true holiness,' and if that principle of righteousness and holiness by which we are 'created unto good works,' is a 'new man,' a 'divine nature;' it is easy to infer, that man was at first created 'righteous' or 'holy.'" (pp. 9, 10.)

"2. All things, as at first made by God, 'were very good.' Nor indeed could he make them otherwise. Now, a rational being is not good, unless his rational powers are all devoted to God. The goodness of man, as a rational being, must lie in a devotedness and consecration to God. Consequently, man was at first thus devoted to God: otherwise he was not good. But this devotedness to the love and service of God is true righteousness or holiness. This righteousness then, this goodness, or uprightness, this regular and due state or disposition of the human mind, was at first natural to man. It was wrought into his nature, and concreated with his rational powers. A rational creature, as such, is capable of knowing, loving, serving, living in communion with, the Most Holy One. Adam at first either did or did not use this capacity; either he knew and loved God, or he did not. If he did not, he was not 'very good,' no, nor good at all: if he did, he was upright, righteous, holy." (p. 12.)

"3. When God vested man with dominion over the other creatures, how was he qualified for exercising that dominion, unless he had in himself a principle of love and obedience to the Supreme Governor? Did not God form the creatures obedient to man, to confirm man in his loving obedience to God? Or did he create them with a disposition to depend on and obey man as their lord, and not create man with a disposition to obey and live dependent on the Lord of all? But this disposition is uprightness. Therefore God 'made man upright.'" (p. 13.)

"4. Either man was created with principles of love and obedience, or he was created an enemy to God. One of these must be: for as all the duty required of man, as a rational being, is summarily comprised in love, a supreme love to God, and a subordinate love to others, for his sake; so there can be no medium between a rational creature's loving God, and not loving, which is a degree of 'enmity' to him. Either, O man, thou lovest God, or thou dost not: if thou dost, thou art holy or righteous; if thou dost not, thou art indisposed to serve him in such a manner, and with such a frame of spirit, as he requires. Then thou art an enemy to God, a rebel against his authority. But God could not create man in such a state, in a state of enmity against himself. It follows, that man was created a lover of God, that is, righteous and holy." (p. 14.)

"In a word: can you prove, either that man was not 'created after God,' or that this does not mean, being 'created in righteousness and true holiness?' Was not man, as all creatures, good in his kind? And is a rational creature good, unless all its powers are devoted to God? Was not man duly qualified at first to exercise dominion over the other creatures? And could he be so qualified without a principle of love and obedience to their common Lord? Lastly: can any man prove, either that man could be innocent if he did not love the Lord his God with all his heart; or that such a love to God is not 'righteousness and true holiness?'" (p. 15.)

"From the doctrine of man's original righteousness we may easily conclude that of original sin. For this reason it is, that some so earnestly protest against original righteousness, because they dread looking on themselves as 'by nature' fallen creatures, and 'children of wrath.' If man was not holy at first, he could not fall from a state of holiness; and, consequently, the first transgression exposed him and his posterity to nothing but temporal death. But, on the other hand, if 'man was made upright, it follows, (1.) That man, when he fell, lost his original righteousness, and therewith

his title to God's favour, and to communion with God. (2.) That he thereby incurred not only temporal but spiritual death. He became dead in sin and a child of wrath. And, (3.) That all his posterity are born with such a nature, not as man had at first, but as he contracted by his fall." (pp. 20, 21.)

And the Lord God commanded the man, saying, Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat: but of the tree of knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it: for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die, Gen. ii, 16, 17.

"God forbade man to eat of this tree, in token of his sovereign authority, and for the exercise of man's love, and the trial of his obedience. The words added, 'In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die,' or literally, 'In dying thou shalt die,' mean, not only, 'Thou shalt certainly die,' but, 'Thou shalt suffer every kind of death:' thy soul as well as thy body shall die. And, indeed, if God made man upright or holy; if man at first enjoyed the life of God, including holiness joined with blessedness; and if the miserable state of the soul (as well as the dissolution of the body) is in the Scripture termed 'death;' it plainly follows, that the original threatening includes nothing less than a loss of man's original uprightness, of his title to God's favour, and a happy life of communion with God." (pp. 26, 27.)

"The words mean, farther, 'Thou shalt instantly die;' as soon as ever thou eatest. And so he did. For in that instant his original righteousness, title to God's favour, and communion with God being lost, he was spiritually dead, 'dead in sin;' his soul was dead to God, and his body liable to death, temporal and eternal." (pp. 28, 29.)

"And as there is a threatening of death expressed in these words, so a promise of life is implied. The threatening death only in case of disobedience, implied, that otherwise he should not die. And even since the fall, the law of God promises life to obedience, as well as threatens death to disobedience; since the tenor of it is, 'Do this and live: if thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments.'" (p. 30.)

"Now, a law given by God with a promise of life and a threatening of death, consented to by man, is evidently a covenant. For what is a covenant, but a mutual agreement of two or more parties on certain terms? Now, in this sense God covenanted with man, and man covenanted with God. God gave a law, promising life in case of obedience, threatening death in case of disobedience. And man accepted of the terms. Here, therefore, was a real covenant." (p. 31.)

"But, to guard this against objections, I add:—

"1. We do not affirm, that God visibly appeared, and formally treated with Adam, as one man with another. Without so formal a procedure, God could, and doubtless did, signify to him, on what terms he was to expect life or death." (p. 32.)

"2. We do not assert, that God promised to translate him to heaven; but, without question, he made Adam sensible, that if he continued obedient he should continue happy, whether in paradise or some other region.

"3. If one greatly superior will freely condescend to treat with an inferior, this does not disannul the mutual agreement, or hinder its having the nature of a covenant. So God entered into a proper covenant with Abraham of old, and with his people in the Gospel. And if so, much more might he do so with man, when perfectly upright toward God." (p. 33.)

"And this covenant was made with Adam, not only for himself, but likewise for all his posterity. This appears,—

"1. From the tenor of the original threatening, compared with the present state of mankind. For it is evident, that every one of his posterity is born liable to death; that the death, to which all are liable, was not threatened but in case of man's sinning; that man was not liable to death till he sinned,

and his being so was the result of the threatening; and that the Scripture constantly points at sin as the sole cause of death, and of all suffering. But if all mankind are born liable to that which was originally threatened only to sin, then all mankind are accounted sinners, and as such are concerned in the original threatening, and consequently in the original promise." (p. 34.)

"2. From 1 Cor. xv, 22: 'In Adam all die.' Here the Apostle speaks, not of both our parents, but of Adam singly, (as also Rom. v,) to denote our peculiar relation to him. The 'all' mentioned, are all his natural descendants, who 'all die in' or through him; that is, are liable to death on account of their relation to him. And it is not only a bodily death that is here spoken of; for it stands opposed, not to a bare revival of the body, but to a happy and glorious resurrection, such as 'they that are Christ's' will partake of at his second coming. For of this resurrection, not that of the ungodly, the Apostle is speaking throughout this chapter. But they could not 'die in Adam,' if they did not in some sense sin in him, and fall with him; if the covenant had not been made with him, not for himself only, but for all his posterity." (pp. 35, 36.)

"3. From verses 45 and 47 of the same chapter. The 'first man, Adam,' and 'the second Man, the last Adam,' are here opposed. Now, why is Christ, notwithstanding the millions of men intervening between Adam and him, and following after his birth, called 'the second Man,' and 'the last Adam?' We have an answer, Rom. v, 12, 14, &c, where Adam is said to be 'a figure of Christ;' and the resemblance between them is shown to lie in this,—that as 'sin' and 'death' descend from one, so 'righteousness' and 'life' from the other. Consequently, what Christ is with regard to all his spiritual seed, that Adam is with regard to all his natural descendants; namely, a public person, a federal head, a legal representative: one with whom the covenant was made, not only for himself, but also for his whole posterity."

Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God. That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit, John iii, 5, 6.

"In this text we have,—

"I. The new birth described;

"II. The necessity of it insisted on;

"III. The original corruption of every child of Adam observed, as that from which the necessity of such a change arises.

"I. The new birth is here described. Whatever this implies, the Spirit of God is the sole author of it. He does not help a man to regenerate himself, but takes the work into his own hands. A child of God, as such, is 'not born of blood;' does not become so by descent from pious parents. He is not 'born of the will of the flesh;' is not renewed by the power of his own carnal will; 'nor of man,' of any man whatsoever, 'but of God,' by the sole power of his Spirit.

"In regeneration, the Holy Spirit mortifies 'the old man,' corrupt nature, and breathes a principle of life into the soul; a principle of faith, of sincere love, and willing obedience to God. He who was 'dead in sin,' is now 'dead to sin,' and 'alive to God through Jesus Christ.' God has 'created in him a clean heart, and renewed a right Spirit within him.' He has 'created' him 'unto good works,' and 'written' his 'law in his heart.' But if the Spirit of God is the sole agent in the work of regeneration; if the soul of man has no active interest or concern in his 'being born again;' if man was created holy, and regeneration reinstamps that holy image of God on the soul; if 'the new man is created after God in righteousness and true holiness;' if the corruption of nature (termed 'the old man' or 'flesh') is not contracted by imitation or custom, but is an inbred hereditary distemper, coeval with our nature; if all truly good works are the fruits of a good heart,

a good principle wrought in the soul ; it plainly follows, that the faith, hope, love, fear, which distinguish the children of God from others, are not of the nature of acquired, but of infused, habits or principles. To say then, 'that all holiness must be the effect of a man's own choice and endeavour, and that, by a right use of his natural powers, every man may and must attain a habit of holiness,' that is, 'be born again,' however pleasing it may be to human vanity, is contrary to the whole tenor of Scripture.

"And all the scriptural expressions on this head are grounded on the real nature of things. 'Sin' is of the nature of 'filth' and 'corruption.' It pollutes the whole man, and renders him as an 'unclean thing' in the sight of God. When, therefore, the Spirit of God removes this, he is said to 'create a clean heart,' to 'purify the heart,' to 'sprinkle clean water upon' us, to wash us 'from' our 'filthiness.' And this cleansing efficacy is in the text expressed by being 'born of water and of the Spirit.'

"When, therefore, our Lord speaks of being 'born of the Spirit,' his plain meaning is, 'There is a spiritual cleansing you must partake of, mentioned in those promises: 'I will sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean; from all your filthiness and from all your idols will I cleanse you. A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you. And I will take away the stony heart, and I will give you a heart of flesh.' These promises give us a plain description of the Spirit's regenerating work; without experiencing which, our state is miserable now, and will be much more so hereafter.

"II. For this spiritual renovation of the soul is indispensably necessary. Without it none can 'enter the kingdom of heaven,' either the kingdom of grace or of glory.

"1. 'Except a man be born of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of' grace; he cannot be a loyal subject of Jesus Christ. By nature we are subjects of Satan; and such we must remain, unless renewing grace 'translate us into the kingdom of God's dear Son.'

"2. Consequently, 'except we are born again, we cannot enter into the kingdom' of glory. Indeed, supposing he could be admitted there, what could an unregenerate sinner do in heaven? He could not possibly have any relish either for the business, the company, or the enjoyments of that world.

"III. Our Lord, having asserted the absolute necessity of the new birth, to show the ground of this necessity, adds, 'That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit.' Here observe,—

"1. Our Lord opposes 'flesh' and 'spirit' to each other; which opposition we often meet with. Whatever, therefore, is meant by these two, they denote things opposite.

"2. He speaks here of two several births, which are distinctly mentioned.

"3. The former of these two is spoken of as that which renders the other so necessary. Because 'that which is born of the flesh is flesh;' therefore 'we must be born of the Spirit:' therefore this great change must be wrought in us, or we cannot 'enter into the kingdom of God.'

"4. If the latter of these is made necessary by the former, then to be 'born flesh' is to be born corrupt and sinful. And, indeed, the word 'flesh' is very frequently taken for the corrupt principle in man. It is always so taken when it stands opposed to 'the Spirit,' or to that inwrought principle of obedience, which itself also (taking the name of its Author) is sometimes termed 'Spirit.'

"Now, in the text, whatever or whoever is born of a man, since the fall, is denominated 'flesh.' And that 'flesh' is here put, not for sinless frailty, but sinful corruption, we learn from its being opposed to the 'Spirit.' Christ was born frail, as well as we, and in this sense was 'flesh;' yet, being without sin, he had no need to be 'born of the Spirit.' This is not made necessary by any sinless infirmities, but by a sinful nature only. This alone is opposite to 'the Spirit;' thus, therefore, we must understand it here.

“But Dr. Taylor says, ‘To be born of the flesh is only to be naturally born of a woman.’ I answer, Is not ‘flesh’ opposed to ‘Spirit’ in this verse! Is it not the Spirit of God, which is spoken of in the latter clause, together with the principle of grace, which is in every regenerate person? And is any thing beside sinful corruption opposite to the Spirit of God! No, certainly! But if so, and if wherever ‘flesh’ is opposed to ‘the Spirit,’ it implies sinful corruption, then it is evident, to be ‘born of the flesh’ is to be the sinful offspring of sinful parents, so as to have need of the renewing influences of the Holy Spirit, on that account, even from our birth.

“If to ‘walk after the flesh,’ as opposed to ‘walking after the Spirit,’ is to follow our sinful inclinations; if to ‘be in the flesh,’ opposed to ‘being in the Spirit,’ is to be in a state of sin; if ‘the flesh’ and ‘the Spirit’ are two contrary principles, which counteract each other; Gal. v, 16, 17; if ‘the works of the flesh, and the lusts of the flesh,’ are opposed to ‘the Spirit’ and ‘the fruit of the Spirit;’ then, ‘to be born of the flesh’ must signify more than barely to be born of a woman. Had Adam transmitted a pure nature to his descendants, still each of them would have been born of a woman; but they would have had no necessity of being ‘born of the Spirit,’ or renewed by the Holy Ghost.

“But what is that corruption of nature which the Scripture terms *flesh*? There are two branches of it: 1. A want of original righteousness: 2. A natural propensity to sin.

“1. A want of original righteousness. God created man righteous; holiness was connatural to his soul; a principle of love and obedience to God. But when he sinned he lost this principle. And every man is now born totally void, both of the knowledge and love of God.

“2. A natural propensity to sin is in every man. And this is inseparable from the other. If man is born and grows up without the knowledge or love of God, he is born and grows up propense to sin; which includes two things,—An aversion to what is good, and an inclination to what is evil.

“We are naturally averse to what is good. ‘The carnal mind is enmity against God.’ Nature does not, will not, cannot, submit to his holy, just, and good law. Therefore, ‘they that are in the flesh cannot please God.’ Being averse to the will, law, and ways of God, they are utterly indisposed for such an obedience as the relation between God and man indispensably requires.

“And as we are all naturally averse to what is good, so we are naturally inclined to what is evil. Even young children of themselves run into evil; but are with difficulty brought to practise what is good. No sooner do they discover reason, than they discover evil, unreasonable dispositions. And these discovering themselves in every one, even from his early childhood, manifestly prove the inbred and universal corruption of human nature.

“But why is this corruption termed *flesh*? Not because it is confined to the body. It is the corruption of our whole nature, and is therefore termed ‘the old man.’ Not because it consists merely in a repugnance of the sensual appetites to reason. This is but one branch of that corruption; the whole of it is far more extensive. Not because it is primarily seated in the body; it is primarily seated in the soul. If ‘sin reigns in our mortal bodies,’ it is because the sinful soul uses the bodily members as ‘instruments of unrighteousness.’

“Nay, all which those words, *That which is born of the flesh is flesh*, mean, is this: All men being descended of frail and mortal parents are, like them, frail and mortal. In consequence of Adam’s sin, all his descendants die.’

“I answer, 1. Though this be true, it is not the whole truth. Nor is it the proper truth of the text, which speaks of our being ‘born of the flesh,’ as the reason why we must be ‘born of the Spirit.’

“2. It is not consistent with the moral perfections of God for sinless creatures to be born ‘mortal.’ Death, in every sense of the word, is the proper

wages of sin.' 'Sin' has the same causal influence on death, as the obedience of Christ has on eternal life.

"3. We were not only born 'mortal,' but 'children of wrath;' we who are now regenerate, as well as others.

"4. The Scripture ascribes both our 'mortality' and 'corruption' to our relation to Adam. 'In him all die;' 'through the offence of one, many,' all mankind, 'are dead,' liable to death. Again: 'By the disobedience of one,' the same, 'many are constituted sinners.' Therefore, when our Lord says, 'That which is born of the flesh is flesh,' he means not only that we and our parents are 'mortal,' but that all mankind derive spiritual as well as temporal death from their first father."

THE SCRIPTURE DOCTRINE

OF

IMPUTED SIN AND RIGHTEOUSNESS.

"1. SIN is 'a transgression of the law;' of that law of God to which a rational creature is subject. 'Righteousness' is a fulfilment of, or conformity to, that law. This is the proper Scriptural sense of the words. But as sin involves the creature in guilt, that is, a liability to punishment, the same words are often used to denote either sin itself, or guilt and punishment. On the other hand, righteousness denotes, not only a fulfilling of the law, but also a freedom from guilt and punishment; yea, and sometimes all the rewards of righteousness." (pp. 1, 2.)

"Accordingly, to impute sin, is either to impute sin itself, or guilt on the account of it. To impute sin itself to a person, is to account him a transgressor of the law, to pronounce him such, or to treat him as a transgressor. To impute guilt to a person, is to account him obnoxious to a threatened punishment, to pronounce him so, or to inflict that punishment. So, to impute righteousness, properly so called, is to account him a fulfiller of the law, to pronounce him so to be, and to treat him as righteous. And to impute righteousness, as opposed to guilt, is to account, to pronounce, and to treat him as guiltless.

"Thus much is agreed. But the point in question is, 'Does God impute no sin or righteousness but what is personal?' Dr. Taylor positively asserts, he does not. I undertake to prove that he does; that he imputes Adam's first sin to all mankind, and our sins to Christ." (p. 5.)

"1. God imputes Adam's first sin to all mankind. I do not mean that the actual commission of it was imputed to any beside himself; (it was impossible it should;) nor is the guilt of it imputed to any of his descendants, in the full latitude of it, or in regard to its attendant circumstances. It constitutes none of them equally guilty with him. Yet both that sin itself, and a degree of guilt on account of it, are imputed to all his posterity; the sin itself is imputed to them, as included in their head. And on this account they are reputed guilty, are 'children of wrath,' liable to the threatened punishment. And this cannot be denied, supposing, (1.) Man's original righteousness: (2.) Adam's being the federal head of all mankind." (p. 6.)

"(1.) Man's original righteousness has been largely proved. Let me add only an argument *ad hominem*. [On the opponent's own principle.] Supposing (not granting) that the Son of God is no more than the first of creatures, either he was originally righteous, or he was not. If he was not, then time was when he was not 'the Holy One of God;' and possibly he never might have been such, no, nor righteous at all; but instead of that, as ungodly, guilty, and wretched, as the devil himself is. For the best creature is (Dr. Taylor grants) alterable for the worst; and the best, when corrupted, becomes the worst. Again: If the Son of God was a mere creature, and as

such made without righteousness, (which every creature must be, according to Dr. Taylor,) then he was not, could not be, at first as righteous, as like God, as the holy angels are now, yea, or as any holy man on earth is. But if these suppositions are shockingly absurd; if the Son of God could not have become as bad as the devil; if he never was unrighteous; if he was not originally less holy than angels and men are now; then the assertion, 'that righteousness must be the effect of a creature's antecedent choice and endeavour,' falls to the ground." (pp. 7, 9, 10.)

"But the Hebrew word *jasher*, Dr. Taylor says, 'does not generally signify a moral character.' This is one of the numerous critical mistakes in this gentleman's books. Of the more than one hundred and fifty texts in which *jasher*, or the substantive *jasher*, occurs, there are very few which do not confirm our interpretation of Ecclesiastes vii, 29. 'But *jasher* is applied to various things not capable of moral action.' It is; and what then! Many of these applications are neither for us nor against us. Some make strongly for us; as when it is applied to the words or ways of God and man. But the question now is, what it signifies when applied to God or to moral agents, and that by way of opposition to a vicious character and conduct. Is it not, in the text before us, applied to man as a moral agent, and by way of opposition to a corrupt character and conduct! No man can deny it. Either, therefore, prove, that *jasher*, when opposed as here, to a corrupt conduct and character, does not signify righteous, or acknowledge the truth, that God 'created man upright,' or righteous." (p. 11.)

"To evade the argument from Ephesians iv, 24, Dr. Taylor first says, 'The old man means a heathenish life;' and then says, 'The old and new man do not signify a course of life.' What then do they signify? Why, 'The old man,' says he, 'relates to the Gentile state; and the new man is either the Christian state, or the Christian Church, body, society.' But for all this, he says again, a page or two after, 'The old and new man, and the new man's being renewed, and the renewing of the Ephesians, do all manifestly refer to their Gentile state and wicked course of life, from which they were lately converted.'

"When, then, the Apostle says, 'Our old man is crucified with' Christ, (Romans vi, 6,) is it the Gentile state or course of life which was so crucified! No; but the corrupt nature, 'the body of sin,' as it is termed in the same verse. And 'to put off the old man,' is, (according to St. Paul,) 'to crucify' this 'with its affections and desires.' On the other hand, to 'put on the new man,' is to cultivate the divine principle which is formed in the soul of every believer by the Spirit of Christ. It is this of which it is said, (i.) It is created; and in regard to it we are said to be 'created unto good works.' (ii.) It is renewed; for it is indeed no other than original righteousness restored. (iii.) It is after God, after his image and likeness, now stamped afresh on the soul. (iv.) It consists in righteousness and holiness, or that knowledge which comprehends both." (pp. 13, 14.)

"Again: To that argument, 'Either man at first loved God, or he was an enemy to God,' Dr. Taylor gives only this slight, superficial answer: 'Man could not love God before he knew him;' without vouchsafing the least notice of the arguments which prove, that man was not created without the knowledge of God. Let him attend to those proofs, and either honestly yield to their force, or, if he is able, fairly confute them.

"The doctrine of original sin presupposes,—

"(2.) Adam's being the federal head of all mankind. Several proofs of this having been given already, I need not produce more until those are answered.

"2. God imputes our sins, or the guilt of them, to Christ. He consented to be responsible for them, to suffer the punishment due for them. This sufficiently appears from Isa. liii, which contains a summary of the Scripture doctrine upon this head. 'He hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows.' The word *nasa* (*borne*) signifies, (1.) To take up somewhat, as on one's

shoulders: (2.) To *bear* or *carry* something weightily, as a porter does a burden: (3.) To *take away*: and in all these senses it is here applied to the Son of God. He *carried*, as a strong man does a heavy burden, (the clear, indisputable sense of the other word, *sabal*,) our sorrows; the sufferings of various kinds which were due to our sins. 'He was wounded for our transgressions, and bruised for our iniquities.' Wounds and bruises are put for the whole of his sufferings; as his death and blood frequently are. He was wounded and bruised, not for sins of his own; not merely to show God's hatred of sin; not chiefly to give us a pattern of patience; but for our sins, as the proper, impulsive cause. Our sins were the procuring cause of all his sufferings. His sufferings were the penal effects of our sins. 'The chastisement of our peace,' the punishment necessary to procure it, 'was' laid 'on him,' freely submitting thereto: 'and by his stripes' (a part of his sufferings again put for the whole) 'we are healed;' pardon, sanctification, and final salvation, are all purchased and bestowed upon us. Every chastisement is for some fault. That laid on Christ was not for his own, but ours; and was needful to reconcile an offended Lawgiver, and offending guilty creatures to each other. So 'the Lord laid on him the iniquity of us all;' that is, the punishment due to our iniquity." (pp. 16-20.)

"It is true, as Dr. Taylor says, 'sin and iniquity often signify affliction or suffering.' But why? Because it is usual for a cause to give denomination to its effect. And so the consequences of sin are called by the same name. But this rather hurts Dr. Taylor's cause than helps it. For sufferings could with no propriety be called sin, if they were not the proper effects of it. Man, in innocence, was liable to no suffering or sorrow; he was indeed tried, but not by suffering. All sorrow was introduced by sin; and if man is 'born to trouble,' it is because he is born 'in sin.' God indeed does afflict his children for their good; and turns even death into a blessing. Yet as it is the effect of sin, so is it in itself an enemy to all mankind; nor would any man have been either tried or corrected by affliction, had it not been for sin." (pp. 21, 22.)

"The Lord's laying on Christ 'the iniquity of us all,' was eminently typified by the high priest putting all the iniquities of Israel on the scape-goat, who then carried them away. 'But the goat,' says Dr. Taylor, 'was to suffer nothing.' This is a gross mistake. It was a 'sin-offering,' (verse 5,) and, as such, was to 'bear upon him all the iniquities' of the people into the wilderness; and there (as the Jewish Doctors unanimously hold) to suffer a violent death by way of punishment, instead of the people, for their sins 'put upon him.' Yet Dr. Taylor says, 'Here was no imputation of sin.' No! What is the difference between imputing sins, and putting them upon him! This is just of a piece with, 'A sin-offering that suffered nothing;' a creature 'turned loose into a land the properest for its subsistence,' while bearing upon him all the iniquities of God's people!" (pp. 23-25.)

"Thus 'Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us.' Dr. Taylor, when he wrote his late books, was not apprized of the usual Scripture meaning of this awful word, *curse*. It is often put to signify the legal punishment of sin. What the law of God threatens against transgressors, or the threatening itself, is frequently called by this name. What signifies then his triling observation, 'that God inflicted no curse on our first parents?' Gen. iii, 16-18; that is, he did not say, in so many words, 'Cursed art thou, O man,' or, 'O woman.' But God's cursing the ground for man's sake, was really a curse pronounced against him; and what the Lord said to the woman was really a curse, a penalty legally inflicted on her. For God is then said to curse, when he either threatens to punish, or actually punishes, his creatures for sin. See Deut. xxvii, 15, &c; xxviii, 16, &c; Jer. xvii, 5; Zech. v, 3." (pp. 39, 40.)

"To conclude: Either we must allow the imputation of Adam's sin, whatever difficulties attend it, or renounce justification by Christ, and salvation through the merit of his blood. Accordingly, the Secinians do this. Whether

Dr. Taylor does, let every thinking man judge, after having weighed what he writes, particularly at pages 72, 73, of his 'Scripture Doctrine.' 'The worthiness of Christ is his consummate virtue. It is virtue that carrieth every cause in heaven. Virtue is the only price which purchaseth every thing with God. True virtue, or the right exercise of reason, is true worth, and the only valuable consideration, the only power which prevails with God.' These passages are indeed connected with others, which carry with them a show of ascribing honour to Christ and grace. But the fallacy lies open to every careful, intelligent, unprejudiced reader. He ascribes to Christ a singular worthiness; but it is nothing more than a superior degree of the same kind of worthiness which belongs to every virtuous man. He talks of Christ's consummate virtue, or his obedience to God, and good will to man. And to this virtue of his, as imitated by us, he would teach us to ascribe our acceptance with God; which is indeed to ascribe it to ourselves, or to our own virtue; to works of righteousness done by us, in direct opposition to the whole tenor of the Gospel. To what dangerous lengths are men carried by an ignorance of God, as infinitely holy and just; by a fond conceit of their own abilities, and a resolved opposition to the doctrine of original sin! Rather than allow this, they renounce Christ as the meritorious procurer of salvation for sinners. They may seem, indeed, to acknowledge him as such, and talk of 'eternal life as given by God through his Son.' But all this is mere show, and can only impose on the ignorant and unwary. They dare not profess, in plain terms, that Christ has merited salvation for any; neither can they consistently allow this, while they deny original sin." (pp. 80, 81.)

"Let not any, then, who regard their everlasting interests, entertain or even tamper with doctrines which, how plausibly soever recommended, are contrary to many express texts, nay, to the whole tenor of Scripture, and which cannot be embraced without renouncing an humble dependence on Christ, and rejecting the Gospel method of salvation." (p. 82.)

"God grant every reader of this plain treatise may not only be convinced of the truth and importance of the Scripture doctrines maintained therein, but invincibly confirmed in his attachments to them, by an experimental knowledge of their happy influence on faith, holiness, and comfort! Then shall we gladly say, We, who are made sinners by the disobedience of Adam, are made righteous by the obedience of Christ. His righteousness entitles us to a far better inheritance than that we lost in Adam. In consequence of being justified through him, we shall 'reign in life' with him. Unto whom, with God the Father, and the sanctifying, comforting Spirit, be ascribed all praise for ever!" (p. 83.)

PART VI.

THE DOCTRINE OF ORIGINAL SIN EXPLAINED AND VINDICATED.

"THE phrase, *original sin*, so far as we can discover, was first used in the fourth century. The first who used it was either St. Chrysostom, or Hilary, some of whose words are these: 'The Psalmist says, *Behold, I was conceived in iniquities, and in sins did my mother conceive me.* He acknowledges that he was born under original sin and the law of sin.' Soon after Hilary's time, St. Augustine, and other Christian writers, brought it into common use." (pp. 2, 3.)

"The Scriptural doctrine of original sin may be comprised in the following propositions:—

"I. Man was originally made righteous or holy.

"II. That original righteousness was lost by the first sin.

"III. Thereby man incurred death of every kind; for,—

"IV. Adam's first sin was the sin of a public person, one whom God had appointed to represent all his descendants.

“V. Hence all these are from their birth ‘children of wrath,’ void of all righteousness, and propense to sin of all sorts.

“I add, VI. This is not only a truth agreeable to Scripture and reason, but a truth of the utmost importance, and one to which the Churches of Christ, from the beginning, have borne a clear testimony.” (p. 8.)

“I. Man was originally made righteous or holy; formed with such a principle of love and obedience to his Maker as disposed and enabled him to perform the whole of his duty with ease and pleasure. This has been proved already; and this wholly overturns Dr. Taylor’s fundamental aphorism, ‘Whatever is natural is necessary, and what is necessary is not sinful.’ For if man was originally righteous or holy, we may argue thus: It was at first natural to man to love and obey his Maker; yet it was not necessary; neither as necessary is opposed to voluntary or free; (for he both loved and obeyed freely and willingly;) nor, as necessary means unavoidable; (this is manifest by the event;) no, nor as necessary is opposed to rewardable; for had he continued to love and obey, he would have been rewarded with everlasting happiness. Therefore that assertion, ‘Whatever is natural is necessary,’ is palpably, glaringly false; consequently, what is natural, as well as what is acquired, may be good or evil, rewardable or punishable.” (p. 10.)

“II. Man’s original righteousness was lost by the first sin. Though he was made righteous he was not made immutable. He was free to stand or fall. And he soon fell, and lost at once both the favour and image of God. This fully appears, 1. From the account which Moses gives of our first parents, where we read, (1.) ‘The eyes of them both were opened, and they knew that they were naked;’ Gen. iii; that is, they were conscious of guilt, and touched with a pungent sense of their folly and wickedness. They began to find their nakedness irksome to them, and to reflect on it with sinful emotions of soul. (2.) Immediately they were indisposed for communion with God, and struck with such a dread of him as could not consist with true love. (Verse 8.) (3.) When questioned by God, how do they prevaricate, instead of confessing their sin, and humbly imploring forgiveness! which proves, not only their having sinned, but their being as yet wholly impenitent. (4.) The judgment passed upon them was a proof of their being guilty in the sight of God. Thus was man’s original righteousness lost; thus did he fall both from the favour and image of God.” (pp. 14, 15.)

“This appears, 2. From the guilt which inseparably attends every transgression of the divine law. I say, every transgression; because every sin virtually contains all sin; for, ‘whosoever keepeth the whole law and offendeth in one point, he is guilty of all.’ Every single offence is a virtual breach of all the commands of God. There is in every particular sin, the principle of all sin; namely, the contempt of that sovereign authority which is equally stamped upon every command. When, therefore, our first parents ate the forbidden fruit, they not only violated a particular precept, but the entire law of God. They could not sin in one instance, without virtually transgressing the whole law of their creation; which being once done, their title to God’s favour and their original righteousness were both lost.” (p. 16.)

“This appears, 3. From the comprehensive nature and aggravating circumstances of the first transgression. For it implied, (1.) Unbelief: Man did not dare to break the divine command till he was brought to question the truth of the divine threatening. (2.) Irreverence of God: Reverence is a mixture of love and fear; and had they continued in their first love and filial fear, they could not have broken through the sole command of God. (3.) Ingratitude: For what a return did they hereby make to their Creator for all his benefits! (4.) Pride and ambition; affecting to be ‘as gods, knowing good and evil.’ (5.) Sensuality: The woman looked upon the fruit with an irregular appetite. Here the conflict between reason and sense began. To talk of such a conflict in man before he fell is to represent him as in a degree sinful and guilty even while innocent. For conflict implies opposition; and

an opposition of appetite to reason is nothing else than a repugnance to the law of God. But of this our first parents were no way guilty, till their innocence was impaired; till they were led by the temptation of the devil to desire the forbidden fruit. (6.) Robbery: For the fruit was none of theirs. They had no manner of right to it. Therefore their taking it was a flat robbery of God; which cannot be less criminal than robbing our fellow creatures. So comprehensive was the nature, so aggravated the circumstances, of man's first transgression." (pp. 17, 18.)

"III. Hereby he incurred death of every kind; not only temporal, but also spiritual and eternal. By losing his original righteousness, he became not only mortal as to his body, but also spiritually dead, dead to God, dead in sin; void of that principle which St. Paul terms, 'the life of God,' Eph. iv, 18; St. John, 'eternal life abiding in us,' 1 John iii, 15. A creature formed with a capacity of knowing, loving, and serving God, must be either 'dead in sin,' or 'alive to God.' Adam, in his primitive state, was 'alive to God;' but after he had sinned, dead in sin, as well as dead in law." (p. 20.)

"But Dr. Taylor is sure, only temporal death was to be the consequence of his disobedience. 'For death is the loss of life, and must be understood according to the nature of the life to which it is opposed.' Most true; and the life to which it is here opposed, the life Adam enjoyed, till lost by sin, was not only bodily life, but that principle of holiness which the Scripture terms, 'the life of God.' It was also a title to eternal life. All this, therefore, he lost by sin. And that justly; for 'death is the' due 'wages of sin;' death, both temporal, spiritual, and eternal." (p. 21.)

"IV. Adam's first sin was the sin of a public person,—one whom God had appointed to represent all his descendants.

"This also has been proved. In one sense, indeed, Adam's sin was not ours. It was not our personal fault, our actual transgression. But in another sense it was ours; it was the sin of our common representative: And, as such, St. Paul shows it is imputed to us and all his descendants. Hence,—

"V. All these are from their birth 'children of wrath;' void of all righteousness, and propense to sin of all sorts.

"In order to clear and confirm this proposition, I intend,

"1. To consider a text which proves original sin in the full extent of it.

"2. To explain some other texts, which relate either to the guilt or the corruption we derive from our first parents.

"3. To add some arguments which Dr. Taylor has taken no notice of, or touched but very slightly.

"4. To answer objections.

"And, 1. To consider that text, 'And were by nature children of wrath, even as others,' Eph. ii, 3. In the beginning of the chapter, St. Paul puts the Ephesians in mind of what God had done for them. This led him to observe what they had been before their conversion to God: They had been 'dead in trespasses and sins;' but were now 'quickened,' made alive to God. They had 'walked according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that worketh with energy in the children of disobedience.' 'Among such,' saith the Apostle, 'we all had our conversation in times past;' the whole time before our conversion; 'fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind; and were by nature children of wrath, even as others.' On this I observe,—

"(1.) The persons spoken of are both the believing Ephesians and the Apostle himself. For he says not, 'Ye were,' speaking in the second person, as he had done, verses 1, 2; but, 'We were,'—plainly with a design the more expressly to include himself. Indeed, had he still spoken in the second person, yet what is here affirmed would have been true of him as well as them. But for the sake of more explicitly including himself, he chose to say, 'We were;'—you, Ephesians, who were descended of Heathen parents, and I, who was born in the visible Church.

"(2.) The 'wrath' here spoken of, means either God's displeasure at

sinners, or the punishment which he threatens and inflicts for sin." (pp. 25-28.)

"(3.) 'Children of wrath,' is a Hebraism, and denotes persons worthy of, or liable to, wrath. And this implies the being sinners; seeing sin only exposes us to God's displeasure and the dreadful effects of it.

"(4.) This charge the Apostle fixes on himself and them, as they had been before their conversion. He does not say, *We are*, but '*we were*, children of wrath.'" (p. 29.)

"(5.) He speaks of himself and the converted Ephesians as having been so equally with others. There is an emphasis on the words, 'even as others;' even as the stubborn Jews and idolatrous Heathens; even as all who are still 'strangers and enemies' to Christ. These are still 'children of wrath:' But whatever difference there is between us and them, we were once what they are now.

"(6.) He expressly says, 'We were children of wrath even as others, by nature,' or from our birth. He does not say, *We became* so by education, or by imitation, or by custom in sinning; but, to show us when it is that we commence sinners, by what means we become 'children of wrath,' whence it is that we are so prone to evil from our infancy, and to imitate bad rather than good examples, he says, 'We were children of wrath by nature:' we were born fallen creatures; we came into the world sinners, and, as such, liable to wrath, in consequence of the fall of our first father.

"But it is affirmed, (i.) That '*by nature* means, by habit or custom.' I answer, Though the term, *nature*, with some qualifying expression annexed, is sometimes taken for inveterate custom, yet it is never so taken when put singly, without any such qualifying expression. When, therefore, the Apostle says absolutely, 'We were children of wrath by nature,' this, according to the constant sense of the words, must mean, *We were so from our birth.*" (p. 31.)

"It is affirmed, (ii.) That, because the original words stand thus, *τεκνα φουσι οργης*, *children by nature of wrath*; therefore, *children by nature* means only *truly and really* children of wrath.' I answer, The consequence is good for nothing: For let the words stand as they will, it is evident that *τεκνα φουσι* are, *children by birth*; or, such as are born so, in distinction from those who become such afterward.

"It is affirmed, (iii.) 'That *φουσι*, *by nature*, signifies no more than *truly or really*.' I answer, First, It is not allowed, that any good Greek writers ever use the word in this sense. Secondly, Whatever others do, the writers of the New Testament always use it in another sense. So Galatians ii, 15: 'We who are Jews by nature,' *φουσι Ισδουοι*; that is, *We who are born Jews*, in contradistinction to proselytes. 'Ye did service to them which by nature are no gods,' Gal. iv, 8; *μη φουσι σοι θεοις*, persons or things which are partakers of no *divine nature*. 'The Gentiles do by nature the things contained in the law,' Rom. ii, 14; that is by their own natural powers, without a written law. Neither here, nor any where else, does the word *φουσι* signify no more than *really or truly*." (p. 32.)

"It remains, then, that the word which we render *by nature* does really so signify.

"And yet it is allowed, we are not so guilty by nature, as a course of actual sin afterward makes us. But we are, antecedent to that course, 'children of wrath;' liable to some degree of wrath and punishment. Here, then, from a plain text, taken in its obvious sense, we have a clear evidence both of what divines term, original sin imputed, and of original sin inherent. The former is the sin of Adam, so far reckoned ours as to constitute us in some degree guilty; the latter, a want of original righteousness, and a corruption of nature; whence it is, that from our infancy we are averse to what is good, and propense to what is evil." (p. 33.)

"I am, 2. To explain some other texts which relate either to the guilt or the corruption which we derive from our first parents.

"Genesis v, 3: Here the image of Adam, in which he begat a son after

his fall, stands opposed to the image of God, in which man was at first created. Moses had said, 'In the day that God created man, in the likeness of God made he him.' (Verse 1.) In this, speaking of Adam as he was after the fall, he does not say, He begat a son in the likeness of God; but, He 'begat a son in his own likeness, after his image.' Now, this must refer to Adam, either as a man, or as a good man, or as a mortal, sinful man. But it could not refer to him merely as a man. The inspired writer could not design to inform us that Adam begat a man, not a lion, or a horse. It could not well refer to him as a good man; for it is not said, Adam begat a son, who at length became pious like himself; but, He 'begat a son in his own likeness.' It refers to him, therefore, as a mortal, sinful man; giving us to know, that the mortality and corruption contracted by the fall descended from Adam to his son: Adam, a sinner, begat a sinner like himself. And if Seth was thus a sinner by nature, so is every other descendant of Adam." (pp. 35, 36.)

"Dr. Taylor takes no notice of the antithesis between 'the likeness of God,' (verse 1.) and 'the likeness of Adam,' (verse 3:.) On the other hand, he speaks of these two as one; as if Seth had been 'born' in the very same image of God wherein Adam was 'made.' But this cannot be admitted; because Adam had now lost his original righteousness. It must therefore be 'the likeness' of fallen, corrupted Adam which is here intended.

"And God saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually,' Gen. vi, 5. Here Moses, having observed, as the cause of the flood, that 'God saw that the wickedness of man was great,' to account for this general wickedness, adds, 'Every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was evil;' yea, was 'only evil,' and that 'continually.' The heart of man is here put for his soul. This God had formed with a marvellous thinking power. But so is his soul debased, that 'every imagination,' figment, formation, 'of the thoughts,' of it, 'is evil,' only evil, 'continually' evil. Whatever it forms within itself, as a thinking power, is an evil formation. This Moses spoke of the antediluvians; but we cannot confine it to them. If all their actual wickedness sprung from the evil formations of their corrupt heart; and if consequently they were sinners from the birth, so are all others likewise." (p. 37.)

"I will not again curse the ground any more for man's sake; for the imagination of man's heart is evil from his youth; neither will I again smite any more every living thing,' Gen. viii, 21. I will not be provoked to this by the wickedness of mankind; for they are inclined to sin from their childhood. Was I, therefore, to do this as often as they deserve, I must be continually destroying the earth. The word רָצוֹן—*imagination*—(as was observed before) includes the thoughts, affections, inclinations, with every thing which the soul, as a thinking being, forges and frames within itself. And the word we render *youth*, includes childhood and infancy, the earliest age of man; the whole time from his birth, or (as others affirm) from his formation in the womb.

"Indeed Dr. Taylor would translate the text, 'Although the imagination of man's heart should be evil from his youth.' But, (1.) Though the particle וְ sometimes signifies *although*; yet *for* is its common meaning. And we are not to recede from the usual signification of a word without any necessity. (2.) If we read *although*, it will not at all invalidate our proof. For still the plain meaning of the words would be, 'I will not send another general flood, although every figment or formation of the heart of every man is evil from his earliest infancy.'" (p. 39.)

"Although affliction cometh not forth of the dust; yet man is born to trouble, as the sparks fly upward,' Job v, 6, 7. The word which is here rendered affliction, sometimes signifies 'iniquity.' For what reason, but to show that these two, 'sin' and 'affliction,' are inseparable? Sin is the cause of affliction; and affliction, of whatever kind, is the genuine effect of sin.

Indeed it is incompatible with the justice and mercy of God to appoint afflictions of any kind for the innocent. If Christ suffered, it was because the sins of others were imputed to him. If, then, every one of the posterity of Adam 'is born to trouble,' it must be, because he is born a sinner: For man was not originally made to suffer. Nor while he preserved his innocence was he liable to suffering of any kind. Are the angels, or any pure, sinless creatures, liable to any sorrow or affliction? Surely no. But every child of Adam is. And it is in consequence of his sin, that the present life of man is short and afflictive; of which the very Heathens were deeply sensible. They also saw, that 'great travail is created for every man, and a heavy yoke is upon the sons of Adam, from the day that they go out of their mother's womb, till the day that they return to the mother of all things.' (p. 40.)

"Vain man would be wise, though man be born like a wild ass's colt," Job xi, 12; in the original, 'though man be born' (will be born in every age) 'the colt of a wild ass.' Dr. Taylor owns, 'We are born quite ignorant.' But this is far from reaching the plain import of the text, in which man, as born into the world, is compared to an animal most remarkably stupid and intractable. And such all the sons of Adam naturally are, particularly with regard to the things of God; from their infancy slow to learn what is good, though impetuously propense to learn and practise what is evil." (pp. 43, 44.)

"Job xiv, 4, and xv, 14. I join these, because the latter confirms the former. 'Who can bring a clean thing,' or person, 'out of an unclean? Not one.' This is express. Job had been reflecting on the sorrowful, uncertain, imperfect, state of all Adam's children in the present world. (xiv, 1-3.) Then he carries his thoughts to the spring of such a state, the original corruption of man. 'Who,' what creature, can make an innocent, righteous person proceed from a parent defiled by sin? 'Not one.' Through the whole Scripture we may observe, 'sin' is described as 'uncleanness,' and a sinner as an unclean thing. On the contrary, holiness is expressed by 'cleanness' of heart and hands; and the righteous man is described as clean. Agreeably to which, the text asserts the natural impossibility of any man's being born clean, guiltless, and sinless, because he proceeds from them who are unclean, guilty, and defiled with sin.

"The Septuagint translate the text, 'Who shall be clean from filth? Not one; even though his life on earth be a single day.' And this rendering, though not according to the Hebrew, is followed by all the fathers; and shows what was the general belief of the Jews before Christ came into the world."

"But since *the heavens* and *stars* are represented as *not clean*, compared to God, may not man also be here termed unclean, only as compared with him? I answer, (1.) The heavens are manifestly compared with God; but man is not in either of these texts. He is here described, not as he is in comparison of God, but as he is absolutely in himself. (2.) When 'the heavens' and 'man' are mentioned in the same text, and man is set forth as 'unclean,' his 'uncleanness' is expressed by his being 'unrighteous;' and that always means guilty or sinful. Nor, indeed is the innocent frailty of mankind ever in Scripture termed 'uncleanness.'" (pp. 45, 46.)

"Behold, I was shapen in iniquity; and in sin did my mother conceive me,' Psalm li, 5. The Psalmist here confesses, bewails, and condemns himself, for his natural corruption, as that which principally gave birth to the horrid sins with which he had been overtaken. 'Behold!' He prefixes this to render his confession the more remarkable, and to show the importance of the truth here declared: 'I was shapen;' this passive verb denotes somewhat in which neither David nor his parents had any active concern: 'In' or with 'iniquity, and in' or with 'sin did my mother conceive me.' The word which we render 'conceive,' signifies properly, to *warm*, or to *cherish by warmth*. It does not, therefore, so directly refer to the act of conceiving as to the cherishing what is conceived till the time of its birth. But either way the

proof is equally strong for the corruption of mankind from their first existence." (pp. 47, 48.)

"The wicked are estranged from the womb: they go astray as soon as they are born, speaking lies. They are estranged from the womb,' Psalm lviii, 3, 4; strangers and averse to true, practical religion, from the birth. 'They go astray as soon as they are born, speaking lies.' Not that they actually speak lies as soon as they are born; but they naturally incline that way, and discover that inclination as early as is possible." (pp. 51, 52.)

"Foolishness is bound in the heart of a child; but the rod of correction shall drive it far from him,' Prov. xxii, 15. 'The rod and reproof give wisdom: but a child left to himself bringeth his mother to shame,' xxix, 15. These passages put together are a plain testimony of the inbred corruption of young children. 'Foolishness,' in the former, is not barely 'appetite, or a want of the knowledge attainable by instruction.' Neither of these deserve that sharp correction. But it is an indisposedness to what is good, and a strong propensity to evil. This 'foolishness is bound in the heart of a child;' it is rooted in his inmost nature. It is, as it were, 'fastened to him by strong cords;' so the original word signifies. From this corruption of heart in every child it is, that the 'rod of correction' is necessary to give him 'wisdom:' hence it is, that 'a child left to himself,' without correction, 'brings his mother to shame.' If a child were born equally inclined to virtue and vice, why should the wise man speak of foolishness, or wickedness, as fastened so closely to his heart? And why should 'the rod and reproof' be so necessary for him? These texts, therefore, are another clear proof of the corruption of human nature.

"Those things which proceed out of the mouth, come from the heart, and they defile the man. For from within, out of the heart, proceed evil thoughts, adulteries, murders:—All these things come from within, and defile the man,' Matt. xv, 18, 19; Mark vii, 20-23. Our Lord here teaches, that all evil thoughts, words, and actions, of every kind, flow out of the heart, the soul of man, as being now averse to all good, and inclined to all evil." (pp. 55, 56.)

"Rom. v, 12-19. Let the reader please to read the whole passage very carefully. The Apostle here discourses of Adam and Christ as two representatives or public persons, comparing the 'sin' of the one, with the 'righteousness' of the other." (p. 66.)

"On this I observe, (1.) The 'one man,' spoken of throughout, is Adam, the common head of mankind: and to him (not to the devil or Eve) the Apostle ascribes the introduction of 'sin' and 'death.' The devil was the first sinner, and Eve, seduced by him, sinned before her husband. Yet the Apostle saith, 'By one man sin entered into the world; through the offence of one many are dead; the judgment was by one to condemnation; death reigned by one. By the offence of one, judgment came upon all men; by one man's disobedience many were made sinners.' Now, why should the Apostle lay all this on Adam, whose sin was posterior both to the devil's and Eve's, if Adam was not appointed by God the federal head of mankind? In regard to which the Apostle points at him singly, as the type or 'figure of Him that was to come.' According to Dr. Taylor's doctrine, he should rather have said, 'By the devil sin entered into the world;' or, 'Through the disobedience of Eve many were made sinners.' But, instead of this he fixes on our first father alone, as bringing sin and death on all his posterity." (p. 67.)

"(2.) 'The sin, transgression, offence, disobedience,' here spoken of, was Adam's eating the forbidden fruit. It is remarkable, that as the Apostle throughout his discourse arraigns one man only, so he ascribes all the mischief done to one single offence of that one man. And as he then stood in that special relation of federal as well as natural head to his descendants, so upon his committing that one sin, this special relation ceased.

"(3.) The 'all,' (verses 12, 18,) and the 'many,' (verses 15, 19,) are all

the natural descendants of Adam; equivalent with 'the world,' (verse 12,) which means the inhabitants of it." (p. 69.)

"(4.) 'The effects of Adam's sin on his descendants, the Apostle reduces to two heads, sin and death. 'By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed on all men, for that all have sinned.' 'Sin' sometimes means 'punishment;' but not here: 'sin' and 'death' are here plainly distinguished. The common translation is therefore right, and gives us the true meaning of the words. 'Death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned;' namely, in or with their first father. And this agrees with the context; the purport of which is, that all have sinned, and are therefore liable to the death originally threatened; which is evident from this: That 'until the law sin was in the world;'—in the ages that preceded the law of Moses, all men were sinners in the sight of God: 'But sin is not imputed where there is no law;'—none can be sinners in the sight of God if they are not transgressors of some law, for the transgressing of which they are reputed guilty: 'Nevertheless death reigned' all the time 'from Adam to Moses' over all mankind. Now, if none is liable to death, but for sin; if 'sin is not imputed where there is no law;' and if, notwithstanding this, all mankind in all ages have died; infants themselves, who cannot actually sin, not excepted; it is undeniable, that guilt is imputed to all for the sin of Adam. Why else are they liable to that which is inflicted on none but for sin?

"This is the purport of the Apostle's arguing, (verses 12–14,) which having led him to mention Adam as a figure of Christ, he then draws a parallel between them. The substance of it is this: As through the 'offence of Adam many are dead,' as 'by the disobedience of him many are made sinners;' so through the righteousness or 'obedience of Christ many are made righteous.' But how are many dead, or made sinners, through the disobedience of Adam! His first sin so far affects all his descendants as to constitute them guilty, or liable to all that death which was contained in the original threatening." (p. 72.)

"But Dr. Taylor avers, 'To be made sinners, means only to be subjected to temporal death.'

"I answer, (1.) Whatever it means, the disobedience of Adam had a proper, causal influence upon it; just as the obedience of Christ has upon our being made righteous.

"(2.) What 'to be made sinners' means, must be learned from the opposite to it, in the latter part of the verse. Now, allowing the Apostle to be his own interpreter, 'being made righteous' is the same with 'justification,' verse 16. Of this he had treated largely before. And through the whole of his discourse, 'to be justified' is to be acquitted from guilt, and 'accepted of God' as righteous. Consequently, 'to be made sinners' is to be 'condemned of God,' or to be 'children of wrath,' and that on account of Adam's sin." (p. 73.)

"'By man came death: in Adam all die,' 1 Cor. xv, 21, 22. Let the reader please to bear in mind the whole of the two verses and the context. By 'man,' in the twenty-first verse, is meant Adam. 'The 'all' spoken of are all his natural descendants. These 'all die;' that is, as his descendants, are liable to death, yea, to death everlasting. That this is the meaning appears hence: that the 'being made alive,' to which this dying stands opposed, is not a mere recovery of life, but a blessed resurrection to a glorious immortality. Hence I observe, (1.) Man was originally immortal as well as righteous. In his primitive state he was not liable to death. (2.) Death is constantly ascribed to sin, as the sole and proper cause of it. As it was threatened only for sin, so the sentence was not pronounced till after man had sinned. (3.) All men are mortal from their birth. As soon as they begin to live they are liable to death, the punishment denounced against sin, and sin only. (4.) This is the genuine effect of the first sin of our first father. The Apostle does not attribute it to the devil; neither does he say, 'In Adam and Eve all die.' But here also he mentions Adam singly. Him he

speaks of as 'a figure of Christ,' verses 45, 47, 48. And here, as the sole author of death to all his natural descendants. 'In Adam,' or on account of his fall, 'all' of mankind, in every age, 'die;' consequently, in him all sinned. With him all fell in his first transgression. That they are all born liable to the legal punishment of sin proves him the federal as well as natural head of mankind; whose sin is so far imputed to all men, that they are born 'children of wrath,' and liable to death." (pp. 74-77.)

"Thus have I considered a large number of texts, which testify of original sin, imputed and inherent. Some are more express than others, of which kind are Job xiv, 4; Psalm li, 5; lviii, 3; Rom. v, 12, &c; 1 Cor. xv, 22; Eph. ii, 3. That in Ephesians presents us with a direct proof of the entire doctrine. Those in Romans and Corinthians relate directly to original sin imputed, and are but consequential proofs of original corruption. The rest refer particularly to this, and are but consequential proofs of original sin imputed.

"And as this doctrine stands impregnable on the basis of Scripture, so it is perfectly agreeable to sound reason; as may appear from a few plain arguments which confirm this Scripture doctrine." (p. 79.)

"(1.) If the first man was by God's appointment, as has been shown, the federal head of all his descendants, it follows, that when Adam sinned and fell, they all sinned in him, and fell with him. And if they did, they must come into the world both guilty and unclean.

"'But we had no hand in Adam's sin, and therefore cannot be guilty on account of it.'

"This, 'We had no hand in it,' is ambiguous. It means either, 'We did not actually join therein,' which no one denies, or, 'We were wholly unconcerned in it;' the contrary to which has been fully proved.

"(2.) Since Adam's posterity are born liable to death, which is the due 'wages of sin,' it follows, that they are born sinners. No art can set aside the consequence.

"(3.) Either Christ is the Saviour of infants, or he is not; if he is not, how is he 'the Saviour of all men?' But, if he is, then infants are sinners; for he suffered death for sinners only. He 'came to seek and save' only 'that which was lost;' to 'save his people from their sins.' It follows, that infants are sinners; that they are lost, and, without Christ, are undone for ever.

"(4.) The consequences of the contrary opinion are shockingly absurd:—
 "(i.) If original sin is not, either death is not 'the wages of sin,' or there is punishment without guilt; God punishes innocent, guiltless creatures. To suppose which is to impute iniquity to the Most Holy." (p. 84.)

"(ii.) If we are not sinners by nature, there are sinful actions without a principle, fruit growing without a root. 'No; men contract sinful habits by degrees, and then commence sinners.' But whence is it that they contract those habits so easily and speedily? Whence is it, that, as soon as ever we discover reason, we discover sinful dispositions? The early discoveries of reason prove a principle of reason planted in our nature. In like manner the early discoveries of sinful dispositions prove those dispositions planted therein." (p. 85.)

"(iii.) If we were not ruined by the first Adam, neither are we recovered by the second. If the sin of Adam was not imputed to us, neither is the righteousness of Christ.

"(iv.) If we do not derive a corrupt nature from Adam, we do not derive a new nature from Christ.

"(v.) A denial of original sin not only renders baptism needless with regard to infants, but represents a great part of mankind as having no need of Christ, or the grace of the new covenant. I now speak of infants in particular, who, if not 'guilty before God,' no more need the merits and grace of the Second Adam than the brutes themselves.

"Lastly. A denial of original sin contradicts the main design of the Gos-

pel, which is to humble vain man, and to ascribe to God's free grace, not man's free will, the whole of his salvation. Nor, indeed, can we let this doctrine go without giving up, at the same time, the greatest part, if not all, of the essential articles of the Christian faith. If we give up this, we cannot defend either justification by the merits of Christ, or the renewal of our natures by his Spirit. Dr. Taylor's book is not, therefore, subversive of a particular branch, but of the whole scheme, of Christianity.

"VI. The doctrine, therefore, of original sin is not only a truth agreeable to Scripture and reason, but a truth of the utmost importance. And it is a truth to which the Churches of Christ, from the beginning, have borne a clear testimony.

"Few truths, if any, are more necessary to be known, believed, and thoroughly considered. For if we are not acquainted with this, we do not know ourselves; and if we do not know ourselves, we cannot rightly know Christ and the grace of God. And on this knowledge of Christ and the grace of God depends the whole of our salvation. St. Augustine, therefore, well remarks, 'Christianity lies properly in the knowledge of what concerns Adam and Christ.' For, certainly, if we do not know Christ, we know nothing to any purpose; and we cannot know Christ, without some knowledge of what relates to Adam, who was 'the figure of Him that was to come.'

"But if this doctrine is so important, why is so little said of it in Scripture, and in the writings of the ancients?"

"This is a grand mistake. We totally deny that the Scripture says little of it. Dr. Taylor, indeed, affirms, 'There are but five passages of Scripture that plainly relate to the effects of Adam's fall.' Not so; many scriptures, as has been shown, plainly and directly teach us this doctrine; and many others deliver that from which it may be rationally and easily deduced. Indeed, the whole doctrine of salvation by Christ, and divine grace, implies this; and each of its main branches—justification and regeneration—directly leads to it. So does the doctrine of man's original righteousness, than which nothing is more clearly revealed." (p. 88.)

"And if the writers before St. Augustine say little concerning it, is not the reason plain? The occasions of their writing did not lead them to enlarge on what none had ever opposed or denied. For none had ever opposed or denied this doctrine. 'Who,' says Vincentius Lirinensis, 'before Celestius, denied all mankind to be involved in the guilt of Adam's transgression?' Yet they are not silent concerning it. Justin Martyr speaks of 'mankind as fallen under death and the deceit of the serpent;' of 'all Adam's descendants, as condemned for his sin; and all that are Christ's, as justified by him.' (*Dial. with Trypho.*) In Irenæus there are numerous, strong, express testimonies, both to original righteousness and original sin in the full extent: 'What we lost in Adam, that is, a being after the image and likeness of God, this we recover by Christ.' (*Irenæus*, l. 3, c. 20.) Again: 'They who receive the ingrafted word return to the ancient nature of man, that by which he was made after the image and likeness of God.' (*Ibid.* l. 5, c. 10.) He likewise speaks of our 'sinning in Adam:' 'In the first Adam,' says he, 'we offended God; in the second Adam, we are reconciled;' and frequently of 'man's losing the image of God by the fall, and recovering it by Christ.' Tertullian says, 'Man was in the beginning deceived, and, therefore, condemned to death; upon which his whole race became infected and partaker of his condemnation.' (*De Testimonio Animæ.*) Cyprian is express in his epistle to Fidus. Origen says, 'The curse of Adam is common to all.' Again: 'Man, by sinning, lost the image and likeness of God.' And again: 'No one is clean from the filth of sin, even though he is not above a day old.'" (p. 93.)

"The whole of me,' says Nazianzen, 'has need of being saved, since the whole of me fell, and was condemned for the disobedience of my first father.' Many more are the testimonies of Athanasius, Basil, Hilary; all prior to St. Augustine. And how generally since St. Augustine this important truth

has been asserted is well known. Plain it is, therefore, that the Churches of Christ, from the beginning, have borne clear testimony to it.

“To conclude, 1. This is a Scriptural doctrine: Many plain texts directly teach it.

“2. It is a rational doctrine, thoroughly consistent with the dictates of sound reason; and this, notwithstanding there may be some circumstances relating thereto which human reason cannot fathom.” (p. 91.)

“3. It is a practical doctrine. It has the closest connection with the life, power, and practice of religion. It leads man to the foundation of all Christian practice, the knowledge of himself; and hereby, to the knowledge of God, and the knowledge of Christ crucified. It prepares him for, and confirms him in, just conceptions of the dependence of his salvation, on the merits of Christ for justification, and the power of his Spirit for inward and outward holiness. It humbles the natural pride of man; it excludes self-applause and boasting; and points out the true and only way whereby we may fulfil all righteousness.

“4. It is an experimental doctrine. The sincere Christian, day by day, carries the proof of it in his own bosom; experiencing that in himself, which is abundantly sufficient to convince him, that ‘in him,’ by nature, ‘dwelleth no good thing; but that it is God alone who worketh in him both to will and to do of his good pleasure.’”

LEWISHAM, March 23, 1757.

I HAVE NOW gone through, as my leisure would permit, this whole complicated question; and I have spoken on each branch of it with plainness and openness, according to the best light I have at present. I have only a few words more to add, and that with the same openness and simplicity.

What I have often acknowledged, I now repeat. Were it not on a point of so deep importance, I would no more enter the lists with Dr. Taylor, than I would lift my hand against a giant. I acknowledge your abilities of every kind; your natural and acquired endowments; your strong understanding; your lively and fruitful imagination; your plain and easy, yet nervous, style. I make no doubt of your having studied the original Scriptures for many years. And I believe you have moral endowments which are infinitely more valuable and more amiable than all these. For (if I am not greatly deceived) you bear “good will to all men.” And may not I add, you fear God?

O what might not you do with these abilities! What would be too great for you to attempt and effect! Of what service might you be, not only to your own countrymen, but to all that bear the Christian name! How might you advance the cause of true, primitive, Scriptural Christianity; of solid, rational virtue; of the deep, holy, happy, spiritual religion, which is brought to light by the Gospel! How capable are you of recommending, not barely morality, (the duty of man to man,) but piety, the duty of man to God, even the “worshipping him in spirit and in truth!” How well qualified are you to explain, enforce, defend, even “the deep things of God;” the nature of the kingdom of God “within us;” yea, the *interiora regni Dei!* [Inner things of the kingdom of God!] (I speak on supposition of your having the “unction of the Holy One,” added to your other qualifications.) And are you, whom God has so highly favoured, among those who serve the opposite cause? If one might transfer the words of a man to Him, might not one conceive Him to say, *Και σὺ εἶ ἐκείνων; καὶ σὺ, τέκνον;* [Art thou also one of them? even thou, son?] Are you disserving the cause of inward

religion, labouring to destroy the inward kingdom of God, sapping the foundation of all true, spiritual worship, advancing morality on the ruins of piety? Are *you* among those who are overthrowing the very foundations of primitive, Scriptural Christianity? which certainly can have no ground to stand upon, if the scheme lately advanced be true. What room is there for it, till men repent? know themselves? Without this can they know or love God? O why should you block up the way to repentance, and consequently, to the whole religion of the heart? "Let a man be a fool," says the Apostle, "that he may be wise." But you tell him, he is wise already; that every man is by nature as wise as Adam was in paradise. He gladly drinks in the soothing sound, and sleeps on and takes his rest. We beseech those who are mad after earthly things, to take knowledge of the dreadful state they are in; to return to their Father, and beg of him "the spirit of love and of a sound mind." You tell them they are of a "sound mind" already. They believe, and turn to their husks again. Jesus comes to "seek and save that which is lost." You tell the men of form, (though as dead to God as a stone,) that they are not lost; that (inasmuch as they are free from gross sins) they are in a good way, and will undoubtedly be saved. So they live and die, without the knowledge, love, or image of God; and die eternally!

"They will be saved." But are they saved already? We know all real Christians are. If they are, if these are possessed of the present salvation which the Scripture speaks of, what is that salvation? How poor, dry, dull, shallow, superficial a thing! Wherein does it excel what the wiser Heathens taught, nay, and perhaps experienced? What poor pitiable creatures are those Christians, so called, who have advanced no higher than this! You see enough of these on every side; perhaps even in your own congregation. What knowledge have they of the things of God? what love to God or to Christ? what heavenly mindedness? how much of "the mind which was in Christ Jesus?" How little have they profited by all your instructions! How few are wiser and better than when you knew them first! O take knowledge of the reason why they are not! That doctrine will not "make them wise unto salvation." All it can possibly do, is to shake off the leaves. It does not affect the branches of sin. Unholy tempers are just as they were. Much less does it strike at the root: Pride, self-will, unbelief, heart-idolatry, remain undisturbed and unsuspected.

I am grieved for the people who are thus seeking death in the error of their life. I am grieved for you, who surely desire to teach them the way of God in truth. O Sir, think it possible, that you may have been mistaken! that you may have leaned too far, to what you thought the better extreme! Be persuaded once more to review your whole cause, and that from the very foundation. And in doing so, you will not disdain to desire more than natural light. O that "the Father of glory may give unto you the Spirit of wisdom and revelation!" May He "enlighten the eyes of your understanding, that you may know what is the hope of his calling, and what the riches of the glory of his inheritance in the saints!"

LEWISHAM, March 24, 1757.

PART VII.

THE DOCTRINE OF ORIGINAL SIN.

BECAUSE of the unspeakable importance of thoroughly understanding this great foundation of all revealed religion, I subjoin one more extract, (from Mr. Boston's "Fourfold State of Man,") relating both to the original and the present state of man:—

"God 'made man upright.' By man we are to understand our first parents, the archetypal pair, the root of mankind. This man was made right, (agreeable to the nature of God, whose work is perfect,) without any imperfection, corruption, or principle of corruption, in his body or soul. He was made upright; that is, straight with the will and law of God, without any irregularity in his soul. God made him thus; he did not first make him, and then make him righteous: But in the very making of him he made him righteous; righteousness was concreated with him. With the same breath that God breathed into him a living soul, he breathed into him a righteous soul.

"This righteousness was the conformity of all the faculties and powers of his soul to the moral law; which implied three things:—

"First. His understanding was a lamp of light. He was made after God's image, and consequently could not want knowledge, which is a part thereof. And a perfect knowledge of the law was necessary to fit him for universal obedience, seeing no obedience can be according to the law, unless it proceed from a sense of the command of God requiring it. It is true, Adam had not the law writ on tables of stone; but it was written upon his mind. God impressed it upon his soul, and made him a law to himself, as the remains of it even among the Heathens testify. And seeing man was made to be the mouth of the creation, to glorify God in his works, we have ground to believe, he had an exquisite knowledge of the works of God. We have a proof of this in his giving names to the beasts of the field, and the fowls of the air, and these such as express their nature: 'Whatsoever Adam called every living thing, that was the name thereof.' And the dominion which God gave him over the creatures, soberly to use them according to his will, (still in subordination to the will of God,) implies a knowledge of their natures.

"Secondly. His will lay straight with the will of God. There was no corruption in his will, no bent or inclination to evil; for that is sin properly so called; and, therefore, inconsistent with that uprightness with which it is expressly said he was endued at his creation. The will of man was then naturally inclined to God and goodness, though mutably. It was disposed by its original make to follow the Creator's will, as the shadow does the body. It was not left in an equal balance to good and evil; for then he had not been upright, or conform to the law; which no more can allow the creature not to be inclined to God as his end, than it can allow man to be a god to himself.

"Thirdly. His affections were regular, pure, and holy. All his passions, yea, all his sensitive motions and inclinations, were subordinate to his reason and will, which lay straight with the will of God. They were all, therefore, pure from all defilement, free from all disorder or distemper; because in all their motions they were duly subjected to his clear reason and his holy will. He had also an executive power, answerable to his will; a power to do the good which he knew should be done, and which he inclined to do; even to fulfil the whole law of God. If it had not been so, God would not have required perfect obedience of him. For to say that 'the Lord gathereth where he hath not strowed,' is but the blasphemy of a slothful servant.

"From what has been said it may be gathered, that man's original righteousness was universal, and natural, yet mutable.

"1. It was universal, both with respect to the subject of it, the whole man; and the object of it, the whole law: it was diffused through the whole man; it was a blessed leaven that leavened the whole lump. Man was then holy in soul, body, and spirit: while the soul remained untainted, the members of the body were consecrated vessels and instruments of righteousness. A combat between reason and appetite, nay, the least inclination to sin, was utterly inconsistent with this uprightness in which man was created; and has been invented to veil the corruption of man's nature, and to obscure the grace of God in Christ Jesus. And as this righteousness spread through the whole man, so it respected the whole law. There was nothing in the law but what was agreeable to his reason and will. His soul was shapen out in length and breadth, to the commandment, though exceeding broad; so that his original righteousness was not only perfect in parts, but in degrees.

"2. As it was universal, so it was natural to him. He was created with it. And it was necessary to the perfection of man, as he came out of the hand of God; necessary to constitute him in a state of integrity. Yet,—

"3. It was mutable: it was a righteousness which might be lost, as appears from the sad event. His will was not indifferent to good and evil: God set it toward good only, yet did not so fix it, that it could not alter; it was movable to evil, but by man himself only.

"Thus was man made originally righteous, being 'created in God's own image,' (Gen. i, 27,) which consists in 'knowledge, righteousness, and holiness,' Col. iii, 10; Eph. iv, 24. All that God made 'was very good,' according to their several natures: Gen. i, 31. And so man was morally good, being 'made after the image' of Him who is 'good and upright,' Psa. xxv, 8. Without this he could not have answered the end of his creation, which was to know, love, and serve his God. Nay, he could not be created otherwise; for he must either have been conform to the law in his powers, principles, and inclinations, or not. If he was, he was righteous: if not, he was a sinner; which is absurd and horrible to imagine.

"And as man was holy, so he was happy. He was full of peace as well as of love. And he was the favourite of Heaven. He bore the image of God, who cannot but love his own image. While he was alone in the world he was not alone; for he had free, full 'communion with God.' As yet there was nothing to turn away the face of God from the work of his own hands; seeing sin had not as yet entered, which alone could make the breach.

"He was also lord of the world, universal emperor of the whole earth. His Creator gave him 'dominion over the fish of the sea, the fowl of the air, and every thing that moveth on the earth.' He was God's deputy-governor in the lower world; and this his dominion was an image of God's sovereignty. Thus was man 'crowned with glory and honour,' having 'all things put under his feet.'

"Again: As he had perfect tranquillity in his own breast, so he had a perfect calm without. His heart had nothing to reproach him with; and, without, there was nothing to annoy him. Their beautiful bodies were not capable of injuries from the air. They were liable to no diseases or pains; and though they were not to live idle, yet toil, weariness, and sweat of the brows, were not known in this state.

"Lastly. He was immortal. He would never have died if he had not sinned. Death was threatened only in case of sin. The perfect constitution of his body, which came out of God's hand, was 'very good;' and the righteousness of his soul removed all inward causes of death. And God's special care of his innocent creature secured him against outward violence. Such were the holiness and the happiness of man in his original state.

"But there is now a sad alteration in our nature. It is now entirely corrupted. Where at first there was nothing evil, there is now nothing good: I shall,

"First, prove this.

“Secondly, represent this corruption in its several parts.

“Thirdly, show how man’s nature comes to be thus corrupted.

“First. I shall prove that man’s nature is corrupted, both by God’s word, and by men’s experience and observation.

“1. For proof from God’s word, let us consider,

“(1.) How it takes particular notice of fallen Adam’s communicating his image to his posterity. ‘Adam begat a son in his own likeness, after his image,’ Gen. v. 3. Compare this with verse 1: ‘In the day that God created man, in the image of God made he him.’ Behold here, how the ‘image’ after which man was ‘made,’ and the ‘image’ after which he is begotten, are opposed. Man was ‘made’ in the likeness of God; a holy and righteous God ‘made’ a holy and righteous creature: but fallen Adam ‘begat’ a son, not in the likeness of God, but in his ‘own likeness;’ corrupt, sinful Adam begat a corrupt, sinful son. For as the image of God included ‘righteousness’ and ‘immortality,’ so this image of fallen Adam included ‘corruption’ and ‘death.’ Moses, giving us in this chapter the first bill of mortality that ever was in the world, ushers it in with this observation,—that dying Adam begat mortals. Having sinned, he became ‘mortal,’ according to the threatening. And so he ‘begat a son in his own likeness,’ sinful, and therefore mortal; and so ‘sin and death passed on all.’

“Let us consider, (2.) That text, ‘Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? Not one,’ Job xiv. 4. Our first parents were unclean; how then can we be clean? How could our immediate parents be clean? Or how shall our children be so? The uncleanness here mentioned is a sinful uncleanness; for it is such as makes man’s days ‘full of trouble.’ And it is natural, being derived from unclean parents. ‘How can he be clean that is born of a woman?’ God can ‘bring a clean thing out of an unclean;’ and did so in the case of the man Christ; but no other can. Every person then that is born according to the course of nature is born unclean; if the root be corrupt, so are the branches. Neither is the matter mended, though the parents be holy. For they are such by ‘grace,’ not by ‘nature;’ and they beget their children as men, not as holy men; wherefore, as the circumcised parent begets an uncircumcised child, so the holiest parents beget unholy children, and cannot communicate their grace to them as they do their nature.

“(3.) Hear our Lord’s determination of the point: ‘That which is born of the flesh is flesh,’ John iii. 6. Behold the corruption of all mankind; all are ‘flesh.’ It does not mean, all are frail; (though that is a sad truth too; yea, and our natural frailty is an evidence of our natural corruption;) but, all are ‘corrupt’ and ‘sinful,’ and that naturally. Hence our Lord argues, that because they are ‘flesh,’ therefore they ‘must be born again,’ or they ‘cannot enter into the kingdom of God.’ (Verses 3, 5.) And as the corruption of our nature evidences the absolute necessity of regeneration, so the necessity of regeneration proves the corruption of our nature. For why should a man need a second birth, if his nature were not ruined in the first birth? Even infants must be born again; for this rule admits of no exception; and therefore they were circumcised under the Old Testament, as having ‘the body of the sins of the flesh,’ (which is conveyed to them by natural generation,) the whole old man, ‘to put off,’ Col ii. 11. And now, by the appointment of Christ, they are to be baptized; which shows they are unclean, and that there is no salvation for them, but ‘by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost.’

“(4.) ‘We are by nature children of wrath.’ We are worthy of, and liable to, the wrath of God; and that ‘by nature;’ and therefore, doubtless, we are by nature sinful creatures. We are condemned before we have done good or evil; under the curse ere we know what it is. But ‘will a lion roar in the forest while he hath no prey?’ Will a holy and just God roar in his wrath against man, if he be not, by his sin, made a prey for wrath? No, he will not, he cannot. We conclude, then, that, according to the word of God, man’s nature is a corrupt nature.

"2. If we consult experience, and observe the case of the world, in the things that are obvious to any person, we shall, by its fruits, easily discover the root of bitterness. I shall instance but in a few:—

"(1.) Who sees not a flood of miseries overflowing the world! Every one, at home and abroad, in city and country, in palaces and cottages, is groaning under some displeasing circumstance or other. Some are oppressed with poverty or want; some chastened with pain or sickness; some are lamenting their losses; none is without a cross of one sort or another. No man's condition is so soft but there is some thorn of uneasiness in it. And at length death, 'the wages of sin,' comes, and sweeps all away. Now, what but sin has opened the sluice! There is not a complaint or sigh heard in the world, or a tear that falls from our eye, but it is an evidence, that man is fallen as a star from heaven. For God 'distributeth sorrows in his anger,' Job xxi, 17. This is a plain proof of the corruption of nature; forasmuch as those that have not actually sinned have their share of these sorrows; yea, and draw their first breath weeping. There are also graves of the smallest as well as the largest size; and there are never wanting some in the world, who, like Rachel, are 'weeping for their children, because they are not.'

"(2.) How early does this corruption of nature appear! It is soon discerned which way the bias of the heart lies. Do not the children of fallen Adam, before they can go alone, follow their father's footsteps? What pride, ambition, curiosity, vanity, wilfulness, and averseness to good, appear in them! And when they creep out of infancy, there is a necessity of using 'the rod of correction, to drive away the foolishness that is bound in their heart.'

"(3.) Take a view of the outbreakings of sin in the world. 'The wickedness of man is yet great in the earth.' Behold the bitter fruits of corrupt nature! 'By swearing, and lying, and killing, and stealing, and committing adultery, they break out,' (like the breaking forth of waters,) 'and blood toucheth blood.' The world is filled with all manner of filthiness, wickedness, and impiety. And whence is this deluge of sin on the earth, but from the breaking up of the fountains of the great deep, 'the heart of man,' out of which 'proceed adulteries, fornications, murders, thefts, covetousness, wickedness.' Ye may, it may be, thank God, that ye are not in these respects 'like other men:' and you have reason; for the corruption of nature is the very same in you as in them.

"(4.) Cast your eye upon those terrible convulsions the world is thrown into by the wickedness of men. Lions prey not on lions, nor wolves on wolves; but men bite and devour one another. Upon how slight occasions will men sheathe their swords in one another's bowels! Since Cain shed Abel's blood, the world has been turned into a slaughter house. And the chase has been continued, ever since Nimrod began his hunting; as on the earth, so in the seas, the greater still devouring the lesser. Now, when we see the world in such a ferment, every one stabbing another with words or swords, these violent heats among the sons of Adam speak the whole body to be distempered; 'the whole head to be sick, and the whole heart faint.'

"(5.) Consider the necessity of human laws, fenced with terrors and severities. Man was made for society; and God himself said, when he created him, it was not good for him to be alone. Yet the case is such now, that, in society, he must be hedged in with thorns. And that from hence we may the better discern the corruption of man's nature, consider, (i.) Every man naturally loves to be at full liberty himself; and, were he to follow his inclination, would vote himself out of the reach of all laws, divine and human: yet, (ii.) no man would willingly adventure to live in a lawless society; and, therefore, even pirates and robbers have laws among themselves. Thus men show they are conscious of the corruption of nature, not daring to trust one another but upon security. (iii.) How dangerous soever it is to break through the hedge, yet many will do it daily. They will not only sacrifice

their conscience and credit, but, for the pleasure of a few moments, lay themselves open to a violent death, by the laws of the land wherein they live. (iv.) Laws are often made to yield to man's lusts. Sometimes whole societies break off the fetters, and the voice of laws cannot be heard for the noise of arms: and seldom there is a time, wherein there are not some persons so great and daring, that the laws dare not look them in the face. (v.) Observe even the Israelites, separated to God from all the nations of the earth; yet what horrible confusions were among them, when 'there was no king in Israel!' How hard was it to reform them, when they had the best of magistrates! And how quickly did they turn aside again, when they had wicked rulers! It seems, one grand design of that sacred history was, to discover the corruption of man's nature. (vi.) Consider the remains of natural corruption, even in them that believe. Though grace has entered, corruption is not expelled; they find it with them at all times, and in all places. If a man have an ill neighbour, he may remove; but should he go into a wilderness, or pitch his tent on a remote rock in the sea, there it will be with him. I need not stand to prove so clear a point: but consider these few things on this head: 1st. If it be thus in the green tree, how must it be in the dry? Does so much of the old remain even in those who have received a new nature? How great, then, must that corruption be in those, where it is unmixed with renewing grace! 2d. Though natural corruption is no burden to a natural man, is he therefore free from it? No, no. Only he is dead, and feels not the sinking weight. Many a groan is heard from a sick bed, but never one from a grave. 3d. The good man resists the old nature; he strives to starve it; yet it remains. How must it spread, then, and strengthen itself in the soul, where it is not starved, but fed, as in unbelievers! If the garden of the diligent find him full work, in cutting off and rooting up, surely that of the sluggard must needs be 'all grown over with thorns.'

"I shall add but one observation more, that in every man naturally the image of fallen Adam appears: to evince which, I appeal to the consciences of all, in the following particulars:—

"(1.) If God by his holy law or wise providence put a restraint upon us, to keep us back from any thing, does not that restraint whet the edge of our natural inclinations, and make us so much the keener in our desires? The very Heathens were convinced, that there is this spirit of contradiction in us, though they knew not the spring of it. How often do men give themselves a loose in those things, wherein if God had left them at liberty, they would have bound up themselves! And is not this a repeating of our father's folly, that men will rather climb for forbidden fruit, than gather what Providence offers to them, when they have God's express allowance for it!

"(2.) Is it not natural to us, to care for the body, at the expense of the soul! This was one ingredient in the sin of our first parents, Gen. iii, 6. O how happy might we be, if we were but at half the pains about our souls, which we bestow upon our bodies! if that question, 'What must I do to be saved?' did but run near so often through our minds, as those, 'What shall we eat? What shall we drink? Wherewithal shall we be clothed?'

"(3.) Is not every one by nature discontent with his present lot, or with some one thing or other in it? Some one thing is always missing; so that man is a creature given to change. If any doubt of this, let them look over all their enjoyments, and, after a review of them, listen to their own hearts, and they will hear a secret murmuring for want of something. Since the hearts of our first parents wandered from God, their posterity have a natural disease, which Solomon calls, 'The wandering of desire;' literally, 'The walking of the soul,' Eccles. vi, 9. This is a sort of diabolical fancy, wherein the soul traverseth the world, feeds itself with a thousand airy nothings, snatcheth at this and the other imagined excellency; goes here and there and everywhere, except where it should go. And the soul is never cured of this disease till it takes up its rest in God through Christ.

"(4.) Do not Adam's children naturally follow his footsteps, in 'hiding'

themselves 'from the presence of the Lord?' Gen. iii, 8. We are just as blind in this matter as he was, who thought to 'hide himself from the presence of the Lord among the trees of the garden.' We promise ourselves more security in a secret sin than in one that is openly committed. 'The adulterer saith, No eye shall see me.' And men will freely do that in secret, which they would be ashamed to do in the presence of a child: as if darkness could hide from an all-seeing God. Are we not naturally careless of 'communion with God?' nay, and averse to it? Never was there any communion between God and Adam's children, where God himself had not the first word. If he would let them alone, they would never inquire after him.

"(5.) How loath are men to 'confess sin,' to take guilt and shame to themselves! And was it not thus in the case before us? Adam confesses his nakedness, (which indeed he could not deny,) but not one word does he say about his sin. It is as natural for us to hide sin as to commit it. Many instances of this we see daily; but how many will there be in that day when God 'will judge the secrets of men?' Many a foul mouth will then be seen, which is now 'wiped, and saith, I have done no wickedness.'

"Lastly. Is it not natural for us to extenuate our sin, and transfer the guilt to others? As Adam laid the blame of his sin on the woman: And did not the woman lay the blame on the serpent? Adam's children need not be taught this; for before they can well speak, if they cannot deny, they lisp out something to lessen their fault, and lay the blame upon another. Nay, so natural is this to men, that, in the greatest of sins, they will charge the fault on God himself; blaspheming his providence under the name of ill luck, or misfortune, and so laying the blame of their sin at Heaven's door. Thus does 'the foolishness of man pervert his ways;' and his heart fretteth against the Lord. Let us then call Adam, Father: Let us not deny the relation, seeing we bear his image.

"I proceed to inquire into the corruption of nature in the several parts of it. But who can take the exact dimensions of it, in its breadth, length, height, and depth! 'The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked: Who can know it?' However, we may quickly perceive so much of it as may show the absolute necessity of regeneration. Man, in his natural state, is altogether corrupt, through all the faculties of his soul: Corrupt in his understanding, his will, his affections, his conscience, and his memory.

"I. The understanding is despoiled of its primitive glory, and covered over with confusion. We are fallen into the hands of our grand adversary, and are deprived of our two eyes. 'There is none that understandeth;' the very mind and conscience of the natural man are defiled or spoiled. But to point out this corruption of the understanding more particularly, let the following things be considered:—

"First. There is a natural weakness in the minds of men, with respect to spiritual things. How hard is it to teach them the common principles of religion; to make truths so plain, that they may understand them! Try the same persons in other things, speak of the things of this world, and they will understand quickly; but it is hard to make them know how their souls may be saved, or how their hearts may find rest in Christ. Consider even those who have many advantages above the common run of mankind: Yet how small is their knowledge of divine things! What confusion still remains in their minds! How often are they mired and 'speak as a child,' even in the matter of practical truths! It is a pitiable weakness, that we cannot perceive the things which God has revealed. And it must needs be a sinful weakness, since the law of God requires us to know and believe them.

"Secondly. Man's understanding is naturally overwhelmed with gross 'darkness' in spiritual things. Man, at the instigation of the devil, attempting to break out a new light in his mind, instead of that, broke up the doors of the bottomless pit, by the smoke whereof he was covered with darkness.

When God at first made man, his mind was a lamp of light; but sin has now turned it into darkness. Sin has closed the window of the soul. It is the land of darkness and the shadow of death, where 'the light is as darkness.' The 'prince of darkness' reigns therein, and nothing but the 'works of darkness' are framed there. That you may be the more fully convinced of this, take the following evidences of it:—

"1. The darkness that was upon the face of 'the world' before, and at the time that Christ came. When Adam by his sin had lost his light, it pleased God to reveal to him the way of salvation, Gen. iii, 15. This was handed down by holy men before the flood; yet the natural darkness of the mind of man so prevailed, as to carry off all sense of true religion from the old world, except what remained in Noah's family. After the flood, as men increased, their natural darkness of mind prevailed again, and the light decayed, till it died out among the generality of mankind, and was preserved only among the posterity of Shem. And even with them it was near setting, when God called Abraham 'from serving other gods,' Joshua xxiv, 15. God gave him a more full revelation, which he communicated to his family: Gen. xviii, 19. Yet the natural darkness wore it out at length, save that it was preserved among the posterity of Jacob. In Egypt, that darkness so prevailed over them also, that a new revelation was necessary. And many a dark cloud got above that, during the time from Moses to Christ. When Christ came, nothing was to be seen in the Gentile world but 'darkness and cruel habitations.' They were drowned in superstition and idolatry; and whatever wisdom was among their philosophers, 'the world by that wisdom knew not God,' but became more and more vain in their imaginations. Nor were the Jews much wiser: Except a few, gross darkness covered them also. Their traditions were multiplied; but the knowledge of those things wherein the life of religion lies was lost. They gloried in outward ordinances, but knew nothing of 'worshipping God in Spirit and in truth.'

"Now, what but the natural darkness of men's minds could still thus wear out the light of external revelation? Men did not forget the way of preserving their lives; but how quickly did they forget the way of saving their souls! So that it was necessary for God himself to reveal it again and again. Yea, and a mere external revelation did not suffice to remove this darkness: no, not when it was by Christ in person; there needed also the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven. Such is the natural darkness of our minds, that it only yields to the blood and Spirit of Christ.

"2. Every natural man's heart, how refined soever he appear, is full of darkness, disorder, and confusion. The unrenewed part of mankind are rambling through the world, like so many blind men, who will neither take a guide, nor can guide themselves, and therefore fall over this and the other precipice into destruction. Some are running after their covetousness, some sticking in the mire of sensuality, others dashing on the rock of pride; every one stumbling on one stone of stumbling or other, as their unmortified passions drive them. And while some are lying along in the way, others are coming up and falling headlong over them. Errors swarm in the world; all the unregenerate are utterly mistaken in the point of true happiness. All desire to be happy; but, touching the way to happiness, there are almost as many opinions as there are men. They are like the blind Sodomites about Lot's house; all seeking to 'find the door,' but in vain. Look into thine own heart, (if thou art not born again,) and thou wilt see all turned upside down; heaven lying under, and earth at top; look into thy life, and see how thou art playing the madman, eagerly flying after that which is not, and slighting that which is, and will be for ever. Thus is man's understanding naturally overwhelmed with gross 'darkness' in spiritual things.

"Thirdly. There is in the mind of man a natural bias to evil: Let us reflect a little, and we shall find incontestible evidence of it.

"1. Men's minds have a natural dexterity to do mischief; none are so simple as to want skill for this. None needs to be taught it; but as weeds,

without being sown, grow up of their own accord, so does this 'earthly, sensual, devilish wisdom' naturally grow up in us.

"2. We naturally form gross conceptions of spiritual things, as if the soul were quite immersed in flesh and blood. Let men but look into themselves, and they will find this bias in their minds; whereof the idolatry which still prevails so far and wide is an incontestible evidence; for it plainly shows men would have a visible deity; therefore they change the 'glory of the incorruptible God into an image.' Indeed the reformation of these nations has banished gross idolatry out of our churches: But heart-reformation alone can banish mental idolatry, subtle and refined image-worship, out of our minds.

"3. How difficult is it to detain the carnal mind before the Lord! to fix it in the meditation of spiritual things! When God is speaking to man by his word, or they are speaking to him in prayer, the body remains before God, but the world steals away the heart. Though the eyes be closed, the man sees a thousand vanities, and the mind roves hither and thither; and many times the man scarce comes to himself, till he is 'gone from the presence of the Lord.' The worldly man's mind does not wander when he is contriving business, casting up his accounts, or telling his money. If he answers you not at first, he tells you he did not hear you, he was busy, his mind was fixed. But the carnal mind employed about spiritual things is out of its element, and therefore cannot fix.

"4. Consider how the carnal 'imagination' supplies the want of real objects to the corrupt heart. The unclean person is filled with speculative impurities, 'having eyes full of adultery.' The covetous man fills his heart with the world, if he cannot get his hands full of it. The malicious person acts his revenge in his own breast; the envious, within his own narrow soul, sees his neighbour laid low enough; and so every lust is fed by the imagination. These things may suffice to convince us of the natural bias of the mind to evil.

"Fourthly. There is in the carnal mind an opposition to spiritual truths, and an aversion to the receiving them. God has revealed to sinners the way of salvation; he has given his word. But do natural men believe it? Indeed they do not. They believe not the promises of the word; for they who receive them are thereby made 'partakers of the divine nature.' They believe not the threatenings of the word; otherwise they could not live as they do. I doubt not but most, if not all, of you, who are in a state of nature, will here plead, Not Guilty. But the very difficulty you find in assenting to this truth, proves the unbelief with which I charge you. Has it not proceeded so far with some, that it has steeled their foreheads openly to reject all revealed religion? And though ye set not your mouths as they do against the heavens, yet the same bitter root of unbelief is in you, and reigns and will reign in you, till overcoming grace captivate your minds to the belief of the truth. To convince you of this,—

"Consider, 1. How have you learned those truths which you think you believe? Is it not merely by the benefit of your education, and of external revelation? You are strangers to the inward work of the Holy Spirit, bearing witness with the word in your hearts; and therefore ye are still unbelievers. 'It is written in the prophets, And they shall be all taught of God. Every one therefore that hath heard and learned of the Father,' saith our Lord, 'cometh unto me.' But ye have not come to Christ; therefore ye have not been 'taught of God.' Ye have not been so taught, and therefore ye have not come; ye believe not.

"Consider, 2. The utter inconsistency of most men's lives with the principles which they profess. They profess to believe the Scripture; but how little are they concerned about what is revealed therein! How unconcerned are ye even about that weighty point, whether ye be born again, or not! Many live as they were born, and are like to die as they live, and yet live in peace. Do such believe the sinfulness of a natural state! Do they believe they are 'children of wrath!' Do they believe there is no salvation without

regeneration? and no regeneration, but what makes man 'a new creature?' O no! If ye did, ye could not live in your sins, live out of Christ, and yet hope for mercy.

"Fifthly. Man is naturally high-minded. Lowliness is not a flower which grows in the field of nature. It is natural to man to think highly of himself and what is his own. 'Vain man would be wise;' so he accounts himself, and so he would be accounted by others. His way is right, because it is 'his own;' 'for every way of a man is right in his own eyes.' He is 'alive without the law;' and therefore his hope is strong, and his confidence firm. It is another tower of Babel; the word batters it, yet it stands. One while breaches are made in it, but they are quickly repaired. At another time, it is all made to shake; but it is still kept up; till God's Spirit raise a heart-quake within the man, which tumbles it down, and leaves not one stone upon another.

"Thus much of the corruption of the understanding. Call the understanding, '*Ichabod*;' for the glory is departed from it.' Consider this, ye that are yet in the state of nature, and groan ye out your case before the Lord, that the Sun of Righteousness may arise upon you, before ye be shut up in everlasting darkness. What avails your worldly wisdom? What do all your attainments in religion avail, while your understanding lies wrapped up in darkness and confusion, utterly void of the light of life?

"2. Nor is the will less corrupted than the understanding. It was at first faithful, and ruled with God; but now it is turned traitor against God, and rules with and for the devil. To open this plague of the heart, let the following things be considered:—

"First. There is in the unrenewed will an utter inability for what is truly good in the sight of God. Indeed a natural man has a power to choose and do what is materially good; but though he can will what is good and right, he can do nothing aright and well. 'Without me,' that is, separate from me, 'ye can do nothing;' nothing truly and spiritually good. To evidence this, consider,—

"(1.) How often do men see the good they should choose, and the evil they should refuse; and yet their hearts have no more power to comply with their light, than if they were arrested by some invisible hand! Their consciences tell them the right way; yet cannot their will be brought up to it. Else, how is it, that the clear arguments on the side of virtue do not bring men over to that side? Although heaven and hell were but a may be, even this would determine the will to holiness, could it be determined by reason. Yet so far is it from this, that men 'knowing the judgment of God, that they who do such things are worthy of death, not only do the same, but have pleasure in them that do them.'

"(2.) Let those who have been truly convinced of the spirituality of the law, speak, and tell if they then found themselves able to incline their hearts toward it. Nay, the more that light shone into their souls, did they not find their hearts more and more unable to comply with it? Yea, there are some who are yet in the devil's camp that can tell from their own experience, light let into the mind cannot give life to the will, or enable it to comply therewith.

"Secondly. There is in the unrenewed will an averseness to good. Sin is the natural man's element; and he is as loath to part with it, as the fishes are to come out of the water. He is sick; but utterly averse to the remedy: he loves his disease, so that he loathes the Physician. He is a captive, a prisoner, and a slave; but he loves his conqueror, gaoler, and master: he is fond of his fetters, prison, and drudgery, and has no liking to his liberty. For evidence of this averseness to good in the will of man,—

"Consider, 1. The untowardness of children. How averse are they to restraint! Are they not 'as bullocks unaccustomed to the yoke?' Yea, it is far easier to tame young bullocks to the yoke, than to bring young children under discipline. Every man may see in this, as in a glass, that man

is naturally wild and wilful; that, according to Zophar's observation, he 'is born a wild ass's colt.' What can be said more! He is like a 'colt,' the colt of an 'ass,' the colt of a 'wild ass; a wild ass used to the wildness, that snuffeth up the wind at her pleasure; in her occasion who can turn her away?'

"2. What pain and difficulty do men find in bringing their hearts to religious duties! And what a task is it to the natural man to abide at them! to leave the world but a little, and converse with God! When they are engaged in worldly business or company, time seems to fly, and is gone before they are aware. But how heavily does it drive, while a prayer, a sermon, or a Sabbath lasts! With many the Lord's day is the longest day in the week; and therefore they must sleep longer that morning, and go sooner to bed that night, than ordinarily they do, that the day may be of a tolerable length. And still their hearts say, 'When will the Sabbath be gone?'

"3. Consider how the will of the natural man 'rebels against the light.' Sometimes he is not able to keep it out; but he 'loves darkness rather than light.' The outer door of the understanding is broken open, but the inner door of the will remains shut. Corruption and conscience then encounter; till conscience is forced to give back; convictions are murdered, and truth is made and 'held' prisoner 'in unrighteousness.'

"4. When the Spirit of the Lord is working a deeper work, yet what 'resistance' does the soul make! When he comes, he finds the 'strong man keeping the house,' while the soul is fast asleep in the devil's arms, till the Lord awakens in the sinner, opens his eyes, and strikes him with terror, while the clouds are black above his head, and the sword of vengeance is held to his breast. But what pains is he at to put a fair face on a black heart! to shake off his fears, or make head against them! Carnal reason suggests, if it be ill with him, it will be ill with many. When he is beat from this, and sees no advantage in going to hell with company, he resolves to leave his sins; but cannot think of breaking off so soon; there is time enough, and he will do it afterward. When at length he is constrained to part with some sins, others are kept as right hands or right eyes. Nay, when he is so pressed, that he must needs say before the Lord, he is willing to part with all his idols, yet how long will his heart give the lie to his tongue, and prevent the execution of it!

"Thirdly. There is in the will of man a natural proneness to evil. Men are naturally 'bent to backsliding from God;' they hang (as the word is) toward backsliding. Leave the unrenewed will to itself, it will choose sin and reject holiness; and that as certainly as water poured on the side of a hill will run downward and not upward.

"1. Is not the way of evil the first way wherein the children of men go? Do not their inclinations plainly appear on the wrong side, while they have not cunning to hide them? As soon as it appears we are reasonable creatures, it appears we are sinful creatures. 'Foolishness is bound in the heart of a child, till the rod of correction drives it from him.' It is bound in the heart, woven into our very nature; nor will the knots loose; they must be broke asunder by strokes. Words will not do; the rod must be taken to drive it away. Not that the rod of itself will do this; the sad experience of many parents testifies the contrary. And Solomon himself tells you, 'Though thou shouldest bray a fool in a mortar, yet will not his foolishness depart from him.' But the rod is an ordinance of God, appointed for that end; which, like the word, is made effectual, by the Spirit's accompanying his own ordinance.

"2. How easily men are led into sin! persuaded to evil, though not to good. Those whom the word cannot draw to holiness, Satan leads to wickedness at his pleasure. To learn doing ill is always easy to the unrenewed man; but to learn to do good is as difficult as for 'the Ethiopian to change his skin.' Were the will evenly poised between good and evil, one might be embraced with as much ease as the other. But experience testifies it is

not; yea, the experience of all ages. How often did the Israelites forsake the Almighty God, and dote upon the idols of the nations! But did ever one of those nations forsake their idols, and grow fond of the God of Israel? No, no. Though man is naturally given to change, it is but from evil to evil; not from evil to good. Surely then the will of man stands not in equal balance, but has a cast on the wrong side.

“3. Consider how men go on still in the way of sin, till they meet with a stop from another hand than their own. ‘I hid me, and he went on frowardly in the way of his own heart.’ If God withdraws his restraining hand, man is in no doubt which way to choose; for the way of sin is ‘the way of his heart;’ his heart naturally lies that way. As long as God suffereth them, all nations ‘walk in their own way.’ The natural man is so fixed in evil, that there needs no more to show he is off of God’s way, than to say, He is upon ‘his own.’

“Fourthly. There is a natural contrariety, a direct opposition, in the will of man to God himself. ‘The carnal mind is enmity against God; it is not subject to the law of God, neither can be.’

“I have a charge against every unregenerate man and woman, to be proved by the testimony of Scripture, and their own conscience; namely, that, whether they have the form of religion or no, they are heart-enemies to God; to the Son of God, to the Spirit of God, and to the law of God. Hear this, all ye careless souls, that live at ease in your natural state!

“1. Ye are ‘enemies to God in your mind.’ Ye are not as yet reconciled to him. The natural enmity is not slain, though perhaps it lies hid, and ye do not perceive it. Every natural man is an enemy to God, as he is revealed in his word,—to an infinitely holy, just, powerful, and true Being. In effect, men are naturally ‘haters of God;’ and if they could, they would certainly make him another than what he is.

“To convince you of this, let me propose a few queries: (1.) How are your hearts affected to the infinite holiness of God! if ye are not ‘partakers of his holiness,’ ye cannot be reconciled to it. The heathens, finding they were not like God in holiness, made their gods like themselves in filthiness; and thereby discovered what sort of a god the natural man would have. God is holy. Can an unholy creature love his unspotted holiness? Nay, it is ‘the righteous’ only that can ‘give thanks at the remembrance of his holiness.’ God is light: can creatures of darkness, and that walk in darkness, rejoice therein? Nay, ‘every one that doeth evil hateth the light.’ For what communion hath light with darkness? (2.) How are your hearts affected to the justice of God! There is not a man who is wedded to his sins, but would be content with the blood of his body to blot that letter out of the name of God. Can the malefactor love his condemning judge; or an unjustified sinner a just God? No, he cannot. And hence, since men cannot get the doctrine of his justice blotted out of the Bible, yet it is such an eye-sore to them, that they strive to blot it out of their minds; they ruin themselves by presuming on his mercy, ‘saying in their heart, The Lord will not do good, neither will he do evil.’ (3.) How are ye affected to the omniscience and omnipresence of God? Men naturally would rather have a blind idol, than an all-seeing God; and therefore do what they can, as Adam did, to ‘hide themselves from the presence of the Lord.’ They no more love an omnipresent God, than the thief loves to have the judge witness to his evil deeds. (4.) How are ye affected to the truth of God? How many hope that God will not be true to his word! There are thousands that hear the Gospel, and hope to be saved, who never experienced the new birth, nor do at all concern themselves in that question,—whether they are born again or not. Our Lord’s words are plain and peremptory: ‘Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God.’ What, then, are such hopes, but real hopes that God will recall his word, and that Christ will prove a false Prophet? (5.) How are they affected to the power of God? None but new creatures can love him for it. Every natural man would contribute to the building

another tower of Babel, to hem it in. On these grounds I declare every unregenerate man 'an enemy to God.'

"2. Ye are enemies to the Son of God: that enmity to Christ is in your hearts, which would have made you join the 'husbandmen who killed the heir and cast him out of the vineyard.' 'Am I a dog,' ye will say, 'to have so treated my dear Saviour?' So said Hazeel, in another case. Yet how did he act? Many call him *dear*, to whom their sins are ten times dearer than their Saviour. He is no otherwise dear to them, than as they abuse his death, for the peaceable enjoyment of their sins; that they may live as they list in this world, and, when they die, be kept out of hell. To convince you of this, I will lay before you the enmity of your hearts against Christ in all his offices:—

"(1.) Every unregenerate man is an enemy to Christ in his prophetic office. For evidence of this, consider,—

"(i.) The entertainment he meets with, when he comes to teach souls 'inwardly' by his 'Spirit.' Men do what they can to stop their ears, that they may not hear his voice. They 'always resist the Holy Ghost;' they 'desire not the knowledge of his ways.' The old calumny is thrown upon him again: 'He is mad; why hear ye him?' 'The spirit of bondage' is accounted by many mere distraction and melancholy: men thus blaspheming God's work, because they themselves are beside themselves, and cannot judge of those matters.

"(ii.) Consider the entertainment he meets with, when he comes to teach men outwardly by his word.

"1st. His written word, the Bible, is slighted. Many lay by their Bibles with their Sunday clothes. Alas! the dust about your Bibles is a witness of the enmity of your hearts against Christ as a Prophet. And of those who read them oftener, how few are there that read them as the word of the Lord to their souls in particular, so as to keep up communion with God therein! Hence they are strangers to the solid comfort of the Scriptures; and if at any time they are dejected, it is something else, and not the word of God, which revives their drooping spirits.

"2d. Christ's word preached is despised. Men can, without remorse, make to themselves one silent Sabbath after another. And, alas! when they 'tread his courts,' how little reverence and awe of God appears on their spirits! Many stand like brazen walls before the word, on whom it makes no breach at all. Nay, not a few are growing worse and worse, notwithstanding 'precept upon precept.' What tears of blood are sufficient to lament this! Remember, we are but the 'voice of one crying.' The Speaker is in heaven: yet ye refuse Him that speaketh, and prefer the prince of darkness before the Prince of Peace. A dismal darkness overspread the world by Adam's fall, more terrible than if the sun and moon had been extinguished. And it must have covered us eternally, had not 'the grace of God appeared' to dispel it. But we fly from it, and, like the wild beasts, lay ourselves down in our dens. Such is the enmity of the hearts of men against Christ in his prophetic office.

"(2.) The natural man is an enemy to Christ in his priestly office. He is appointed of the Father 'a Priest for ever,' that, by his sacrifice and intercession alone, sinners may have access to, and peace with, God. But 'Christ crucified' is ever a stumbling block and foolishness to the unregenerate part of mankind.

"None of Adam's children naturally incline to receive the blessing in borrowed robes, but would always climb up to heaven on a thread spun out of their own bowels. They look on God as a great Master, and themselves as his servants, that must work and win heaven as their wages. Hence, when conscience awakes, they think that, to be saved, they must answer the demands of the law; serve God as well as they can, and pray for mercy wherein they come short. And thus many come to duties, that never come out of them to Christ.

“Indeed, the natural man, going to God in duties, will continually be found, either to go without a Mediator, or with more mediators than one. Nature is blind, and therefore venturous; it puts men on going immediately to God without Christ. Converse with many hearers of the Gospel on their hopes of salvation, and the name of Christ will scarce be heard from their mouth. Ask them, how they think to find the pardon of sin. They say, they look for mercy, because God is a merciful God; and this is all they have to trust in. Others look for mercy for Christ’s sake. But how do they know Christ will take their plea in hand? Why, they pray, mourn, confess, and have great desires. So they have something of their own to recommend them to him. They were never made ‘poor in spirit,’ and brought empty-handed to God, to lay the stress of all on his atoning blood.

“(3.) The natural man is an enemy to Christ in his kingly office.

“How unwilling are natural men to submit to the laws and discipline of his kingdom! However they may be brought to some outward submission to the King of saints, yet sin always retains its throne in their hearts, and they are ‘serving divers lusts and pleasures.’ None but those in whom Christ is formed do really put the crown on his head. None but these receive the kingdom of Christ within them, and let him set up and put down in their souls as he will. As for others, any lord shall sooner have the rule over them than the Lord of glory. They kindly entertain his enemies, and will never absolutely resign themselves to his government. Thus you see the natural man is an enemy to Jesus Christ in all his offices.

“3. Ye are enemies to the Spirit of God: He is the Spirit of holiness. The natural man is unholy, and loves to be so; and therefore ‘resists the Holy Ghost.’ The work of the Spirit is to ‘convince the world of sin, righteousness, and judgment.’ But O, how do men strive to ward off these convictions, as they would a blow that threatened their life! If the Spirit dart them in, so that they cannot avoid them, does not the heart say, ‘Hast thou found me, O mine enemy?’ And indeed they treat him as an enemy, doing their utmost to stifle their convictions, and to murder these harbingers that come to prepare the way of the Lord into the soul. Some fill their hands with business, to put convictions out of their head, as Cain, who fell to building a city. Some put them off with fair promises, as Felix did; some sport or sleep them away. And how can it be otherwise? For it is the work of the Holy Spirit to subdue lusts, and burn up corruption. How then can he whose lusts are dear as his life fail of being an enemy to Him?

“Lastly. Ye are enemies to the law of God. Though the natural man ‘desires to be under the law,’ as a covenant of works; yet as it is a rule of life, he ‘is not subject to it, neither indeed can be.’ For, (1.) Every natural man is wedded to some sin, which he cannot part with. And as he cannot bring up his inclinations to the law, he would fain bring down the law to his inclinations. And this is a plain standing evidence of the enmity of his heart against it. (2.) The law, set home on the awakened conscience in its spirituality, irritates corruption. It is as oil to the fire, which instead of quenching, makes it flame the more. ‘When the commandment comes, sin revives.’ What reason can be assigned for this, but the natural enmity of the heart against the holy law? We conclude then, that the unregenerate are heart-enemies to God, his Son, his Spirit, and his law; that there is a natural contrariety, opposition, and enmity in the will of man, to God himself and his holy will.

“Fifthly. The unrenewed will is wholly perverse, in reference to the end of man. Man is a merely dependent being; having no existence or goodness originally from himself; but all he has is from God, as the first cause and spring of all perfection, natural and moral. Dependence is woven into his very nature; so that, should God withdraw from him, he would sink into nothing. Since then whatever man is, he is of Him, surely whatever he is, he should be to Him; as the waters which came out of the sea return thither again. And thus man was created looking directly to God, as his last end;

but falling into sin, he fell off from God, and turned into himself. Now this infers a total apostasy and universal corruption in man; for where the last end is changed, there can be no real goodness. And this is the case of all men in their natural state: They seek not God, but themselves. Hence though many fair shreds of morality are among them, yet 'there is none that doeth good, no, not one.' For though some of them 'run well,' they are still off the way; they never aim at the right mark. Whithersoever they move, they cannot move beyond the circle of self. They seek themselves, they act for themselves; their natural, civil, and religious actions, from whatever spring they come, do all run into, and meet in, this dead sea.

"Most men are so far from making God their end in their natural and civil actions, that he is not in all their thoughts. They eat and drink for no higher end, than their own pleasure or necessity. Nor do the drops of sweetness God has put into the creatures raise their souls toward that ocean of delights that are in the Creator. And what are the natural man's civil actions, such as buying, selling, working, but fruit to himself? Yea, self is the highest end of unregenerate men, even in their religious actions. They perform duties for a name; for some worldly interest; or, at best, in order to escape from hell. They seek not God at all, but for their own interest: So that God is only the means, and self their end.

"Thus have I given a rude draught of man's will in his natural state, drawn from Scripture and our own experience. Now, since all must be wrong where the understanding and will are so corrupt, I shall briefly despatch what remains.

"3. The *affections* are corrupted; wholly disordered and distempered. They are like an unruly horse, that either will not receive, or violently runs away with the rider. Man's heart is naturally a mother of abominations: 'For from within, out of the heart of men, proceed evil thoughts, adulteries, fornications, murders, thefts, covetousness.' The natural man's affections are wholly misplaced; he is a spiritual monster. His heart is, where his feet should be, fixed on earth: His heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on: His face is toward hell, his back toward heaven. He loves what he should hate, and hates what he should love; joys in what he ought to mourn for, and mourns for what he should rejoice in; glories in his shame, and is ashamed of his glory; abhors what he should desire, and desires what he should abhor. If his affections are set on lawful objects, they are either excessive or defective. These objects have either too little of them, or too much. But spiritual things have always too little.

"Here is 'a threefold cord' against heaven, not easily broken,—a blind mind, a perverse will, disordered affections. The mind, swelled with pride, says, The man should not stoop; the will, opposite to the will of God, says, He will not; and the corrupt affections, rising against the Lord, in defence of the corrupt will, say, He shall not. And thus we stand out against God, till we are created anew by Christ Jesus.

"4. The *conscience* is corrupt and defiled. It cannot do its work, but according to the light it hath to work by. Wherefore, seeing 'the natural man discerneth not spiritual things,' his conscience is quite useless in that point. It may indeed check far grosser sins; but spiritual sins it discerns not. Thus it will fly in the face of many for drunkenness; who yet have a profound peace though they live in unbelief, and are utter strangers to spiritual worship and 'the life of faith.' And the light of his conscience being faint and languishing, even in the things which it does reach, its incitements to duty, and struggles against sin, are very remiss and easily got over. But there is also a false light in the dark mind, which often 'calls evil good, and good evil.' And such a conscience is like a blind and furious horse, which violently runs down all that comes in his way. Indeed, whenever conscience is awakened by the spirit of conviction, it will rage and roar, and put the whole man in a consternation. It makes the stiff heart to tremble, and the knees to bow; sets the eyes a weeping, the tongue a confessing. But still

it is an evil conscience, which naturally leads only to despair; and will do it effectually, unless either sin prevails over it to lull it asleep, as in the case of Felix, or the blood of Christ prevail over it, sprinkling and 'purging it from dead works.'

"Thus is man by nature wholly corrupted. But whence came this total corruption of our nature? That man's nature was corrupt, the very Heathens perceived; but how 'sin entered' they could not tell. But the Scripture is very plain in the point: 'By one man sin entered into the world.' 'By one man's disobedience many' (all) 'were made sinners.' Adam's sin corrupted man's nature, and leavened the whole lump of mankind. We putrefied in Adam as our root. The root was poisoned, and so the branches were envenomed. The vine turned 'the vine of Sodom,' and so the grapes became 'grapes of gall.' Adam, by his sin, became not only guilty, but corrupt; and so transmits guilt and corruption to his posterity. By his sin he stripped himself of his original righteousness and corrupted himself. We were in him representatively, as our moral head; we were in him seminally, as our natural head. Hence we fell in him; (as Levi 'paid tithes' when 'in the loins of Abraham;') 'by his disobedience' we 'were made sinners;' his first sin is imputed to us. And we are left without that original righteousness which being given to him as a common person, he cast off. And this is necessarily followed, in him and us, by the corruption of our whole nature; righteousness and corruption being two contraries, one of which must always be in man. And Adam, our common father, being corrupt, so are we; for 'who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean?'

"It remains only to apply this doctrine. And First, for *information*: Is man's nature wholly corrupted? Then, 1. No wonder the grave opens its devouring mouth for us as soon as the womb has cast us forth. For we are all, in a spiritual sense, dead-born; yea, and 'filthy,' Psalm xiv, 3, noisome, rank, and stinking, as a corrupt thing; so the word imports. Let us not complain of the miseries we are exposed to at our entrance, or during our continuance, in the world. Here is the venom that has poisoned all the springs of earthly enjoyments. It is the corruption of human nature, which brings forth all the miseries of life.

"2. Behold here, as in a glass, the spring of all the wickedness, profaneness, and formality in the world. Every thing acts agreeable to its own nature; and so corrupt man acts corruptly. You need not wonder at the sinfulness of your own heart and life, nor at the sinfulness and perverseness of others. If a man be crooked, he cannot but halt; and if the clock be set wrong, how can it point the hour right?

"3. See here why sin is so pleasant, and religion such a burden, to men: Sin is natural; holiness not so. Oxen cannot feed in the sea, nor fishes in the fruitful field. A swine brought into a palace would prefer the mire. And corrupt nature tends ever to impurity.

"4. Learn from hence the nature and necessity of regeneration. (1.) The nature: It is not a partial, but a total change. Thy whole nature is corrupted; therefore, the whole must be renewed. 'All things' must 'become new.' If a man who had received many wounds were cured of all but one, he might still bleed to death. It is not a change made by human industry, but by the almighty Spirit of God. A man must be 'born of the Spirit.' Our nature is corrupt, and none but the God of nature can change it. Man may pin a new life to an old heart, but he can never change the heart. (2.) The necessity: It is absolutely necessary in order to salvation. 'Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God.' No unclean thing can enter 'the new Jerusalem.' But thou art by nature wholly unclean. Deceive not thyself: No mercy of God, no blood of Christ, will bring an unregenerate sinner to heaven. For God will never open a fountain of mercy to wash away his own holiness and truth; nor did Christ shed his precious blood to blot out the truths of God. Heaven! What would you do there, who are not born again! A holy Head, and corrupt members! A Head full of

treasures of grace, members filled with treasures of wickedness ! Ye are no ways adapted to the society above, more than beasts to converse with men. Could the unrenewed man go to heaven, he would go to it no otherwise than now he comes to the duties of holiness, that is, leaving his heart behind him.

“ We may apply this doctrine, Secondly, for *lamentation*. Well may we lament thy case, O natural man ; for it is the saddest case one can be in out of hell. It is time to lament for thee ; for thou art dead already, dead while thou livest. Thou carriest about a dead soul in a living body ; and because thou art dead, canst not lament thy own case. Thou ‘ hast no good in thee ; ’ thy soul is a mass of darkness, rebellion, and vileness, before God. Thou ‘ canst do no good ; ’ thou canst do nothing but sin. For thou art ‘ the servant of sin, ’ and, therefore, free from righteousness ; thou dost not, canst not, meddle with it. Thou art ‘ under the dominion of sin ; ’ a dominion where righteousness can have no place. Thou art a child and a servant of the devil as long as thou art in a state of nature. But, to prevent any mistake, consider that Satan hath two kinds of servants. There are some employed, as it were, in coarser work. These bear the devil’s mark in their foreheads ; having no form of godliness ; not so much as performing the external duties of religion ; but living apparently as sons of earth, only minding earthly things. Whereas, others are employed in more refined work, who carry his mark in their right hand, which they can and do hide, by a form of religion, from the view of the world. These sacrifice to the corrupt mind, as the other to the flesh. Pride, unbelief, self-pleasing, and the like spiritual sins, prey on their corrupted, wholly corrupted souls. Both are servants of the same house, equally void of righteousness.

“ Indeed, how is it possible thou shouldst be able to do any thing good, whose nature is wholly corrupt ? ‘ Can an evil tree bring forth good fruit ? Do men gather grapes of thorns ? ’ If then thy nature be totally evil, all thou doest is certainly so too.

“ Hear, O sinner, what is thy case ! Innumerable sins compass thee about ; floods of impurities overwhelm thee. Sins of all sorts roll up and down in the dead sea of thy soul ; where no good can breathe, because of the corruption there. Thy lips are unclean ; the opening of thy mouth is as the opening of a grave, full of stench and rottenness. Thy natural actions are sin ; for ‘ when ye did eat, and when ye did drink, did not ye eat for yourselves and drink for yourselves ? ’ Zech. vii, 6. Thy civil actions are sin : ‘ The ploughing of the wicked is sin, ’ Prov. xxi, 4. Thy religious actions are sin : ‘ The sacrifice of the wicked is an abomination to the Lord. ’ The thoughts and imaginations of thy heart are ‘ only evil continually. ’ A deed may be soon done, a word soon spoken, a thought pass ; but each of these is an item in thy accounts. O sad reckoning ! As many thoughts, words, actions, so many sins ; and the longer thou livest, thy accounts swell the more. Should a tear be dropped for every sin, thine eyes must be ‘ fountains of tears. ’ For nothing but sin comes from thee ; thy heart frames nothing but evil imaginations ; there is nothing in thy life, but what is framed by thy heart ; therefore, there is nothing in thy heart or life but evil.

“ And all thy religion, if thou hast any, is lost labour if thou art not born again : Truly then thy duties are sins. Would not the best wine be loathsome in a foul vessel ? So is the religion of an unregenerate man. Thy duties cannot make thy corrupt soul holy ; but thy corrupt heart makes them unclean. Thou wast wont to divide thy works into two sorts ; to count some good and some evil. But thou must count again, and put all under one head ; for God writes on them all, ‘ Only evil. ’

“ And thou canst not help thyself. What canst thou do to take away thy sin, who art wholly corrupt ? Will mud and filth wash our filthiness ? And wilt thou purge out sin by sinning ? Job took a potsherd to scrape himself, because his hands were as full of boils as his body. This is the case of thy corrupt soul, so long as thou art in a state of nature. Thou art poor indeed, extremely ‘ miserable and poor ; ’ thou hast no shelter but a refuge of lies ;

no garment for thy soul, but 'filthy rags;' nothing to nourish it, but husks that cannot satisfy. More than that, thou hast got such a bruise in the loins of Adam, that thou art 'without strength,' unable to do any thing. Nay, more than all this, thou canst not so much as seek aright, but liest helpless, as an infant exposed in the open field.

"O that ye would believe this sad truth! How little is it believed in the world! Few are concerned to have their evil lives reformed; but fewer far, to have their evil nature changed. Most men know not what they are; as the eye, which, seeing many things, never sees itself. But until ye know every one 'the plague of his own heart,' there is no hope of your recovery. Why will ye not believe the plain testimony of Scripture! Alas! that is the nature of your disease. 'Thou knowest not that thou art wretched, and miserable, and poor, and blind, and naked.' Lord, open their eyes, before they lift them up in hell, and see what they will not see now!

"Meantime, let us have a special eye upon the corruption and sin of our nature. What avails it to take notice of other sins, while this mother sin is unnoticed! This is a weighty point; in speaking to which, I shall,—

"1. Point at some evidences of men's overlooking the sin of their nature. As (1.) Men's being so confident of themselves, as if they were in no danger of gross sins. Many would take heinously such a caution as Christ gave his Apostles: 'Take heed of surfeiting and drunkenness.' They would be ready to cry out, 'Am I a dog?' It would raise the pride of their heart, not their fear and trembling. And all this is a proof that they know not the corruption of their own nature. (2.) Untenderness toward them that fall. Many, in this case cast off all bowels of compassion; a plain proof that they do not know, or 'consider themselves, lest they also be tempted.' Grace, indeed, does make men zealous against sin, in others, as well as in themselves. But eyes turned inward to the corruption of nature, clothe them with pity and compassion, and fill them with thankfulness, that they were not the persons left to be such spectacles of human frailty. (3.) Men's venturing so boldly on temptation, in confidence of their coming off fairly. Were they sensible of the corruption of their nature, they would beware of entering on the devil's ground; as one girt about with bags of gunpowder would be loath to walk where sparks of fire were flying.

"2. I shall mention a few things in which ye should have a special eye to the sin of your nature. (1.) In your application to Christ. When you are with the Physician, O forget not this disease! They never yet knew their errand to Christ, who went not to Him for the sin of their nature; for his blood to take away the guilt and his Spirit to break the power of it. Though ye should lay before him a catalogue of sins, which might reach from earth to heaven, yet if you omit this, you have forgot the best part of the errand a poor sinner has to the Physician of souls. (2.) Have a special eye to it in your repentance. If you would repent indeed, let the streams lead you up to the fountain, and mourn over your corrupt nature, as the cause of all sin, in heart, word, and work. 'Against thee, thee only have I sinned, and done this evil in thy sight. Behold I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me.' (3.) Have a special eye to it in your mortification. 'Crucify the flesh with its affections and desires.' It is the root of bitterness which must be struck at, else we labour in vain. In vain do we go about to purge the streams, if we are at no pains about the muddy fountain. (4.) Ye are to eye this in your daily walk. He that would walk uprightly, must have one eye upward to Jesus Christ, another inward to the corruption of his own nature.

"3. I shall offer some reasons, why we should especially observe the sin of our nature. (1.) Because, of all sins, it is the most extensive and diffusive. It goes through the whole man, and spoils all. Other sins mar particular parts of the image of God; but this defaces the whole. It is the poison of the old serpent cast into the fountain, and so infects every action, every breathing of the soul.

“(2.) It is the cause of all particular sins, both in our hearts and lives. ‘Out of the heart of man proceed evil thoughts, adulteries,’ and all other abominations. It is the bitter fountain; and particular lusts are but rivulets running from it, which bring forth into the life a part only, not the whole, of what is within.

“(3.) It is virtually all sins; for it is the seed of all, which want but the occasion to set up their heads. Hence it is called, ‘a body of death,’ as consisting of the several members which constitute that ‘body of sins,’ (Col. ii. 11,) whose life lies in spiritual death. It is the cursed ground, fit to bring forth all manner of noxious weeds. Never did every sin appear in the conversation of the vilest wretch that ever lived. But look into thy nature, and thou mayest see all and every sin in the root thereof. There is a fulness of all unrighteousness there;—Atheism, idolatry, adultery, murder. Perhaps none of these appear to thee in thy heart; but there is more in that unfathomable depth of wickedness than thou knowest.

“(4.) The sin of our nature is of all sins the most fixed and abiding. Sinful actions are transient, though the guilt and stain of them may remain. But the corruption of nature passes not away. It remains in its full power, by night and by day, at all times, till nature is changed by converting grace.

“You may observe three things in the corrupt heart: (i.) There is the corrupt nature, the evil bent of the heart, whereby men are unapt for all good, and fitted for all evil. (ii.) There are particular lusts or dispositions of that corrupt nature, such as pride, passion, covetousness. (iii.) There is one of these stronger than all the rest,—‘the sin which doth so easily beset us.’ So that the river divides into many streams, whereof one is greater than the rest. The corruption of nature is the river-head, which has many particular lusts wherein it runs; but it mainly disburdens itself into that which we call the predominant sin. But as in some rivers the main stream runs not always in the same channel, so the besetting sin may change; as lust in youth may be succeeded by covetousness in old age. Now, what does it avail, to reform in other things, while the reigning sin retains its full power? What, if a particular sin be gone? If the sin of our nature keep the throne, it will set up another in its stead;—as when a water-course is stopped in one place, it will break forth in another. Thus some cast off their prodigality; but covetousness comes in its stead. Some quit their profaneness; but the same stream runs in the other channel of self-righteousness.

“That you may have a full view of the sin of your nature, I would recommend to you three things:—1. Study to know the spirituality and the extent of the law of God; for that is the glass wherein you may see yourselves. 2. Observe your hearts at all times; but especially under temptation. Temptation is a fire that brings up the scum of the unregenerate heart. 3. Go to God through Jesus Christ, for illumination by his Spirit. Say unto him, ‘What I know not, teach thou me!’ and be willing to take in light from the word. It is by the word the Spirit teacheth; but unless he teach, all other teaching is to little purpose. You will never see yourself aright, till he light his candle in your breast. Neither the fulness and glory of Christ, nor the corruption and vileness of our nature, ever were, or can be, rightly learned, but where the Spirit of Christ is the teacher.

“To conclude: Let the consideration of what has been said commend Christ to you all. Ye that are brought out of your natural state, be humble; still coming to Christ, still cleaving to him, for the purging out what remains of your natural corruption. Ye that are yet in your natural state, what will ye do? Ye must die; ye must stand at the judgment seat of God. Will you lie down, and sleep another night at ease in this case! See ye do it not. Before another day you may be set before his dreadful tribunal, in the grave-clothes of your corrupt state, and your vile souls cast into the pit of destruction, to be for ever buried out of God’s sight: for I testify unto you, there is no peace with God, no pardon, no heaven for you in this state. There is

but a step betwixt you and eternal destruction from the presence of the Lord. If the brittle thread of life, which may be broke with a touch in a moment, or ever you are aware, be broke while you are in this state, you are ruined for ever and without remedy. But come ye speedily to Jesus Christ. He hath cleansed as vile souls as yours. 'Confess your sins;' and he will both 'forgive your sins, and cleanse you from all unrighteousness.'

Bristol, August 17, 1757.

A LETTER

TO

THE REVEREND JOHN TAYLOR, D. D.

HARTLEPOOL, July 3, 1759.

REVEREND SIR,—I esteem you, as a person of uncommon sense and learning; but your doctrine I cannot esteem: and, some time since, I believed it to be my duty to speak my sentiments at large concerning your doctrine of Original Sin. When Mr. Newton mentioned this, and asked whether you designed to answer, you said you thought not; for it would only be a personal controversy between John Wesley and John Taylor.—How gladly, if I durst, would I accept of this discharge! But, certainly, it is a controversy of the highest importance; nay, of all those things that concern our eternal peace. It is Christianity, or Heathenism. For, take away the Scriptural doctrine of redemption, justification, and the new birth, the beginning of sanctification; or, which amounts to the same, explain them as you do,—and in what is Christianity better than Heathenism? Wherein (save in rectifying some of our notions) has the religion of St. Paul any preëminence over that of Socrates or Epictetus? The point is, therefore, Are those things that have been believed for so many ages, throughout the Christian world, real, solid truths, or monkish dreams and vain imaginations?

Either you or I mistake the whole of Christianity, from the beginning to the end! Either my scheme or yours is as contrary to the Scriptural, as the Koran is. Is it mine or yours? Yours has gone through all England, and made numerous converts. I attack it from end to end: let all England judge whether it can be defended or not.

Earnestly praying that God may give you and me a right understanding in all things,

I am, Reverend Sir, your servant for Christ's sake,

JOHN WESLEY.

AN EXTRACT

OF

A LETTER TO THE REVEREND MR. LAW.

OCCASIONED BY SOME OF HIS LATE WRITINGS.

REVEREND SIR,—In matters of religion I regard no writings but the inspired. Tauler, Behmen, and a whole army of Mystic authors, are with me nothing to St. Paul. In every point I appeal "to the law and the testimony," and value no authority but this.

At a time when I was in great danger of not valuing this authority enough, you made that important observation: "I see where your mistake lies. You would have a philosophical religion; but there can be no such thing. Religion is the most plain, simple thing in the world. It is only, 'We love him, because he first loved us.' So far as you add philosophy to religion, just so far you spoil it." This remark I have never forgotten since; and I trust in God I never shall.

But have not you? Permit me, sir, to speak plainly. Have you ever thought of it since? Is there a writer in England who so continually blends philosophy with religion? even in tracts on "The Spirit of Prayer," and "The Spirit of Love," wherein, from the titles of them, one would expect to find no more of philosophy than in the Epistles of St. John. Concerning which, give me leave to observe in general, 1. That the whole of it is utterly superfluous: a man may be full both of prayer and love, and not know a word of this hypothesis. 2. The whole of this hypothesis is unproved; it is all precarious, all uncertain. 3. The whole hypothesis has a dangerous tendency. It naturally leads men off from plain, practical religion, and fills them with the "knowledge" that "puffeth up," instead of the "love" that "edifieth." And, 4. It is often flatly contrary to Scripture, to reason, and to itself.

But over and above this superfluous, uncertain, dangerous, irrational, and unscriptural philosophy, have not you lately grieved many who are not strangers to the spirit of prayer or love, by advancing tenets in religion, some of which they think are unsupported by Scripture, some even repugnant to it? Allow me, sir, first to touch upon your philosophy, and then to speak freely concerning these.

I. As to your philosophy, the main of your theory respects, 1. Things antecedent to the creation: 2. The creation itself: 3. Adam in paradise: 4. The fall of man.

I do not undertake formally to refute what you have asserted on any of these heads. I dare not; I cannot answer either to God or man such an employment of my time. I shall only give a sketch of this strange system, and ask a few obvious questions.

And 1. Of things antecedent to the creation.

"All that can be conceived is God, or nature, or creature." (Mr. Law's words are enclosed all along in commas.) (*Spirit of Prayer*, part ii, p. 33.)

Is nature created, or not created? It must be one or the other; for there is no medium. If not created, is it not God? If created, is it not a creature? How then can there be three, God, nature, and creature; since nature must coincide either with God or creature?

"Nature is in itself a hungry, wrathful fire of life." (p. 34.)

"Nature is and can be only a desire. Desire is the very being of nature." (*Spirit of Love*, part i, p. 20.)

"Nature is only a desire, because it is for the sake of something else. Nature is only a torment; because it cannot help itself to that which it wants." (p. 34.)

"Nature is the outward manifestation of the invisible glories of God." (Part ii, p. 62.)

Is not the first of these definitions contradictory to all that precede?

If desire is the very being of nature; if it is a torment, a hungry wrathful fire; how is it "the outward manifestation of the invisible glories of God?"

“Nature as well as God is antecedent to all creatures.” (p. 59.)

“There is an eternal nature, as universal and as unlimited as God.” (p. 64.)

Is then nature God? Or are there two eternal, universal, infinite beings?

“Nothing is before eternal nature but God.” (*Ib.*)

“*Nothing but!*” Is any thing before that which is eternal? But how is this grand account of nature consistent with what you say elsewhere?

“Nature, and darkness, and self, are but three different expressions for one and the same thing.” (p. 181.)

“Nature has all evil and no evil in it.” (p. 192.) Yea,

“Nature, self, or darkness, has not only no evil in it, but is the only ground of all good.” (*Ib.*)

O rare darkness!

“Nature has seven chief properties, and can have neither more nor less, because it is a birth from the Deity in nature.” Is nature a birth from the Deity in nature? Is this sense? If it be, what kind of proof is it? Is it not *ignotum per æque ignotum*? [What is unknown by what is equally unknown?] “For God is tri-une, and nature is tri-une.” “*Nature is tri-une!*” Is not this flat begging the question? “And hence arise properties, three and three.” Nay, why not nine and nine? “And that which brings these three and three into union is another property.” (*Spirit of Love*, part ii, p. 64.) Why so? Why may it not be two, or five, or nine? Is it not rather the will and power of God?

“The three first properties of nature are the whole essence of that desire which is, and is called, nature.” (p. 69.) How? Are the properties of a thing the same as the essence of it? What confusion is this! But if they were, can a part of its properties be the whole essence of it?

“The three first properties of nature are attraction, resistance, and whirling. In these three properties of the desire, you see the reason of the three great laws of matter and motion, and need not be told that Sir Isaac ploughed with Jacob Behmen’s heifer.” (p. 37.) Just as much as Milton ploughed with Francis Quarles’s heifer.

How does it appear, that these are any of the properties of nature, if you mean by nature any thing distinct from matter? And how are they the properties of desire? What a jumbling of dissonant notions is here!

“The fourth property” (you affirm, not prove) “is called fire: The fifth, the form of light and love.” What do you mean by the form of love? Are light and love one and the same thing? “The sixth, sound or understanding.” Are then sound and understanding the same thing? “The seventh, a life of triumphing joy.” (p. 58.) Is then a life of triumphing joy, “that which brings the three and three properties into union?” If so, how can it be “the result of that union?” Do these things hang together?

To conclude this head: You say, “Attraction is an incessant working of three contrary properties, drawing, resisting, and whirling.” (p. 200.) That is, in plain terms, (a discovery worthy of Jacob Behmen, and yet not borrowed by Sir Isaac.) “Drawing is incessant drawing, resistance, and whirling.”

2. Of the creation:—

You put these words, with many more equally important, into the mouth of God himself!

“Angels first inhabited the region which is now taken up by the sun and the planets that move round him. It was then all a glassy sea, in which perpetual scenes of light and glory were ever rising and changing in obedience to their call. Hence they fancied they had infinite power, and resolved to abjure all submission to God. In that moment they were whirled down into their own dark, fiery, working powers. And in that moment the glassy sea, by the wrathful workings of these spirits, was broke in pieces, and became a chaos of fire and wrath, thickness and darkness.” (*Spirit of Prayer*, part i, p. 14, &c.)

I would inquire upon this,

- (1.) Is it well for a man to take such liberty with the most high God?
- (2.) Is not this being immeasurably “wise above that which is written?” wiser than all the Prophets and all the Apostles put together?
- (3.) How can any thing of this be proved?—Why thus: “‘Darkness was upon the face of the deep.’ What can this mean, but that the fall of angels brought desolation into the very place of this world?” (Part ii, p. 49.) What a proof!

Secondly. “The Scripture shows, that the Spirit of God entering into this darkness,” that is, into the very place where Satan reigned before, “brought forth a new world.” (p. 50.)

Where does it show, that this darkness was the place where Satan reigned? I cannot find it in *my* Bible.

Thirdly. “How could the devil be called the prince of this world, if it was not once his own kingdom?” (*Ib.*)

May he not be so called, because he *now* reigns therein? Is he not now “the ruler of the darkness,” or wickedness, “of this world?”

Fourthly. “Had it not been their own kingdom, the devils could have no power here. This may pass for a demonstration, that this is the very place in which the angels fell.” (p. 51.)

I doubt it will not pass. Cannot God permit Satan to exert his power wherever it pleaseth him?

Hitherto then we have not a grain of sound proof. Yet you pronounce with all peremptoriness,

“The grounds of true religion cannot be truly known but by going so far back as this fall of angels.” (pp. 37, 38.)

Cannot! Positively cannot! How few men in England, in Europe, can or do go back so far! And are there none but these, no not one, who knows the grounds of true religion?

“It was their revolt which brought wrath and fire and thickness and darkness into nature.” (*Ib.*)

If it was sin that brought fire into the world, (which is hard to prove,) did it bring darkness, and thickness too? But if it did, what harm is there in either? Is not thickness as good in its place as thinness? And as to darkness, you say yourself, “It has not only no evil in it, but is the only ground of all possible good.”

Touching creation in general you aver,—

“A creation out of nothing is no better sense than a creation into nothing.” (p. 30.)

“A creation *into nothing*” is a contradiction in terms. Can you say a creation *out of nothing* is so? It is indeed tautology; since the single term *creation* is equivalent with production out of nothing.

“That all things were created out of nothing has not the least tittle of Scripture to support it.” (p. 55.)

Is it not supported (as all the Christian Church has thought hitherto) by the very first verse of Genesis?

“Nay, it is a fiction big with the grossest absurdities. It is full of horrid consequences. It separates every thing from God. It leaves no relation between God and the creature. For” (mark the proof!) “if it is created out of nothing, it cannot have something of God in it.” (p. 58.)

The consequence is not clear. Till this is made good, can any of those propositions be allowed?

“Nature is the first birth of God.” Did God create it or not? If not, how came it out of him? If he did, did he create it out of something, or nothing?

“St. Paul says, All things are of, or out of, God.” And what does this prove, but that God is the cause of all things?

“The materiality of the angelic kingdom was spiritual.” (*Spirit of Prayer*, part ii, p. 27.) What is spiritual materiality? Is it not much the same with immaterial materiality?

“This spiritual materiality brought forth the heavenly flesh and blood of angels.” (*Ib.* p. 57.) That angels have bodies, you affirm elsewhere. But are you sure they have flesh and blood? Are not the angels spirits? And surely a spirit hath not flesh and blood.

“The whole glassy sea was a mirror of beauteous forms, colours, and sounds, perpetually springing up, having also fruits and vegetables, but not gross, as the fruits of the world. This was continually bringing forth new figures of life; not animals, but ideal forms of the endless divisibility of life.” (Part i, pp. 18, 19.)

This likewise is put into the mouth of God. But is nonsense from the Most High!

What less is “a mirror of beauteous sounds?” And what are “figures of life?” Are they alive or dead, or between both, as a man may be between sleeping and waking? What are “ideal forms of the endless divisibility of life?” Are they the same with those forms of stones, one of which Maraton took up (while he was seeking Yaratilda) to throw at the form of a lion? (See the *Spectator*.)

“The glassy sea being become thick and dark, the spirit converted its fire and wrath into sun and stars, its dross and darkness into earth, its mobility into air, its moisture into water.” (Part ii, p. 29.)

Was wrath converted into sun or stars, or a little of it bestowed on both? How was darkness turned into earth, or mobility into air? Has not fire more mobility than this? Did there need omnipotence, to convert fire into fire, into the sun, or moisture into water?

“Darkness was absolutely unknown to the angels till they fell. Hence it appears, that darkness is the ground of the materiality of nature.” (p. 33.) *Appears*—to whom? Nothing appears to me, but the proving *ignotum per ignotius*, [what is unknown by what is more unknown.]

“All life is a desire.” (*Spirit of Love*, part ii, p. 198.) “Every de-

sire, as such, is and must be made up of contrariety. God's bringing a sensible creature into existence is the bringing the power of desire into a creaturely state." (*Ib.*) Does not all this require a little more proof, and not a little illustration?

"Hard and soft, thick and thin, could have no existence, till nature lost its first purity. And this is the one true origin of all the materiality of this world. Else, nothing thick or hard could ever have been." (Part i, p. 21.) Does not this call for much proof? since most people believe God created matter, merely because so it seemed good in his sight.

But you add a kind of proof. "How comes a flint to be so hard and dark? It is because the meekness and fluidity of the light, air, and water are not in it." (*Ib.*) *The meekness of light, and air, and water!* What is that? Is air or water capable of virtue?

"The first property of nature is a constraining, attracting, and coagulating power." (p. 24.) I wait the proof of this.

"God brought gross matter out of the sinful properties of nature, that thereby the fallen angels might lose all their power over them." (p. 27.) And have they lost all power over them? Is Satan no longer prince of the power of the air?

"As all matter is owing to the first property of nature, which is an astringing, compressing desire." (p. 28.) Stop here, sir. I totally deny, that any unintelligent being is capable of any desire at all. And yet this gross, capital mistake, runs through your whole theory.

"The fourth property is fire." (p. 49.) Where is the proof? "Which changes the properties of nature into a heavenly state." (p. 48.) Proof again? "The conjunction of God and nature brings forth fire." This needs the most proof of all.

"Every right kindled fire must give forth light." Why? "Because the eternal fire is the effect of supernatural light." Nay, then light should rather give forth fire.

"The fire of the soul and that of the body has but one nature." (p. 52.) Can either Behmen or Spinososa prove this?

3. Of Adam in paradise.

"Paradise is a heavenly birth of life." (*Spirit of Prayer*, part i, p. 6.) How does this definition explain the thing defined?

"Adam had at first both a heavenly and an earthly body. Into the latter was the spirit of this world breathed; and in this spirit and body did the heavenly spirit and body of Adam dwell." (p. 7.) So he had originally two bodies and two souls! This will need abundance of proof. "The spirit and body of this world was the medium through which he was to have commerce with this world." The proof? "But it was no more alive in him, than Satan and the serpent were alive in him at his first creation. Good and evil were then only in his outward body and in the outward world." What! was there evil in the world, and even in Adam, together with Satan and the serpent, at his first creation? "But they were kept unactive by the power of the heavenly man within him." Did this case cover the earthly man, or the earthly case the heavenly?

But "he had power to choose, whether he would use his outward body only as a means of opening the outward world to him;" (so it was

not quite unactive neither;) “or of opening the bestial life in himself. Till this was opened in him, nothing in this outward world, no more than his own outward body,” (so now it is unactive again,) “could act upon him, make any impressions upon him, or raise any sensations in him; neither had he any feeling of good or evil from it.” (p. 9.) All this being entirely new, we must beg clear and full proof of it.

“God said to man at his creation, Rule thou over this imperfect, perishing world, without partaking of its impure nature.” (p. 21.) Was not the world then at first perfect in its kind? Was it impure then? Or would it have perished if man had not sinned? And are we sure that God spake thus?

“The end God proposed in the creation was the restoring all things to their glorious state.” (*Spirit of Prayer*, part ii, p. 61.) “*In the creation!*” Was not this rather the end which he proposed in the redemption?

“Adam was created to keep what is called the curse, covered and overcome by Paradise. And as Paradise concealed and overcame all the evil in the elements, so Adam’s heavenly man concealed from him all the evil of the earthly nature that was under it.” (p. 62.) Can we believe that there was any evil in man from the creation, if we believe the Bible?

“Our own good spirit is the very Spirit of God; and yet not God, but the Spirit of God kindled into a creaturely form.” Is there any meaning in these words? And how are they consistent with those that follow? “This spirit is so related to God, as my breath is to the air.” (p. 195.) Nay, if so, your spirit is God. For your breath is air.

“That Adam had at first the nature of an angel, is plain from hence, that he was both male and female in one person. Now, this (the being both male and female) is the very perfection of the angelic nature.” (p. 65.) Naturalists say that snails have this perfection. But who can prove that angels have?

You attempt to prove it thus: “‘In the resurrection they neither marry, nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels.’ Here we are told, (1.) That the being male and female in one person is the very nature of angels. (2.) That man shall be so too at the resurrection: therefore he was so at first.” (p. 66.)

Indeed, we are not told here, that angels are hermaphrodites. No, nor any thing like it. The whole passage is: “They who are accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry, nor are given in marriage; neither can they die any more; for they are equal unto the angels,” Luke xx, 35, 36; namely, (not in being male and female, but) in this, that they “cannot die any more.” This is the indisputable meaning of the words. So this whole proof vanishes into air.

You have one more thought, full as new as this: “All earthly beasts are but creaturely eruptions of the disorder that is broken out from the fallen spiritual world. So earthly serpents are but transitory out-births of covetousness, envy, pride, and wrath.” (*Spirit of Love*, part ii, p. 207.)

How shall we reconcile this with the Mosaic account? “And God said, Let the earth bring forth cattle, and creeping thing, and beast.

And God made the beast of the earth; and God saw that it was good," Gen. i, 24, 25. Does any thing here intimate that beasts or serpents literally crept out of the womb of sin? And what have serpents, in particular, to do with covetousness, or, indeed, with envy, unless in poetic fables?

4. Of the fall of man.

"Adam had lost much of his perfection before Eve was taken out of him. 'It is not good,' said God, 'that man should be alone.' This shows that Adam had now made that not to be good, which God saw to be good when he created him." (*Spirit of Prayer*, p. 74.) Nay, does it show either more or less than this, that it was not conducive to the wise ends God had in view, for man to remain single?

"God then divided the human nature into a male and female creature: otherwise man would have brought forth his own likeness out of himself, in the same manner as he had a birth from God. But Adam let in an adulterous love of the world: by this his virginity was lost, and he had no longer a power of bringing forth a birth from himself." (p. 75.) We have no shadow of proof for all this.

"This state of inability is called his falling into a deep sleep." (p. 76.) How does this agree with, "The Lord God caused a deep sleep to fall upon Adam?" Gen. ii, 21.

"God took his Eve out of him, as a lesser evil, to avoid a greater. For it was a less folly to love the female part of himself, than to love things lower than himself." (p. 77.)

Who can extract this out of the words of Moses? Who can reconcile it with the words of our Lord? "He who made them at the beginning" (not a word of any previous fall) "made them male and female, and said, For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and cleave unto his wife," Matt. xix, 4, 5. Is here any intimation, that for a man to love his wife is only less folly than to love the world? "A man ought so to love his wife, even as Christ the Church." Is there any folly in the love of Christ to the Church?

"Marriage came in by Adam's falling from his first perfection." (p. 88.) Does this account do honour to that institution, any more than that memorable saying of an eminent Mystic, "Marriage is but licensed whoredom?"

"Had Adam stood, no Eve would have been taken out of him. But from Eve God raised that angelic man, whom Adam should have brought forth without Eve, who is called the Second Adam, as being both male and female." (p. 79.) Many things here want proof. How does it appear, (1.) That Eve would not have been, had Adam stood? (2.) That had he stood, he would have brought forth the Second Adam without Eve? (3.) That Christ was both male and female? and, (4.) That he was on this account called the Second Adam?

"The Second Adam is now to do that which the first should have done." (p. 84.) Is he to do no more than that? no more than a mere creature should have done? Then what need is there of his being any more than a creature? What need of his being God?

"Our having from him a new heavenly flesh and blood, raised in us by his spiritual power, is the strongest proof that we should have been born of Adam by the same spiritual power." (p. 85.)

Had Adam then the very same spiritual power which Christ had? And would he, if he had stood, have transmitted to us the very same benefit? Surely none that believes the Christian Revelation will aver this in cool blood!

“From Adam’s desire turned toward the world, the earth got a power of giving forth an evil tree. It was his will which opened a passage for the evil hid in the earth,” (I know not how it came there before Adam fell,) “to bring forth a tree in its own likeness. No sooner was it brought forth, than God assured him that death was hid in it: a plain proof that this tree was not from God, but from a power in the earth, which could not show itself, till Adam desired to taste something which was not paradisiacal.” (p. 96.)

This is the marvellous in the highest degree, and affords many questions not very easy to be answered. But, waiving all these, can any thing be more flatly contradictory to the Mosaic account? We read there, “The Lord God formed man. And the Lord planted a garden. And out of the ground made the Lord God every tree to grow that is pleasant to the sight and good for food; the tree of life also, and the tree of knowledge of good and evil.” Gen. ii, 7–9. Is it not here plainly taught that this tree was from God? that, not the desire of Adam, but the Lord God, made this tree to grow, as well as the tree of life? And when was it that God gave him that solemn warning, “In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die?” verse 17. Not as soon as that tree was brought forth; but when Adam was put into the garden.

“At first, all the natural properties of man’s creaturely life were hid in God, just as the natural qualities of darkness are hid till glorified by the light.” (*Spirit of Love*, part ii, p. 181.) Nay, were they not sufficiently hid by the heavenly man? Need they be hid over and over?

“But when man fell, all these properties broke forth, just as the darkness, when it has lost the light, must show forth its own coldness, horror, and other uncomfortable qualities.” *Exemplum placet!* [A pretty illustration!] But, are either coldness or horror natural qualities of darkness? If so, they must be inseparable from it. But who will affirm this?

“Darkness, though contrary to light, is yet absolutely necessary to it. Without this, no manifestation or visibility of light could possibly be.” This is absolutely new and surprising. But how is it to be proved?

Thus: “God dwelleth in the light which no man can approach. Therefore, light cannot be manifested to man but by darkness.” (p. 189.) Ah, poor consequence! Would not the same text just as well prove transubstantiation?

“Light and darkness do every thing, whether good or evil, that is done in man. Light is all power, light is all things and nothing.” (*Ib.*)

I cannot conceive what ideas you affix to the terms *light* and *darkness*. But I forget. You except against ideas. Can you teach us to think without them?

Once more: You say, “Darkness is a positive thing, and has a strength and substantiality in it.” (p. 182.) I have scarce met with a greater friend to darkness, except “the illuminated Jacob Behmen.”

But, sir, have you not done him an irreparable injury? I do not mean by misrepresenting his sentiments; (though some of his profound admirers are positive that you misunderstand and murder him through-

out;) but by dragging him out of his awful obscurity; by pouring light upon his venerable darkness. Men may admire the deepness of the well, and the excellence of the water it contains: but if some officious person puts a light into it, it will appear to be both very shallow and very dirty.

I could not have borne to spend so many words on so egregious trifles, but that they are mischievous trifles:—

Hæ nugæ seria ducent

In mala.

[These trifles will lead to serious mischief.]

This is dreadfully apparent in your own case, (I would not speak, but that I dare not refrain,) whom, notwithstanding your uncommon abilities, they have led astray in things of the greatest importance. Bad philosophy has, by insensible degrees, paved the way for bad divinity: in consequence of this miserable hypothesis, you advance many things in religion also, some of which are unsupported by Scripture, some even repugnant to it.

II. Some of these I shall now mention with the utmost plainness, as knowing for whom, and before whom, I speak.

And, I. You deny the omnipotence of God.

You say: “As no seeing eye could be created unless there was, antecedent to it, a natural visibility of things,” (Why not? Why might not visible things be created at the same instant with it?) “so no creature could come into any natural life, unless such a state of nature was antecedent to it.” (p. 60.) “All that God does is, and must be, done in and by the powers of nature.” (p. 135.) What then did it avail that, as you elsewhere say, God was before nature? He not only could not then do all things, but he could do nothing till nature existed. But if so, how came nature itself, this second eternal, to exist at all?

“There cannot possibly be any other difference between created beings, than arises from that out of which they were created.” (p. 60.) Why not? Who will stay the hand of the Almighty, or say unto him, What doest thou?

“No fruits or vegetables could have sprung up in the divided elements, but because they are parts of that glassy sea, where angelical fruits grew before.” (*Spirit of Prayer*, part i, p. 19.)

But how came those fruits to grow before? How came they to grow in the glassy sea? Were they not produced out of nothing at first? If not, God was not before nature. If they were, cannot he still produce out of nothing whatsoever pleaseth him?

“All outward nature being fallen from heaven,” (that we deny,) “must, as well as it can, do and work as it did in heaven.” (p. 20.) “*As well as it can!*” What can it do without God, who upholdeth all things by the word of his power? And what can it not do, if he pleaseth? Or, rather, what cannot he do, with or without it?

“Matter could not possibly be, but from sin.” (*Spirit of Love*, part i, p. 23.) That is, in very plain terms, God could not have created matter if Satan had not sinned!

“God could not create man with a soul and a body, unless there was such a thing as nature antecedent to the creation of man.” (p. 30.)

Why could not God do this? Because “body and spirit are not two

separate things, but are only the inward and outward condition of one and the same being. Every creature must have its own body, and cannot be without it. For its body is that" (who would have thought it!) "which makes it manifest to itself. It cannot know either that it is, or what it is, but by its own body!" (p. 32.)

What a heap of bold assertions is here to curb omnipotence! And not one of them has a tittle of proof, unless one can prove the other!

But we have more still: "The body of any creature has nothing of its own, but is solely the outward manifestation of that which is inwardly in the soul. Every animal has nothing in its outward form or shape but that which is the form and growth of its spirit. As no number can be any thing else but that which the units contained in it make it to be, so no body can be any thing else but the coagulation or sum total of those properties of nature that are coagulated in it." (p. 33.)

Astonishing! What a discovery is this, that a body is only a curdled spirit! that our bodies are only the sum total of our spiritual properties! and that the form of every man's body is only the form of his spirit made visible!

"Every spirit manifests its own nature by that body which proceeds from it as its own birth." (Part ii, p. 17.)

Does the body then grow out of the spirit, as the hair and nails grow out of the body; and this in consequence of the "powers of nature," distinct from the power and will of God?

To abridge God of his power, after creation, as well as before it, you affirm, farther,—

"This is an axiom that cannot be shaken, Nothing can rise higher than its first created nature; and therefore an angel at last must have been an angel at first. Do you think it possible for an ox to be changed into a rational philosopher? Yet this is as possible as for one who has only by creation the life of this world to be changed into an angel of heaven. The life of this world can reach no farther than this world; no omnipotence of God can carry it farther: therefore, if man is to be an angel at last, he must have been created an angel; because no creature can possibly have any other life, or higher degree of life, than that which his creation brought forth in him." (*Spirit of Prayer*, part ii, p. 81.)

I have quoted this passage at some length, that the sense of it may appear beyond dispute. But what divinity! and what reasoning to support it! Can God raise nothing higher than its first created state? Is it not possible for him to change an ox or a stone into a rational philosopher, or a child of Abraham? to change a man or a worm into an angel of heaven? Poor omnipotence which cannot do this! Whether he will or no, is another question. But if he cannot do it, how can he be said to do "whatsoever pleaseth him in heaven, and in earth, and in the sea, and in all deep places?"

Thus does your attachment to a miserable philosophy, lead you to deny the almighty power of God.

2. It leads you, in the Second place, to deny his justice; to abridge this no less than his power.

This I may be permitted to consider more at large; because, though it was allowed by all the wiser Heathens of past ages, yet it is now one main hinge on which the controversy between Christianity and Deism

turns. To convert a thousand Deists, therefore, by giving up this point, with the doctrine of justification which is built upon it, is little more than it would be to convert as many Jews by allowing the Messiah is not yet come. It is converting them by allowing all they contend for; by granting them the main point in question. Consequently, it is no other than establishing Deism, while it pretends to overturn it.

I would greatly wish, in weighing what you have advanced on this head, to forget who speaks, and simply consider what is spoken. The person I greatly reverence and love: the doctrine I utterly abhor; as I apprehend it to be totally subversive of the very essence of Christianity.

God himself hath declared, that, in consequence of his justice, he will, in the great day of general retribution, "render to every man according to his works, whether they be good or evil."

But man says, No: "There is no righteous wrath or vindictive justice in God." (*Spirit of Love*, part ii, p. 108.) If so, ye may go on, ye children of the devil, in doing the works of your father. It is written indeed, "The wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness:" but this is not literally to be taken; for, properly speaking, there is no such thing as the wrath of God!

Fear not the bugbear of everlasting burnings. There is not only no everlasting punishment, but no punishment at all; no such thing in the universe. It is a mere vulgar error!

I should be extremely glad to prophesy these smooth things too, did not a difficulty lie in the way. As nothing is more frequently or more expressly declared in Scripture, than God's anger at sin, and his punishing it both temporally and eternally, every assertion of this kind strikes directly at the credit of the whole revelation. For if there be one falsehood in the Bible, there may be a thousand; neither can it proceed from the God of truth. However, I will weigh all your assertions. And may the God of truth shine on both our hearts!

I must premise, that I have no objection to the using the words *wrath* (or *anger*) and *justice* as nearly synonymous; seeing anger stands in the same relation to justice, as love does to mercy; love and anger being the passions (speaking after the manner of men) which correspond with the dispositions of mercy and justice. Whoever therefore denies God to be capable of wrath or anger, acts consistently in denying his justice also.

You begin: "(1.) No wrath (anger, vindictive justice) ever was or ever will be in God. If a wrath of God were any where, it must be every where." (*Spirit of Prayer*, part i, p. 27.) So it is, as sure as the just God is every where.

"(2.) Wrath and pain dwell only in the creatures." (p. 28.) Pain is only in creatures. Of wrath, we are to inquire farther.

"(3.) To say, God ever punished any creature out of wrath, is as absurd as to say, He began the creation out of wrath." I conceive not. It is not as absurd to say, "God is angry at the guilty," as to say, "God is angry at the innocent." Now, it is certain, when God began the creation of man, no guilty men were in being.

"(4.) He must always will that to his creatures, which he willed at the creation of them." True; and he willed, at the very creation of men, "to reward every one as his work should be."

“(5.) God is incapable of willing pain to any creature, because he is nothing but goodness.” (p. 29.) You mean, because his goodness excludes justice. Nay, that is the very question.

“(6.) God can give nothing but happiness from himself because he hath nothing else in himself.” (*Spirit of Love*, part i, p. 3.) As if you had said, “God can give nothing but infinity from himself, because he has nothing else in himself.” It is certain he has not. He is all infinity. Yet that argument will not hold.

“(7.) God can no more begin to have any wrath after the creature is fallen, than he could be infinite wrath and rage from all eternity.” (Part ii, p. 4.) No changing the terms. We have nothing to do with rage. This properly means excessive anger. Setting this aside, I answer to the argument, God was infinitely just from all eternity: in consequence of which, his anger then began to show itself, when man had sinned.

“(8.) No wrath can be in God, unless God was, from all eternity, an infinity of wrath.” (p. 6.) That is, infinitely just. So he was and will be to all eternity.

“(9.) There must either be no possibility of wrath, or no possibility of its having any bounds.” (p. 7.) The divine justice cannot possibly have any bounds. It is as unlimited as his power.

“(10.) Two things show the nature of wrath,—a tempest and a raging sore. The former is wrath in the elements; the latter is wrath in the body. Now, both these are a disorder; but there is no disorder in God: therefore there is no wrath in God.” (p. 13.)

“A tempest is wrath in the elements; a raging sore is wrath in the body.” It is not. Neither the body, the elements, nor any thing inanimate is capable of wrath. And when we say, “The sore looks angry,” does any one dream this is to be taken literally? The pillars of the argument, therefore, are rotten. Consequently, the superstructure falls to the ground.

In vain would you prop it up by saying, “Wrath can have no other nature in body than it has in spirit, because it can have no existence in body, but what it has from spirit.” (p. 15.) Nay, it can have no existence in body at all, as yourself affirm presently after. Yet you strangely go on: “There is but one wrath in all outward things, animate or inanimate.” Most true; for all wrath is in animals; things inanimate are utterly incapable of it.

“There can be but one kind of wrath, because nothing can be wrathful but spirit.” (p. 18.)

Never then let us talk of wrathful elements, of wrathful tempests or sores, again.

“(11.) Wrath and evil are but two words for the same thing.” (*Ib.*) This is home; but it cannot be granted without proof.

“(12.) God is as incapable of wrath, as of thickness, hardness, and darkness; because wrath can exist no where else but in thickness, hardness, and darkness.” (p. 71.)

So far from it, that wrath cannot exist in thickness or hardness at all. For these are qualities of bodies; and “nothing can be wrathful but spirit.”

“(13.) Wrath cannot be in any creature, till it has lost its first perfection.” (p. 72.) That remains to be proved.

Thus far you have advanced arguments for your doctrine. You next attempt to answer objections:—

And to the objection, that Scripture speaks so frequently of the wrath of God, you answer,—

“(1.) All the wrath and vengeance that ever was in any creature, is to be called and looked on as the wrath and vengeance of God.”

I totally deny that proposition, and call for the proof of it.

“(2.) God works every thing in nature. Therefore all death, or rage, or curse, wherever it is, must be said, in the language of Scripture, to be the wrath or vengeance of God.” (p. 55.)

I deny the consequence. The latter proposition does not follow from the former. And indeed it is not true. All death, and rage, and curse, is not in the language of Scripture termed the wrath and vengeance of God.

“(3.) Because the devils have their life from God; therefore, their cursed, miserable, wrathful life is said to be the curse, and misery, and wrath of God upon them.” (p. 53.)

Neither can this be proved, that the devils having their life from God, is the reason why they are said to be under his wrath. Nor does the Scripture ever term their wrathful, miserable life, the wrath or misery of God.

“(4.) Devils are his, as well as holy angels. Therefore all the wrath and rage of the one must be as truly his wrath and rage burning in them, as the joy of the others is his joy.” (p. 54.)

So it seems, the wrath of God in Scripture means no more or less than the wrath of the devil! However, this argument will not prove it. The joy of saints (not of angels that I remember) is styled the joy of their Lord, because he prepared it for them, and bestows it on them. Does he prepare and bestow the rage of devils upon them?

“(5.) His wrath and his vengeance are no more in God, than what the Psalmist calls his ice and his frost.” (p. 74.)

There is nothing parallel in the case. We cannot take the latter expression literally, without glaring absurdity; the former we may.

“(6.) ‘The earth trembled because he was wroth.’ No wrath here but in the elements.”

Nay, if so, here was no wrath at all. For we are agreed, “Only spirits can be wrathful.”

(7.) One more text, usually cited against your opinion, you improve into an argument for it: “‘Avenge not yourselves, for vengeance is mine.’ This is a full proof that vengeance is not in God. If it was, then it would belong to every child of God, or he could not ‘be perfect as his Father is perfect.’” (p. 76.)

Yes, he could in all his imitable perfections. But God has peculiarly forbidden our imitating him in this. *Vengeance*, says he, *is mine*, incommunicably mine; unless so far as he delegates it to those who are in authority. This therefore clearly shows, that God executes vengeance; though justice, not vengeance, is properly in Him.

Having now proved (as you suppose) that God has neither anger nor justice, it remains only to show (which indeed follows by easy and natural consequence) that he never did nor can punish.

“To say, Adam’s miserable state was a punishment inflicted upon him by God is an utter absurdity.” (*Spirit of Prayer*, part i, p. 24.) “His sin had not the least punishment of any kind inflicted upon it by God.” (p. 26.)

This is flat and plain. But let us see how far this account agrees with that which God himself hath given :—

“Of the tree of knowledge of good and evil thou shalt not eat : in the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die,” Gen. ii, 17. “And the serpent said unto the woman, Ye shall not die,” iii, 4. “And the woman being deceived,” did eat ; 1 Tim. ii, 14 ; “and gave unto her husband, and he did eat,” Gen. iii, 6. “And the Lord God said unto the serpent, Because thou hast done this, thou art cursed. Dust thou shalt eat all the days of thy life ;” verse 14 ; “and I will put enmity between thee and the woman,” verse 15. “Unto the woman he said, I will greatly multiply thy sorrow and” (that is, *in*) “thy conception,” verse 16. “And unto Adam he said, Because thou hast eaten of the tree, cursed is the ground for thy sake : in sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life,” verse 17. “Dust thou art, and unto dust thou shalt return,” verse 19.

Can any man read this and affirm, “God did not inflict the least punishment, of any kind, either on Eve, or Adam, or the serpent?” With what eyes or understanding then must he read!

But you say, “All that came on Adam was implied in what he chose to himself.” (p. 25.) It was. He chose it to himself in the same sense that he who robs chooses to be hanged. But this does not at all prove, that the death which one or the other suffers is no punishment.

You go on : “Fire and brimstone, or manna, rained on the earth, are only one and the same love. It was the same love that preserved Noah, burned up Sodom, and overwhelmed Pharaoh in the Red Sea.” (*Spirit of Love*, part ii, pp. 72, 78.)

Surely nothing can equal this, unless you add, (which indeed you must do, to be consistent with yourself,) “It is one and the same love which will say, ‘Come, ye blessed,’ and ‘Depart, ye cursed, into everlasting fire.’”

You add : “‘Whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth.’ Here you have God’s own word for it, nothing but love chasteneth.” (p. 81.) We know his love chasteneth his children. Of these only God is speaking here, as appears from the latter clause of the sentence. And yet we cannot say even as to them, “It is nothing but his love.” It is mercy mixed with justice.

You cite one text more : “I have smitten you : yet have ye not returned to me ;” Amos iv, 9 ; and say, “Now, how is it possible for words to give stronger proof?” (*Ib.*) Proof of what? Not that God did not punish them ; but that “in the midst of wrath he remembered mercy.”

To these texts of Scripture (wide enough of the point) you subjoin : “The doctrine of atonement made by Christ is the strongest demonstration, that the wrath to be atoned cannot be in God.” (p. 85.) Who talks of *wrath to be atoned*? “The wrath to be atoned” is neither sense nor English, though it is a solecism you perpetually run into : (I hope, not on purpose to puzzle the cause :) that the sin to be atoned cannot be in God, we all allow ; but it does not affect the question.

Once more, to silence all contradiction at once, to stop the mouths of all gainsayers, you say, “This (that there is no anger, no vindictive

justice in God, no punishment at all inflicted by him) is openly asserted, constantly affirmed and repeated, in the plainest letter of Scripture." Whether this, or the very reverse is true, will appear from a few out of numberless texts, which I shall barely set down, without any comment, and leave to your cool consideration.

You say, (1.) There is no vindictive, avenging, or punitive justice in God. (2.) There is no wrath or anger in God. (3.) God inflicts no punishment on any creature, neither in this world, nor that to come.

God says,—

(1.) "The just Lord is in the midst of you," Zeph. iii, 5. "Justice and judgment are the habitation of thy throne," Psalm lxxxix, 14. "Wilt thou condemn him that is most just?" Job xxxiv, 17. "He is excellent in power, and in plenty of justice," xxxvii, 23. "Just and true are thy ways, O King of saints," Rev. xv, 3. "Thou art just in all that is brought upon us," Neh. ix, 33. "There is no God beside me, a just God and a Saviour," Isa. xlv, 21. "Whom God hath set forth, that he might be just, and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus," Rom. iii, 25, 26.

(2.) "The Lord heard their words, and was wroth," Deut. i, 34. "The Lord was wroth with me for your sakes," iii, 26. "I was wroth with my people," Isa. xlvii, 6. "For his covetousness I was wroth," lvii, 17. "And the anger of the Lord was kindled against Israel," Numbers xxv, 3. "His wrath is against them that forsake him," Ezra viii, 22. "Thou art very wroth with us," Lam. v, 22. "Thou art wroth, for we have sinned," Isaiah lxiv, 5. "Who may stand in thy sight when thou art angry?" Psa. lxxvi, 7. "I have mingled my drink with weeping, because of thine indignation and thy wrath," cii, 9, 10. "In my wrath I smote thee," Isaiah lx, 10. "He hath visited in his anger," Job xxxv, 15. "God distributeth sorrows in his anger," xxi, 17. "I have seen affliction by the rod of his wrath," Lam. iii, 1. "I swear in my wrath, they shall not enter into my rest," Psalm xcvi, 11. "He casteth upon them the fierceness of his anger, wrath, and indignation. He made a way to his anger; he spared not their soul from death," lxxviii, 49, 50. "At his wrath the earth shall tremble," Jer. x, 10. "The land is desolate because of his anger," xxv, 38. "By his anger they are consumed," Job iv, 9. "The Lord shall swallow them up in his wrath, and the fire shall devour them," Psalm xxi, 9. "The Lord turned not from his wrath," 2 Kings xxiii, 26. "For all this his anger is not turned away, but his hand is stretched out still," Isaiah v, 25. "The Lord is slow to anger, and of great kindness; he will not always chide, neither keepeth he his anger for ever," Psa. ciii, 8, 9. "The Lord turned from the fierceness of his anger," Joshua vii, 26. "In wrath remember mercy," Hab. iii, 2. "Though thou wast angry, thine anger is turned away," Isa. xii, 1. "Many a time turned he his anger away," Psa. lxxviii, 38.

(3.) "I will punish the world for their evil, and the wicked for their iniquity," Isa. xliii, 11. "Behold, the Lord cometh to punish the inhabitants of the earth for their iniquity," xxvi, 21. "Is not destruction to the wicked, and a strange punishment to the workers of iniquity?" Job xxxi, 3. "I will punish you according to the fruit of your doings," Jer. xxi, 14. "I will punish you for all your iniquities," Amos iii, 2. "If ye will not hearken unto me, then I will punish you seven times more for your sins," Lev. xxvi, 18. "I will punish all that oppress them," Jer. xxx, 20.

Now, which am I to believe? God or man?

Your miserable philosophy leads you, in the Third place, totally to deny the Scripture doctrine of justification. Indeed, you do not appear to have the least conception of the matter; no, not even to know what the term justification means. Accordingly, you affirm,—

"Salvation, which all divines agree includes both justification and sancti-

fication, is nothing else but to be made like Christ." (*Spirit of Prayer*, part i, p. 53.)

"Regeneration is the whole of man's salvation." (Part ii, p. 37.)

"Redemption is nothing else but the life of God in the soul." (Part i, p. 79.)

"The one only work of Christ as your Redeemer is to raise into life the smothered spark of heaven in you." (*Spirit of Love*, part ii, p. 45.)

"He is our atonement and reconciliation with God, because by him we are set again in our first state of holiness." (Part i, p. 10.)

"The atonement of the divine wrath or justice," (a mere solecism, on which your whole reasoning for several pages is built,) "and the extinguishing of sin in the creature, are only different expressions of the same thing." (Part ii, p. 86.) Nay, the former is an expression of nothing: it is flat nonsense.

"All that Christ does as an atonement, has no other operation but that of renewing the fallen nature of man." (p. 106.)

Here are seven peremptory assertions. But till they are fully proved I cannot give up my Bible.

But you grow bolder and bolder, and say, "The satisfaction of Christ is represented in all our systems of divinity, as a satisfaction made to God; and the sufferings and death of Christ, as that which could only avail with God to have mercy on man. Nay, what is still worse, if possible, the ground, and nature, and efficacy of this great transaction between God and man is often explained by debtor and creditor; man as having contracted a debt with God, which he could not pay, and God as having a right to insist upon the payment of it." (p. 91.)

"There is no wrath in God, no fictitious atonement, no folly of debtor and creditor." (p. 131.)

"*What is still worse, if possible! Folly of debtor and creditor!*" Surely I would not have spoken thus, unless I had been above the Son of God.

"After this manner pray ye, Forgive us our debts as we forgive our debtors," Matt. vi, 9, 12. "And Jesus said, There was a certain creditor which had two debtors," Luke vii, 41. "The kingdom of heaven is likened to a king who would take account of his servants. And one was brought unto him who owed him ten thousand talents. But forasmuch as he had not to pay, his lord commanded him to be sold, and all that he had. The servant fell down, saying, Lord, have patience with me. And his lord was moved with compassion, and forgave him the debt." Yet, afterward, on his unmercifulness to his fellow servant, he retracted that forgiveness; "and delivered him to the tormentors, till he should pay all that was due unto him. So likewise shall my heavenly Father do unto you also, if ye from your heart forgive not every one his brother their trespasses," Matt. xviii, 23, &c.

Is not man here represented as having contracted a debt with God which he cannot pay? and God as having, nevertheless, a right to insist upon the payment of it? and a right, if he hath not to pay, of delivering him to the tormentors? And is it not expressly asserted that God will, in some cases, claim this right, and use it to the uttermost? Upon whom, then, lights this imputation of folly, and of "what is still worse?" "Lord, lay not this sin to their charge! Forgive them, for they know not what they do."

But if the Son of God did not die to atone for our sins, what did he die for?

You answer: "He died,

"(1.) To extinguish our own hell within us." (*Spirit of Prayer*, part ii, p. 159.)

Nay, the Scripture represents this, not as the first, but the second, end of his death.

"(2.) To show that he was above the world, death, hell, and Satan." (pp. 130, 131.)

Where is it written that he died for this end? Could he not have done this without dying at all?

"(3.) His death was the only possible way of overcoming all the evil that was in fallen man." (p. 129.)

This is true, supposing he atoned for our sins. But if this supposition be not made, his death was not the only possible way whereby the Almighty could have overcome all things.

"(4.) Through this he got power to give the same victory to all his brethren of the human race." (p. 132.)

Had he not this power before? Otherwise, how was he *Ὁ ὢν*, *He that is*; "God over all, blessed for ever?"

If Christ died for no other ends than these, what need was there of his being more than a creature?

As you seem never to have employed your thoughts on justification or redemption, in the Scripture sense, I beg leave to subjoin a plain account thereof, wrote by a woman of the last century:—(*Annæ Mariæ a Schurman Ευχαριστια*, pars ii, p. 118, &c.)

"(1.) Christ hath acquired for us a right to eternal life by his satisfaction and merits alone. Neither our repentance nor amendment can be any satisfaction for sin. It is only 'through his blood that we have redemption,' Ephesians i, 7. This alone 'cleanseth us from all sin,' 1 John i, 7. And herein 'was the love of God manifested toward us, that he sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins,' 1 John iv, 9, 10. So was the Lord 'our righteousness,' Jer. xxiii, 6: without which we could not have been justified. As man owed his Creator the perfect obedience of his whole life, or a punishment proportioned to his transgression, it was impossible he could satisfy him by a partial and imperfect obedience. Neither could he merit any thing from Him to whom he owed all things. There was need therefore of a Mediator who could repair the immense wrong he had done to the Divine Majesty, satisfy the Supreme Judge, who had pronounced the sentence of death against the transgressors of his law, suffer in the place of his people, and merit for them pardon, holiness, and glory. Accordingly, he 'gave himself a ransom for all,' 1 Tim. ii, 6; and 'by himself purged our sins,' Heb. i, 3. 'He loved us, and gave himself for us, an offering and a sacrifice to God,' Eph. v, 2. So we read, God 'raised him from the dead; who was delivered for our offences, and raised again for our justification:' because our Surety's being discharged by the will and act of the Judge himself, is a full proof that he has paid our whole debt.

"(2.) Nor is there any more sure way to the imitation of Christ, than faith in Christ crucified, in Him 'who suffered for us, leaving us an example,' that we might tread in his steps; who 'died for us, while we were yet enemies,' that we might be 'justified by his blood,' Rom. v, 9. Yet it is true, this doctrine finds no place in those who are proud of heart, who love their own reasonings, and have no taste for 'the sincere milk of the word.' But it is precious to them who feel the weight of their sins, who know they 'are by nature children of wrath,' and, at the same time, utterly incapable either of

paying the debt, of rising from the death of sin, of conquering themselves, the world, and the devil, or of meriting eternal life.

“(3.) The origin and cause of our redemption is, the ineffable love of God the Father, who willed to redeem us by the blood of his own Son;—the grace of the Son, who freely took our curse upon him, and imparts his blessing and merits to us;—and the Holy Spirit, who communicates the love of the Father and the grace of the Son to our hearts.

“When we speak of this, and of the satisfaction of Christ, we speak of the inmost mystery of the Christian faith. Therefore all the inventions of men ought now to be kept at the utmost distance; nor can any thing certain be established, without the express authority of Scripture. And herein is offered first to our consideration, the only-begotten Son of God, as the Head of the redeemed, the righteous Servant of God, who by the knowledge of himself ‘shall justify many,’ Isaiah liii, 11. Him God hath constituted the ‘surety of that better covenant,’ Heb. vii, 22,—the covenant of grace. And how clearly is his execution of this office described in the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah! where the prophet describes him as ‘bearing our griefs,’ or sins, ‘and carrying our sorrows.’ (Verse 4.) ‘All we,’ says he, ‘like sheep, have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way; and the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all.’ (Verse 6.) All mankind have forsaken God, and placed their own will upon his throne, and so were liable to the highest punishment, when the Mediator voluntarily interposed himself between them and the just Judge. And the incomprehensible love of God, that he might spare them, ‘spared not his own Son.’ This is shown in those words: ‘The Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all.’ It was on this account that ‘He was oppressed and afflicted, and brought as a lamb to the slaughter,’ (verse 7;) while God ‘made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him,’ 2 Cor. v, 21. This is expressed in the ninth and tenth verses: ‘He had done no violence, nor was any deceit in his mouth. Yet it pleased the Lord to bruise him,’ when he ‘made his soul an offering for sin.’ How exactly do his own words agree with these: ‘I am the good Shepherd, and I lay down my life for the sheep!’ John x, 14, 15. For them ‘was he taken from prison and from judgment, and cut off out of the land of the living,’ Isa. liii, 8. How doth God herein ‘commend his love toward’ us, in ‘delivering up his own Son to die for us!’ Yea, God ‘was pleased with bruising him,’ when, clothed with our flesh, and bearing our sins, he manifested to angels and men his infinite love of divine justice, till, being ‘made obedient unto death, even the death of the cross,’ he satisfied its utmost demand.

“It was then God ‘was pleased to bruise him,’ when ‘he made his soul an offering for sin.’ He then appeared before the Judge of all, under ‘the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin,’ as the Apostle speaks. And therefore God was pleased ‘to condemn sin in the flesh,’ Rom. viii, 3, 4; to ‘bruise him’ who sustained the person of sinners. But this was only the prelude of a glorious victory. Therefore, the prophet adds: ‘He shall see his seed, he shall prolong his days, and the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in his hand,’ Isa. liii, 10. After repeating (verse 11) the sum of all, ‘He shall bear their iniquities,’ he subjoins the cause of his reward: ‘Because he poured out his soul unto death, and was numbered with the transgressors; for he bore the sin of many, and made intercession for the transgressors.’ (Verse 12.)

“The fifth verse, of which I have not yet spoken, renders this great truth still more evident: ‘He was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities: the chastisement of our peace was upon him, and by his stripes we are healed.’ He loved his own body less than his mystical body, the Church, and therefore gave the former for the latter, ‘to redeem and purchase it with his own blood,’ by paying himself as a ransom for it. Hereby ‘nailing the handwriting which was against us to his cross, he took it out of the way,’ and so became ‘our peace.’

“(4.) From all which it appears, that Christ was not only a pattern, but,

first and principally, the surety of the new covenant, yea, a sacrifice and a victim for the sins of his people; 'whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood,' Rom. iii, 25. And that precious sacrifice offered on the cross is the very centre and marrow of the Gospel. To that one offering whereby our great High Priest 'hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified,' Heb. x, 14, all the ancient sacrifices referred, as well as numberless other types and figures. 'All these,' says the Apostle, 'were shadows of things to come; but the body is Christ,' Col. ii, 17. He it was, who, 'not by the blood of bulls and goats, but by his own blood, entered into the holiest, having obtained eternal redemption for us,' Heb. ix, 12. In consequence of this we are accepted, 'through the offering of the body of Christ once for all,' x, 10. In all the ancient types and figures, 'without shedding of blood there was no remission;' which was intended to show, there never could be any without the blood of the great Antitype; without that grand propitiatory sacrifice, which (like the figure of it) was to be offered 'without the gate.'

"Indeed, the whole worship of the Old Testament teaches nothing else but the satisfaction made by the blood of Christ, and our reconciliation with God thereby: hence he is styled, 'The Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world;' with a view to the paschal lamb, and the other lambs that were offered in sacrifice: on which account the inhabitants of heaven likewise 'give glory, and sing a new song, because he hath redeemed' them 'unto God by his blood, out of every tribe, and tongue, and people, and nation,' Rev. v, 9.

"(5.) To this might be added the numerous figures that occur in the lives of the old patriarchs, prophets, and kings. But it may suffice to add to the preceding only two testimonies more of the manner of our redemption by a proper sacrifice; the one that of St. Paul,—'Christ hath delivered us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us; as it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree,' Gal. iii, 13; the other of St. Peter,—'Who himself bore our sins in his own body on the tree,' 1 Peter ii, 24. From all this abundantly appears the substitution of the Messiah in the place of his people, thereby atoning for their sins, and restoring them to the favour of God.

"These are the points which are so vehemently opposed by Socinus and his followers, who rob Christ of the principal part of his priestly office, and leave him only that of interceding for us by prayer; as if any intercession were worthy of Christ, which had not his full satisfaction and propitiatory sacrifice for its foundation. Indeed these cannot be put asunder, as sufficiently appears from the words cited before,—'He bore the sin of many, and made intercession for the transgressors;' where the Holy Ghost closely joins his intercession with his satisfaction made by sacrifice. These and a thousand other solid arguments that might be advanced in proof of this fundamental doctrine, overturn all the cavils that flow from corrupt reason, which indeed are weak and thin as a spider's web."

I have dwelt the longer on this head, because of its inexpressible moment. For whether or no the doctrine of justification by faith be, as all Protestants thought at the time of the reformation, *articulus stantis vel cadentis Ecclesiae*, "a doctrine without which there can be no Christian Church;" most certainly there can be none where the whole notion of justification is ridiculed and exploded, unless it be such a Church as includes, according to your account, every child of man, of which, consequently, Turks, Deists, and Pagans are as real members as the most pious Christian under the sun. I cannot but observe, that this is the very essence of Deism; no serious Infidel need contend for more. I would therefore no more set one of this opinion to convert Deists, than I would set a Turk to convert Mohammedans.

4. As every one that is justified is born of God, I am naturally led to consider, in the next place, (so far as it is delivered in the tracts now before us,) your doctrine of the new birth.

“In the day that Adam ate of the tree, he died; that is, his heavenly spirit, with its heavenly body, were extinguished. To make that heavenly spirit and body to be alive again in man, this is regeneration.” (*Spirit of Prayer*, part i, p. 9.) O no; this is not; nor any thing like it. This is the unscriptural dream of Behmen’s heated imagination.

“See the true reason why only the Son of God could be our Redeemer. It is because he alone could be able to bring to life again that celestial spirit and body which had died in Adam.” (*Ib.*)

Not so; but he alone could be our Redeemer, because he alone “by that one oblation of himself once offered,” could make “a sufficient sacrifice and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world.”

“See also why a man must ‘be born again of water and of the Spirit.’ He must be born again of the Spirit, because Adam’s heavenly spirit was lost.” (*Ib.*) Nay, but because Adam had lost the inward image of God, wherein he was created. And no less than the Almighty Spirit of God could renew that image in his soul.

“He must be born of water, because that heavenly body which Adam lost was formed out of the heavenly materiality, which is called water.” (*Ib.*)

Vain philosophy! The plain meaning of the expression, “Except a man be born of water,” is neither more nor less than this, “Except he be baptized.” And the plain reason why he ought to be thus born of water is, because God hath appointed it. He hath appointed it as an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace, which grace is, “a death unto sin, and a new birth unto righteousness.”

“The necessity of our regaining our first heavenly body is the necessity” (I presume you mean, the ground of the necessity) “of our eating the body and blood of Christ.” (p. 10.)

Neither can I believe this, till I find it in the Bible. I am there taught to believe, that our “spiritually receiving the body and blood of Christ,” which is most eminently done in the Lord’s Supper, is necessary to “strengthen and refresh our souls, as our bodies are by the bread and wine.”

“The necessity of having again our first heavenly spirit is shown by the necessity of our being baptized with the Holy Ghost!” (*Ib.*)

No. That we “must be baptized with the Holy Ghost,” implies this and no more, that we cannot be “renewed in righteousness and true holiness” any otherwise than by being overshadowed, quickened, and animated by that blessed Spirit.

“Our fall is nothing else but the falling of our soul from its heavenly body and spirit, into a bestial body and spirit. Our redemption” (you mean, our new birth) “is nothing else but the regaining our first angelic spirit and body.” (*Ib.*)

What an account is here of the Christian redemption! How would Dr. Tindal have smiled at this! Where you say, “Redemption is nothing else but the life of God in the soul,” you allow an essential part of it. But here you allow it to be nothing else but that which is no part of it at all; nothing else but a whim, a madman’s dream, a chimera, a mere non entity!

“This,” (angelic spirit and body,) “in Scripture, is called our ‘new’ or ‘inward man.’” (*Ib.*)

The “inward man” in Scripture means one thing, the “new man” another. The former means, the mind, opposed to the body: “Though our outward man,” our body, “perish, yet the inward man,” the mind or soul, “is renewed day by day,” 2 Cor. iv, 16. The latter means, universal holiness: “Put off the old man, which is corrupt; and put on the new man, which, after God, is created in righteousness and true holiness,” Eph. iv, 22, 24. But neither does the one nor the other ever mean “this angelic spirit and body.”

You yourself know better what the new birth is. You describe it better, though still with amazing queerness of language, where you say,—

“Man hath the light and water of an outward nature to quench the wrath of his own life, and the light and meekness of Christ, as a seed born in him, to bring forth anew the image of God.”

But it is not strange, that you speak so confusedly and darkly, as you generally do, of the new birth, seeing you seem to have no conception of that faith whereby we are born again.

This abundantly appears from your frank declaration, “We are neither saved by faith nor by works.” (*Spirit of Prayer*, part ii, p. 36.) Flatly contrary to the declaration of St. Paul, “By grace we are saved through faith.”

To put the matter out of dispute, you declare that you mean by faith, “a desire to be one with Christ.” (Part i, p. 50.)

Again: “The desire of turning to God is the coming of Christ into the soul. This faith will save thee.” (p. 76.)

So, in your judgment, saving faith is, “a desire of coming to God, or of being one with Christ.” I know the contrary from experience. I had this desire many years before I even knew what saving faith was.

Faith is so far from being only this desire, that it is no desire at all. It differs from all desire *toto genere*, [wholly,] although doubtless all good desires accompany it. It is, according to St. Paul, an *ελεγχος*, an “evidence” or “conviction” (which is totally different from a desire) “of things not seen,” a supernatural, a divine evidence and conviction of the things which God hath revealed in his word; of this in particular, that the Son of God hath loved me and given himself for me. Whosoever hath this faith is born of God. Whosoever thus believeth is saved; and if he endure therein to the end, shall be saved everlastingly.

The process of this work in the soul, of the present salvation which is through faith, you likewise describe confusedly and obscurely. The sum of what you say is this:—

“The painful sense of what you are, kindled into a working state of sensibility by the light of God, is the light and fire from whence the spirit of prayer proceeds. In its first kindling, nothing is found but pain, wrath, and darkness: And therefore its first prayer is all humility.” (Part ii, p. 172.)

Would it not be more intelligible if one had said, “The convincing Spirit of God gives you to see and feel that you are a poor undone, guilty, helpless sinner: at the same time, he incites you to cry for help to Him who is ‘mighty to save.’” This is true. But it is not true, that,

in the first kindling of this fire, in plain terms, during the first convictions, "nothing is found but pain, wrath, and darkness." Very often there are found, even in the first conviction, sweet gleams of light, touches of joy, of hope, and of love, mixed with sorrow and fear. Much less is it true, that the first prayer of an awakening sinner is all humility. (*Ib.*) On the contrary, a sinner newly awakened has always more or less confidence in himself, in what he is, or has, or does, and will do; which is not humility, but downright pride. And this mingles itself with all his prayer, till the day-star is just rising in his heart.

You add: "This prayer is met by the divine love, and changed into hymns, and songs, and thanksgivings." (*Ib.*) It is so, when, "being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ." "This state of fervour melts away all earthly passions and affections, and leaves no inclination in the soul, but to delight in God alone." (*Ib.*) It is certain, this is the genuine effect of "the love of God shed abroad in the heart;" which expression of St. Paul, I suppose, means the same with "this state of fervour." "Then its prayer changes again, and continually stands in fulness of faith, in purity of love, in absolute resignation to do and be what and how his Beloved pleaseth. This is the last state of the spirit of prayer, and is our highest union with God in this life." (p. 173.)

Assuredly it is: fulness of faith, beholding, with open face, the glory of the Lord; purity of love, free from all mixture of its contrary, yielding the whole heart to God; absolute resignation, excluding every degree of self will, sacrificing every thought, word, and work to God. But do we change directly, from our first love, into the highest union with God? Surely not. There is an intermediate state between that of "babes in Christ," and that of fathers. You yourself are very sensible there is, although you here speak as if there were not.

You go on: "People who have long dwelt in this fervour are frightened when coldness seizes upon them;" (p. 174;) that is, when they lose it, when their love grows cold. And certainly, well they may, if this fervour was to bring them to "fulness of faith, purity of love, and absolute resignation." Well they may be affrighted, if that fervour be lost before "it has done its work."

Indeed, they might be affrighted when it is not lost, if that which follows be true: "Fervour is good, and ought to be loved; but distress and coldness are better. It brings the soul nearer to God than the fervour did." (pp. 175, 176.)

The fervour, you said, brought the soul to "its highest union with God in this life." Can coldness do more? Can it bring us to a union higher than the highest?

To explain this, you say, "The fervour made the soul delight in God. But it was too much an own delight. It was a fancied self holiness, and occasioned rest and satisfaction in itself, in a spiritual self." (p. 175.) Either fervour does bring us to purity of love, and absolute resignation, or not. To say, It does not, contradicts what you said before: to say it does, contradicts what you say now. For if it does, we cannot say, "Coldness does the work which fervour did in a higher degree."

I should not insist so long on these glaring inconsistencies, were not the doctrine you are here labouring to support absolutely inconsistent

with that of St. Paul, and naturally productive of the most fatal consequences. St. Paul asserts, the present kingdom of God in the soul is "righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost." He continually teaches, that these, which God hath joined, man ought not to put asunder; that peace and joy should never be separated from righteousness, being the divine means both of preserving and increasing it; and that we may, yea, ought, to rejoice evermore, till the God of peace sanctifies us wholly. But if these things are so, then "distress and coldness are" not "better" than fervent love, and joy in the Holy Ghost.

Again: the doctrine, that it is better and more profitable for the soul to lose its sense of the love of God than to keep it, is not only unscriptural, but naturally attended with the most fatal consequences. It directly tends to obstruct, if not destroy, the work of God in the heart, by causing men to bless themselves in those ways which damp the fervour of their affections; and to imagine they are considerably advanced in grace, when they have grieved, yea, quenched, the Spirit. Nay, but let all who now feel the love of God in their hearts, and "walk in the light as he is in the light," labour, by every possible means, to "keep themselves in the love of God." Let them be ever "fervent in spirit;" let them "rejoice evermore," and stir up the gift of God which is in them. And if, at any time, "coldness seizes upon them," let them be assured, they have grieved the Spirit of God. Let them be affrighted; let them fear lest they sink lower and lower; yea, into total deadness and hardness of heart. At the peril of their souls, let them not rest in darkness, but examine themselves, search out their spirits, cry vehemently to God, and not cease till he restores the light of his countenance.

5. If this doctrine of the profitableness of coldness above fervour directly tends to make believers easy, while they are sliding back into unbelief, you have another which tends as directly to make them easy who never believed at all, I mean, that of Christ in every man. What you advance on this head, I desire next to consider, as the importance of it requires.

"The birth of Christ is already begun in every one. Jesus is already within thee, (whoever thou art,) living, stirring, calling, knocking at the door of thy heart." (*Spirit of Prayer*, part i, p. 55.)

"Every man has Christ in his spirit, lying there as in a state of insensibility and death." (*Spirit of Love*, part ii, p. 34.)

But he is living, for all that. And though "in a state of insensibility," he is "stirring, calling, knocking at the door of the heart!"

"Something of heaven" (you use this phrase as equivalent with Christ) "lies, in every soul, in a state of inactivity and death." (p. 35.)

"All the holy nature, tempers, and Spirit of Christ lie hid as a seed in thy soul." (*Spirit of Prayer*, part i, p. 68.)

But are they active or inactive? living and stirring, or in a state of insensibility and death?

"Thou art poor, and blind, and naked, and miserable, while all the peace and joy of God are within thee." (p. 74.)

This is most wonderful of all! Are these within him who is "dead in sin," who is a "stranger to all that is holy and heavenly?" If they are, how can he be miserable, who has "all the peace and joy of God within

him?" Will you say, "They are in him, but he does not feel them?" Nay, then, they are not in him. I have peace in me no longer than I feel peace; I feel joy, or I have it not.

"See here the extent of the Catholic Church of Christ! It takes in all the world." (p. 56.)

So Jews, Mohammedans, Deists, Heathens, are all members of the Church of Christ! Should we not add devils too, seeing these also are to dwell with us in heaven?

"Poor sinner, Christ dwelleth in the centre, the fund or bottom, of thy soul." (p. 59.)

What is this? What is either the centre, the top, or bottom of a spirit?

"When Adam fell, this centre of his soul became a prisoner in an earthly animal. But from the moment God spoke Christ into Adam, all the treasures of the divine nature, the light and Spirit of God, came again into man, into the centre of his soul." (p. 60.)

I cannot find in the Bible when that was, when "God spoke Christ into Adam."

We come now to the proofs of these strong assertions:—

And, (1.) "No faith could ever begin, unless every man had Christ in him." (*Spirit of Love*, part ii, p. 34.)

This proposition needs just as much proof itself, as that which it is brought to prove.

(2.) "Unless the remains of the perfect love of God were in every man, it would be impossible he should ever love God at all." (p. 38.)

Why so? Cannot God give his love this moment to one who never loved him before?

(3.) "Unless Christ was hidden in the soul, there could not be the least beginning of man's salvation. For what could begin to desire heaven, unless something of heaven was hid in the soul!" (p. 35.)

What could! Why, any soul which had nothing but hell in it before, the moment grace was infused from above.

(4.) "The Ten Commandments lay hid in men's souls," (how?) "till called into sensibility by writing them on stone. Just so Christ lies in the soul, till awakened by the mediatorial office of the holy Jesus." (p. 37.)

This is only assertion still, not proof. But what do you mean by the mediatorial office of Christ? And how is Christ "awakened by the mediatorial office of the holy Jesus?"

(5.) "The sea cannot be moved by any other wind than that which had its birth from the sea itself." (p. 40.)

I think it can. I have seen it "moved by a wind which had its birth from the" land.

(6.) "The musician cannot make his instrument give any other melody than that which lies hid in it, as its own inward state." (p. 42.)

Did the tune, then, lie hid in the trumpet, before the trumpeter blew? And was this tune, or another, or all that ever were and will be played on it, the inward state of the trumpet?

"No more can the mind have any grief or joy but that which is from itself." (p. 43.)

An unhappy comparison! For the instrument can have no melody

or sound at all from itself; and most unhappily applied to the operations of God upon the souls of men. For has God no more power over my soul, than I have over a musical instrument?

These are your arguments to prove that Christ is in every man: a blessing which St. Paul thought was peculiar to believers. He said, "Christ is in you, except ye be reprobates," unbelievers. You say, Christ is in you, whether ye be reprobates or no. "If any man hath not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his," saith the Apostle. Yea, but "every man," saith Mr. Law, "hath the Spirit of God. The Spirit of Christ is in every soul." (*Spirit of Prayer*, part i, p. 63.) "He that hath not the Son of God hath not life," saith St. John. But Mr. Law saith, "Every man hath the Son of God." Sleep on, then, ye sons of Belial, and take your rest; ye are all safe; for "he that hath the Son, hath life."

There can hardly be any doctrine under heaven more agreeable to flesh and blood; nor any which more directly tends to prevent the very dawn of conviction, or, at least, to hinder its deepening in the soul, and coming to a sound issue. None more naturally tends to keep men asleep in sin, and to lull asleep those who begin to be awakened. Only persuade one of this, "Christ is already in thy heart; thou hast now the inspiration of his Spirit; all the peace and joy of God are within thee, yea, all the holy nature, tempers, and Spirit of Christ;" and you need do no more; the syren song quiets all his sorrow and fear. As soon as you have sewed this pillow to his soul, he sinks back into the sleep of death.

6. But you have made an ample amends for this, by providing so short and easy a way to heaven; not a long, narrow, troublesome, round-about path, like that described in the Bible; but one that will as compendiously save the soul, as Dr. Ward's "pill and drop" heal the body: a way so plain, that they who follow it need no Bible, no human teaching, no outward means whatever; being every one able to stand alone, every one sufficient for himself!

"The first step is, to turn wholly from yourself, and to give up yourself wholly unto God." (Part ii, p. 22.)

If it be, no flesh living shall be saved. How grievously do we stumble at the threshold! Do you seriously call this *the first step*,—to turn wholly from myself, and give up myself wholly unto God? Am I then to step first on the highest round of the ladder? Not unless you turn it upside down. The way to heaven would be short indeed, if the first and the last step were all one; if we were to step as far the moment we set out, as we can do till we enter into glory.

But what do you mean by giving up myself to God? You answer: "Every sincere wish and desire after Christian virtues, is giving up yourself to him, and the very perfection of faith." (*Spirit of Love*, part ii, p. 217.)

Far, very far from it: I know from the experience of a thousand persons, as well as from Scripture, and the very reason of the thing, that a man may have sincere desires after all these, long before he attains them. He may sincerely wish to give himself up to God, long before he is able so to do. He may desire this, not only before he has the perfection, but before he has any degree, of saving faith.

More marvellous still is that which follows: "You may easily and immediately, by the mere turning of your mind, have all these virtues,—patience, meekness, humility, and resignation to God." (p. 212.)

Who may? Not I; not you; not any that is born of a woman; as is proved by the daily experience of all that know what patience, meekness, or resignation means.

But how shall I know whether I have faith or not? "I will give you an infallible touchstone. Retire from all conversation only for a month. Neither write, nor read, nor debate any thing with yourself. Stop all the former workings of your heart and mind, and stand all this month in prayer to God. If your heart cannot give itself up in this manner to prayer, be fully assured you are an infidel." (*Spirit of Prayer*, part ii, p. 163.)

If this be so, the infidels are a goodly company! if every man be of that number who cannot "stop all the former workings of his heart and mind, and stand thus in prayer to God for a month together."

But I would gladly know by what authority you give us this touchstone; and how you prove it to be infallible. I read nothing like it in the oracles of God. I cannot find one word there of "refraining from all conversation, from writing, and reading for a month." (I fear you make no exception in favour of public worship or reading the word of God.) Where does the Bible speak of this? of stopping for a month, or a day, all the former workings of my heart and mind? of refraining from all converse with the children of God, and from reading his word? It would be no wonder, should any man make this unscriptural (if not anti-scriptural) experiment, if Satan were permitted to work in him "a strong delusion," so that he should "believe a lie."

Nearly related to this touchstone is the direction which you give elsewhere: "Stop all self-activity; be retired, silent, passive, and humbly attentive to the inward light." (Part i, pp. 77, 82.)

But beware "the light which is in thee be not darkness;" as it surely is, if it agree not with "the law and the testimony." "Open thy heart to all its impressions," if they agree with that truly infallible touchstone. Otherwise regard no impression of any kind, at the peril of thy soul,— "wholly stopping the workings of thy own reason and judgment." I find no such advice in the word of God. And I fear they who stop the workings of their reason, lie the more open to the workings of their imagination.

There is abundantly greater danger of this when we fancy we have no longer need to "be taught of man." To this your late writings directly lead. One who admires them will be very apt to cry out, "I have found all that I need know of God, of Christ, of myself, of heaven, of hell, of sin, of grace, and of salvation." (Part ii, p. 4.) And the rather, because you yourself affirm roundly, "When once we apprehend the all of God, and our own nothingness," (which a man may persuade himself he does, in less than four-and-twenty hours,) "it brings a kind of infallibility into the soul in which it dwells; all that is vain, and false, and deceitful, is forced to vanish and fly before it." (Part i, p. 95.) Agreeably to which, you tell your convert, "You have no questions to ask of any body." (*Spirit of Love*, part ii, p. 218.) And if, notwithstanding this, he will ask, "But how am I to keep up the flame of

love?" you answer, "I wonder you should want to know this. Does a blind, or sick, or lame man want to know how he should desire sight, health, or limbs?" (*Spirit of Prayer*, part ii, p. 165.) No; but he wants to know how he should attain, and how he should keep, them. And he who has attained the love of God, may still want to know how he shall keep it. And he may still inquire, "May I not take my own passions, or the suggestions of evil spirits, for the workings of the Spirit of God?" (p. 198.) To this you answer, "Every man knows when he is governed by the spirit of wrath, envy, or covetousness, as easily and as certainly as he knows when he is hungry." (*Ib.*) Indeed he does not; neither as easily nor as certainly. Without great care, he may take wrath to be pious zeal, envy to be virtuous emulation, and covetousness to be Christian prudence or laudable frugality. "Now the knowledge of the Spirit of God in yourself is as perceptible as covetousness." Perhaps so; for this is as difficultly perceptible as any temper of the human soul. "And liable to no more delusion." Indeed it need not; for this is liable to ten thousand delusions.

You add: "His Spirit is more distinguishable from all other spirits, than any of your natural affections are from one another." (p. 199.) Suppose joy and grief: Is it more distinguishable from all other spirits, than these are from one another? Did any man ever mistake grief for joy? No, not from the beginning of the world. But did none ever mistake nature for grace? Who will be so hardy as to affirm this?

But you set your pupil as much above the being taught by books, as being taught by men. "Seek," say you, "for help no other way, neither from men, nor books; but wholly leave yourself to God." (*Spirit of Love*, part ii, p. 225.)

But how can a man "leave himself wholly to God," in the total neglect of his ordinances? The old Bible way is, to "leave ourselves wholly to God," in the constant use of all the means he hath ordained. And I cannot yet think the new is better, though you are fully persuaded it is. "There are two ways," you say, "of attaining goodness and virtue; the one by books or the ministry of men, the other by an inward birth. The former is only in order to the latter." This is most true, that all the externals of religion are in order to the renewal of our soul in righteousness and true holiness. But it is not true, that the external way is one, and the internal way another. There is but one Scriptural way, wherein we receive inward grace, through the outward means which God hath appointed.

Some might think that when you advised, "not to seek help from books," you did not include the Bible. But you clear up this, where you answer the objection, of your not esteeming the Bible enough. You say, "How could you more magnify John the Baptist, than by going from his teaching, to be taught by that Christ to whom he directed you? Now, the Bible can have no other office or power, than to direct you to Christ. How then can you more magnify the Bible than by going from its teaching, to be taught by Christ?" So you set Christ and the Bible in flat opposition to each other! And is this the way we are to learn of him? Nay, but we are taught of him, not by going from the Bible, but by keeping close to it. Both by the Bible and by experience we know, that his word and his Spirit act in connection with each other. And thus

it is, that by Christ continually teaching and strengthening him through the Scripture, "the man of God is made perfect, and thoroughly furnished for every good word and work."

According to your veneration for the Bible, is your regard for public worship and for the Lord's Supper. "Christ," you say, "is the church or temple of God within thee. There the supper of the Lamb is kept. When thou art well grounded in this inward worship, thou wilt have learned to live unto God above time and place. For every day will be Sunday to thee; and wherever thou goest, thou wilt have a priest, a church, and an altar along with thee." (*Spirit of Prayer*, part i, p. 73.)

The plain inference is, Thou wilt not need to make any difference between Sunday and other days. Thou wilt need no other church than that which thou hast always along with thee; no other supper, worship, priest, or altar. Be well grounded in this inward worship, and it supercedes all the rest.

This is right pleasing to flesh and blood; and I could most easily believe it, if I did not believe the Bible. But that teaches me inwardly to worship God, as at all times and in all places, so particularly on his own day, in the congregation of his people, at his altar, and by the ministry of those his servants whom he hath given for this very thing, 'for the perfecting of the saints,' and with whom he will be to the end of the world.

Extremely dangerous therefore is this other Gospel, which leads quite aside of the Gospel of Christ. And what must the consequence be, if we thus "break," yea, "and teach men so," not "one" only, neither "the least" of "his commandments?" Even that we "shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven." God grant this may not fall on you or me!

7. However, whether we have a place in heaven or not, you are very sure we shall have none in hell. For there is no hell in *rerum naturâ*, 'no such place in the universe.' You declare this over and over again, in great variety of expressions. It may suffice to mention two or three: 'Hell is no penalty prepared or inflicted by God.' (*Spirit of Prayer*, part ii, p. 33.) "Damnation is only that which springs up within you." (*Spirit of Love*, part ii, p. 47.) "Hell and damnation are nothing but the various operations of self." (*Spirit of Prayer*, part i, p. 79.)

I rather incline to the account published a few years ago, by a wise and pious man, (the late bishop of Cork,) where he is speaking of the improvement of human knowledge by revelation. Some of his words are: "Concerning future punishments, we learn from revelation only, (1.) That they are both for soul and body, which are distinguished in Scripture by 'the worm that dieth not,' and 'the fire which never shall be quenched:' and accordingly we are bid to 'fear him who is able to destroy both body and soul in hell.' Upon which I shall only remark, that whereas we find by experience, the body and soul in this life are not capable of suffering the extremity of pain and anguish at the same time, insomuch, that the greatest anguish of mind is lost and diverted by acute and pungent pain of body; yet we learn from Scripture, that in hell the wicked will be subject to extreme torments of both together." (*Procedure, &c, of Human Understanding*, p. 350.)

"(2.) That the chief cause of their eternal misery will be an eternal

exclusion from the beatific vision of God. This exclusion seems to be the only punishment to which we can now conceive a pure spirit liable. And according as all intelligent beings are at a less or greater distance from this fountain of all happiness, so they are necessarily more or less miserable or happy.

“(3.) That one part of those punishments will be by fire, than which we have not any revelation more express and positive. And as it is an instance of great goodness in God, that the joys of heaven are represented to us under the figurative images of light and glory and a kingdom, and that the substance shall exceed the utmost of our conception; so it is an argument of his strict justice, that future punishments are more literally threatened and foretold.

“(4.) The eternity of these punishments is revealed as plainly as words can express it. And the difficulty of that question, ‘What proportion endless torments can bear to momentary sins,’ is quite removed by considering, that the punishments denounced are not sanctions entirely arbitrary, but are withal so many previous warnings or declarations of the natural tendency of sin itself. So that an unrepenting sinner must be miserable in another life by a necessity of nature. Therefore he is not capable of mercy; since there never can be an alteration of his condition, without such a change of the whole man as would put the natural and settled order of the creation out of course.” (p. 351.)

Doubtless this eminent man (whose books on the Human Understanding, and on Divine Analogy, I would earnestly recommend to all who either in whole or in part deny the Christian Revelation) grounded his judgment both of the nature and duration of future punishments on these and the like passages of Scripture:—

“If we sin wilfully after we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins; but a certain fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation, which shall devour the adversaries. He that despised Moses’ law died without mercy: of how much sorer punishment shall he be thought worthy, who hath trodden under foot the Son of God! For we know him that hath said, Vengeance belongeth unto me, I will recompense. It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God,” Heb. x, 26–31.

And let not any who live and die in their sins, vainly hope to escape his vengeance. “For if God spared not the angels that sinned, but cast them down to hell, and delivered them into chains of darkness, to be reserved unto judgment; the Lord knoweth how to reserve the unjust unto the day of judgment to be punished,” 2 Pet. ii, 4–9. In that day, peculiarly styled, “the day of the Lord,” they “that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake; some to everlasting life, and some to everlasting shame and contempt,” Dan. xii, 2. Among the latter will all those be found, who are now, by their obstinate impenitence, “treasuring up to themselves wrath against the day of wrath and revelation of the righteous judgment of God; who will” then render “indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish, upon every soul of man that doeth evil,” Rom. ii, 5–9. He hath declared the very sentence which he will then pronounce on all the workers of iniquity: “Depart, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels,” Matt. xxv, 41. And in that hour it will be executed; being “cast into outer darkness, where is wailing and gnashing of teeth,” verse 30; they “will be punished with everlasting destruction, from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power,” 2 Thess. i, 9. A punishment not only without end, but likewise without intermission. For when once “they are cast into that furnace of fire,” that “lake of fire burning with brimstone, the

worm," gnawing their soul, "dieth not, and the fire," tormenting their body, "is not quenched." So that "they have no rest day or night; but the smoke of their torment ascendeth up for ever and ever."

Now, thus much cannot be denied, that these texts speak as if there were really such a place as hell, as if there were a real fire there, and as if it would remain for ever. I would then ask but one plain question: If the case is not so, why did God speak as if it was? Say you, "To affright men from sin?" What, by guile, by dissimulation, by hanging out false colours? Can you possibly ascribe this to the God of truth? Can you believe it of him? Can you conceive the Most High dressing up a scarecrow, as we do to fright children? Far be it from him! If there be then any such fraud in the Bible, the Bible is not of God. And indeed this must be the result of all: if there be "no unquenchable fire, no everlasting burnings," there is no dependence on those writings wherein they are so expressly asserted, nor of the eternity of heaven, any more than of hell. So that if we give up the one, we must give up the other. No hell, no heaven, no revelation!

In vain you strive to supply the place of this, by putting purgatory in its room; by saying, "These virtues must have their perfect work in you, if not before, yet certainly after, death. Every thing else must be taken from you by fire, either here or hereafter." (*Spirit of Love*, part ii, p. 232.) Poor, broken reed! Nothing will "be taken from you," by that fire which is "prepared for the devil and his angels," but all rest, all joy, all comfort, all hope. For "the worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched."

I have now, sir, delivered my own soul. And I have used great plainness of speech; such as I could not have prevailed on myself to use to one whom I so much respect, on any other occasion.

O that your latter Works may be more and greater than your first! Surely they would, if you could ever be persuaded to study, instead of the writings of Tauler and Behmen, those of St. Paul, James, Peter, and John; to spew out of your mouth and out of your heart that vain philosophy, and speak neither higher nor lower things, neither more nor less, than the oracles of God; to renounce, despise, abhor all the high-flown bombast, all the unintelligible jargon of the Mystics, and come back to the plain religion of the Bible, "We love him, because he first loved us."

LONDON, January 6, 1756.

THOUGHTS UPON JACOB BEHMEN.

I HAVE considered the Memoirs of Jacob Behmen, of which I will speak very freely.

I believe he was a good man. But I see nothing extraordinary either in his life or in his death. I have known many, both men and women, who were far more exemplary in their lives, and far more honoured of God in their death.

I allow he wrote many truths; but none that would have appeared at all extraordinary, had he thrown aside his hard words, and used plain and common language.

What some seem most to admire in his writings, is what I most object to; I mean his philosophy and his phraseology. These are really his own; and these are quite new; therefore, they are quite wrong.

I totally object to his blending religion with philosophy; and as vain a philosophy as ever existed: crude, indigested; supported neither by Scripture nor reason, nor any thing but his own *ipse dixit*: [mere assertion.]

I grant, Mr. Law, by taking immense pains, has licked it into some shape. And he has made it hang tolerably together. But still it admits of no manner of proof.

And all he writes concerning religion is what very many have said before him, and in a far better manner.

To his whole scheme I object,

1. The whole foundation of it is wrong; the very attempt to explain religion, which is the most simple thing in the world, by an abstruse, complicated, philosophical theory, is the most absurd thing that can be conceived.

I pray, consider but one argument against it. Either St. Paul and St. John knew this theory, or they did not. Mr. Law supposes, they did not know it; but that Jacob knew more than them both. I verily think this needs no confutation. Let him believe it that can. But if they did know it, how did they dare to conceal any part of the counsel of God?

Upon the theory itself I shall only repeat a very little of what I observed in my printed "Letter to Mr. Law:"—

"All that can be conceived," says Mr. Law, quoting from Jacob, "is God, or nature, or creature."

Is nature created or not created? It must be one or the other; for there is no medium. If not created, it is God. If created, is it not a creature? How then can these be three,—God, nature, and creature; since nature must coincide either with God or creature?

"Nature is in itself a hungry, wrathful fire of life. Nature is and can be only a desire. Desire is the very being of nature." "Nature is only a desire, because it is for the sake of something else! Nature is only a torment, because it cannot help itself to what it wants."

Shame to human understanding, that any man should fall in love with such stark, staring nonsense as this!

"Nature, as well as God, is antecedent to all creatures. There is an eternal nature, as universal and as unlimited as God." Is then nature God? Or, are there two eternal, universal, infinite beings?

"Nothing is before eternal nature, but God." *Nothing but!* Is any thing before that which is eternal?

"Nature, and darkness, and self, are but three different expressions for one and the same thing." "Nature has all evil and no evil in it."

"Nature has seven chief properties, and can have neither more nor less, because it is a birth from the Deity in nature." (Is nature a *birth from the Deity in nature*? Is not this a flat contradiction?) "For God is tri-une, and nature is tri-une." (*Nature tri-une!* Prove it who can.) "And hence arise properties, three and three." (Why not four and four?) "And that which brings these three and three into union is another property." Sublime jargon!

“The three first properties of nature are the whole essence of that desire which is, and is called, nature.” A part of its properties are the whole essence of it! Flat contradiction again!

“The three first properties of nature are, attraction, resistance, and whirling. In these three properties of the desire, you see the reason of the three great laws of matter and motion.”

How does it appear that these are any of the properties of nature, if you mean by nature any thing distinct from matter? And how are they properties of desire?

“The fourth property is fire; the fifth, the form of light and love;” (what is the form of love? and are light and love the same thing?) “the sixth, sound or understanding;” (the same thing doubtless!) “the seventh, a life of triumphing joy.” Is then “a life of triumphing joy,” “that which brings the three and three properties into union?” If so, how is it “the result of that union?”

Once more: “Attraction is an incessant working of three contrary properties,—drawing, resisting, and whirling.” That is, in plain terms, drawing is incessant drawing, resistance, and whirling.

Such is the philosophy which Jacob received by immediate inspiration; (to mention only the first principles of it:) and by which he is to explain all religion, and the whole revelation of God!

1. As to his divinity, I object, First, to the very design of explaining religion by any philosophy whatever. The Scripture gives us no direction, no, nor any permission, so to do. I object, much more, to the execution of his design; the attempting to explain it by that base, unmeaning, self-contradictory jargon, which is as far remote from all true, genuine philosophy, as it is from the Scripture itself.

2. But be the foundation as it may, he builds no superstructure upon it, but what we knew before, either with regard to internal or external holiness. We knew before, “Neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision, but faith that worketh by love.” And what does he teach us by all his hard, uncouth words, more than this plain truth?

We knew before that we “must be born again;” inwardly changed from all evil tempers to all good; “from an earthly, sensual, devilish mind, to the mind that was in Christ Jesus.” And what more does he teach us on this head, by all his vain, precarious, mystical philosophy?

We knew before that “the loving God with all our heart, and the loving our neighbour as ourselves, is the fulfilling of the law, the end of the commandment,” the sum of all religion. And what has he told us more than this, in all his nineteen volumes?

We knew before that the whole of religion is, a heart and life totally devoted to God. Has he told us, or can he tell us, any thing more? No, nor all the angels in heaven.

We knew before that the foundation and the superstructure of religion are comprised in those words, “We love him because he first loved us.” Does he teach us any thing higher or deeper? In a word, does he teach any single point, either of inward or outward holiness, which we did not know before? If he does, what is it? I cannot find out one in all his writings.

3. But if his matter is not new, if this is nothing uncommon, his manner of speaking is new indeed! His language is utterly new; it

was never used since the world began. And this is the very reason for which he is so admired,—because he speaks (which cannot be denied) as never man spake. Indeed, I hardly know for which he is most admired,—the novelty, or the obscurity, of his language.

But I cannot admire it at all; because it is quite unscriptural. There is no trace of it to be found in any part either of the Old or New Testament. Therefore, I cannot reconcile it to that express command, “If any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God.”

I cannot admire it, because, Secondly, it is barbarous in the highest degree: whatever is peculiar in his phraseology, is not authorized by any good writer whatever. It is queerness itself. It is mere dog Latin. It is an insult upon the ear and the understanding of all mankind.

One allows, “None can understand it without much pains; perhaps not without reading him thrice over.” I would not read him thrice over on any consideration. (1.) Because it would be enough to crack any man’s brain to brood so long over such unintelligible nonsense; and, (2.) Because such a waste of time might provoke God to give me up to a strong delusion, to believe a lie.

But I doubt whether any man understands it at all: For it is so dark and indeterminate, that I have not found any two persons in England who understand it alike. I thought, if any man living understood Behmen, Mr. Law did. “No,” says one who has been studying him these forty years, “Mr. Law never understood a page of him.”

4. The whole of Behmenism, including both phrase and sense, is useless. It stuns and astonishes its admirers. It fills their heads, but it does not change their hearts. It makes no eminent Christians. For many years I have diligently inquired concerning the grand patrons of it. And I have found none of them who were burning and shining lights; none who adorned the doctrine of God our Saviour.

5. But it is not barely useless; it is mischievous, and that in a high degree. For it strikes at the root of both internal and external religion, (suppose Mr. Law understood it,) by sapping the foundation of justification by faith. For Jacob affirms, “God was never angry at sinners.” But, if so, he was never reconciled to them. His wrath was never turned away, if it never existed. And, admitting this, there is no place for justification; nor, consequently, for faith in a pardoning God, which is the root of both inward and outward holiness.

More particularly, it strikes at the root of humility, tending to make men admire themselves, and despise others. Never was a more melancholy proof of this than Mr. Law, who seriously believed himself the most knowing man in the kingdom, and despised all that contradicted him, even in the tenderest manner, as the mire in the streets. It strikes at the root of charity, inspiring into its strictest votaries deep censoriousness toward the world in general, and an inexpressible bitterness toward all who do not receive their new Apostle. This may be observed in all the authors of the memoirs, though, in other respects, good men; and in all I have conversed with in my life who were thorough Behmenists.

Above all, it strikes at the root of external religion, by destroying zeal for good works; by laying little stress on either works of piety or mercy, and still less upon Christian society; it particularly tends to make all men of sense and learning bury their talent in the earth, the natural

effect of continually declaiming, in a loose and indiscriminate manner, against reason and learning.

It strikes at the root of all revealed religion, by making men think meanly of the Bible; a natural effect of thinking Behmen more highly illuminated than any or all of the Apostles. So Mr. S. frankly acknowledged, "While I admired him, I thought St. Paul and St. John very mean writers."

Indeed it quite spoils the taste for plain, simple religion, such as that of the Bible is; and gives a false taste, which can relish nothing so well, as high, obscure, unintelligible jargon.

DECEMBER 22, 1780.

A S P E C I M E N

OF

THE DIVINITY AND PHILOSOPHY OF THE HIGHLY-ILLUMINATED JACOB BEHMEN.

In the late edition of his Works, before the second volume, we have the following advertisement:—

"As he and Mr. Law were raised up by God, and highly qualified as instructors of mankind in divine wisdom, so all who are followers of Christ in simplicity of heart, and seek only the salvation of their souls, will find in their writings every thing relating to their essential happiness. And all the efforts of human wisdom to depreciate them, can be but like sounding brass, or a tinkling cymbal."

Mr. Law's writings are entirely out of the present question: We are only concerned with those of Jacob Behmen; a specimen of which I beg to lay before those who really seek the salvation of their souls:—

"AN EXPLANATION OF THE LORD'S PRAYER.

" <i>Unser vater</i>	<i>in himmel:</i>
" Our Father	in heaven:

"41. *Un* is God's eternal will to nature; *ser* comprehends in it the four forms of nature.

"42. *Va* is the matrix upon the cross; *ter* is Mercury in the centre of nature. And they are the two mothers in the eternal will. The one severs itself into fire, the other into the light of meekness and into water. For *va* is the mother of the light which affords substantiality, and *ter* is the mother of the fire's tincture.

"43. *Im* is the heart: For the syllable *im* goes forth from the heart, and soundeth through the lips.

"44. *Him* means the creation of the soul; *mel* is the angelical soul itself: Which the heart on the cross in the centre between the two mothers has comprehended, and with the word *him* framed it to a creature, viz. into *mel*: For *him* is the habitation of *mel*.

" *Dein nahme werde geheiligt:*

" Thy name be hallowed:

"45. When we say *dein*, we understand how the poor soul swims in the water of this world.

v“ 46. In the syllable *nah* it inclines inward ; and in the syllable *me* it comprehends the heavenly substantiality.

“ 47. When we say *wer*, the whole creature goes along in the will : For *wer* has the whole centre ; and with the syllable *de*, it lays itself down in obedience to the meekness, and will not kindle the *wer* in the fire.

“ 48. And when we say *ge*, the soul goes into the heavenly substantiality ; and then *hei* is the powerful entering upon the cross into the number three. With the syllable *li* the soul's will has comprehended the Holy Ghost. *Get* : There the soul will go forth with the Holy Ghost.

“ *Dein reich komme* :

“ Thy kingdom come :

“ 49. *Dein* : Then the soul gives itself into the will of God.

“ 50. *Reich* : Here it gives itself into the virtue of the angelical world.

“ 51. In the syllable *kom*, it goes into the virtue ; and, with the syllable *me*, it goes into the kingdom as a sprout : For the *me* makes the lips be open.

“ *Dein wille geschehe, wie im himmel* :

“ Thy will be done, as in heaven :

“ *Also auch auff erden* :

“ So also upon earth :

“ 52. *Dein* : Here the will casts itself into God's will.

“ 53. *Wil* is its desire to will the same with the Holy Ghost. *Le* : With this syllable it takes in the will with the spirit into the centre.

“ 54. *Ge* : With this syllable it goes into the will. *Sche* : With this syllable it worketh the work of God. *He* : In this syllable it bows itself as a child.

“ 55. *Wie* : There it goes again into the voice of God ; *im* is the heart of God. *Him* is again the creating of the creatures ; *mel* is the soul willing the will of God.

“ 56. *Al* : There it drives on that will, with the syllable *so*, out of its centre into the outward principle. *Auch* : There it affords all it has in itself out into the outward.

“ 57. *Auff* : With this syllable it apprehends the same again, and desires its substance should not be dissipated.

“ 58. *Er* : With this syllable it brings its substance into the spirit of this world, and there the will shall work wonders. *Den* : With this syllable it shows that it must not be done in the fire of the anger : For this syllable does not break up the centre. They should be done in meek love, and yet taken out of the *er*.

“ *Gieb uns unser taglich brodt heute* :

“ Give us our daily bread to-day :

“ 60. *Gieb* : There the will sticketh in the heart, and presses outward, and the mouth catches it.

“ 61. *Uns* : With this syllable the soul desires food for all its fellow members.

“ 62. *Un* : With this syllable the soul goes into the internal wisdom, wherein, before the creation in the seed, it was discerned in the eternal will. *Ser* : With this syllable it takes the original of nature in the will, where one form in the original penetrates, fills, and preserves the other. And that is the bond of the soul, whereby it eternally subsists. And that the will of the soul desires ; else it would be dissolved.

“ 63. This is the true ‘ doctorship of the Holy Ghost.’ The outward is but foppery.

“ 64. *Tag* : With this syllable the heavenly number is understood, as wherein the Spirit on the cross in the holy matrix comprehends the genitive in the multiplication. *Jich* : In this syllable the soul quickens and strengthens itself with the heavenly number, which springs up out of the Divine Majesty infinitely ; and herein the soul is acknowledged for an angel.”

Whoever desires it, may read the rest of this explanation at his leisure. I will only add the conclusion of it :—

“ *Amen* :

“ 95. *A* is the first letter, and presses forth out of the heart, and has no nature ; but we clearly understand herein, the seeking, longing, or attracting of the eternal will, without nature, wherein nature is generated, which has been from eternity.

“ 96. Now, as the *A* is generated out of the heart, that is, out of the eternal will, so out of *A* afterward comes the whole alphabet with four-and-twenty numbers ; for the *A* begins to number, and comprises the whole number in the syllable *men*.” (*Behmen's Works*, vol. ii, p. 165, &c.)

Now, here I fix my foot. Upon this ground I join issue with every admirer of *Jabob Behmen* in England.

I appeal to every candid man, every man of piety and common sense, whether this explanation deserves those violent encomiums contained in the advertisement.

I ask any person of understanding, First, whether any man in his senses, from the beginning of the world, ever thought of explaining any treatise, divine or human, syllable by syllable. Did a more absurd imagination ever enter into a madman's brain? Is it possible by this means to make sense of any text from *Genesis* to the *Revelation*? Must there not be a very high degree of lunacy before any such design could be formed? I ask, Secondly, If any scripture could be thus explained, if any meaning could be extracted from the several syllables, must it not be from the syllables of the original, not of a translation, whether German or English? I ask, Thirdly, whether this explanation be any explanation at all; whether it gives the meaning of any one petition; nay, whether it does not reduce the divine prayer, all the parts of which are accurately connected together, into an unconnected, incoherent jumble of no one can tell what! I ask, Fourthly, whether we may not pronounce, with the utmost certainty, of one who thus distorts, mangles, and murders the word of God, that the light which is in him is darkness; that he is illuminated from beneath, rather than from above; and that he ought to be styled a demonosopher, rather than a theosopher!

JOHN WESLEY.

A LETTER

TO

THE REV. DR. CONYERS MIDDLETON.

OCCASIONED BY HIS LATE “FREE INQUIRY.”

JANUARY 4, 1748-9.

REVEREND SIR,—1. In your late “*Inquiry*,” you endeavour to prove, First, that there were no miracles wrought in the primitive Church: Secondly, that all the primitive Fathers were fools or knaves, and most of them both one and the other. And it is easy to observe, the whole tenor of your argument tends to prove, Thirdly, that no miracles were wrought by Christ or his Apostles; and, Fourthly, that these too were fools or knaves, or both.

2. I am not agreed with you on any of these heads. My reasons I

shall lay before you, in as free a manner, though not in so smooth or laboured language, as you have laid yours before the world.

3. But I have neither inclination nor leisure to follow you, step by step, through three hundred and seventy-three quarto pages. I shall therefore set aside all I find in your work which does not touch the merits of the cause; and likewise contract the question itself to the three first centuries. For I have no more to do with the writers or miracles of the fourth, than with those of the fourteenth, century.

4. You will naturally ask, "Why do you stop there? What reason can you give for this? If you allow miracles before the empire became Christian, why not afterward too?" I answer, Because, "after the empire became Christian," (they are your own words,) "a general corruption both of faith and morals infected the Christian Church; which, by that revolution, as St. Jerome says, 'lost as much of her virtue, as it had gained of wealth and power.'" (p. 123.) And this very reason St. Chrysostom himself gave in the words you have afterward cited: "There are some who ask, Why are not miracles performed still? Why are there no persons who raise the dead and cure diseases?" To which he replies, that it was owing to the want of faith, and virtue, and piety in those times.

1. You begin your preface by observing, that the "Inquiry" was intended to have been published some time ago; but, upon reflection, you resolved to "give out, first, some sketch of what you was projecting;" (p. 1;) and accordingly "published the 'Introductory Discourse,'" by itself, though "foreseeing it would encounter all the opposition that prejudice, bigotry, and superstition are ever prepared to give to all inquiries" of this nature. (p. 2.) But it was your "comfort, that this would excite candid inquirers to weigh the merit and consequences of it." (p. 3.)

2. The consequences of it are tolerably plain, even to free the good people of England from all that prejudice, bigotry, and superstition, vulgarly called Christianity. But it is not so plain, that "this is the sole expedient which can secure the Protestant religion against the efforts of Rome." (*Ib.*) It may be doubted, whether Deism is the sole expedient to secure us against Popery. For some are of opinion, there are persons in the world who are neither Deists nor Papists.

3. You open the cause artfully enough, by a quotation from Mr. Locke. (p. 4.) But we are agreed to build our faith on no man's authority. His reasons will be considered in their place.

"Those who have written against his and your opinion," you say, "have shown great eagerness, but little knowledge of the question: urged by the hopes of honours, and prepared to fight for every establishment that offers such pay to its defenders." (p. 5.) I have not read one of these; yet I would fain believe, that neither the hope of honour, nor the desire of pay, was the sole, or indeed the main, motive that urged either them or you to engage in writing.

But I grant they are overseen, if they argue against you by citing "the testimonies of the ancient Fathers;" (p. 6;) seeing they might easily perceive you pay no more regard to these than to the Evangelists or Apostles. Neither do I commend them if they "insinuate jealousies of consequences dangerous to Christianity." (*Ib.*) Why they should

insinuate these, I cannot conceive: I need not insinuate that the sun shines at noon-day. You have "opened too great a glare to the public," (p. 7.) to leave them any room for such insinuation. Though, to save appearances, you gravely declare still, "Were my argument allowed to be true, the credit of the Gospel miracles could not, in any degree, be shaken by it." (p. 6.)

4. So far is flourish. Now we come to the point: "The present question," you say, "depends on the joint credibility of the facts, and of the witnesses who attest them, especially" on the former. For, "if the facts be incredible, no testimony can alter the nature of things." (p. 9.) All this is most true. You go on: "The credibility of facts lies open to the trial of our reason and senses. But the credibility of witnesses depends on a variety of principles wholly concealed from us. And though in many cases it may reasonably be presumed, yet in none can it be certainly known." (p. 10.) Sir, will you retract this, or defend it? If you defend, and can prove, as well as assert it, then farewell the credit of all history, not only sacred but profane. If "the credibility of witnesses," of all witnesses, (for you make no distinction,) depends, as you peremptorily affirm, "on a variety of principles wholly concealed from us;" and, consequently, "though it may be presumed in many cases, yet can be certainly known in none;" then it is plain, all the history of the Bible is utterly precarious and uncertain; then I may indeed presume, but cannot certainly know, that Jesus of Nazareth ever was born; much less that he healed the sick, and raised either Lazarus or himself from the dead. Now, sir, go and declare again how careful you are for "the credit of the Gospel miracles!"

5. But for fear any (considering how "frank and open" your nature is, and how "warmly disposed to speak what you take to be true") (p. 7.) should fancy you meant what you said in this declaration, you take care to inform them soon after: "The whole which the wit of man can possibly discover, either of the ways or will of the Creator, must be acquired by attending seriously" (to what? to the Jewish or Christian Revelation? No; but) "to that revelation which he made of himself from the beginning, in the beautiful fabric of this visible world." (p. 22.)

6. I believe your opponents will not hereafter urge you, either with that passage from St. Mark, or any other from Scripture. At least, I will not, unless I forget myself; as I observe you have done just now. For you said but now, "Before we proceed to examine testimonies for the decision of this dispute, our first care should be, to inform ourselves of the nature of those miraculous powers which are the subject of it, as they are represented to us in the history of the Gospel." (p. 10.) Very true; "this should be our first care." I was therefore all attention to hear your account of "the nature of those powers, as they are represented to us in the Gospel." But alas! you say not a word more about it; but slip away to those "zealous champions who have attempted" (bold men as they are) "to refute the 'Introductory Discourse.'" (p. 11.)

Perhaps you will say, "Yes, I repeat that text from St. Mark." You do; yet not describing the nature of those powers; but only to open the way to "one of your antagonists;" (p. 12;) of whom you yourself affirm, that "not one of them seems to have spent a thought in con-

sidering those powers as they are set forth in the New Testament." (p. 11.) Consequently, the bare repeating that text does not prove you (any more than them) to have "spent one thought upon the subject."

7. From this antagonist you ramble away to another; after a long citation from whom you subjoin: "It being agreed then, that, in the original promise, there is no intimation of any particular period, to which their continuance was limited." (pp. 13, 14.) Sir, you have lost your way. We have as yet nothing to do with their continuance. "For till we have learned from those sacred records" (I use your own words) "what they were, and in what manner exerted by the Apostles, we cannot form a proper judgment of those evidences which are brought either to confirm or confute their continuance in the Church; and must consequently dispute at random, as chance or prejudice may prompt us, about things unknown to us." (p. 11.)

Now, sir, if this be true, (as without doubt it is,) then it necessarily follows, that, seeing, from the beginning of your book to the end, you spend not one page to inform either yourself or your readers concerning the nature of these miraculous powers, "as they are represented to us in the history of the Gospel;" you dispute throughout the whole "at random, as chance or prejudice prompts you, about things unknown to you."

8. Your reply to "the adversaries of your scheme," (pp. 15-27,) I may let alone for the present; and the rather, because the arguments used therein will occur again and again. Only I would here take notice of one assertion, "that the miraculous powers conferred on the Apostles themselves were imparted just at the moment of their exertion, and withdrawn again as soon as those particular occasions were served." (p. 23.) You should not have asserted this, be it true or false, without some stronger proof. "This, I say, is evident," (*Ib.*) is not a sufficient proof; nor, "A treatise is prepared on that subject." (p. 24.) Neither is it proved by that comment of Grotius on our Lord's promise,* which, literally translated, runs thus: "To every believer there was then given some wonderful power, which was to exert itself, not indeed always, but when there was occasion."

9. But waiving this, I grant "the single point in dispute is, whether the testimony of the Fathers be a sufficient ground to believe, that miraculous gifts subsisted at all after the days of the Apostles." (p. 27.) But with this you interweave another question, whether the Fathers were not all fools or knaves. In treating of which, you strongly intimate,—First, that such gifts did never subsist; and, Secondly, that the Apostles were equally wise and good with the "wonder-workers" (your favourite term) that followed them.

When therefore you add, "My opinion is this, that, after our Lord's ascension, the extraordinary gifts he had promised were poured out on the Apostles, and the other primary instruments of planting the Gospel, in order to enable them to overrule the inveterate prejudices both of the Jews and Gentiles, and to bear up against the discouraging shocks of popular rage and persecution;" (p. 28;) I look upon all this to be mere grimace. You believe not one word of what you say. You cannot

* *Non omnibus omnia—ita tamen cuilibet credenti tunc data sit admirabilis facultas, quæ se, non semper quidem, sed datâ occasione explicaret.*—GROTIUS in Marcum [ou Mark] xvi, 17.

possibly, if you believe what you said before. For who can believe both the sides of a contradiction?

10. However, I will suppose you do believe it, and will argue with you from your own words. But first let us have a few more of them: "In process of time, as miraculous powers began to be less and less wanted, so they began gradually to decline, till they were finally withdrawn." (p. 29.) "And this may probably be thought to have happened while some of the Apostles were still living."

These were given, you say, to the first planters of the Gospel, "in order to enable them to overrule the inveterate prejudices both of Jews and Gentiles, and to bear up against the shocks of persecution." Thus far we are agreed. They were given for these ends. But if you allow this, you cannot suppose, consistently with yourself, that they were withdrawn till these ends were fully answered. So long, therefore, as those prejudices subsisted, and Christians were exposed to the shocks of persecution, you cannot deny but there was the same occasion for those powers to be continued, as there was for their being given at first. And this, you say, is "a postulatum which all people will grant, that they continued as long as they were necessary to the Church." (p. 11.)

11. Now, did those prejudices cease, or was persecution at an end, while some of the Apostles were still living? You have yourself abundantly shown they did not. You know there was as sharp persecution in the third century, as there was in the first, while all the Apostles were living. And with regard to prejudices, you have industriously remarked, that "the principal writers of Rome, who make any mention of the Christians, about the time of Trajan, speak of them as a set of despicable, stubborn, and even wicked enthusiasts;" (p. 193;) that "Suetonius calls them 'a race of men of a new and mischievous superstition;'" (p. 194;) and that "Tacitus, describing the horrible tortures which they suffered under Nero, says, 'They were detested for their flagitious practices; possessed with an abominable superstition; and condemned, not so much for their supposed crime of firing the city, as from the hatred of all mankind.'" (*Ib.*)

And "their condition," say you, "continued much the same, till they were established by the civil power; during all which time they were constantly insulted and calumniated by their Heathen adversaries, as a stupid, credulous, impious sect, the very scum of mankind." (p. 195.) In a word, both with regard to prejudice and persecution, I read in your following page:

"The Heathen magistrates would not give themselves the trouble to make the least inquiry into their manners or doctrines; but condemned them for the mere name, without examination or trial; treating a Christian of course as guilty of every crime, as an enemy of the gods, emperors, laws, and of nature itself." (p. 196.)

12. If then the end of those miraculous powers was, "to overcome inveterate prejudices, and to enable the Christians to bear up against the shocks of persecution," how can you possibly conceive that those powers should cease while some of the Apostles were living? With what colour can you assert, that they were less wanted for these ends, in the second and third, than in the Apostolic, age? With what shadow of reason can you maintain, that (if they ever subsisted at all) they were

finally withdrawn before Christianity was established by the civil power? Then indeed these ends did manifestly cease; persecution was at an end; and the inveterate prejudices which had so long obtained were in great measure rooted up; another plain reason why the powers which were to balance these should remain in the Church so long, and no longer.

13. You go on to acquaint us with the excellences of your performance. "The reader," you say, "will find in these sheets none of those arts which are commonly employed by disputants to perplex a good cause, or to palliate a bad one; no subtile refinements, forced constructions, or evasive distinctions; but plain reasoning, grounded on plain facts, and published with an honest and disinterested view to free the minds of men from an inveterate imposture. I have shown that the ancient Fathers, by whom that delusion was imposed, were extremely credulous and superstitious; possessed with strong prejudices, and scrupling no art or means by which they might propagate the same." (p. 31.) Surely, sir, you add the latter part of this paragraph, on purpose to confute the former; for just here you use one of the unfairest arts which the most dishonest disputant can employ, in endeavouring to forestall the judgment of the reader, and to prejudice him against those men on whom he ought not to pass any sentence before he has heard the evidence.

1. In the beginning of your "Introductory Discourse," you declare the reasons which moved you to publish it. One of these, you say, was the late increase of Popery in this kingdom; (p. 41;) chiefly occasioned, as you suppose, by the confident assertions of the Romish emissaries, that there has been a succession of miracles in their Church from the Apostolic to the present age. To obviate this plea, you would "settle some rule of discerning the true from the false; so as to give a reason for admitting the miracles of one age, and rejecting those of another." (p. 44.)

2. This has a pleasing sound, and is extremely well imagined to prejudice a Protestant reader in your favour. You then slide with great art into your subject: "This claim of a miraculous power, now peculiar to the Church of Rome, was asserted in all Christian countries till the Reformation." (*Ib.*) But then "the cheat was detected:" (p. 45:) nay and men began to "suspect that the Church had long been governed by the same arts." "For, it was easy to trace them up to the primitive Church, though not to fix the time when the cheat began; to show how long after the days of the Apostles the miraculous gifts continued in the Church." (p. 46.) However, it is commonly believed, that they continued till Christianity was the established religion. Some indeed extend them to the fourth and fifth centuries; (p. 50;) but these, you say, betray the Protestant cause. (p. 51.) "For in the third, fourth, and fifth, the chief corruptions of Popery were introduced, or at least the seeds of them sown. By these I mean, monkery; the worship of relics; invocation of saints; prayers for the dead; the superstitious use of images, of the sacraments, of the sign of the cross, and of the consecrated oil." (p. 52.)

3. I have nothing to do with the fourth or fifth century. But to what you allege in support of this charge, so far as it relates to the third century, I have a few things to reply.

And, First, you quote not one line from any Father in the third century, in favour of monkery, the worship of relics, the invocation of saints, or the superstitious use either of images or consecrated oil. How is this, sir? You brought eight accusations at once against the Fathers of the third, as well as the following centuries: and as to five of the eight, when we call for the proof, you have not one word to say! As to the sixth, you say, "In the sacrament of the Eucharist, several abuses were introduced." (p. 57.) You instance, first, in mixing the wine with water. But how does it appear that this was any abuse at all? or, that "Irenæus declared it to have been taught as well as practised by our Saviour?" (*Ib.*) The words you quote to prove this, do not prove it at all; they simply relate a matter of fact: "Taking the bread, he confessed it to be his body; and the mixed cup, he affirmed it was his blood."* You cannot be ignorant of this fact, that the cup used after the paschal supper was always mixed with water. But "Cyprian declared this mixture to have been enjoined to himself by a divine revelation." (p. 58.) If he did, that will not prove it to be an abuse: so that you are wide of the point still. You instance next in their sending the bread to the sick; which (as well as the mixture) is mentioned by Justin Martyr. This fact, likewise we allow; but you have not proved it to be an abuse. I grant, that, near a hundred years after, some began to have a superstitious regard for this bread. But that in "Tertullian's days it was carried home and locked up as a divine treasure," I call upon you to prove; as also that infant communion was an abuse; or the styling it "the sacrifice of the body of Christ." (p. 59.) I believe the offering it up for the martyrs was an abuse; and that this, with the superstitious use of the sign of the cross, were, if not the earliest of all, yet as early as any which crept into the Christian Church.

4. It is certain, "praying for the dead was common in the second century." (p. 60.) You might have said, "And in the first also;" seeing that petition, "Thy kingdom come," manifestly concerns the saints in paradise, as well as those upon earth. But it is far from certain, that "the purpose of this was to procure relief and refreshment to the departed souls in some intermediate state of expiatory pains;" or that "this was the general opinion of those times."

5. As to the "consecrated oil," (p. 63,) you seem entirely to forget that it was neither St. Jerome, nor St. Chrysostom, but St. James, who said, "Is any sick among you? Let him send for the elders of the church; and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil, in the name of the Lord: and the prayer of faith shall save the sick, and the Lord shall raise him up." (Verses 14, 15.)

The sum is: You have charged the Fathers of the third century with eight of the chief corruptions of Popery: (1.) Monkery; (2.) The worship of relics; (3.) Invocation of saints; (4.) The superstitious use of images; (5.) Of the consecrated oil; (6.) Of the sacraments; (7.) Of the sign of the cross; (8.) Praying for the dead.

And what is all this heavy charge come to at last? Why, just thus much: Some of them, in the beginning of the third century, did superstitiously use the sign of the cross; and others, in the middle of that

* *Accipiens panem, suum corpus esse confitebatur; et temperamentum calicis, suum sanguinem confirmavit.*

century, offered up the Eucharist for the martyrs on their annual festivals; though how you make this "the superstitious use of the sacraments," I know not, or how these come to be the "chief corruptions of Popery."

Praying thus far for the dead, "that God would shortly accomplish the number of his elect and hasten his kingdom," and anointing the sick with oil, you will not easily prove to be any corruptions at all.

As to monkery, the worship of relics, invocation of saints, and the superstitious use of images, you have not even attempted to prove that these Fathers were guilty: so that, for aught appears, you might as well have charged them on the Apostles. "Yet it is no more," you solemnly assure us, "than what fact and truth oblige you to say!" (p. 65.) When I meet with any of these assurances for the time to come, I shall remember to stand upon my guard.

6. In the following pages you are arguing against the miracles of the fourth and fifth century. After which you add: "But if these must be rejected, where then are we to stop? And to what period must we confine ourselves? This, indeed, is the grand difficulty, and what has puzzled all the other Doctors who have considered the same question before me." (p. 71.) Sir, your memory is short. In this very discourse you yourself said just the contrary. You told us awhile ago, that, not only Dr. Marshall, Dr. Dodwell, and Archbishop Tillotson, but the generality of the Protestant Doctors, were agreed to what period they should confine themselves; believing that miracles subsisted through the three first centuries, and ceased in the beginning of the fourth. (p. 46, *et seq.*)

7. However, that none of them may ever be puzzled any more, you will "lay down some general principles, which may lead us to a more rational solution of the matter than any that has hitherto been offered." (*Ib.*) Here again I was all attention. And what did the mountain bring forth? What are these general principles, preceded by so solemn a declaration, and laid down for thirteen pages together? (pp. 71-84.) Why, they are dwindled down into one, "that the forged miracles of the fourth century taint the credit of all the later miracles!" I should desire you to prove, that the miracles of the fourth century were all forged, but that it is not material to our question.

8. But you endeavour to show it is: "For that surprising confidence," you say, "with which the Fathers of the fourth age have affirmed as true what they themselves had forged, or, at least, knew to be forged," (a little more proof of that,) "makes us suspect, that so bold a defiance of truth could not become general at once, but must have been carried gradually to that height by custom and the example of former times." (p. 81.) It does not appear that it did become general till long after the fourth century. And as this supposition is not sufficiently proved, the inference from it is nothing worth.

9. You say, Secondly, "This age, in which Christianity was established, had no occasion for any miracles. They would not, therefore, begin to forge miracles at a time when there was no particular temptation to it." (*Ib.*) Yes, the greatest temptation in the world, if they were such men as you suppose. If they were men that would scruple no art or means to enlarge their own credit and authority, they would

naturally "begin to forge miracles" at that time when real miracles were no more.

10. You say, Thirdly, "The later Fathers had equal piety with the earlier, but more learning and less credulity. If these, then, be found either to have forged miracles themselves, or propagated what they knew to be forged, or to have been deluded by the forgeries of others, it must excite the same suspicion of their predecessors." (p. 85.) I answer (1.) It is not plain that the later Fathers had equal piety with the earlier: Nor, (2.) That they had less credulity. It seems, some of them had much more: Witness Hilarion's camel, and smelling a devil or a sinner; though even he was not so quick-scented as St. Pachomius, who (as many believe to this day) could "smell a heretic at a mile's distance." (*Free Inquiry*, pp. 89, 90.) But if, (3.) The earlier Fathers were holier than the later, they were not only less likely to delude others, but (even on Plato's supposition) to be deluded themselves: For they would have more assistance from God.

11. But you say, Fourthly, "The earlier ages of the Church were not purer than the later. Nay, in some respects they were worse. For there never was any age in which so many rank heresies were professed, or so many spurious books forged and published, under the names of Christ and his Apostles; several of which are cited by the most eminent Fathers of those ages, as of equal authority with the Scriptures. And none can doubt but those who would forge, or make use of forged books, would make use of forged miracles." (*Introd. Disc.* pp. 86, 87.)

I answer, (1.) It is allowed, that before the end of the third century the Church was greatly degenerated from its first purity. Yet I doubt not, (2.) But abundantly more rank heresies have been publicly professed in many later ages; but they were not publicly protested against, and therefore historians did not record them. (3.) You cannot but know it has always been the judgment of learned men, (which you are at liberty to refute if you are able,) that the far greater part of those spurious books have been forged by heretics; and that many more were compiled by weak, well-meaning men, from what had been orally delivered down from the Apostles. But, (4.) There have been in the Church from the beginning men who had only the name of Christians. And these doubtless were capable of pious frauds, so called. But this ought not to be charged upon the whole body. Add to this, (5.) What is observed by Mr. Daillé: "I impute a great part of this mischief to those men who, before the invention of printing, were the transcribers and copiers out of manuscripts. We may well presume that these men took the same liberty in forging as St. Jerome complains they did in corrupting books; especially since this course was beneficial to them, which the other was not." Much more to the same effect we have in his treatise "Of the Right Use of the Fathers," part i, chapter iii. N. B. These transcribers were not all Christians; no, not in name; perhaps few, if any of them, in the first century. (6.) By what evidences do you prove, that these spurious books "are frequently cited by the most eminent Fathers, as not only genuine, but of equal authority with the Scriptures themselves?" or, Lastly, that they either forged these books themselves, or made use of what they knew to be forged? These things also you are not to take for granted, but to prove, before your argument can be of force.

12. We are come at last to your general conclusion : " There is no sufficient reason to believe, that any miraculous powers subsisted in any age of the Church after the times of the Apostles." (p. 91.)

But pretended miracles, you say, arose thus : " As the high authority of the Apostolic writings excited some of the most learned Christians" (prove that!) " to forge books under their names ; so the great fame of the Apostolic miracles would naturally excite some of the most crafty, when the Apostles were dead, to attempt some juggling tricks in imitation of them. And when these artful pretenders had maintained their ground through the first three centuries, the leading clergy of the fourth understood their interest too well to part with the old plea of miraculous gifts." (p. 92.)

Round assertions indeed ! But surely, sir, you do not think that reasonable men will take these for proofs ! You are here advancing a charge of the blackest nature. But where are your vouchers ? Where are the witnesses to support it ? Hitherto you have not been able to produce one, through a course of three hundred years ; unless you bring in those Heathen, of whose senseless, shameless prejudices you have yourself given so clear an account.

But you designed to produce your witnesses in the " Free Inquiry," a year or two after the " Introductory Discourse" was published. So you condemn them first, and try them afterward : You will pass sentence now, and hear the evidence by and by ! A genuine specimen of that " impartial regard to truth," which you profess upon all occasions.

13. Another instance of this is in your marginal note : " The primitive Christians were perpetually reproached for their gross credulity." They were ; but by whom ? Why by Jews and Heathens. Accordingly, the two witnesses you produce here are Celsus the Jew, and Julian the Apostate. But lest this should not suffice, you make them confess the charge : " The Fathers," your words are, " defend themselves by saying, that they did no more than the philosophers had always done : That Pythagoras's precepts were inculcated with an *ipse dixit*,* and they found the same method useful with the vulgar." (p. 93.) And is this their whole defence ? Do the very men to whom you refer, Origen and Arnobius, in the very tracts to which you refer, give no other answer than this argument *ad hominem* ? † Stand this as another genuine proof of Dr. Middleton's candour and impartiality !

14. A further proof of your " frank and open nature," and of your " contenting yourself with the discharge of your own conscience, by a free declaration of your real sentiments," (p. 40,) I find in the very next page. Here you solemnly declare : " Christianity is confirmed by the evidence of such miracles as, of all others on record, are the least liable to exception, and carry the clearest marks of their sincerity ; being wrought by Christ and his Apostles for an end so great, so important, as to be highly worthy the interposition of the Deity ; wrought by mean and simple men, and delivered by eye-witnesses, whose characters exclude the suspicion of fraud." (p. 94.) Sir, do you believe one word of what you so solemnly declare ? You have yourself declared the con-

[* The disciples of Pythagoras silenced all doubts, and refuted all objections, by appealing to his authority. *Αυτος εφη, ipse dixit*—he said so,—decided every dispute.]

[† An argument from the professed principles of an opponent.]

trary. But if you do not, where shall we have you? Or how can we believe you another time? How shall we know, I will not say, when you speak truth, but when you would have us think you do? By what criterion shall we distinguish between what is spoken in your real, and what in your personated, character? how discern when you speak as Dr. Middleton, and when as the public librarian?

15. You go on: "By granting the Romanists but a single age of miracles after the Apostles, we shall be entangled in difficulties, whence we can never extricate ourselves till we allow the same powers to the present age." (p. 96.) I will allow them, however, three ages of miracles, and let them make what advantage of it they can.

You proceed: "If the Scriptures are a complete rule," (I reject the word *sufficient*, because it is ambiguous,) "we do not want the Fathers as guides, or, if clear, as interpreters. An esteem for them has carried many into dangerous errors; the neglect of them can have no ill consequences." (p. 97.) I answer, (1.) The Scriptures are a complete rule of faith and practice; and they are clear in all necessary points. And yet their clearness does not prove, that they need not be explained; nor their completeness, that they need not be enforced. (2.) The esteeming the writings of the first three centuries, not equally with, but next to, the Scriptures, never carried any man yet into dangerous errors, nor probably ever will. But it has brought many out of dangerous errors, and particularly out of the errors of Popery. (3.) The neglect, in your sense, of the primitive Fathers, that is, the thinking they were all fools and knaves, has this natural consequence, (which I grant is no ill one, according to your principles,) to make all who are not real Christians think Jesus of Nazareth and his Apostles just as honest and wise as them.

16. You afterward endeavour to show how the Church of England came to have such an esteem for the ancient Fathers. There are several particulars in this account which are liable to exception. But I let them pass, as they have little connection with the point in question.

17. You conclude your "Introductory Discourse" thus: "The design of the present treatise is to fix the religion of the Protestants on its proper basis, that is, on the sacred Scriptures." (p. 111.) Here again you speak in your personated character; as also when you "freely own the primitive writers to be of use in attesting and transmitting to us the genuine books of the Holy Scriptures!" (p. 112.) Books, for the full attestation as well as safe transmission whereof, you have doubtless the deepest concern!

18. I cannot dismiss this discourse without observing, that the uncommon artfulness and disingenuity which glare through the whole, must needs give disgust to every honest and upright heart; nor is it any credit at all to the cause you have espoused. Nay, I am persuaded there are many in these kingdoms, who, though they think as you do concerning the Christian system, yet could not endure the thought of writing against it in the manner that you have done; of combating fraud (if it were so) with fraud, and practising the very thing which they professed to expose and abhor.

In your "Free Inquiry" itself, you propose,—

"I. To draw out in order all the principal testimonies which relate to

miraculous gifts, as they are found in the writings of the Fathers, from the earliest ages after the Apostles; whence we shall see, at one view, the whole evidence by which they have hitherto been supported.

“II. To throw together all which those Fathers have delivered, concerning the persons said to have been endowed with those gifts.” (p. 1.)

“III. To illustrate the particular characters and opinions of the Fathers who attest those miracles.

“IV. To review all the several kinds of miracles which are pretended to have been wrought, and to observe from the nature of each how far they may reasonably be suspected.

“V. To refute some of the most plausible objections which have been hitherto made.” (p. 2.)

I was in hopes you would have given, at least in entering upon your main work, what you promised so long ago, an account of “the proper nature and condition of those miraculous powers which are the subject of the whole dispute, as they are represented to us in the history of the Gospel.” (*Pref.* p. 10.) But as you do not appear to have any thought of doing it at all, you will give me leave at length to do it for you.

The original promise of these runs thus: “These signs shall follow them that believe: in my name shall they cast out devils; they shall speak with new tongues; they shall take up serpents; and if they drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them; they shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover,” Mark xvi, 17, 18.

A farther account is given of them by St. Peter, on the very day whereon that promise was fulfilled: “This is that which was spoken of by the Prophet Joel, And it shall come to pass in the last days, saith God, your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, and your young men shall see visions, and your old men shall dream dreams,” Acts ii, 16, 17.

The account given by St. Paul is a little fuller than this: “There are diversities of gifts,” (*χαρισμάτων*, the usual scriptural term for the miraculous gifts of the Holy Ghost,) “but the same Spirit: for to one is given the word of wisdom; to another the gifts of healing; to another the working of” other “miracles; to another prophecy; to another discernment of spirits; to another divers kinds of tongues; to another the interpretation of tongues. All these worketh that one and the same Spirit, dividing to every man severally as he will,” 1 Cor. xii, 4–11.

Hence we may observe, that the chief *χαρίσματα*, *spiritual gifts*, conferred on the Apostolic Church, were, 1. Casting out devils: 2. Speaking with new tongues: 3. Escaping dangers, in which otherwise they must have perished: 4. Healing the sick: 5. Prophecy, foretelling things to come: 6. Visions: 7. Divine dreams: and, 8. Discerning of spirits.

Some of these appear to have been chiefly designed for the conviction of Jews and Heathens,—as the casting out devils and speaking with new tongues; some, chiefly for the benefit of their fellow Christians,—as healing the sick, foretelling things to come, and the discernment of spirits; and all, in order to enable those who either wrought or saw them, to “run with patience the race set before them,” through all the storms of persecution which the most inveterate prejudice, rage, and malice could raise against them.

I. 1. You are, First, “to draw out in order all the principal testimonies which relate to miraculous gifts, as they are found in the writings of the Fathers from the earliest ages after the Apostles.”

You begin with the Apostolic Fathers ; that is, those who lived and conversed with the Apostles. "There are several," you say, "of this character, whose writings still remain to us: St. Barnabas, St. Clemens, St. Ignatius, St. Polycarp, St. Hermas. Now, if those gifts had subsisted after the days of the Apostles, these must have possessed a la ge share of them. But if any of them had, he would have mentioned it in his writings, which not one of them has done." (p. 3.)

The argument, fully proposed, runs thus:—

If any such gifts had subsisted in them, or in their days, they must have mentioned them in their circular epistles to the Churches ; (for so their predecessors, the Apostles, did ;) but they did not mention any such gifts therein.

Sir, your consequence is not of any force ; as will easily appear by a parallel argument :—

If such gifts had subsisted in St. Peter, or in his days, he must have mentioned them in his circular epistles to the Churches. But he does not mention any such gifts therein. Therefore, they did not subsist in him, or in his days.

Your argument therefore proves too much : nor can it conclude against an Apostolic Father, without concluding against the Apostle too.

If therefore the Apostolic Fathers had not mentioned any miraculous gifts in their circular epistles to the Churches, you could not have inferred that they possessed none ; since neither does he mention them in his circular epistles, whom you allow to have possessed them.

Of all the Apostles, you can produce but one, St. Paul, who makes mention of these gifts : and that not in his circular epistles to the Churches ; for I know not that he wrote any such.

2. All this time I have been arguing on your own suppositions, that these five Apostolic Fathers all wrote circular epistles to the Churches, and yet never mentioned these gifts therein. But neither of these suppositions is true. For, (1.) Hermas wrote no epistle at all. (2.) Although the rest wrote epistles to particular Churches, (Clemens to the Corinthians, Ignatius to the Romans, &c.) yet not one of them wrote any circular epistle to the Churches, like those of St. James and St. Peter ; unless we allow that to be a genuine epistle, which bears the name of St. Barnabas. (3.) You own, they all "speak of spiritual gifts, as abounding among the Christians of that age ;" but assert, "These cannot mean any thing more than faith, hope, and charity." (*Ib.*) You assert: But the proof, sir ! I want the proof. Though I am but one of the vulgar, yet I am not half so credulous as you apprehend the first Christians to have been. *Ipse dixit* will not satisfy me ; I want plain, clear, logical proof ; especially when I consider how much you build upon this ; that it is the main foundation whereon your hypothesis stands. You yourself must allow, that in the epistles of St. Paul, *πνευματικα χαρισματα*, *spiritual gifts*, does always mean more than faith, hope, and charity ; that it constantly means *miraculous gifts*. How then do you prove, that, in the epistles of St. Ignatius, it means quite another thing ? not miraculous gifts, but only the ordinary gifts and graces of the Gospel ? I thought "the reader" was to "find no evasive distinctions in the following sheets." (*Pref.* p. 31.) Prove then that this distinction is not evasive ; that the same words mean absolutely different things.

Till this is clearly and solidly done, reasonable men must believe that this and the like expressions mean the same thing in the writings of the Apostolical Fathers as they do in the writings of the Apostles ; namely, not the ordinary graces of the Gospel, but the extraordinary gifts of the Holy Ghost.

3. You aim indeed at a proof, which would be home to the point, if you were but able to make it out. "These Fathers themselves seem to disclaim all gifts of a more extraordinary kind. Thus Polycarp, in his epistle to the Philippians, says, 'Neither I, nor any other such as I am, can come up to the wisdom of the blessed Paul.' And in the same epistle he declares, 'It was not granted to him to practise that, *Be ye angry, and sin not.*' St. Ignatius also, in his epistle to the Ephesians, says, 'These things I prescribe to you, not as if I were somebody extraordinary. For though I am bound for his name, I am not yet perfect in Christ Jesus.'" (pp. 7, 8.) I think verily, these extraordinary proofs may stand without any reply.

4. Yet you courteously add: "If from the passages referred to above, or any other, it should appear probable to any, that they were favoured on some occasions with some extraordinary illuminations, visions, or divine impressions, I shall not dispute that point ; but remind them only, that these gifts were granted for their particular comfort ; and do not therefore, in any manner, affect or relate to the question now before us." (p. 10.)

I ask pardon, sir. These do so deeply affect, so nearly relate to, the question now before us, even as stated by yourself, (*Pref.* p. 28,) that, in allowing these you give up the substance of the question. You yourself have declared that one great end of the extraordinary gifts conferred on the Apostles was, "to enable them to bear up against the shocks of popular rage and persecution." Now, were not "extraordinary illuminations, visions, and impressions," if given at all, given for this very end ; "for their particular comfort," as you now word it ? Therefore, in allowing these to the Apostolic Fathers, you allow extraordinary gifts, which had been formerly granted to the Apostles, to have subsisted in the Church after the days of the Apostles, and for the same end as they did before.

5. Therefore the Apostolic writers have not left us in the dark, with regard to our present argument ; and consequently your triumph comes too soon : "Here then we have an interval of half a century, in which we have the strongest reason to presume that the extraordinary gifts of the Apostolic age were withdrawn." (p. 9.) No ; not if all the Apostolic Fathers speak of spiritual gifts as abounding among the Christians of that age ; not if "extraordinary illuminations, visions, and divine impressions still subsisted among them." For, as to your now putting in, "as exerted openly in the Church for the conviction of unbelievers," I must desire you to put it out again ; it comes a great deal too late. The question between you and me was stated without it, above a hundred pages back. Although, if it be admitted, it will do you no service ; seeing your proposition is overthrown, if there were "miraculous gifts after the days of the Apostles," whether they were "openly exerted for the conviction of unbelievers" or not.

6. I was a little surprised that you should take your leave of the

Apostolic Fathers so soon. But, upon looking forward, my surprise was at an end: I found you was not guilty of any design to spare them; but only delayed your remarks till the reader should be prepared for what might have shocked him, had it stood in its proper place.

I do not find, indeed, that you make any objection to any part of the Epistles of Ignatius; no, nor of the Catholic Epistle, as it is called, which is inscribed with the name of Barnabas. This clearly convinces me, you have not read it; I am apt to think, not one page of it; seeing, if you had, you would never have let slip such an opportunity of exposing one that was called an Apostolic Father.

7. But it would have been strange, if you had not somewhere brought in the famous phœnix of Clemens Romanus. And yet you are very merciful upon that head, barely remarking concerning it, that "he alleged the ridiculous story of the phœnix, as a type and proof of the resurrection. Whether all the Heathen writers treat it as nothing else but a mere fable, I know not." (p. 55.) But that it is so, is certain; and consequently the argument drawn from it is weak and inconclusive. Yet it will not hence follow, either that Clemens was a wicked man, or that he had none of the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit.

8. There is no real blemish to be found in the whole character of St. Polycarp. But there is one circumstance left upon record concerning him which has the appearance of weakness. And with this you do not fail to acquaint your reader at a convenient season; namely, "that in the most ancient dispute concerning the time of holding Easter, St. Polycarp and Anicetus severally alleged Apostolic tradition for their different practice." (p. 60.) And it is not improbable, that both alleged what was true; that in a point of so little importance the Apostles varied themselves; some of them observing it on the fourteenth day of the moon, and others not. But, be this as it may, it can be no proof, either that Polycarp was not a holy man, or that he was not favoured with the extraordinary, as well as ordinary, gifts of the Spirit.

9. With regard to the narrative of his martyrdom, you affirm, "It is one of the most authentic pieces in all primitive antiquity." (p. 124.) I will not vouch for its authenticity; nor therefore for the story of the dove, the flame forming an arch, the fragrant smell, or the revelation to Pionius. But your attempt to account for these things is truly curious. You say, "An arch of flame round his body is an appearance which might easily happen, from the common effects of wind. And the dove said to fly out of him, might be conveyed into the wood which was prepared to consume him." (p. 229.) How much more naturally may we account for both, by supposing the whole to be a modern fiction, wrote on occasion of that account mentioned by Eusebius, but lost many ages ago! But whatever may be thought of this account of his death, neither does this affect the question, whether during his life he was endued with the miraculous gifts of the Holy Ghost.

10. There is one of those whom you style Apostolic Fathers yet behind, of whom you talk full as familiarly as of the rest: I mean, Hermas: "To whom," you say, "some impute the fraud of forging the Sibylline books." (p. 37.) It would not have been amiss, if you had told us, which of the ancients, whether Christian, Jew, or Heathen, ever accused him of this. If none ever did, some will be apt to

think it is giving a person but hard measure, to bring an accusation against him which never was heard of till sixteen hundred years after his death.

But I can the more easily excuse you, because he is a person whom you are wholly unacquainted with; though it is much, curiosity did not lead you, when you had Archbishop Wake's translation in your hand, to read over if it were but half a dozen pages of his famous "Shepherd." But charity obliges me to believe you never did. Otherwise, I cannot conceive you would so peremptorily affirm, of him and the rest together, "There is not the least claim or pretension, in all their several pieces, to any of those extraordinary gifts which are the subject of this inquiry." (p. 3.) I am amazed! Sir, have you never a friend in the world? If you was yourself ignorant of the whole affair, would no one inform you, that all the three books of Hermas, from the first page to the last, are nothing else than a recital of his extraordinary gifts, his visions, prophecies, and revelations?

Can you expect after this, that any man in his senses should take your word for any thing under heaven? that any one should credit any thing which you affirm? or believe you any farther than he can see you? Jesus, whom you persecute, can forgive you this; but how can you forgive yourself? One would think you should be crying out day and night, "The Shepherd of Hermas will not let me sleep!"

11. You proceed to the testimony of Justin Martyr, who wrote about fifty years after the Apostles: he says, (I translate his words literally,) "There are prophetic gifts among us even until now. You may see with us both women and men having gifts from the Spirit of God." He particularly insists on that of "casting out devils, as what every one might see with his own eyes." (p. 10.)

Irenæus, who wrote somewhat later, affirms, "that all who were truly disciples of Jesus wrought miracles in his name: some cast out devils; others had visions, or the knowledge of future events; others healed the sick." And as to raising the dead, he declares it to have been frequently performed on necessary occasions, by great fasting, and the joint supplication of the Church. "And we hear many," says he, "speaking with all kinds of tongues, and expounding the mysteries of God." (pp. 11, 12.)

"Theophilus, bishop of Antioch, who lived in the same age, speaks of casting out devils as then common in the Church." (*Ib.*)

12. "Tertullian, who flourished toward the end of the second century, challenges the Heathen magistrates, to 'call before their tribunals any person possessed with a devil. And if the evil spirit, when commanded by any Christian, did not confess himself to be a devil, who elsewhere called himself a god, they should take the life of that Christian.'" (*Ib.*)

"Minutius Felix, supposed to have wrote in the beginning of the third century, addressing himself to his Heathen friend, says, 'The greatest part of you know what confessions the demons make concerning themselves, when we expel them out of the bodies of men.'" (p. 13.)

13. "Origen, something younger than Minutius, declares, that there remained still the manifest indications of the Holy Spirit. 'For the Christians,' says he, 'cast out devils, perform many cures, foretel things to come. And many have been converted to Christianity by visions. I have seen many examples of this sort.'" (p. 14.)

In another place he says, "Signs of the Holy Ghost were shown at the beginning of the teaching of Jesus;" (not, as you translate it, "Miracles

began with the preaching of Jesus ;" that is quite a different thing ;) " more were shown after his ascension, but afterward fewer. However, even now there are still some remains of them with a few, whose souls are cleansed by the word, and a life conformable to it." (p. 15.) Again : " Some," says he, " heal the sick. I myself have seen many so healed, of loss of senses, madness, and innumerable other evils which neither men nor devils can cure." (*Ib.*) " And this is done, not by magical arts, but by prayer, and certain plain adjurations, such as any common Christian may use ; for generally common men do things of this kind." (p. 16.)

14. " Cyprian, who wrote about the middle of the third century, says, ' Beside the visions of the night, even in the day-time, innocent children among us are filled with the Holy Spirit ; and in ecstasies see, and hear, and speak those things by which God is pleased to admonish and instruct us.' " (*Ib.*) Elsewhere he particularly mentions the casting out of devils : " Which," says he, " either depart immediately, or by degrees, according to the faith of the patient, or the grace of him that works the cure." (p. 17.)

" Arnobius, who is supposed to have wrote in the year of Christ 303, tells us, ' Christ appears even now to men unpoluted, and eminently holy, who love him ;—whose very name puts evil spirits to flight, strikes their prophets dumb, deprives the soothsayers of the power of answering, and frustrates the acts of arrogant magicians.' " (p. 18.)

" Lactantius, who wrote about the same time, speaking of evil spirits, says, ' Being adjured by Christians, they retire out of the bodies of men, confess themselves to be demons, and tell their names, even the same which are adored in the temples.' " (*Ib.*)

15. " These," you say, " are the principal testimonies which assert miraculous gifts through the three first centuries ; which might be supported by many more of the same kind, from the same as well as different writers. But none will scruple to risk the fate of the cause upon these." (p. 19.) Thus far I do not scruple it. I do not doubt but the testimonies of these nine witnesses, added to the evidence of the Apostolic Fathers, will satisfy every impartial man with regard to the point in question. Yet I see no cause, if there are nine witnesses more, to give up their evidence ; seeing you may possibly raise objections against these which the others are unconcerned in.

If then you should invalidate what I have to reply in behalf of the witnesses now produced, you will have done but half your work. I shall afterward require a fair hearing for the others also.

16. You close this head with remarking, (1.) " That the silence of all the Apostolic writers on the subject of these gifts, must dispose us to conclude they were then withdrawn." (*Ib.*) O sir, mention this no more. I intreat you, never name their silence again. They speak loud enough to shame you as long as you live. You cannot therefore talk with any grace of " the pretended revival of them, after a cessation of forty or fifty years ;" or draw conclusions from that which never was.

Your second remark is perfectly new : I dare say, none ever observed before yourself, that this particular circumstance of the primitive Christians " carried with it an air of imposture," namely, their " challenging all the world to come and see the miracles which they wrought !" (p. 21.) To complete the argument, you should have added, And their staking their lives upon the performance of them.

17. I doubt you have not gone one step forward yet. You have indeed advanced many bold assertions ; but you have not fairly proved one single conclusion with regard to the point in hand.

But a natural effect of your lively imagination is, that from this time you argue more and more weakly; inasmuch as, the farther you go, the more things you imagine (and only imagine) yourself to have proved. Consequently, as you gather up more mistakes every step you take, every page is more precarious than the former.

II. 1. The Second thing you proposed was, "to throw together all which those Fathers have delivered concerning the persons said to have been endued with the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit." (*Ib.*)

"Now, whenever we think or speak with reverence," say you, "of those primitive times, it is always with regard to these very Fathers, whose testimonies I have been collecting. And they were indeed the chief persons and champions of the Christian cause, the pastors, bishops, and martyrs of the primitive Church; namely, Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Theophilus, Tertullian, Minutius Felix, Origen, Cyprian, Arnobius, Lactantius." Sir, you stumble at the threshold. A common dictionary may inform you that these were not all either pastors, bishops, or martyrs.

2. You go on as you set out: "Yet none of these have any where affirmed, that they themselves were endued with any power of working miracles." (p. 22.) You should say, With any of those extraordinary gifts promised by our Lord, and conferred on his Apostles.

No! Have "none of these any where affirmed, that they themselves were endued" with any extraordinary gifts? What think you of the very first of them, Justin Martyr? Either you are quite mistaken in the account you give of him elsewhere, (pp. 27, 30,) or he affirmed this of himself over and over. And as to Cyprian, you will by and by spend several pages together, (pp. 101, &c.) on the extraordinary gifts he affirmed himself to be endued with.

But suppose they had not any where affirmed this of themselves, what would you infer therefrom? that they were not endued with any extraordinary gifts? Then, by the very same method of arguing, you might prove that neither St. Peter, nor James, nor John, were endued with any such. For neither do they any where affirm this of themselves in any of the writings which they have left behind them.

3. Your argument concerning the Apostolic Fathers is just as conclusive as this. For if you say, "The writers following the Apostolic Fathers do not affirm them to have had any miraculous gifts; therefore they had none;" by a parity of reason you must say, "The writers following the Apostles do not affirm them to have had any miraculous gifts; therefore the Apostles had none."

4. Your next argument against the existence of those gifts is, "that the Fathers do not tell us the names of them which had them." This is not altogether true. The names of Justin Martyr and Cyprian are pretty well known; as is, among the learned, that of Dionysius, Bishop of Alexandria. (pp. 106, 212.) But what, if they did not? Supposing miraculous powers were openly exerted in the Church, and that not only they themselves, but every one else, might see this whenever they pleased; if any Heathen might come and see whenever he pleased, what could a reasonable man desire more? What did it signify to him to know the names of those whom he heard prophesying, or saw working miracles? Though, without doubt, whoever saw the miracles wrought,

might easily learn the names of those that wrought them; which, nevertheless, the Christians had no need to publish abroad, to expose them so much the more to the rage and malice of their persecutors.

6. Your third argument is, "The Christian workers of miracles were always charged with imposture by their adversaries. Lucian tells us, 'Whenever any crafty juggler went to the Christians, he grew rich immediately.' And Celsus represents the Christian wonder-workers as mere vagabonds and common cheats, who rambled about to fairs and markets." (p. 23.)

And is it any wonder, that either a Jew or a Heathen should represent them thus? Sir, I do not blame you for not believing the Christian system, but for betraying so gross a partiality; for gleaning up every scrap of Heathen scandal, and palming it upon us as unquestionable evidence; and for not translating even these miserable fragments with any accuracy or faithfulness. Instead of giving us the text, bad as it is, you commonly substitute a paraphrase yet worse. And this the unlearned reader naturally supposes to be a faithful translation. It is no credit to your cause, if it needs such supportis. And this is no credit to you, if it does not.

To that of Lucian and Celsus, you add the evidence of Cæcilius too, who calls, say you, these workers of miracles, "a lurking nation, shunning the light." Then they were strangely altered all on a sudden; for you told us that, just before, they were proving themselves cheats by a widely different method,—by "calling out both upon magistrates and people, and challenging all the world to come and see what they did!" (p. 20.)

I was not aware that you had begun "to throw together all which the Fathers have delivered, concerning the persons said to have been endued with those extraordinary gifts." And it seems you have made an end of it! And accordingly you proceed to sum up the evidence; to "observe, upon the whole, from these characters of the primitive wonder-workers, as given both by friends and enemies, we may fairly conclude that the gifts of those ages were generally engrossed by private Christians, who travelled about from city to city to assist the ordinary preachers, in the conversion of Pagans, by the extraordinary miracles they pretended to perform." (p. 24.)

Characters given both by friends and enemies! Pray, sir, what friends have you cited for this character? or what enemies, except only Celsus the Jew? (And you are a miserable interpreter for him.) So, from the single testimony of such a witness, you lay it down as an oracular truth, that all the miracle-workers of the three first ages were "mere vagabonds and common cheats," rambling about from city to city, to assist in converting Heathens, by tricks and imposture! And this you ingeniously call, "throwing together all which the Fathers have delivered concerning them!"

9. But, to complete all, "Here again," you say, "we see a dispensation of things ascribed to God, quite different from that which we meet with in the New Testament." (p. 24.) *We see a dispensation!* Where? Not in the primitive Church; not in the writings of one single Christian; not of one Heathen; and only of one Jew; for poor Celsus had not a second; though he multiplies, under your forming hand, into a cloud of witnesses. He alone ascribes this to the ancient Christians, which you

in their name ascribe to God. With the same regard to truth you go on: "In those days the power of working miracles" (you should say, the extraordinary gifts) "was committed to none but those who presided in the Church of Christ." *Ipsè dixit* [mere say so] for that. But I cannot take your word; especially when the Apostles and Evangelists say otherwise. "But, upon the pretended revival of those powers,"—Sir, we do not pretend the revival of them; seeing we shall believe they never were intermitted, till you can prove the contrary,—we find the administration of them committed, not to those who had the government of the Church, not to the bishops, the martyrs, or the principal champions of the Christian cause, but to boys, to women, and, above all, to private and obscure laymen; not only of an inferior, but sometimes also of a bad, character."

Surely, sir, you talk in your sleep: you could never talk thus, if you had your eyes open, and your understanding about you. "We find the administration of them committed, not to those who had the government of the church." No! I thought Cyprian had had the government of the church at Carthage, and Dionysius at Alexandria! "Not to the bishops." Who were these then that were mentioned last? Bishops, or no bishops? "Not to the martyrs." Well, if Cyprian was neither bishop nor martyr, I hope you will allow Justin's claim. "Not to the principal champions of the Christian cause." And yet you told us, not three pages since, that "these very Fathers were the chief champions of the Christian cause in those days!"—"But to boys, and to women." I answer: "This is that which was spoken of by the Prophet Joel, It shall come to pass, that I will pour out my Spirit, saith the Lord, and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy!"—a circumstance which turns this argument full against you, till you openly avow you do not believe those prophecies. "And, above all, to private and obscure laymen, not only of an inferior, but sometimes of a bad, character." I answer, (1.) You cite only one Ante-Nicene writer, to prove them committed to "private and obscure laymen." And he says this and no more: "Generally private men do things of this kind."* By what rule of grammar you construe *ιδιωται*, *private and obscure laymen*, I know not. (2.) To prove these were sometimes men of a bad character, you quote also but one Ante-Nicene Father; (for I presume you will not assert the genuineness of the, so called, "Apostolical Constitutions;") and that one is, in effect, none at all: it is Tertullian, who, in his "Prescription against Heretics," says, "They will add many things of the authority" (or power) "of every heretical teacher; that they raised the dead, healed the sick, foretold things to come."† *They will add!* But did Tertullian believe them? There is no shadow of reason to think he did. And if not, what is all this to the purpose? No more than the tales of later ages which you add, concerning the miracles wrought by bones and relics.

10. "These things," you add, "are so strange, as to give just reason to suspect that there was some original fraud in the case, and that those strolling wonder-workers, by a dexterity of juggling, imposed upon the pious Fathers, whose strong prejudices, and ardent zeal for the interest

* *ὡς επιταν ιδιωται το τριστον κωιτηται*.—Origen. *Cont. Cels.* l. vii.

† *Adjicient multa de autoritate cujusque doctoris hæretici, illos mortuos suscitasse, debiles reformasse, &c.*

of Christianity, would dispose them to embrace, without examination, whatever seemed to promote so good a cause." (p. 25.) You now speak tolerably plain, and would be much disappointed if those who have no "strong prejudices for Christianity" did not apply what you say of these "strolling wonder-workers" to the Apostles, as well as their successors.

11. A very short answer will suffice: "These things are so strange." They are more strange than true. You have not proved one jot or tittle of them yet. Therefore, the consequences you draw must fall to the ground till you find them some better support.

12. Nay, but "it is certain and notorious," you say, "that this was really the case in some instances;" that is, that "strolling, juggling wonder-workers imposed upon the pious Fathers." (p. 26.) Sir, I must come in again with my cuckoo's note,—The proof! Where is the proof? Till this is produced I cannot allow that "this is certain and notorious," even in one individual instance.

13. Let us now stand still, and observe what it is you have made out, under this Second head. What you proposed was, "to throw together all which the primitive Fathers had delivered concerning the persons said to be then endued with the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit." And how have you executed what you proposed? You have thrown together a quotation from a Jew, two from Heathens, three quarters of a line from Origen, and three lines from Tertullian! Nothing at all, it is true, to the point in question. But that you could not help.

14. And this, it seems, is "all you have been able to draw from any of the primitive writers, concerning the persons who were endued with the extraordinary gifts of the Holy Ghost!" (p. 21.)

Permit me, sir, to apply to you what was spoken on another occasion: "Sir, the well is deep, and thou hast nothing to draw with;" neither sufficient skill, nor industry and application. Besides, you are resolved to draw out of the well what was never in it, and must, of course, lose all your labour.

III. 1. You are, "Thirdly, to show the particular characters and opinions of those Fathers who attest these gifts."

Suffer me to remind you that you mentioned nine of these, Justin, Irenæus, Theophilus, Tertullian, Minutius Felix, Origen, Cyprian, Arnobius, and Lactantius. You are therefore now to show what were "the particular characters and opinions of these Fathers."

Indeed, I should think their opinions had small relation to the question. But, since you think otherwise, I am prepared to hear you.

You premise, "that an unexceptionable witness must have" (p. 26) both judgment and honesty; and then, passing over the Apostolic Fathers, as supposing them on your side, endeavour to show that these other Fathers had neither.

2. You begin with Justin Martyr, who, you say, "frequently affirms, that the miraculous gift of expounding the Holy Scriptures, or the mysteries of God, was granted to himself, by the special grace of God." (p. 27.) Upon which I observe, (1.) It has not yet been agreed among learned men, that declaring "the mysteries of God" is the same thing with "expounding the Holy Scriptures." (2.) It is not clear that Justin does affirm his being endued either with one or the other; at least, not from

the passages which you cite. The first, literally translated, runs thus: "He hath revealed to us whatsoever things we have understood by his grace from the Scriptures also."* The other: "I have not any such power; but God has given me the grace to understand his Scriptures."† Now, sir, by which of these does it appear that Justin affirms he had the miraculous gift of expounding the Scriptures?

3. However, you will affirm it, were it only to have the pleasure of confuting it. In order to which, you recite three passages from his writings, wherein he interprets Scripture weakly enough; and then add, after a strained compliment to Dr. Grabe, and a mangled translation of one of his remarks: "His works are but little else than a wretched collection of interpretations of the same kind. Yet this pious Father insists that they were all suggested to him from heaven." (p. 30.) No; neither the one nor the other. Neither do interpretations of Scripture (good or bad) make the tenth part of his writings; nor does he insist that *all* those which are found therein were suggested to him from heaven. This does not follow from any passage you have cited yet; nor from his saying, in a particular case, "Do you think I could have understood these things in the Scriptures, if I had not, by the will of God, received the grace to understand them?"

4. However, now you clap your wings. "What credit," say you, "can be due to this Father, in the report of other people's gifts, who was so grossly deceived, or willing, at least, to deceive others, in this confident attestation of his own?" (*Ib.*) The answer is plain and obvious. It is not clear that he attests his own at all. Consequently, as yet his credit is unblemished.

"But he did not understand Hebrew, and gave a wrong derivation of the Hebrew word, *Satan*." Allowing this, that he was no good etymologist, his credit as a witness may be as good as ever.

5. But, to blast his credit for ever, you will now reckon up all the heresies which he held. And, First: "He believed the doctrine of the Millennium; or, 'that all the saints should be raised in the flesh, and reign with Christ, in the enjoyment of all sensual pleasures, for a thousand years before the general resurrection.'" (p. 31.) These you mark as though they were Justin's words. I take knowledge you hold no faith is to be kept with heretics; and that all means are fair which conduce to so good an end as driving the Christian heresy out of the world.

It is by this principle only that I can account for your adding: "Which doctrine" (that of their enjoying all sensual pleasures) "he deduces from the testimony of the Prophets, and of St. John the Apostle; and was followed in it by the Fathers of the second and third centuries."

The doctrine (as you very well know) which Justin deduced from the Prophets and the Apostles, and in which he was undoubtedly followed by the Fathers of the second and third centuries, is this:—

The souls of them who have been martyred for the witness of Jesus, and for the word of God, and who have not worshipped the beast, neither received his mark, shall live and reign with Christ a thousand years.

* Απεκαλύψεν ην ημεν παντα οσα και απο των γραφων δια της χαριτος αυτου νενοηκαμεν.—Dial. par. 2.

† Ουδε γαρ δυναμις εμοι ποιησθαι τις εστιν, αλλα χαρις παρα Θεου εδοθη μοι εις το συνιεναι τις γραφας αυτου.—Dial. par. 2.

But the rest of the dead shall not live again, until the thousand years are finished.

Now, to say they believe this, is neither more nor less than to say, they believe the Bible.

6. The second heresy you charge him with is the believing, "that those 'sons of God' mentioned Gen. vi, 4, of whom it is there said, 'They came in unto the daughters of men, and they bare children to them,' were evil angels." (p. 32.) And I allow, he too lightly received this on the testimony of the Jewish commentators. But this only proves that he was a fallible man; not that he was a knave, or that he had not eyes and ears.

7. You charge him, Thirdly, "with treating the spurious books, published under the names of the *Sibyl* and *Hystaspes*, with the same reverence as the prophetic Scriptures." (p. 33.) His words are: "By the power of evil spirits, it was made death to read the books of Hystaspes, or of the Sibyl, or of the Prophets." Well; how does this prove that he treated those books with the same reverence as the prophetic Scriptures?

"But it is certain," you say, "that, from this example and authority of Justin, they were held in the highest veneration by the Fathers and Rulers of the Church, through all succeeding ages." (*Ib.*)

I do not conceive it is certain. I wait your proof, first, of the fact; next, of the reason you assign for it. The fact itself, that "these books were held in the highest veneration by the Fathers and Rulers through all succeeding ages," is in nowise proved by that single quotation from Clemens Alexandrinus, wherein he urges the Heathens with the testimonies of their own authors, of the Sibyl, and of Hystaspes. (p. 34.) We cannot infer from hence, that he himself held them "in the highest veneration;" much less, that all the Fathers did. And as to the reason you assign for that veneration,—the example and authority of Justin,—you cite no writer of any kind, good or bad. So he that will believe it, may.

But some, you tell us, "impute the forging these books to Justin." Be pleased to tell us, likewise, who those are; and what grounds they allege for that imputation. Till then, it can be of no signification.

8. You charge him, Fourthly, "with believing that silly story concerning the Septuagint version of the Old Testament; with saying, that he himself, when at Alexandria, saw the remains of the cells in which the translators were shut up; and with making a considerable mistake in the chronology relating thereto." (p. 37.) And, if all this be allowed, and, over and above, that he "frequently cites apocryphal books, and cites the Scriptures by memory;" what have you gained toward the proof of your grand conclusion, that "he was either too great a fool, or too great a knave, to be believed touching a plain matter of fact?"

9. You seem sensible of this, and therefore add, Fifthly: "It will be said, perhaps, that these instances show a weakness of judgment, but do not touch the credit of Justin as a witness of fact." (p. 29.) But can you scrape up nothing from all the dunghills of antiquity that does? I dare say, you will do your utmost. And, first, you reply, "The want of judgment alone may, in some cases, disqualify a man from being a good witness. Thus, Justin himself was imposed upon by those of

Alexandria, who showed him some old ruins under the name of cells. And so he was by those who told him, there was a statue at Rome, inscribed, *Simoni Deo Sancto*; [to the holy God Simon;] whereas it was really inscribed, *Semoni Saucio Deo*; [to the minor god Sancus;] to an old deity of the Sabines. Now," say you, "if he was deceived in such obvious facts, how much more easily would he be deceived by subtle and crafty impostors!" (pp. 40, 41.) Far less easily. A man of good judgment may be deceived in the inscriptions of statues, and points of ancient history. But, if he has only eyes and ears, and a small degree of common sense, he cannot be deceived in facts where he is both an eye and ear witness.

10. For a parting blow, you endeavour to prove, Sixthly, that Justin was a knave, as well as a fool. To this end you remark, that "he charges the Jews with erasing three passages out of the Greek Bible; one whereof stands there still, and the other two were not expunged by some Jew, but added by some Christian. Nay, that able critic and divine, John Croius," (you know when to bestow honourable appellations,) "says, Justin forged and published this passage for the confirmation of the Christian doctrine, as well as the greatest part of the Sibylline oracles, and the sentences of Mercurius." (p. 42.)

With far greater probability than John Croius asserts that Justin forged these passages, a man of candour would hope that he read them in his copy (though incorrect) of the Greek Bible. And till you disprove this, or prove the assertion of Croius, you are got not a jot farther still. But, notwithstanding you have taken true pains to blacken him, both with regard to his morals and understanding, he may still be an honest man, and an unexceptionable witness, as to plain facts done before his face.

11. You fall upon Irenæus next, and carefully enumerate all the mistakes in his writings. As, First, that he held the doctrine of the millennium, and related a weak fancy of Papias concerning it. Secondly: That he believed our Saviour to have lived fifty years. Thirdly: That he believed Enoch and Elias were translated, and St. Paul caught up to that very paradise from which Adam was expelled. (So he might, and all the later Fathers with him, without being either the better or the worse.) Fourthly: That he believed the story concerning the Septuagint Version; nay, and that the Scriptures were destroyed in the Babylonish captivity, but restored again after seventy years by Esdras, inspired for that purpose. "In this also" (you say, but do not prove) "he was followed by all the principal Fathers that succeeded him; although there is no better foundation for it, than that fabulous relation in the second book of Esdras." You add, Fifthly, that "he believed the sons of God who came in to the daughters of men were evil angels." And all the early Fathers, you are very ready to believe, "were drawn into the same error, by the authority of the apocryphal book of Enoch, cited by St. Jude." (p. 44.)

12. It is not only out of your good will to St. Jude, or Irenæus, you gather up these fragments of error, that nothing be lost, but also to the whole body of the ancient Christians. For "all those absurdities," you say, "were taught by the Fathers of those ages," (naturally implying, by all the Fathers,) "as doctrines of the universal Church, derived in-

mediately from the Apostles ; and thought so necessary, that those who held the contrary were hardly considered as real Christians." Here I must beg you to prove as well as assert, (1.) That all these absurdities of the millennium in the grossest sense of it, of the age of Christ, of paradise, of the destruction of the Scriptures, of the Septuagint Version, and of evil angels mixing with women, were taught by all the Fathers of those ages : (2.) That all those Fathers taught these as doctrines of the universal Church, derived immediately from the Apostles : and, (3.) That they all denied those to be real Christians who held the contrary.

13. You next cite two far-fetched interpretations of Scripture, and a weak saying out of the writings of Irenæus. But all three prove no more, than that in these instances he did not speak with strictness of judgment ; not, that he was incapable of knowing what he saw with his own eyes, or of truly relating it to others.

Before we proceed to what with equal good humour and impartiality you remark concerning the rest of these Fathers, it will be proper to consider what more is interspersed concerning these in the sequel of this argument.

14. And, First, you say, "Justin used an inconclusive argument for the existence of the souls of men after death." (p. 67.) It is possible he might ; but whether it was conclusive or no, this does not affect his moral character.

You say, Secondly, "It was the common opinion of all the Fathers, taken from the authority of Justin Martyr, that the demons wanted the fumes of the sacrifices to strengthen them for the enjoyment of their lustful pleasures." (p. 69.)

Sir, no man of reason will believe this, concerning one of the Fathers, upon your bare assertion. I must therefore desire you to prove by more than a scrap of a sentence, (1.) That Justin himself held this opinion : (2.) That he invented it : (3.) That it was the common opinion of all the Fathers : and, (4.) That they all took it on his authority.

15. You affirm, Thirdly : "He says, that all devils yield and submit to the name of Jesus ; as also to the name of the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob." (p. 85.) Very likely he may.

Lastly. You cite a passage from him, concerning the Spirit of God influencing the minds of holy men. But neither does this in any measure affect his credit as a witness of fact. Consequently, after all that you have been able to draw, either from himself, or any of the primitive writers, here is one witness of unquestionable credit, touching the miracles wrought in the primitive Church, touching the subsistence of the extraordinary gifts after the days of the Apostles.

16. But let us come once more to Irenæus ; for you have not done with him yet : "Forgery," you say, "has been actually charged upon Justin," (by John Croius and Dr. Middleton,) "and may with equal reason be charged on Irenæus. For what other account can be given of his frequent appeals to Apostolical tradition, for the support of so many incredible doctrines?" (p. 111.) Why, this very natural one, that in non-essential points he too easily followed the authority of Papias, a weak man, who on slight grounds believed many trifling things to have been said or done by the Apostles. And allowing all this, yet it does not give us so "lamentable an idea of those primitive ages and primitive champions of the Christian cause." (p. 59.)

The same account may be given of his mistake concerning the age of our Lord. (*Ib.*) There is, therefore, as yet, neither reason nor any plausible pretence for laying forgery to his charge. And consequently, thus far his credit as a witness stands clear and unimpeached.

But you say, Secondly, "He was a zealous asserter of tradition." (p. 61.) He might be so, and yet be an honest man; and that, whether he was mistaken or no, in supposing Papias to have been a disciple of John the Apostle. (p. 64.)

17. You say, Thirdly, He supposed "that the disciples of Simon Magus, as well as Carpocrates, used magical arts;" (p. 68;) that "the dead were frequently raised in his time;" (p. 72;) that "the Jews by the name of God cast out devils;" (p. 85;) and that "many had even then the gift of tongues, although he had it not himself." This is the whole of your charge against St. Irenæus, when summed up and laid together. And now, let any reasonable person judge, whether all this gives us the least cause to question, either his having sense enough to discern a plain matter of fact, or honesty enough to relate it. Here then is one more credible witness of miraculous gifts after the days of the Apostles.

18. What you advance concerning the history of tradition, I am neither concerned to defend nor to confute. Only I must observe, you forget yourself again, where you say, "The fable of the millennium, of the old age of Christ, with many more, were all embraced by the earliest Fathers." (p. 64.) For modesty's sake, sir, think a little before you speak; and remember you yourself inform us, that one of these was never embraced at all, but by one single Father only.

19. "I cannot," you say, "dismiss this article, without taking notice, that witchcraft was universally believed through all ages of the primitive Church." (p. 66.) This you show by citations from several of the Fathers; who likewise believed, as you inform us, that "evil spirits had power frequently to afflict either the bodies or minds of men;" that they "acted the parts of the Heathen gods, and assumed the forms of those who were called from the dead. Now, this opinion," say you, "is not only a proof of the grossest credulity, but of that species of it which, of all others, lays a man most open to imposture." (p. 70.)

And yet this opinion, as you know full well, has its foundation, not only in the histories of all ages, and all nations throughout the habitable world, even where Christianity never obtained; but particularly in Scripture; in abundance of passages both of the Old and New Testament; as where the Israelites were expressly commanded not to "suffer a witch to live;" (*ib.*) where St. Paul numbers "witchcraft" with "the works of the flesh," Gal. v, 19, 20; and ranks it with adultery and idolatry; and where St. John declares, "Without are sorcerers, and whoremongers, and murderers," Rev. xxii, 15.

That the gods of the Heathens are devils, (1 Cor. x, 20,) is declared in terms, by one of those who are styled inspired writers. And many conceive, that another of them gives us a plain instance of their "assuming the form of those who were called from the dead," 1 Sam. xxviii, 13, 14.

Of the power of evil spirits to afflict the minds of men, none can doubt, who believe there are any such beings. And of their power to afflict the body, we have abundant proof, both in the history of Job, and that of the Gospel demoniacs.

I do not mean, sir, to accuse you of believing these things : you have shown that you are guiltless in this matter ; and that you pay no more regard to that antiquated book, the Bible, than you do to the Second Book of Esdras. But, alas ! the Fathers were not so far enlightened. And because they were bigoted to that old book, they of consequence held for truth what, you assure us, was mere delusion and imposture.

20. Now to apply : “ A mind,” you say, “ so totally possessed by superstitious fancies, could not even suspect the pretensions of those vagrant jugglers, who in those primitive ages were so numerous, and so industriously employed in deluding their fellow creatures. Both Heathens, Jews, and Christians are all allowed to have had such impostors among them.” (p. 71.) By whom, sir, is this allowed of the Christians ? By whom, but Celsus, was it affirmed of them ? Who informed you of their growing so numerous, and using such industry in their employment ? To speak the plain truth, your mind appears “ to be so totally possessed by” these “ vagrant jugglers,” that you cannot say one word about the primitive Church, but they immediately start up before you ; though there is no more proof of their ever existing, than of a witch’s sailing in an egg shell.

21. You conclude this head : “ When pious Christians are arrived to this pitch of credulity, as to believe that evil spirits or evil men can work miracles, in opposition to the Gospel ; their very piety will oblige them to admit as miraculous whatever is pretended to be wrought in defence of it.” (*Ib.*) Once more you have spoken out ; you have shown, without disguise, what you think of St. Paul, and the “ lying miracles,” (2 Thess. ii, 9,) which he (poor man !) believed evil spirits or evil men could work in opposition to the Gospel ; and of St. John, talking so idly of him who “ doeth great wonders, and deceiveth them that dwell on the earth” (even though they were not Christians) “ by means of those miracles which he hath power to do,” Rev. xiii, 13, 14.

22. You have now finished the third thing you proposed ; which was, “ to show the particular characters of the several Fathers, who attest” that they were eye and ear witnesses of the extraordinary gifts in the primitive Church.

You named nine of these : Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Theophilus, Tertullian, Minutius Felix, Origen, Cyprian, Arnobius, and Lactantius ; at the same time observing, that many other writers attest the same thing.

But let the others stand by. Are these good men and true ? That is the present question.

You say, “ No ;” and, to prove that these nine are knaves, bring several charges against two of them.

These have been answered at large : some of them proved to be false, some, though true, yet not invalidating their evidence.

But supposing we waive the evidence of these two, here are seven more still to come.

O, but you say, “ If there were twice seven, they only repeat the words which these have taught them.”

You say ; but how often must you be reminded that saying and proving are two things ? I grant, in three or four opinions, some (though not all) of these were mistaken, as well as those two. But this by no means

proves that they were all knaves together; or that if Justin Martyr or Irenæus speaks wrong, I am therefore to give no credit to the evidence of Theophilus or Minutius Felix.

23. You have therefore made a more lame piece of work on this head, if possible, than on the preceding. You have promised great things, and performed just nothing. You have left above three parts in four of your work entirely untouched; as these two are not a fourth part even of the writers you have named, as attesting the continuance of the "extraordinary gifts" after the age of the Apostles.

But you have taught that trick at least to your "vagrant jugglers," to supply the defect of all other arguments. At every dead lift you are sure to play upon us these dear creatures of your own imagination. They are the very strength of your battle, your tenth legion. Yet if a man impertinently calls for proof of their existence, if he comes close and engages them hand to hand, they immediately vanish away.

IV. You are, in the Fourth place, to "review all the several kinds of miraculous gifts which are pretended to have been given; and to observe, from the nature of each, how far they may reasonably be suspected." (p. 72.)

"These," you say, "are, 1. The power of raising the dead. 2. Of healing the sick. 3. Of casting out devils. 4. Of prophesying. 5. Of seeing visions. 6. Of discovering the secrets of men. 7. Of expounding the Scriptures. 8. Of speaking with tongues."

I had rather have had an account of the miraculous powers as they are represented to us in the history of the Gospel. But that account you are not inclined to give. So we will make the best of what we have.

Section I. 1. And, First, as to "raising the dead." Irenæus affirms: "This was frequently performed on necessary occasions; when, by great fastings, and the joint supplication of the Church, the spirit of the dead person returned into him, and the man was given back to the prayers of the saints." (*Ib.*)

2. But you object: "There is not an instance of this to be found in the three first centuries." (*Ib.*) I presume you mean, no Heathen historian has mentioned it; for Christian historians were not. I answer, (1.) It is not probable a Heathen historian would have related such a fact, had he known it. (2.) It is equally improbable, he should know it; seeing the Christians knew with whom they had to do; and that, had such an instance been made public, they would not long have enjoyed him who had been given back to their prayers. They could not but remember what had been before, when the Jews sought Lazarus also to kill him; a very obvious reason why a miracle of this particular kind ought not to have been published abroad; especially considering, Thirdly, that it was not designed for the conversion of the Heathens; but "on occasions necessary" for the good of the Church, of the Christian community. Lastly: It was a miracle proper, above all others, to support and confirm the Christians, who were daily tortured and slain, but sustained by the hope of obtaining a better resurrection.

3. You object, Secondly: "The Heathens constantly affirmed the thing itself to be impossible." (p. 73.) They did so. But is it "a thing incredible with you, that God should raise the dead?"

4. You object Thirdly, that when "Autolyceus, an eminent Heathen

scarce forty years after this, said to Theophilus, Bishop of Antioch, 'Show me but one raised from the dead, that I may see and believe;' (*ib.*) Theophilus could not." Supposing he could not, I do not see that this contradicts the testimony of Irenæus; for he does not affirm, (though you say he does,) that this was "performed, as it were, in every parish, or place where there was a Christian Church." (p. 72.) He does not affirm, that it was performed at Antioch; probably, not in any Church, unless where a concurrence of important circumstances required it. Much less does he affirm, that the persons raised in France would be alive forty years after. Therefore, although it be granted, (1.) That the historians of that age are silent; (2.) That the Heathens said the thing was impossible; and (3.) That Theophilus did not answer the challenge of the Heathen, Autolyceus;—all this will not invalidate, in any degree, the express testimony of Irenæus, or prove that none have been raised from the dead since the days of the Apostles.

Section II. 1. "The next gift is, that of healing the sick; often performed by anointing them with oil; in favour of which," as you observe, "the ancient testimonies are more full and express." (p. 75.) But "this," you say, "might be accounted for without a miracle, by the natural efficacy of the oil itself." (p. 76.) I doubt not. Be pleased to try how many you can cure thus, that are blind, deaf, dumb, or paralytic; and experience, if not philosophy, will teach you, that oil has no such natural efficacy as this.

2. Of this you seem not insensible already, and therefore fly away to your favourite supposition, that "they were not cured at all; that the whole matter was a cheat from the beginning to the end." But by what arguments do you evince this? The first is, "The Heathens pretended to do the same." Nay, and "managed the imposture with so much art, that the Christians could neither deny nor detect it; but insisted always that it was performed by demons, or evil spirits." (*ib.*) But still the Heathens maintained, "the cures were wrought by their gods, by Æsculapius in particular." And where is the difference? seeing as was observed before, "the gods of the Heathens were but devils."

3. But you say, "Although public monuments were erected in proof and memory of these cures, at the time when they were performed, yet it is certain all those Heathen miracles were pure forgeries." (p. 79.) How is it certain? If you can swallow this without good proof, you are far more credulous than I. I cannot believe that the whole body of the Heathens, for so many generations, were utterly destitute of common sense, any more than of common honesty. Why should you fix such a charge on whole cities and countries? You could have done no more, if they had been Christians!

4. But "diseases, though fatal and desperate, are oft surprisingly healed of themselves." And therefore "we cannot pay any great regard to such stories, unless we knew more precisely in this case the real bounds between nature and miracle." (*ib.*) Sir, I understand you well. The drift of the argument is easily seen. It points at the Master, as well as his servants; and tends to prove that, after all this talk about miraculous cures, we are not sure there were ever any in the world. But it will do no harm. For, although we grant, (1.) That some recover, even in seemingly desperate cases; and, (2.) That we do not

know, in any case, the precise bounds between nature and miracle; yet it does not follow, Therefore I cannot be assured there ever was a miracle of healing in the world. To explain this by instance: I do not precisely know how far nature may go in healing, that is, restoring sight to, the blind; yet this I assuredly know, that if a man born blind is restored to sight by a word, this is not nature, but miracle. And to such a story, well attested, all reasonable men will pay the highest regard.

5. The sum of what you have advanced on this head, is, (1.) That the Heathens themselves had miraculous cures among them. (2.) That oil may cure some diseases by its natural efficacy. And (3.) That we do not know the precise bounds of nature. All this I allow. But all this will not prove that no miraculous cures were performed, either by our Lord, and his Apostles, or by those who lived in the three succeeding centuries.

Section III. 1. The Third of the miraculous powers said to have been in the primitive Church, is that of casting out devils. The testimonies concerning this are out of number, and as plain as words can make them. To show, therefore, that all these signify nothing, and that there were never any devils cast out at all, neither by the Apostles, nor since the Apostles, (for the argument proves both or neither,) is a task worthy of you. And, to give you your just praise, you have here put forth all your strength.

2. And yet I cannot but apprehend, there was a much shorter way. Would it not have been readier to overthrow all those testimonies at a stroke, by proving there never was any devil in the world? Then the whole affair of casting him out had been at an end.

But it is in condescension to the weakness and prejudices of mankind that you go less out of the common road, and only observe, "that those who were said to be possessed of the devil, may have been ill of the falling sickness." And their symptoms, you say, "seem to be nothing else but the ordinary symptoms of an epilepsy." (p. 81.)

If it be asked, But were "the speeches and confessions of the devils, and their answering to all questions, nothing but the ordinary symptoms of an epilepsy?" you take in a second hypothesis, and account for these "by the arts of imposture, and contrivance between the persons concerned in the act." (p. 82.)

But is not this something extraordinary, that men in epileptic fits should be capable of so much art and contrivance? To get over this difficulty, we are apt to suppose that art and contrivance were the main ingredients; so that we are to add only *quantum sufficit* [a sufficient quantity] of the epilepsy, and sometimes to leave it out of the composition.

But the proof, sir? where is the proof? I want a little of that too. Instead of this, we have only another supposition: "That all the Fathers were either induced by their prejudices to give too hasty credit to these pretended possessions, or carried away by their zeal to support a delusion which was useful to the Christian cause." (*Ib.*)

I grant they were prejudiced in favour of the Bible; but yet we cannot fairly conclude from hence, either that they were one and all continually deceived by merely pretended possessions; or that they would all lie for God,—a thing absolutely forbidden in that book.

3. But "leaders of sects," you say, "whatever principles they pretend to, have seldom scrupled to use a commodious lie." (p. 83.) I observe you are quite impartial here. You make no exception of age or nation. It is all one to you whether your reader applies this to the son of Abdallah, or the Son of Mary. And yet, sir, I cannot but think there was a difference. I fancy the Jew was an honest man than the Arabian; and though Mohanmed used many a commodious lie, yet Jesus of Nazareth did not.

4. However, "Not one of these Fathers made any scruple of using the hyperbolical style," (that is, in plain English, of lying,) "as an eminent writer of ecclesiastical history declares." (*Ib.*) You should have said, an impartial writer. For who would scruple that character to Mr. Le Clerc? And yet I cannot take either his or your bare word for this. Be pleased to produce a little proof. Hitherto you have proved absolutely nothing on the head; but, as your manner is, taken all for granted.

5. You next relate that famous story from Tertullian: "A woman went to the theatre, and returned possessed with a devil. When the unclean spirit was asked how he dared to assault a Christian, he answered, 'I found her on my own ground.'" (*Ib.*) After relating another, which you endeavour to account for naturally, you intimate that this was a mere lie of Tertullian's. But how is that proved? Why, "Tertullian was an utter enemy to plays and public shows in the theatre." He was so: But can we infer from thence that he was an utter enemy to common honesty?

6. You add: "The Fathers themselves own that even the Jews, yea, and the Heathens, cast out devils. Now, it will be granted, that these Jewish and Heathen exorcists were mere cheats and impostors. But the Fathers believed they really cast them out. Now, if they could take their tricks for the effects of a supernatural power, well might they be deceived by their own impostors. Or they might think it convenient to oppose one cheat to another." (pp. 84, 87, 88.)

Deceived, say you, *by their own impostors*? Why, I thought they were the very men who set them to work! who opposed one cheat to another! Apt scholars, who acted their part so well, as even to deceive their masters! But, whatever the Heathen were, we cannot grant that all the "Jewish exorcists were impostors." Whether the Heathens cast out devils or not, it is sure the sons of the Jews cast them out. I mean, upon supposition, that Jesus of Nazareth cast them out; which is a point not here to be disputed.

7. But "it is very hard to believe what Origen declares, that the devils used to possess and destroy cattle." You might have said, what Matthew and Mark declare concerning the herd of swine; and yet we shall find you, by and by, believing far harder things than this.

Before you subjoined the silly story of Hilarion and his camel, you should, in candour, have informed your reader, that it is disputed, whether the life of Hilarion was wrote by St. Jerome or no. But, be it as it may, I have no concern for either: For they did not live within the three first ages.

8. I know not what you have proved hitherto, though you have affirmed many things, and intimated more. But now we come to the strength of the cause, contained in your five observations.

You observe, First, "that all the primitive accounts of casting out devils, though given by different Fathers, and in different ages, yet exactly agree with regard to all the main circumstances." (p. 91.) And this you apprehend to be a mark of imposture. "It looks," you say, "as if they copied from each other!" Now, a vulgar reader would have imagined that any single account of this kind must be rendered much more (not less) credible, by parallel accounts of what many had severally seen, at different times, and in different places.

9. You observe, Secondly, "that the persons thus possessed were called, *εργασμινοί*, 'ventriquoists;'" (some of them were;) "because they were generally believed to speak out of the belly. Now, there are, at this day," you say, "those who, by art and practice, can speak in the same manner. If we suppose, then, that there were artists of this kind among the ancient Christians, how easily, by a correspondence between the ventriquoist and the exorcist, might they delude the most sensible of their audience!" (p. 92.)

But what did the ventriquoist do with his epilepsy in the mean time? You must not let it go, because many of the circumstances wherein all these accounts agree cannot be tolerably accounted for without it. And yet, how will you make these two agree? It is a point worthy your serious consideration.

But cheats, doubtless, they were, account for it who can. Yet it is strange none of the Heathens should find them out; that the imposture should remain quite undiscovered till fourteen hundred years after the impostors were dead! He must have a very large faith who can believe this; who can suppose that not one of all those impostors should, either through inadvertence, or in the midst of tortures and death, have once intimated any such thing.

10. You observe, Thirdly, "that many demoniacs could not be cured by all the power of the exorcists; and that the cures which were pretended to be wrought on any, were but temporary, were but the cessation of a particular fit or access of the distemper. This," you say, "is evident from the testimony of antiquity itself, and may be clearly collected from the method of treating them in the ancient Church." (*Ib.*)

Sir, you are the most obliging disputant in the world: For you continually answer your own arguments. Your last observation confuted all that you had advanced before. And now you are so kind as to confute that. For if, after all, these demoniacs were real epileptics, and that in so high a degree as to be wholly incurable, what becomes of their art and practice, and of the very good correspondence between the ventriquoist and the exorcist?

Having allowed you your supposition just so long as may suffice to confute yourself, I must now observe, it is not true. For all that is evident from the testimony of antiquity, is this: That although many demoniacs were wholly delivered, yet some were not, even in the third century; but continued months or years, with only intervals of ease, before they were entirely set at liberty.

11. You observe, Fourthly, "that great numbers of demoniacs subsisted in those early ages, whose chief habitation was in a part of the church, where, as in a kind of hospital, they were under the care of the exorcists; which will account for the confidence of those challenges made to the Heathens by the Christians, to come and see how they could drive the devils out of them, while they kept such numbers of them in constant pay; always ready for the

show ; tried and disciplined by your exorcists to groan and howl, and give proper answers to all questions." (pp. 94, 95.)

So now the correspondence between the ventriloquist and the exorcist is grown more close than ever! But the misfortune is, this observation, likewise wholly overthrows that which went before it. For if all the groaning and howling, and other symptoms, were no more than what they "were disciplined to by their exorcists;" (p. 95;) then it cannot be, that "many of them could not possibly be cured by all the power of those exorcists!" (p. 92.) What! could they not possibly be taught to know their masters; and when to end, as well as to begin, the show? One would think that the cures wrought upon these might have been more than temporary. Nay, it is surprising, that, while they had such numbers of them, they should ever suffer the same person to show twice.

12. You observe, Fifthly, "that, whereas this power of casting out devils had hitherto been in the hands only of the meaner part of the laity;" (that wants proof;) "it was, about the year 367, put under the direction of the Clergy; it being then decreed by the Council of Laodicea, that none should be exorcists but those appointed (or ordained) by the Bishop. But no sooner was this done, even by those who favoured and desired to support it, than the gift itself gradually decreased and expired." (p. 95.)

You here overthrow, not only your immediately preceding observation, (as usual,) but likewise what you have observed elsewhere,—that the exorcists began to be ordained "about the middle of the third century." (p. 86.) If so, what need of decreeing it now, above a hundred years after? Again: If the exorcists were ordained a hundred years before this Council sat, what change was made by the decree of the Council? Or how came the power of casting out devils to cease upon it? You say, The Bishops still favoured and desired to support it. Why, then, did they not support it? It must have been they (not the poor exorcists, who were but a degree above sextons) who had hitherto kept such numbers of them in pay. What was become of them now? Were all the groaners and howlers dead, and no more to be procured for money? Or rather, did not the Bishops, think you, grow covetous as they grew rich, and so kept fewer and fewer of them in pay, till at length the whole business dropped?

13. These are your laboured objections against the great promise of our Lord, "In my name shall they cast out devils;" whereby (to make sure work) you strike at him and his Apostles, just as much as at the primitive Fathers. But, by a strange jumble of ideas in your head, you would prove so much, that you prove nothing. By attempting to show all who claimed this power to be at once both fools and knaves, you have spoiled your whole cause, and, in the event, neither shown them to be one nor the other; as the one half of your argument all along just serves to overthrow the other. So that, after all, the ancient testimonies, touching this gift, remain firm and unshaken.

Section IV. 1. You told us above, that the fourth miraculous gift was that of prophesying; the fifth, of seeing visions; the sixth, of discovering the secrets of men." (p. 72.) But here you jumble them all together, telling us, "The next miraculous gift is that of prophetic visions, and ecstastic trances," (*ecstastic ecstasies*, you might have said,)

“and the discovery of men’s hearts.” (p. 96.) But why do you thrust all three into one? Because, you say, “these seem to be the fruit of one spirit.” Most certainly they are, whether it was the Spirit of Truth, or (as you suppose) the spirit of delusion.

2. However, it is the second of these on which you chiefly dwell (the fifth of those you before enumerated,) taking but little notice of the fourth, “foretelling things to come,” and none at all of the sixth, “discovering the secrets of men.” The testimonies, therefore, for these remain in full force, as you do not even attempt to invalidate them. With regard to visions or ecstasies, you observe, First, that Tertullian calls ecstasy “a temporary loss of senses.” (p. 97.) It was so, of the outward senses, which were then locked up. You observe, Secondly, that “Suidas” (a very primitive writer, who lived between eight and nine hundred years after Tertullian) “says, that of all the kinds of madness, that of the Poets and Prophets was alone to be wished for.” I am at a loss to know what this is brought to prove. The question is, Were there visions in the primitive Church? You observe, Thirdly, that Philo the Jew says, (I literally translate his words, which you do not; for it would not answer your purpose,) “When the divine light shines, the human sets; but when that sets, this rises. This uses to befall the Prophets.” (p. 98.) Well, sir, and what is this to the question? Why, “from these testimonies,” you say, “we may collect, that the vision or ecstasy of the primitive Church was of the same kind with those of the Delphic Pythia, or the Cumæan Sibyl.”

Well collected indeed! But I desire a little better testimony than either that of Philo the Jew, or Suidas, a lexicographer of the eleventh century, before I believe this. How little Tertullian is to be regarded on this head you yourself show in the very next page.

3. You say, Fourthly, “Montanus and his associates were the authors of these trances. They first raised this spirit of enthusiasm in the Church, and acquired great credit by their visions and ecstasies.” Sir, you forget; they did not “raise this spirit,” but rather Joel and St. Peter; according to whose words, the “young men saw visions,” before Montanus was born.

4. You observe, Fifthly, how Tertullian was “imposed upon by the craft of ecstatic visionaries,” (p. 99,) and then fall upon Cyprian with all your might: your objections to whom we shall now consider:—

And, First, you lay it down as a postulatam, that he was “fond of power and episcopal authority.” (p. 101.) I cannot grant this, sir: I must have some proof; else this, and all you infer from it, will go for nothing.

You say, Secondly, “In all questionable points of doctrine or discipline, which he had a mind to introduce into the Christian worship, we find him constantly appealing to the testimony of visions and divine revelations. Thus he says to Cæcilius, that he was divinely admonished to mix water with wine in the sacrament, in order to render it effectual.”

You set out unhappily enough. For this can never be a proof of Cyprian’s appealing to visions and revelations in order to introduce questionable points of doctrine or discipline into the Christian worship; because this point was unquestionable, and could not then be “introduced into the Christian worship,” having had a constant place therein,

as you yourself have showed, (*Introductory Discourse*, p. 57,) at least from the time of Justin Martyr.

Indeed, neither Justin nor Cyprian use those words, "In order to render it effectual." They are an ingenious and honest addition of your own, in order to make something out of nothing.

5. I observe you take much the same liberty in your next quotation from Cyprian. "He threatens," you say, "to execute what he was ordered to do 'against them in a vision.'" (p. 102.) Here also the last words, "in a vision," are an improvement upon the text. Cyprian's words are, "I will use that admonition which the Lord commands me to use."* But neither was this in order to introduce any questionable point, either of doctrine or discipline; no more than his using the same threat to Pupianus, who had spoken ill of him and left his communion.

6. You go on: "He says likewise, he was admonished of God to ordain one Numidicus, a confessor, who had been left for dead, half burnt and buried in stones." (pp. 103, 104.) True, but what "questionable point of doctrine" or discipline did he introduce hereby? or by ordaining Celerinus; "who was overruled and compelled by a divine vision to accept that office?" So you affirm Cyprian says. But Cyprian says it not; at least, not in those words which you cite in the margin; which, literally translated, run thus: "I recommend to you Celerinus, joined to our clergy, not by human suffrage, but by the divine favour."†

"In another letter, speaking of Aurelius, whom he had ordained a reader, he says to his clergy and people, 'In ordaining clergy, my dearest brethren, I use to consult you first; but there is no need to wait for human testimonies, when the divine suffrage has been already signified.'"

An impartial man would wonder what you could infer from these five passages put together. Why, by the help of a short postulatam, "He was fond of power," (you have as much ground to say, "He was fond of bloodshed,") you will make it plain, "this was all a trick to enlarge his episcopal authority." But as that postulatam is not allowed, you have all your work to begin again.

Hitherto then the character of Cyprian is unhurt; but now you are resolved to blow it up at once. So you proceed: "The most memorable effect of any of his visions was his flight from his church in the time of persecution. He affirms, that he was commanded to retire by a special revelation from heaven. Yet this plea was a mere fiction, contrived to quiet the scandal which was raised by his flight; and is confuted by himself, where he declares, it was the advice of Tertullus which prevailed with him to withdraw." (pp. 104, 105.)

You here charge Cyprian with confuting himself, in saying, he "withdrew by the advice of Tertullus;" whereas he had "before affirmed, that he was commanded to retire by a special revelation from heaven." Indeed he had not; there is no necessity at all for putting this construction upon those words, "The Lord who commanded me to retire;" which may without any force be understood of the written command, "When they persecute you in this city flee ye into another," Matt. x, 23.

* *Utar eâ admonitione, quâ me Dominus uti jubet.* Epis. 9.

† *Non humanâ suffragatione, sed divinâ dignatione, conjunctum.* Epis. 34.

It is not therefore clear, that this plea of a special revelation was ever advanced. And if it was advanced, it still remains to be proved, that "it was nothing else but a mere fiction."

8. Your citing his editor here, obliges me to add a remark, for which you give continual occasion: If either Rigalt, Mr. Dodwell, Dr. Grabe, Mr. Thirlby, or any editor of the Fathers, ever drops an expression to the disadvantage of the author whom he publishes or illustrates, this you account so much treasure, and will surely find a time to expose it to public view. And all these passages you recite as demonstration. These are doubtless mere oracles; although when the same person speaks in favour of the Father, his authority is not worth a straw. But you have "none of those arts which are commonly employed by disputants to palliate a bad cause!" (*Pref.* p. 31.)

9. What you relate of Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria, you have not from himself, but only from one who lived near a hundred years after Dionysius was dead. Therefore he is not at all accountable for it; as neither am I for any vision of St. Jerome. But I am concerned in the consequence you draw from it: "If this was a fiction, so were Cyprian's too." That will not follow. Many objections may lie against the one, which have no place with regard to the other.

10. You now bring forth your grand discovery, that "all the visions of those days were contrived, or authorized at least, by the leading men of the Church. For they were all applied, either, (1.) To excuse the conduct of particular persons, in some instances of it liable to censure; or, (2.) To enforce some doctrine or discipline pressed by some, but not relished by others; or, (3.) To confirm things not only frivolous, but sometimes even superstitious and hurtful." (p. 109.)

Well, sir, here is the proposition. But where is the proof? I hope we shall have it in your next "Free Inquiry;" and that you will then give us a few instances of such applications, from the writers of the three first centuries.

11. Being not disposed to do this at present, you fall again upon the poor "heretic Montanus; who first gave a vogue" (as you phrase it) "to visions and ecstasies in the Christian Church." (p. 110.) So you told us before. But we cannot believe it yet; because Peter and Paul tell us the contrary.

Indeed, you do not now mention Montanus because it is any thing to the question, but only to make way for observing, that those who wrote against him "employed such arguments against his prophecy as shake the credit of all prophecy. For Epiphanius makes this the very criterion between a true and a false prophet, 'that the true had no ecstasies, constantly retained his senses, and with firmness of mind apprehended and uttered the divine oracles.'" Sir, have you not mistook? Have you not transcribed one sentence in the margin, and translated another? That sentence which stands in your margin is this: "When there was need, the saints of God among the Prophets prophesied all things with the true Spirit, and with a sound understanding and reasonable mind." Now, it is difficult to find out how this comes to "shake the credit of all prophecy."

12. Why thus: "Before the Montanists had brought those ecstasies into disgrace, the prophecy of the orthodox too was exerted in ecstasy."

And so were the prophecies of the Old Testament, according to the current opinion of those earlier days." (p. 111.)

That this was then "the current opinion," you bring three citations to prove. But if you could cite three Fathers more during the three first centuries, expressly affirming that the Prophets were all out of their senses, I would not take their word. For though I take most of the Fathers to have been wise and good men, yet I know none of them were infallible. But do even these three expressly affirm it? No, not one of them; at least in the words you have cited. From Athenagoras you cite only part of a sentence, which, translated as literally as it will well bear, runs thus: "Who in an ecstasy of their own thoughts, being moved by the Divine Spirit, spoke the things with which they were inspired, even as a piper breathes into a pipe." Does Athenagoras *expressly affirm* in these words, that the prophets were "transported out of their senses?" I hope, sir, you do not understand Greek. If so, you show here only a little harmless ignorance.

13. From Justin Martyr also you cite but part of a sentence. He speaks, very nearly, thus:—

"That the Spirit of God descending from heaven, and using righteous men as the quill strikes the harp or lyre, may reveal unto us the knowledge of divine and heavenly things." And does Justin *expressly affirm* in these words, that all the prophets were "transported out of their senses?"

Tertullian's words are: "A man being in the Spirit, especially when he beholds the glory of God, must needs lose sense." (*Necesse est, excidat sensu.*) Now, as it is not plain that he means hereby, lose his understanding, (it being at least equally probable, that he intends no more than, losing for the time the use of his outward senses,) neither can it be said that Tertullian expressly affirms, "The Prophets were all out of their senses." Therefore you have not so much as one Father to vouch for what you say was "the current opinion in those days."

14. I doubt not but all men of learning will observe a circumstance which holds throughout all your quotations. The strength of your argument constantly lies in a loose and paraphractical manner of translating. The strength of mine lies in translating all in the most close and literal manner; so that closeness of translation strengthens mine, in the same proportion as it weakens your arguments; a plain proof of what you elsewhere observe, that you use "no subtle refinements or forced constructions." (*Pref.* p. 31.)

15. But to return to Cyprian: "I cannot forbear," you say, "relating two or three more of his wonderful stories. The first is, A man who had denied Christ was presently struck dumb: the second, A woman who had done so was seized by an unclean spirit, and soon after died in great anguish: the third, of which he says he was an eye witness, is this,—The Heathen magistrates gave to a Christian infant part of what had been offered to an idol. When the deacon forced the consecrated wine on this child, it was immediately seized with convulsions and vomiting; as was a woman who had apostatized, upon taking the consecrated elements." (pp. 112, 113.) The other two relations Cyprian does not affirm of his own personal knowledge.

"Now, what can we think," say you, "of these strange stories, but that

they were partly forged, partly dressed up in this tragical form, to support the discipline of the Church in these times of danger and trial?" (p. 115.)

Why, many will think that some of them are true, even in the manner they are related; and that if any of them are not, Cyprian thought they were, and related them in the sincerity of his heart. Nay, perhaps some will think that the wisdom of God might, "in those times of danger and trial," work things of this kind, for that very end, "to support the discipline of the Church." And till you show the falsehood, or at least the improbability, of this, Cyprian's character stands untainted; not only as a man of sense, (which you yourself allow,) but likewise of eminent integrity; and consequently it is beyond dispute, that visions, the fifth miraculous gift, remained in the Church after the days of the Apostles.

Section V. 1. The sixth of the miraculous gifts which you enumerated above, namely, "the discernment of spirits," you just name, and then entirely pass over. The seventh is, that of "expounding the Scriptures." (p. 116.) You tack to it, "or the mysteries of God." But, inasmuch as it is not yet agreed (as was intimated above) whether this be the same gift, it may just as well be left out.

2. Now, as to this, you say, "There is no trace of it to be found since the days of the Apostles. For even in the second and third centuries, a most senseless and extravagant method of expounding them prevailed. For which when we censure any particular Father, his apologists with one voice allege, 'This is to be charged to the age wherein he lived, which could not relish or endure any better.'"

I doubt much, whether you can produce one single apologist for any "ridiculous comment on sacred writ," who any where "alleges, that the second or third century could not relish or endure any better." But if they were all to say this with one voice, yet no reasonable man could believe them. For it is notoriously contrary to matter of fact. It may be allowed, that some of these Fathers, being afraid of too literal a way of expounding the Scriptures, leaned sometimes to the other extreme. Yet nothing can be more unjust than to infer from hence, "that the age in which they lived could not relish or endure any but senseless, extravagant, enthusiastic, ridiculous comments on sacred writ."

Will you say, that all the comments on Scripture, still to be found in the writings of Ignatius, Polycarp, Athenagoras, or even of Origen and Clemens Alexandrinus, are senseless and extravagant? If not, this charge must fall to the ground; it being manifest, that even "the age in which they lived" could both "endure and relish" sound, sensible, rational (and yet spiritual) comments on holy writ.

Yet this extravagant charge you have repeated over and over in various parts of your work; thrusting it upon your reader in season and out of season: how fairly, let all candid men judge.

3. Touching the miraculous gift of expounding Scripture, you say, "Justin Martyr affirms, it was conferred on him by the special grace of God." (p. 117.) I cannot find where he affirms this. Not in the words you cite, which, literally translated, (as was observed before,) run thus: "He hath revealed to us whatsoever things we have understood by his grace from the Scriptures also." You seem conscious, these words do not prove the point, and therefore eke them out with those of Monsieur

Tillemont. But his own words, and no other, will satisfy me. I cannot believe it, unless from his own mouth.

4. Meantime, I cannot but observe an odd circumstance,—that you are here, in the abundance of your strength, confuting a proposition which, (whether it be true or false,) not one of your antagonists affirms. You are labouring to prove, “there was not in the primitive Church any such miraculous gift as that of expounding the Scriptures.” Pray, sir, who says there was? Not Justin Martyr; not one among all those Fathers whom you have quoted as witnesses of the miraculous gifts, from the tenth to the eighteenth page of your “Inquiry.” If you think they do, I am ready to follow you, step by step, through every quotation you have made.

5. No, nor is this mentioned in any enumeration of the miraculous gifts which I can find in the Holy Scriptures. Prophecy indeed is mentioned more than once, by the Apostles, as well as the Fathers. But the context shows, where it is promised as a miraculous gift, it means the foretelling things to come. All therefore which you say on this head is a mere *ignoratio elenchi*, “a mistake of the question to be proved.”

Section VI. 1. The Eighth and last of the miraculous gifts you enumerated, was, the gift of tongues. And this, it is sure, was claimed by the primitive Christians; for Irenæus says expressly, “‘We hear many in the Church speaking with all kinds of tongues.’ And yet,” you say, “this was granted only on certain special occasions, and then withdrawn again from the Apostles themselves: so that, in the ordinary course of their ministry, they were generally destitute of it. This,” you say, “I have shown elsewhere.” (p. 119.) I presume, in some treatise which I have not seen.

2. But Irenæus, who declares that “many had this gift in his days, yet owns he had it not himself.” This is only a proof that the case was then the same as when St. Paul observed, long before, “Are all workers of miracles? Have all the gifts of healing? Do all speak with tongues?” 1 Cor. xii, 29, 30. No, not even when those gifts were shed abroad in the most abundant manner.

3. “But no other Father has made the least claim to it.” (p. 120.) Perhaps none of those whose writings are now extant; at least, not in those writings which are extant. But what are these in comparison of those which are lost? And how many were burning and shining lights within three hundred years after Christ, who wrote no account of themselves at all; at least none which has come to our hands? But who are they that “speak of it as a gift peculiar to the times of the Apostles?” You say, “There is not a single Father who ventures to speak of it in any other manner.” (*Ib.*) Well, bring but six Ante-Nicene Fathers, who speak of it in this manner, and I will give up the whole point.

4. But you say, “After the Apostolic times, there is not, in all history, one instance, even so much as mentioned, of any particular person who ever exercised this gift.” (*Ib.*) You must mean either that the Heathens have mentioned no instance of this kind, (which is not at all surprising,) or that Irenæus does not mention the names of those many persons who in his time exercised this gift. And this also may be allowed without affecting in anywise the credibility of his testimony concerning them.

5. I must take notice here of another of your postulatums, which leads you into many mistakes. With regard to past ages, you continually take this for granted: "What is not recorded was not done." But this is by no means a self-evident axiom: Nay, possibly it is not true. For there may be many reasons in the depth of the wisdom of God, for his doing many things at various times and places, either by his natural or supernatural power, which were never recorded at all. And abundantly more were recorded once, and that with the fullest evidence, whereof, nevertheless, we find no certain evidence now, at the distance of fourteen hundred years.

6. Perhaps this may obtain in the very case before us. Many may have spoken with new tongues, of whom this is not recorded; at least, the records are lost in a course of so many years: Nay, it is not only possible that it may be so, but it is absolutely certain that it is so; and you yourself must acknowledge it; for you acknowledge that the Apostles, when in strange countries, spoke with strange tongues; that St. John, for instance, when in Asia Minor, St. Peter, when in Italy, (if he was really there,) and the other Apostles, when in other countries, in Parthia, Media, Phrygia, Pamphylia, spoke each to the natives of each, in their own tongues, the wonderful works of God. And yet there is no authentic record of this: There is not, in all history, one well-attested instance of any particular Apostle's exercising this gift in any country whatsoever. Now, sir, if your axiom were allowed, what would be the consequence? Even that the Apostles themselves no more spoke with tongues than any of their successors.

7. I need, therefore, take no trouble about your subsequent reasonings, seeing they are built on such a foundation. Only I must observe an historical mistake which occurs toward the bottom of your next page. Since the reformation, you say, "This gift has never once been heard of, or pretended to, by the Romanists themselves." (p. 122.) But has it been pretended to (whether justly or not) by no others, though not by the Romanists? Has it "never once been heard of" since that time? Sir, your memory fails you again: It has undoubtedly been pretended to, and that at no great distance either from our time or country. It has been heard of more than once, no farther off than the valleys of Dauphiny. Nor is it yet fifty years ago since the Protestant inhabitants of those valleys so loudly pretended to this and other miraculous powers, as to give much disturbance to Paris itself. And how did the king of France confute that pretence, and prevent its being heard any more? Not by the pen of his scholars, but by (a truly Heathen way) the swords and bayonets of his dragoons.

8. You close this head with a very extraordinary thought: "The gift of tongues may," you say, "be considered as a proper test or criterion for determining the miraculous pretensions of all churches. If among their extraordinary gifts they cannot show us this, they have none to show which are genuine." (*Ib.*)

Now, I really thought it had been otherwise. I thought it had been an adjudged rule in the case, "All these worketh one and the self-same Spirit, dividing to every man severally as he will;" and as to every man, so to every Church, every collective body of men. But if this be so, then yours is no proper test for determining the pretensions of all

Churches ; seeing He who worketh as he will, may, with your good leave, give the gift of tongues, where he gives no other ; and may see abundant reasons so to do, whether you and I see them or not. For perhaps we have not always known the mind of the Lord ; not being of the number of his counsellors. On the other hand, he may see good to give many other gifts, where it is not his will to bestow this. Particularly where it would be of no use ; as in a Church where all are of one mind, and all speak the same language.

9. You have now finished, after a fashion, what you proposed to do in the Fourth place, which was, “to review all the several kinds of miraculous gifts which are pretended to have been in the primitive Church.” Indeed, you have dropped one or two of them by the way : Against the rest you have brought forth your strong reasons. Those reasons have been coolly examined. And now let every impartial man, every person of true and unbiassed reason, calmly consider and judge, whether you have made out one point of all that you took in hand ; and whether some miracles of each kind may not have been wrought in the ancient Church, for any thing you have advanced to the contrary.

10. From page 127 to page 158, you relate miracles said to be wrought in the fourth century. I have no concern with these ; but I must weigh an argument which you intermix therewith again and again. It is in substance this : “If we cannot believe the miracles attested by the later Fathers, then we ought not to believe those which are attested by the earliest writers of the Church.” I answer, The consequence is not good ; because the case is not the same with the one and with the other. Several objections, which do not hold with regard to the earlier, may lie against the later, miracles ; drawn either from the improbability of the facts themselves, such as we have no precedent of in holy writ ; from the incompetency of the instruments said to perform them, such as bones, relics, or departed saints ; or from the gross “credulity of a prejudiced, or the dishonesty of an interested, relater.” (p. 145.)

11. One or other of these objections holds against most of the later, though not the earlier, miracles. And if only one holds, it is enough ; it is ground sufficient for making the difference. If, therefore, it was true that there was not a single Father of the fourth age, who was not equally pious with the best of the more ancient, still we might consistently reject most of the miracles of the fourth, while we allowed those of the preceding ages ; both because of the far greater improbability of the facts themselves, and because of the incompetency of the instruments. (p. 159.)

But it is not true, that “the Fathers of the fourth age,” whom you mention, were equally pious with the best of the preceding ages. Nay, according to your account, (which I shall not now contest,) they were not pious at all. For you say, “They were wilful, habitual liars.” And, if so, they had not a grain of piety. Now, that the earlier Fathers were not such has been shown at large ; though, indeed, you complimented them with the same character. Consequently, whether these later Fathers are to be believed or no, we may safely believe the former ; who dared not to do evil that good might come, or to lie either for God or man.

12. I had not intended to say any thing more concerning any of the

miracles of the later ages ; but your way of accounting for one, said to have been wrought in the fifth, is so extremely curious that I cannot pass it by.

The story, it seems, is this : “ Hunneric, an Arian prince, in his persecution of the orthodox in Afric, ordered the tongues of a certain society of them to be cut out by the roots. But, by a surprising instance of God’s good providence, they were enabled to speak articulately and distinctly without their tongues. And so continuing to make open profession of the same doctrine, they became not only preachers, but living witnesses of its truth.” (p. 182.)

Do not mistake me, sir : I have no design at all to vouch for the truth of this miracle. I leave it just as I find it. But what I am concerned with is, your manner of accounting for it.

13. And, First, you say, “ It may not improbably be supposed, that though their tongues were ordered to be cut to the roots, yet the sentence might not be so strictly executed as not to leave in some of them such a share of that organ as was sufficient, in a tolerable degree, for the use of speech.” (p. 183.)

So you think, sir, if only an inch of a man’s tongue were to be neatly taken off, he would be able to talk tolerably well, as soon as the operation was over.

But the most marvellous part is still behind. For you add, “ To come more close to the point : If we should allow that the tongues of these confessors were cut away to the very roots, what will the learned Doctor say, if this boasted miracle should be found at last to be no miracle at all ?” (p. 184.)

“ Say ?” Why, that you have more skill than all the “ strolling wonder-workers” of the three first centuries put together.

But to the point : Let us see how you will set about it. Why, thus : “ The tongue” (as you justly, though keenly, observe) “ has generally been considered as absolutely necessary to the use of speech ; so that to hear men talk without it, might easily pass for a miracle in that credulous age. Yet there was always room to doubt, whether there was any thing miraculous in it or not. But we have an instance in the present century, which clears up all our doubts, and entirely decides the question : I mean, the case of a girl born without a tongue, who talked as easily and distinctly as if she had had one ; an account of which is given in the Memoirs of the Academy of Sciences at Paris.” (*Ib.*)

14. And can you really believe this, that a girl “ spoke distinctly and easily” without any tongue at all ? And, after avowing this belief, do you gravely talk of other men’s credulity ? I wonder that such a volunteer in faith should stagger at any thing. Doubtless, were it related as natural only, not miraculous, you could believe that a man might see without eyes.

Surely there is something very peculiar in this ; something extraordinary, though not miraculous ; that a man who is too wise to believe the Bible, should believe every thing but the Bible ! should swallow any tale, so God be out of the question, though ever so improbable, ever so impossible !

15. “ I have now,” you say, “ thrown together all which I had collected for the support of my argument ;” (p. 187 ;) after a lame recapitulation of which you add with an air of triumph and satisfaction : “ I wish the Fathers

the ablest advocates which Popery itself can afford; for Protestantism, I am sure, can supply none whom they would choose to retain in their cause; none who can defend them without contradicting their own profession and disgracing their own character; or produce any thing, but what deserves to be laughed at, rather than answered." (pp. 188, 189.)

Might it not be well, sir, not to be quite so sure yet? You may not always have the laugh on your side. You are not yet infallibly assured, but that even Protestantism may produce something worth an answer. There may be some Protestants, for aught you know, who have a few grains of common sense left, and may find a way to defend, at least the Ante-Nicene Fathers, without "disgracing their own character." Even such a one as I have faintly attempted this, although I neither have, nor expect to have, any preferment, not even to be a Lambeth chaplain; which if Dr. Middleton is not, it is not his own fault.

V. 1. The last thing you proposed was, "to refute some of the most plausible objections which have been hitherto made." To what you have offered on this head, I must likewise attempt a short reply.

You say, "It is objected, First, that by the character I have given of the Fathers, the authority of the books of the New Testament, which were transmitted to us through their hands, will be rendered precarious and uncertain." (p. 190.)

After a feint of confuting it, you frankly acknowledge the whole of this objection. "I may venture," you say, "to declare, that if this objection be true, it cannot hurt my argument. For if it be natural and necessary, that the craft and credulity of witnesses should always detract from the credit of their testimony, then who can help it? And if this charge be proved on the Fathers, it must be admitted, how far soever the consequences may reach." (p. 192.)

"If it be proved!" Very true. If that charge against the Fathers were really and substantially proved, the authority of the New Testament would be at an end, so far as it depends on one kind of evidence. But that charge is not proved. Therefore even the traditional authority of the New Testament is as firm as ever.

2. "It is objected," you say, "Secondly, that all suspicion of fraud in the case of the primitive miracles is excluded by that public appeal and challenge which the Christian apologists make to their enemies the Heathens, to come and see with their own eyes the reality of the facts which they attest." (p. 193.)

You answer: "This objection has no real weight with any who are acquainted with the condition of the Christians in those days." You then enlarge (as it seems, with a peculiar pleasure) on the general contempt and odium they lay under, from the first appearance of Christianity in the world, till it was established by the civil power. (pp. 194-196.)

"In these circumstances, it cannot be imagined," you say, "that men of figure and fortune would pay any attention to the apologies or writings of a sect so utterly despised." (p. 197.) But, sir, they were hated, as well as despised; and that by the great vulgar, as well as the small. And this very hatred would naturally prompt them to examine the ground of the challenges daily repeated by them they hated; were it only, that, by discovering the fraud, (which they wanted neither opportunity nor skill to do, had there been any,) they might have had a better pretence

for throwing the Christians to the lions, than because the Nile did not, or the Tiber did, overflow.

3. You add: "Much less can we believe that the emperor or senate of Rome should take any notice of those apologies, or even know indeed that any such were addressed to them." (*Ib.*)

Why, sir, by your account, you would make us believe, that all the emperors and senate together were as "senseless, stupid a race of blockheads and brutes," as even the Christians themselves.

But hold. You are going to prove it too: "For," say you, "should the like case happen now, that any Methodist, Moravian, or French prophet," (right skilfully put together,) "should publish an apology for his brethren, addressed to the king and parliament; is it not wholly improbable, that the government would pay any regard to it?" You should add, (to make the parallel complete,) "or know that any such was addressed to them."

No: I conceive the improbability supposed lies wholly on the other side. Whatever the government of heathen Rome was, (which I presume you will not depreciate,) the government of England is remarkable for tenderness to the very meanest subject. It is therefore not improbable in the least, that an address from some thousands of those subjects, how contemptible soever they were generally esteemed, would not be totally disregarded by such a government. But that they should "not know that any such had been addressed to them," is not only improbable, but morally impossible.

If therefore it were possible for the Heathens to "have a worse opinion of the ancient Christians than we," you say, "have of our modern fanatics," still it is utterly incredible that the Roman government should, not only "take no notice of their apologies," but "not even know that any such were addressed to them."

4. "But the publishing books was more expensive then than it is now; and therefore we cannot think the Christians of those days were able to provide such a number of them as was sufficient for the information of the public." (pp. 198, 199.)

Nay, if they were not able to provide themselves food and raiment, they would be sure to provide a sufficient number of these; sufficient, at least, for the information of the emperor and senate, to whom those apologies were addressed. And how great a number, do you suppose, might suffice for them? How many hundred or thousand copies? I apprehend the emperor would be content with one; and one more would be needful for the senate. Now, I really believe the Christians of those days were able to provide both these copies; nay, and even two more; if it should have fallen out, that two or three emperors were on the throne: even though we should suppose that in Tertullian's time there were but forty thousand of them in all Rome.

5. However, you plunge on: "Since, then, the Christians were not able to bear the expense of copying them," (whether the Heathens were disposed to buy them or no, is at present out of the question,) "there is great reason to believe, that their apologies, how gravely soever addressed to emperors and senates, lay unknown for many years." (*Ib.*) There is no great reason to believe it from any thing you have advanced yet. You add: "Especially when the publishing of them was not

only expensive, but so criminal also, as to expose them often to danger, and even to capital punishment."

In very deed, sir, I am sometimes inclined to suspect that you are yourself related to certain ancient Fathers, (notwithstanding the learned quotations which adorn your margin,) who used to say, "*Græcum est : Non potest legi.*" [It is Greek : it cannot be read.] You lay me under an almost invincible temptation to think so upon this very occasion. For what could induce you, if you knew what he said, to place at the bottom of this very page a passage from one of those apologists, Justin Martyr, which so clearly confutes your own argument? The words are : "Although death be determined against those who teach, or even confess, the name of Christ, we both embrace and teach it every where. And if you also receive these words as enemies, you can do no more than kill us."* Could danger then, or the fear of "capital punishment," restrain those Christians from presenting these apologies? No ; capital punishment was no terror to them, who daily offered themselves to the flames, till the very Heathen butchers themselves were tired with slaughtering them.

There can therefore no shadow of doubt remain, with any cool and impartial man, but that these apologies were presented to the most eminent Heathens, to the magistrates, the senate, the emperors. Nor, consequently, is there the least room to doubt of the truth of the facts therein asserted ; seeing the apologists constantly desired their enemies "to come and see them with their own eyes;"—a hazard which those "crafty men" would never have run, had not the facts themselves been infallibly certain. This objection then stands against you in full force. For such a public appeal to their bitterest enemies must exclude all reasonable suspicion of fraud, in the case of the primitive miracles.

6. You tell us, it is objected, Thirdly, "that no suspicion of fraud can reasonably be entertained against those who exposed themselves, even to martyrdom, in confirmation of the truth of what they taught." (*Ib.*)

In order to invalidate this objection, you assert, that some of the primitive Christians might expose themselves to martyrdom, out of mere obstinacy ; others, from a desire of glory ; others, from a fear of reproach ; but the most of all, from the hope of a higher reward in heaven ; especially, as they believed the end of the world was near, and that the martyrs felt no pain in death. "All which topics," you say, "when displayed with art, were sufficient to inflame the multitude to embrace any martyrdom." (pp. 200–204, 208.)

This appears very plausible in speculation. But fact and experience will not answer. You are an eloquent man, and are able to display any topic you please with art enough. Yet if you was to try, with all that art and eloquence, to persuade by all these topics, not a whole multitude, but one simple, credulous ploughman, to go and be shot through the head ; I am afraid, you would scarce prevail with him, after all, to embrace even that easy martyrdom. And it might be more difficult still to find a man who, either out of obstinacy, fear of shame, or desire of

* Καίπερ θάνατον ορισθέντος κατά των διδασκόντων, η ολοις ομολογούντων το ονομα του Χριστου, ημεις πανταχου και ασπαζόμεθα και διδασκομεν. Ει δε και ημεις ως εχθροι εντευξασθε τοιςδε τοις λογοις, η υλτων τι δυνασθε του φονευσειν.—*Just. Mart. Apol. 1, p. 69.*

glory, would calmly and deliberately offer himself to be roasted alive in Smithfield.

7. Have you considered, sir, how the case stood in our own country, scarce two hundred years ago? Not a multitude indeed, and yet not a few, of our own countrymen then expired in the flames. And it was not a general persuasion among them, that martyrs feel no pain in death. That these have feeling, as well as other men, plainly appeared, in the case of Bishop Ridley, crying out, "I cannot burn, I cannot burn!" when his lower parts were consumed. Do you think the fear of shame, or the desire of praise, was the motive on which these acted? Or have you reason to believe it was mere obstinacy that hindered them from accepting deliverance? Sir, since "human nature has always been the same, so that our experience of what now passes in our own soul will be the best comment on what is delivered to us concerning others," let me entreat you to make the case your own. You must not say, "I am not one of the ignorant vulgar: I am a man of sense and learning." So were many of them; not inferior even to you, either in natural or acquired endowments. I ask, then, Would any of these motives suffice to induce you to burn at a stake? I beseech you, lay your hand on your heart, and answer between God and your own soul, what motive could incite you to walk into a fire, but a hope full of immortality. When you mention this motive, you speak to the point. And yet even with regard to this, both you and I should find, did it come to a trial, that the hope of a fool, or the hope of a hypocrite, would stand us in no stead. We should find, nothing else would sustain us in that hour, but a well-grounded confidence of a better resurrection; nothing less than the "steadfastly looking up to heaven, and beholding the glory which shall be revealed."

8. "But heretics," you say, "have been martyrs." I will answer more particularly, when you specify who and when. It may suffice to say now, whosoever he be, that rather than he will offend God, calmly and deliberately chooses to suffer death, I cannot lightly speak evil of him.

But Cyprian says, "Some who had suffered tortures for Christ, yet afterward fell into gross, open sin." It may be so; but it is nothing to the question. It does not prove, in the least, what you brought it to prove; namely, "that bad men have endured martyrdom." Do not evade, sir, and say, "Yes, torments are a kind of martyrdom." True; but not the martyrdom of which we speak.

9. You salve all at last, by declaring gravely, "It is not my design to detract in any manner from the just praise of those primitive martyrs who sustained the cause of Christ at the expense of their lives." (p. 112.) No. Who could ever suppose it was? Who could imagine it was your design to detract from the just praise of Justin, Irenæus, or Cyprian? You only designed to show what their just praise was; namely, the praise of pickpockets, of common cheats and impostors. We understand your meaning, therefore, when you add, "It is reasonable to believe, that they were the best sort of Christians, and the chief ornaments of the church, in their several ages." (p. 213.)

10. You conclude: "My view is to show that their martyrdom does not add any weight to their testimony." Whether it does or no, "it gives the strongest proof" (as you yourself affirm) "of the sincerity of their

faith;" and consequently proves that "no suspicion of fraud can reasonably be entertained against them." (*Ib.*) But this (which you seem to have quite forgot) was the whole of the objection; and, consequently, this as well as both the former objections remain in their full force.

11. "It has been objected," Fourthly, you say, that you "destroy the faith and credit of all history." (p. 114.) But this objection, you affirm, "when seriously considered, will appear to have no sense at all in it." (p. 215.)

That we will try. And one passage, home to the point, is as good as a thousand. Now, sir, be pleased to look back. In your preface, page 9, I read these words: "The credibility of facts lies open to the trial of our reason and senses. But the credibility of witnesses depends on a variety of principles wholly concealed from us. And though, in many cases, it may reasonably be presumed, yet in none can it certainly be known."

If this be as you assert, (I repeat it again,) then farewell the credit of all history. Sir, this is not the cant of zealots: you must not escape so: it is plain, sober reason. If the credibility of witnesses, of all witnesses, (for you make no distinction,) depends, as you peremptorily affirm, on a variety of principles wholly concealed from us, and, consequently, though it may be presumed in many cases, yet can be certainly known in none; then it is plain, all history, sacred or profane, is utterly precarious and uncertain. Then I may indeed presume, but I cannot certainly know, that Julius Cæsar was killed in the senate house; then I cannot certainly know that there was an emperor in Germany, called Charles the Fifth; that Leo the Tenth ever sat in the see of Rome, or Lewis the Fourteenth on the throne of France. Now, let any man of common understanding judge, whether this objection has any sense in it, or no.

12. Under this same head, you fall again upon the case of witchcraft, and say, "There is not in all history any one miraculous fact so authentically attested as the existence of witches. All Christian" (yea, and all Heathen) "nations whatsoever have consented in the belief of them. Now, to deny the reality of facts so solemnly attested, and so universally believed, seems to give the lie to the sense and experience of all Christendom; to the wisest and best of every nation, and to public monuments subsisting to our own times." (p. 221.)

What obliges you, then, to deny it? You answer: "The incredibility of the thing." (p. 223.) O sir, never strain at the incredibility of this, after you have swallowed a hundred people talking without tongues!

13. What you aim at in this also is plain, as well as in your account of the Abbé de Paris. The point of your argument is, "If you cannot believe these, then you ought not to believe the Bible: the incredibility of the things related ought to overrule all testimony whatsoever."

Your argument, at length, would run thus:—

"If things be incredible in themselves, then this incredibility ought to overrule all testimony concerning them.

"But the Gospel miracles are incredible in themselves." Sir, that proposition I deny. You have not proved it yet. You have only now and then, as it were by the by, made any attempt to prove it. And till this is done, you have done nothing, with all the pother that you have made.

14. You reserve the home stroke for the last : " There is hardly a miracle said to be wrought in the primitive times, but what is said to be performed in our days. But all these modern pretensions we ascribe to their true cause, —the craft of a few, playing upon the credulity of the many, for private interest. When, therefore, we read of the same things done by the ancients, and for the same ends, of acquiring wealth, credit, or power ; how can we possibly hesitate to impute them to the same cause of fraud and imposture ?" (p. 230.)

The reason of our hesitation is this : They did not answer the same ends. The modern clergy of Rome do acquire credit and wealth by their pretended miracles. But the ancient clergy acquired nothing by their miracles, but to be " afflicted, destitute, tormented." The one gain all things thereby ; the others lost all things. And this, we think, makes some difference. " Even unto this present hour," says one of them, (writing to those who could easily confute him, if he spoke not the truth,) " we both hunger and thirst, and are naked, and are buffeted, and have no certain dwelling place. Being reviled, we bless ; being persecuted, we suffer it ; being defamed, we entreat. We are become as the filth of the world, as the offscouring of all things unto this day," 1 Cor. iv, 13. Now, sir, whatever be thought of the others, we apprehend such clergy as these, labouring thus, unto the death, for such credit and wealth, are not chargeable with fraud and imposture.

VI. I have now finished what I had to say with regard to your book. Yet I think humanity requires me to add a few words concerning some points frequently touched upon therein, which perhaps you do not so clearly understand.

We have been long disputing about Christians, about Christianity, and the evidence whereby it is supported. But what do these terms mean ? Who is a Christian indeed ? What is real, genuine Christianity ? And what is the surest and most accessible evidence (if I may so speak) whereby I may know that it is of God ? May the God of the Christians enable me to speak on these heads, in a manner suitable to the importance of them !

Section I. 1. I would consider, First, Who is a Christian indeed ? What does that term properly imply ? It has been so long abused, I fear, not only to mean nothing at all, but, what was far worse than nothing, to be a cloak for the vilest hypocrisy, for the grossest abominations and immoralities of every kind, that it is high time to rescue it out of the hands of wretches that are a reproach to human nature ; to show determinately what manner of man he is, to whom this name of right belongs.

2. A Christian cannot think of the Author of his being without abasing himself before Him ; without a deep sense of the distance between a worm of earth, and Him that sitteth on the circle of the heavens. In His presence he sinks into the dust, knowing himself to be less than nothing in His eye ; and being conscious, in a manner words cannot express, of his own littleness, ignorance, foolishness. So that he can only cry out, from the fulness of his heart, " O God ! what is man ? what am I ?"

3. He has a continual sense of his dependence on the Parent of good for his being, and all the blessings that attend it. To Him he refers every natural and every moral endowment ; with all that is commonly

ascribed either to fortune, or to the wisdom, courage, or merit of the possessor. And hence he acquiesces in whatsoever appears to be His will, not only with patience, but with thankfulness. He willingly resigns all he is, all he has, to His wise and gracious disposal. The ruling temper of his heart is the most absolute submission, and the tenderest gratitude, to his sovereign Benefactor. And this grateful love creates filial fear; an awful reverence toward Him, and an earnest care not to give place to any disposition, not to admit an action, word, or thought, which might in any degree displease that indulgent Power to whom he owes his life, breath, and all things.

4. And as he has the strongest affection for the Fountain of all good, so he has the firmest confidence in Him; a confidence which neither pleasure nor pain, neither life nor death, can shake. But yet this, far from creating sloth or indolence, pushes him on to the most vigorous industry. It causes him to put forth all his strength, in obeying Him in whom he confides. So that he is never faint in his mind, never weary of doing whatever he believes to be His will. And as he knows the most acceptable worship of God is to imitate Him he worships, so he is continually labouring to transcribe into himself all His imitable perfections; in particular, His justice, mercy, and truth, so eminently displayed in all His creatures.

5. Above all, remembering that God is love, he is conformed to the same likeness. He is full of love to his neighbour; of universal love; not confined to one sect or party; not restrained to those who agree with him in opinions, or in outward modes of worship; or to those who are allied to him by blood, or recommended by nearness of place. Neither does he love those only that love him, or that are endeared to him by intimacy of acquaintance. But his love resembles that of Him whose mercy is over all His works. It soars above all these scanty bounds, embracing neighbours and strangers, friends and enemies; yea, not only the good and gentle, but also the froward, the evil and unthankful. For he loves every soul that God has made; every child of man, of whatever place or nation. And yet this universal benevolence does in no wise interfere with a peculiar regard for his relations, friends, and benefactors; a fervent love for his country; and the most endeared affection to all men of integrity, of clear and generous virtue.

6. His love, as to these, so to all mankind, is in itself generous and disinterested; springing from no view of advantage to himself, from no regard to profit or praise; no, nor even the pleasure of loving. This is the daughter, not the parent, of his affection. By experience he knows that social love, if it mean the love of our neighbour, is absolutely different from self-love, even of the most allowable kind; just as different as the objects at which they point. And yet it is sure, that, if they are under due regulations, each will give additional force to the other, till they mix together never to be divided.

7. And this universal, disinterested love is productive of all right affections. It is fruitful of gentleness, tenderness, sweetness; of humanity, courtesy, and affability. It makes a Christian rejoice in the virtues of all, and bear a part in their happiness; at the same time that he sympathizes with their pains, and compassionates their infirmities. It creates modesty, condescension, prudence, together with calmness

and evenness of temper. It is the parent of generosity, openness, and frankness, void of jealousy and suspicion. It begets candour, and willingness to believe and hope whatever is kind and friendly of every man; and invincible patience, never overcome of evil, but overcoming evil with good.

8. The same love constrains him to converse, not only with a strict regard to truth, but with artless sincerity and genuine simplicity, as one in whom there is no guile. And, not content with abstaining from all such expressions as are contrary to justice or truth, he endeavours to refrain from every unloving word, either to a present or of an absent person; in all his conversation aiming at this, either to improve himself in knowledge or virtue, or to make those with whom he converses some way wiser, or better, or happier than they were before.

9. The same love is productive of all right actions. It leads him into an earnest and steady discharge of all social offices, of whatever is due to relations of every kind; to his friends, to his country, and to any particular community whereof he is a member. It prevents his willingly hurting or grieving any man. It guides him into a uniform practice of justice and mercy, equally extensive with the principle whence it flows. It constrains him to do all possible good, of every possible kind, to all men; and makes him invariably resolved, in every circumstance of life, to do that, and that only, to others, which, supposing he were himself in the same situation, he would desire they should do to him.

10. And as he is easy to others, so he is easy in himself. He is free from the painful swellings of pride, from the flames of anger, from the impetuous gusts of irregular self-will. He is no longer tortured with envy or malice, or with unreasonable and hurtful desire. He is no more enslaved to the pleasures of sense, but has the full power both over his mind and body, in a continued cheerful course of sobriety, of temperance and chastity. He knows how to use all things in their place, and yet is superior to them all. He stands above those low pleasures of imagination which captivate vulgar minds, whether arising from what mortals term greatness, or from novelty, or beauty. All these too he can taste, and still look upward; still aspire to nobler enjoyments. Neither is he a slave to fame; popular breath affects not him; he stands steady and collected in himself.

11. And he who seeks no praise, cannot fear dispraise. Censure gives him no uneasiness, being conscious to himself that he would not willingly offend, and that he has the approbation of the Lord of all. He cannot fear want, knowing in whose hand is the earth and the fulness thereof, and that it is impossible for him to withhold from one that fears him any manner of thing that is good. He cannot fear pain, knowing it will never be sent, unless it be for his real advantage; and that then his strength will be proportioned to it, as it has always been in times past. He cannot fear death; being able to trust Him he loves with his soul as well as his body; yea, glad to leave the corruptible body in the dust, till it is raised incorruptible and immortal. So that, in honour or shame, in abundance or want, in ease or pain, in life or in death, always, and in all things, he has learned to be content, to be easy, thankful, happy.

12. He is happy in knowing there is a God, an intelligent Cause and Lord of all, and that he is not the produce either of blind chance or

inexorable necessity. He is happy in the full assurance he has that this Creator and End of all things is a Being of boundless wisdom, of infinite power to execute all the designs of his wisdom, and of no less infinite goodness to direct all his power to the advantage of all his creatures. Nay, even the consideration of his immutable justice, rendering to all their due, of his unspotted holiness, of his all-sufficiency in himself, and of that immense ocean of all perfections which centre in God from eternity to eternity, is a continual addition to the happiness of a Christian.

13. A farther addition is made thereto, while, in contemplating even the things that surround him, that thought strikes warmly upon his heart,—

These are thy glorious works, Parent of Good!

while he takes knowledge of the invisible things of God, even his eternal power and wisdom in the things that are seen, the heavens, the earth, the fowls of the air, the lilies of the field. How much more, while, rejoicing in the constant care which he still takes of the work of his own hand, he breaks out, in a transport of love and praise, “O Lord our Governor, how excellent are thy ways in all the earth! Thou that hast set thy glory above the heavens!” While he, as it were, sees the Lord sitting upon his throne, and ruling all things well; while he observes the general providence of God, coëxtended with his whole creation, and surveys all the effects of it in the heavens and earth, as a well-pleased spectator; while he sees the wisdom and goodness of his general government descending to every particular, so presiding over the whole universe as over a single person, so watching over every single person as if he were the whole universe; how does he exult when he reviews the various traces of the Almighty goodness, in what has befallen himself in the several circumstances and changes of his own life! all which he now sees have been allotted to him, and dealt out in number, weight, and measure. With what triumph of soul, in surveying either the general or particular providence of God, does he observe every line pointing out a hereafter, every scene opening into eternity!

14. He is peculiarly and inexpressibly happy, in the clearest and fullest conviction, “This all powerful, all wise, all gracious Being, this Governor of all loves me. This Lover of my soul is always with me, is never absent, no, not for a moment. And I love him: there is none in heaven but thee, none on earth that I desire beside thee! And he has given me to resemble himself; he has stamped his image on my heart. And I live unto him; I do only his will; I glorify him with my body and my spirit. And it will not be long before I shall die unto him; I shall die into the arms of God. And then farewell sin and pain; then it only remains that I should live with him for ever.”

15. This is the plain, naked portraiture of a Christian. But be not prejudiced against him for his name. Forgive his particularities of opinion, and (what you think) superstitious modes of worship. These are circumstances but of small concern, and do not enter into the essence of his character. Cover them with a veil of love, and look at the substance,—his tempers, his holiness, his happiness.

Can calm reason conceive either a more amiable or a more desirable character?

Is it your own? Away with names! Away with opinions! I care not what you are called. I ask not (it does not deserve a thought) what opinion you are of, so you are conscious to yourself, that you are the man whom I have been (however faintly) describing.

Do not you know, you ought to be such? Is the Governor of the world well pleased that you are not?

Do you (at least) desire it? I would to God that desire may penetrate your inmost soul; and that you may have no rest in your spirit till you are, not only almost, but altogether, a Christian!

Section II. 1. The Second point to be considered is, What is real, genuine Christianity? whether we speak of it as a principle in the soul, or as a scheme or system of doctrine.

Christianity, taken in the latter sense, is that system of doctrine which describes the character above recited, which promises, it shall be mine, (provided I will not rest till I attain,) and which tells me how I may attain it.

2. First. It describes this character in all its parts, and that in the most lively and affecting manner. The main lines of this picture are beautifully drawn in many passages of the Old Testament. These are filled up in the New, retouched and finished with all the art of God.

The same we have in miniature more than once; particularly in the thirteenth chapter of the former Epistle to the Corinthians, and in that discourse which St. Matthew records as delivered by our Lord at his entrance upon his public ministry.

3. Secondly. Christianity promises this character shall be mine, if I will not rest till I attain it. This is promised both in the Old Testament and the New. Indeed the New is, in effect, all a promise; seeing every description of the servants of God mentioned therein has the nature of a command; in consequence of those general injunctions: "Be ye followers of me, as I am of Christ," 1 Cor. xi, 1: "Be ye followers of them who through faith and patience inherit the promises," Heb. vi, 12. And every command has the force of a promise, in virtue of those general promises: "A new heart will I give you, and I will put my Spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes, and ye shall keep my judgments and do them," Ezek. xxxvi, 26, 27. "This is the covenant that I will make after those days, saith the Lord; I will put my laws into their minds, and write them in their hearts," Heb. viii, 10. Accordingly, when it is said, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind," Matt. xxii, 37; it is not only a direction what I shall do, but a promise of what God will do in me; exactly equivalent with what is written elsewhere: "The Lord thy God will circumcise thy heart and the heart of thy seed," (alluding to the custom then in use,) "to love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul," Deut. xxx, 6.

4. This being observed, it will readily appear to every serious person, who reads the New Testament with that care which the importance of the subject demands, that every particular branch of the preceding character is manifestly promised therein; either explicitly, under the very form of a promise, or virtually, under that of description or command.

5. Christianity tells me, in the Third place, how I may attain the promise ; namely, by faith.

But what is faith ? Not an opinion, no more than it is a form of words ; not any number of opinions put together, be they ever so true. A string of opinions is no more Christian faith, than a string of beads is Christian holiness.

It is not an assent to any opinion, or any number of opinions. A man may assent to three, or three-and-twenty creeds : he may assent to all the Old and New Testament, (at least, as far as he understands them,) and yet have no Christian faith at all.

6. The faith by which the promise is attained is represented by Christianity, as a power wrought by the Almighty in an immortal spirit, inhabiting a house of clay, to see through that veil into the world of spirits, into things invisible and eternal ; a power to discern those things which with eyes of flesh and blood no man hath seen or can see, either by reason of their nature, which (though they surround us on every side) is not perceivable by these gross senses ; or by reason of their distance, as being yet afar off in the bosom of eternity.

7. This is Christian faith in the general notion of it. In its more particular notion, it is a divine evidence or conviction wrought in the heart, that God is reconciled to me through his Son ; inseparably joined with a confidence in him, as a gracious reconciled Father, as for all things, so especially for all those good things which are invisible and eternal.

To believe (in the Christian sense) is, then, to walk in the light of eternity ; and to have a clear sight of, and confidence in, the Most High, reconciled to me through the Son of his love.

8. Now, how highly desirable is such a faith, were it only on its own account ! For how little does the wisest of men know of any thing more than he can see with his eyes ! What clouds and darkness cover the whole scene of things invisible and eternal ! What does he know even of himself as to his invisible part ? what of his future manner of existence ? How melancholy an account does the prying, learned philosopher, (perhaps the wisest and best of all Heathens,) the great, the venerable Marcus Antoninus, give of these things ! What was the result of all his serious researches, of his high and deep contemplations ? “ Either dissipation, (of the soul as well as the body, into the common, unthinking mass,) or reabsorption into the universal fire, the unintelligent source of all things ; or some unknown manner of conscious existence, after the body sinks to rise no more.” One of these three he supposed must succeed death ; but which, he had no light to determine. Poor Antoninus ! with all his wealth, his honour, his power ! with all his wisdom and philosophy,

What points of knowledge did he gain ?
That life is sacred all,—and vain !
Sacred, how high, and vain, how low,
He could not tell ; but died to know.

9. “ He died to know ! ” and so must you, unless you are now a partaker of Christian faith. O consider this ! Nay, and consider, not only how little you know of the immensity of the things that are beyond sense and time, but how uncertainly do you know even that little ! How faintly

glimmering a light is that you have! Can you properly be said to know any of these things? Is that knowledge any more than bare conjecture? And the reason is plain. You have no senses suitable to invisible or eternal objects. What desiderata then, especially to the rational, the reflecting, part of mankind are these? A more extensive knowledge of things invisible and eternal; a greater certainty in whatever knowledge of them we have; and, in order to both, faculties capable of discerning things invisible.

10. Is it not so? Let impartial reason speak. Does not every thinking man want a window, not so much in his neighbour's, as in his own, breast? He wants an opening there, of whatever kind, that might let in light from eternity. He is pained to be thus feeling after God so darkly, so uncertainly; to know so little of God, and indeed so little of any beside material objects. He is concerned that he must see even that little, not directly, but in the dim, sullied glass of sense; and consequently so imperfectly and obscurely, that it is all a mere enigma still.

11. Now, these very desiderata faith supplies. It gives a more extensive knowledge of things invisible, showing what eye had not seen, nor ear heard, neither could it before enter into our heart to conceive. And all these it shows in the clearest light, with the fullest certainty and evidence. For it does not leave us to receive our notices of them by mere reflection from the dull glass of sense; but resolves a thousand enigmas of the highest concern by giving faculties suited to things invisible. O who would not wish for such a faith, were it only on these accounts! How much more, if by this I may receive the promise, I may attain all that holiness and happiness!

12. So Christianity tells me; and so I find it, may every real Christian say. I now am assured that these things are so: I experience them in my own breast. What Christianity (considered as a doctrine) promised, is accomplished in my soul. And Christianity, considered as an inward principle, is the completion of all those promises. It is holiness and happiness, the image of God impressed on a created spirit; a fountain of peace and love springing up into everlasting life.

Section III. 1. And this I conceive to be the strongest evidence of the truth of Christianity. I do not undervalue traditional evidence. Let it have its place and its due honour. It is highly serviceable in its kind, and in its degree. And yet I cannot set it on a level with this.

It is generally supposed, that traditional evidence is weakened by length of time; as it must necessarily pass through so many hands, in a continued succession of ages. But no length of time can possibly affect the strength of this internal evidence. It is equally strong, equally new, through the course of seventeen hundred years. It passes now, even as it has done from the beginning, directly from God into the believing soul. Do you suppose time will ever dry up this stream? O no! It shall never be cut off:

Labitur et labetur in omne volubilis ævum.

(It flows on, and will for ever flow.)

2. Traditional evidence is of an extremely complicated nature, necessarily including so many and so various considerations, that only men of a strong and clear understanding can be sensible of its full force. On the contrary, how plain and simple is this; and how level to the lowest

capacity! Is not this the sum: "One thing I know; I was blind, but now I see?" An argument so plain, that a peasant, a woman, a child, may feel all its force.

3. The traditional evidence of Christianity stands, as it were, a great way off; and therefore, although it speaks loud and clear, yet makes a less lively impression. It gives us an account of what was transacted long ago, in far distant times as well as places. Whereas the inward evidence is intimately present to all persons, at all times, and in all places. It is nigh thee, in thy mouth and in thy heart, if thou believest in the Lord Jesus Christ. "This," then, "is the record," this is the evidence, emphatically so called, "that God hath given unto us eternal life; and this life is in his Son."

4. If, then, it were possible (which I conceive it is not) to shake the traditional evidence of Christianity, still he that has the internal evidence (and every true believer hath the witness or evidence in himself) would stand firm and unshaken. Still he could say to those who were striking at the external evidence, "Beat on the sack of Anaxagoras." But you can no more hurt my evidence of Christianity, than the tyrant could hurt the spirit of that wise man.

5. I have sometimes been almost inclined to believe, that the wisdom of God has, in most later ages, permitted the external evidence of Christianity to be more or less clogged and incumbered for this very end, that men (of reflection especially) might not altogether rest there, but be constrained to look into themselves also, and attend to the light shining in their hearts.

Nay, it seems (if it may be allowed for us to pry so far into the reasons of the divine dispensations) that, particularly in this age, God suffers all kind of objections to be raised against the traditional evidence of Christianity, that men of understanding, though unwilling to give it up, yet, at the same time they defend this evidence, may not rest the whole strength of their cause thereon, but seek a deeper and firmer support for it.

6. Without this I cannot but doubt, whether they can long maintain their cause; whether, if they do not obey the loud call of God, and lay far more stress than they have hitherto done on this internal evidence of Christianity, they will not, one after another, give up the external, and (in heart at least) go over to those whom they are now contending with; so that in a century or two the people of England will be fairly divided into real Deists and real Christians.

And I apprehend this would be no loss at all, but rather an advantage to the Christian cause; nay, perhaps it would be the speediest, yea, the only effectual, way of bringing all reasonable Deists to be Christians.

7. May I be permitted to speak freely? May I, without offence, ask of you that are called Christians, what real loss would you sustain in giving up your present opinion, that the Christian system is of God? Though you bear the name, you are not Christians: you have neither Christian faith nor love. You have no divine evidence of things unseen; you have not entered into the holiest by the blood of Jesus. You do not love God with all your heart; neither do you love your neighbour as yourself. You are neither happy nor holy. You have not learned in every state therewith to be content; to rejoice evermore, even in

want, pain, death ; and in every thing to give thanks. You are not holy in heart ; superior to pride, to anger, to foolish desires. Neither are you holy in life ; you do not walk as Christ also walked. Does not the main of your Christianity lie in your opinion, decked with a few outward observances ? For as to morality, even honest, Heathen morality, (O let me utter a melancholy truth !) many of those whom you style Deists, there is reason to fear, have far more of it than you.

8. Go on, gentlemen, and prosper. Shame these nominal Christians out of that poor superstition which they call Christianity. Reason, rally, laugh them out of their dead, empty forms, void of spirit, of faith, of love. Convince them, that such mean pageantry (for such it manifestly is, if there is nothing in the heart correspondent with the outward show) is absolutely unworthy, you need not say of God, but even of any man that is endued with common understanding. Show them, that while they are endeavouring to please God thus, they are only beating the air. Know your time ; press on ; push your victories, till you have conquered all that know not God. And then He, whom neither they nor you know now, shall rise and gird himself with strength, and go forth in his almighty love, and sweetly conquer you all together.

9. O that the time were come ! How do I long for you to be partakers of the exceeding great and precious promise ! How am I pained when I hear any of you using those silly terms, which the men of form have taught you, calling the mention of the only thing you want, *cant* ! the deepest wisdom, the highest happiness, *enthusiasm* ! What ignorance is this ! How extremely despicable would it make you in the eyes of any but a Christian ! But he cannot despise you, who loves you as his own soul, who is ready to lay down his life for your sake.

10. Perhaps you will say, " But this internal evidence of Christianity affects only those in whom the promise is fulfilled. It is no evidence to me." There is truth in this objection. It does affect them chiefly, but it does not affect them only. It cannot, in the nature of things, be so strong an evidence to others as it is to them. And yet it may bring a degree of evidence, it may reflect some light on you also.

For, First, you see the beauty and loveliness of Christianity, when it is rightly understood ; and you are sure there is nothing to be desired in comparison of it.

Secondly. You know the Scripture promises this, and says, it is attained by faith, and by no other way.

Thirdly. You see clearly how desirable Christian faith is, even on account of its own intrinsic value.

Fourthly. You are a witness, that the holiness and happiness above described can be attained no other way. The more you have laboured after virtue and happiness, the more convinced you are of this. Thus far then you need not lean upon other men ; thus far you have personal experience.

Fifthly. What reasonable assurance can you have of things whereof you have not personal experience ? Suppose the question were, Can the blind be restored to sight ? This you have not yourself experienced. How then will you know that such a thing ever was ? Can there be an easier or surer way than to talk with one or some number of men who were blind, but are now restored to sight ? They cannot be deceived as

to the fact in question ; the nature of the thing leaves no room for this. And if they are honest men, (which you may learn from other circumstances,) they will not deceive you.

Now, transfer this to the case before us : And those who were blind, but now see,—those who were sick many years, but now are healed,—those who were miserable, but now are happy,—will afford you also a very strong evidence of the truth of Christianity ; as strong as can be in the nature of things, till you experience it in your own soul : and this, though it be allowed they are but plain men, and, in general, of weak understanding ; nay, though some of them should be mistaken in other points, and hold opinions which cannot be defended.

11. All this may be allowed concerning the primitive Fathers ; I mean particularly Clemens Romanus, Ignatius, Polycarp, Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Origen, Clemens Alexandrinus, Cyprian ; to whom I would add Macarius and Ephraim Syrus.

I allow that some of these had not strong natural sense, that few of them had much learning, and none the assistances which our age enjoys in some respects above all that went before.

Hence I doubt not but whoever will be at the pains of reading over their writings for that poor end, will find many mistakes, many weak suppositions, and many ill drawn conclusions.

12. And yet I exceedingly reverence them, as well as their writings, and esteem them very highly in love. I reverence them, because they were Christians, such Christians as are above described. And I reverence their writings, because they describe true, genuine Christianity, and direct us to the strongest evidence of the Christian doctrine.

Indeed, in addressing the Heathens of those times, they intermix other arguments ; particularly, that drawn from the numerous miracles which were then performed in the church ; which they needed only to open their eyes and see daily wrought in the face of the sun.

But still they never relinquish this : “What the Scripture promises, I enjoy. Come and see what Christianity has done here ; and acknowledge it is of God.”

I reverence these ancient Christians (with all their failings) the more, because I see so few Christians now ; because I read so little in the writings of later times, and hear so little, of genuine Christianity ; and because most of the modern Christians, (so called,) not content with being wholly ignorant of it, are deeply prejudiced against it, calling it enthusiasm, and I know not what.

That the God of power and love may make both them, and you, and me, such Christians as those Fathers were, is the earnest prayer of,

Reverend Sir, your real friend and servant.

JANUARY 24, 1748-9.

A LETTER TO A ROMAN CATHOLIC.

1. You have heard ten thousand stories of us who are commonly called Protestants, of which, if you believe only one in a thousand, you must think very hardly of us. But this is quite contrary to our Lord's rule, “Judge not, that ye be not judged ;” and has many ill con-

sequences; particularly this,—it inclines us to think as hardly of you. Hence we are on both sides less willing to help one another, and more ready to hurt each other. Hence brotherly love is utterly destroyed; and each side looking on the other as monsters, gives way to anger, hatred, malice, to every unkind affection; which have frequently broke out in such inhuman barbarities as are scarce named among the Heathens.

2. Now, can nothing be done, even allowing us on both sides to retain our own opinions, for the softening our hearts toward each other the giving a check to this flood of unkindness, and restoring at least some small degree of love among our neighbours and countrymen? Do not you wish for this? Are you not fully convinced, that malice, hatred, revenge, bitterness, whether in us or in you, in our hearts or yours, are an abomination to the Lord? Be our opinions right, or be they wrong, these tempers are undeniably wrong. They are the broad road that leads to destruction, to the nethermost hell.

3. I do not suppose all the bitterness is on your side. I know there is too much on our side also; so much, that I fear many Protestants (so called) will be angry at me too, for writing to you in this manner; and will say, “It is showing you too much favour; you deserve no such treatment at our hands.”

4. But I think you do. I think you deserve the tenderest regard I can show, were it only because the same God hath raised you and me from the dust of the earth, and has made us both capable of loving and enjoying him to eternity; were it only because the Son of God has bought you and me with his own blood. How much more, if you are a person fearing God, (as without question many of you are,) and studying to have a conscience void of offence toward God and toward man?

5. I shall therefore endeavour, as mildly and inoffensively as I can, to remove in some measure the ground of your unkindness, by plainly declaring what our belief and what our practice is; that you may see, we are not altogether such monsters as perhaps you imagined us to be.

A true Protestant may express his belief in these or the like words:—

6. As I am assured that there is an infinite and independent Being, and that it is impossible there should be more than one; so I believe, that this One God is the Father of all things, especially of angels and men; that he is in a peculiar manner the Father of those whom he regenerates by his Spirit, whom he adopts in his Son, as co-heirs with him, and crowns with an eternal inheritance; but in a still higher sense, the Father of his only Son, whom he hath begotten from eternity.

I believe this Father of all, not only to be able to do whatsoever pleaseth him, but also to have an eternal right of making what and when and how he pleaseth, and of possessing and disposing of all that he has made; and that he of his own goodness created heaven and earth, and all that is therein.

7. I believe that Jesus of Nazareth was the Saviour of the world, the Messiah so long foretold; that, being anointed with the Holy Ghost, he was a Prophet, revealing to us the whole will of God; that he was a Priest, who gave himself a sacrifice for sin, and still makes intercession for transgressors, that he is a King, who has all power in heaven and in earth, and will reign till he has subdued all things to himself.

I believe he is the proper, natural Son of God, God of God, very God of very God; and that he is the Lord of all, having absolute, supreme, universal dominion over all things; but more peculiarly our Lord, who believe in him, both by conquest, purchase, and voluntary obligation.

I believe that he was made man, joining the human nature with the divine in one person; being conceived by the singular operation of the Holy Ghost, and born of the blessed Virgin Mary, who, as well after as before she brought him forth, continued a pure and unspotted virgin.

I believe he suffered inexpressible pains both of body and soul, and at last, death, even the death of the cross, at the time that Pontius Pilate governed Judea, under the Roman emperor; that his body was then laid in the grave, and his soul went to the place of separate spirits; that the third day he rose again from the dead; that he ascended into heaven; where he remains in the midst of the throne of God, in the highest power and glory, as Mediator till the end of the world, as God to all eternity; that, in the end, he will come down from heaven, to judge every man according to his works; both those who shall be then alive, and all who have died before that day.

8. I believe the infinite and eternal Spirit of God, equal with the Father and the Son, to be not only perfectly holy in himself, but the immediate cause of all holiness in us; enlightening our understandings, rectifying our wills and affections, renewing our natures, uniting our persons to Christ, assuring us of the adoption of sons, leading us in our actions; purifying and sanctifying our souls and bodies, to a full and eternal enjoyment of God.

9. I believe that Christ by his Apostles gathered unto himself a church, to which he has continually added such as shall be saved; that this catholic, that is, universal, church, extending to all nations and all ages, is holy in all its members, who have fellowship with God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; that they have fellowship with the holy angels, who constantly minister to these heirs of salvation; and with all the living members of Christ on earth, as well as all who are departed in his faith and fear.

10. I believe God forgives all the sins of them that truly repent and unfeignedly believe his holy Gospel; and that, at the last day, all men shall rise again, every one with his own body.

I believe, that as the unjust shall, after their resurrection, be tormented in hell for ever, so the just shall enjoy inconceivable happiness in the presence of God to all eternity.

11. Now, is there any thing wrong in this? Is there any one point which you do not believe as well as we?

But you think we ought to believe more. We will not now enter into the dispute. Only let me ask, If a man sincerely believes thus much, and practises accordingly, can any one possibly persuade you to think that such a man shall perish everlastingly?

12. "But does he practise accordingly?" If he does not, we grant all his faith will not save him. And this leads me to show you, in few and plain words, what the practice of a true Protestant is.

I say, a true Protestant; for I disclaim all common swearers, Sabbath breakers, drunkards; all whoremongers, liars, cheats, extortioners; in a word, all that live in open sin. These are no Protestants; they are

no Christians at all. Give them their own name; they are open Heathens. They are the curse of the nation, the bane of society, the shame of mankind, the scum of the earth.

13. A true Protestant believes in God, has a full confidence in his mercy, fears him with a filial fear, and loves him with all his soul. He worships God in spirit and in truth, in every thing gives him thanks; calls upon him with his heart as well as his lips, at all times and in all places; honours his holy name and his word, and serves him truly all the days of his life.

Now, do not you yourself approve of this? Is there any one point you can condemn? Do not you practise as well as approve of it? Can you ever be happy if you do not? Can you ever expect true peace in this, or glory in the world to come, if you do not believe in God through Christ? if you do not thus fear and love God? My dear friend, consider, I am not persuading you to leave or change your religion, but to follow after that fear and love of God without which all religion is vain. I say not a word to you about your opinions or outward manner of worship. But I say, all worship is an abomination to the Lord, unless you worship him in spirit and in truth; with your heart, as well as your lips; with your spirit, and with your understanding also. Be your form of worship what it will, but in every thing give him thanks; else it is all but lost labour. Use whatever outward observances you please, but put your whole trust in him; but honour his holy name and his word, and serve him truly all the days of your life.

14. Again: A true Protestant loves his neighbour, that is, every man, friend or enemy, good or bad, as himself, as he loves his own soul, as Christ loved us. And as Christ laid down his life for us, so is he ready to lay down his life for his brethren. He shows this love, by doing to all men, in all points, as he would they should do unto him. He loves, honours, and obeys his father and mother, and helps them to the uttermost of his power. He honours and obeys the king, and all that are put in authority under him. He cheerfully submits to all his governors, teachers, spiritual pastors, and masters. He behaves lowly and reverently to all his betters. He hurts nobody, by word or deed. He is true and just in all his dealings. He bears no malice or hatred in his heart. He abstains from all evil speaking, lying, and slandering; neither is guile found in his mouth. Knowing his body to be the temple of the Holy Ghost, he keeps it in sobriety, temperance, and chastity. He does not desire other men's goods; but is content with that he hath; labours to get his own living, and to do the whole will of God in that state of life unto which it has pleased God to call him.

15. Have you any thing to reprove in this? Are you not herein even as he? If not, (tell the truth,) are you not condemned both by God and your own conscience? Can you fall short of any one point hereof without falling short of being a Christian?

Come, my brother, and let us reason together. Are you right if you only love your friend and hate your enemy? Do not even the Heathens and publicans so? You are called to love your enemies; to bless them that curse you, and to pray for them that despitefully use you and persecute you. But are you not disobedient to the heavenly calling? Does your tender love to all men, not only the good, but also the evil

and unthankful, approve you the child of your Father which is in heaven? Otherwise, whatever you believe and whatever you practise, you are of your father the devil. Are you ready to lay down your life for your brethren? And do you do unto all as you would they should do unto you? If not, do not deceive your own soul: You are but a Heathen still. Do you love, honour, and obey your father and mother, and help them to the utmost of your power? Do you honour and obey all in authority? all your governors, spiritual pastors, and masters? Do you behave lowly and reverently to all your betters? Do you hurt nobody, by word or deed? Are you true and just in all your dealings? Do you take care to pay whatever you owe? Do you feel no malice, or envy, or revenge, no hatred or bitterness to any man? If you do, it is plain you are not of God: For all these are the tempers of the devil. Do you speak the truth from your heart to all men, and that in tenderness and love? Are you "an Israelite indeed, in whom is no guile?" Do you keep your body in sobriety, temperance, and chastity, as knowing it is the temple of the Holy Ghost, and that, if any man defile the temple of God, him will God destroy? Have you learned, in every state wherein you are, therewith to be content? Do you labour to get your own living, abhorring idleness as you abhor hell-fire? The devil tempts other men; but an idle man tempts the devil. An idle man's brain is the devil's shop, where he is continually working mischief. Are you not slothful in business? Whatever your hand finds to do, do you do it with your might? And do you do all as unto the Lord, as a sacrifice unto God, acceptable in Christ Jesus?

This, and this alone, is the old religion. This is true, primitive Christianity. O when shall it spread over all the earth! When shall it be found both in us and you? Without waiting for others, let each of us, by the grace of God, amend one.

16. Are we not thus far agreed? Let us thank God for this, and receive it as a fresh token of his love. But if God still loveth us, we ought also to love one another. We ought, without this endless jangling about opinions, to provoke one another to love and to good works. Let the points wherein we differ stand aside; here are enough wherein we agree, enough to be the ground of every Christian temper, and of every Christian action.

O brethren, let us not still fall out by the way! I hope to see you in heaven. And if I practise the religion above described, you dare not say I shall go to hell. You cannot think so. None can persuade you to it. Your own conscience tells you the contrary. Then if we cannot as yet think alike in all things, at least we may love alike. Herein we cannot possibly do amiss. For one point none can doubt a moment,—"God is love; and he that dwelleth in love, dwelleth in God, and God in him."

17. In the name, then, and in the strength, of God, let us resolve, First, not to hurt one another; to do nothing unkind or unfriendly to each other, nothing which we would not have done to ourselves. Rather let us endeavour after every instance of a kind, friendly, and Christian behaviour toward each other.

Let us resolve, Secondly, God being our helper, to speak nothing harsh or unkind of each other. The sure way to avoid this, is to say

all the good we can, both of and to one another : In all our conversation, either with or concerning each other, to use only the language of love ; to speak with all softness and tenderness ; with the most endearing expression, which is consistent with truth and sincerity.

Let us, Thirdly, resolve to harbour no unkind thought, no unfriendly temper, toward each other. Let us lay the axe to the root of the tree ; let us examine all that rises in our heart, and suffer no disposition there which is contrary to tender affection. Then shall we easily refrain from unkind actions and words, when the very root of bitterness is cut up.

Let us, Fourthly, endeavour to help each other on in whatever we are agreed leads to the kingdom. So far as we can, let us always rejoice to strengthen each other's hands in God. Above all, let us each take heed to himself, (since each must give an account of himself to God,) that he fall not short of the religion of love ; that he be not condemned in that he himself approveth. O let you and I (whatever others do) press on to the prize of our high calling ! that, being justified by faith, we may have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ ; that we may rejoice in God through Jesus Christ, by whom we have received the atonement ; that the love of God may be shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us. Let us count all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Jesus Christ our Lord ; being ready for him to suffer the loss of all things, and counting them but dung, that we may win Christ.

I am your affectionate servant, for Christ's sake.

DUBLIN, July 18, 1749.

A ROMAN CATECHISM.

FAITHFULLY DRAWN OUT OF THE ALLOWED WRITINGS OF THE
CHURCH OF ROME.

WITH A REPLY THERETO.

PREFACE.

IT has been a frequent complaint among some of the Romish Church, that the Protestants have misrepresented the doctrine of their Church : On the other side, the Protestants accuse the writers in that Church, of concealing, disguising, and palliating their doctrines. The latter justify their charge by producing such authors as have in several ages not only taught that doctrine, but taught it as the doctrine of their Church ; the former deny the charge, by appealing from particular authors to a higher authority, to councils and public acts and decrees, to missals, breviaries and catechisms. Now, though those Protestants are not to be blamed, when the authors they quote have been first licensed and approved in that Church, and were never afterward condemned by it ; yet in composing this catechism, to avoid contention as much as I can, I have generally observed their directions, and have seldom made use of particular authors, but when it is for the explication of a doctrine that is not sufficiently explained, or for confirmation of a doctrine generally received. I am very confident that the quotations throughout are true, having again and again examined them ; and I have been as careful as I could not to mistake the sense of them ; that I might rightly understand

and truly represent the doctrine which I profess to censure; for without a faithful and impartial examination of an error, there can be no solid confutation of it.

SECTION I.

OF THE CHURCH, AND RULE OF FAITH.

QUES. 1. WHAT is the Church of Rome?

ANS. The Church of Rome is that society of Christians which professes it necessary to salvation to be subject to the Pope of Rome,* as the alone visible head of the Church.†

REPLY. Christ is the Head, from whom the whole body is fitly joined together. And the holding to that Head (Col. ii, 19) is the one great note of the Church, given by St. Austin. (*De Unit. Eccles. c. 3, 4.*) But there is neither in Scripture nor antiquity any evidence for a visible head, and much less for the visible head, the Pope; and, least of all, that it is necessary to salvation to be subject to him.

If it is necessary to salvation to be subject to him, it is necessary to know who is the Pope; but that the world hath often been divided about, when there were sometimes three, and for about forty years together two, Popes.—Vide *Theod. Nicm. de Schism. Univers.*

Q. 2. How comes subjection to the Pope to be necessary to salvation, and an essential note of the Church?

A. Because the Pope is Christ's vicar, St. Peter's successor, (*Concil. Trid. Sess. 6; Decret. de Reform. 1; Bulla Pii IV, sup. Form. Juram.*) and hath the supreme power on earth over the whole Church. (*Concil. Trid. Sess. 14, c. 7.*) "The Church is called one, as it has one invisible Head,—Christ; and one visible, who doth possess the chair at Rome, as the lawful successor of St. Peter, prince of the Apostles." (*Catech. Rom. par. 1, c. 10, n. 11.*)

Rep. If Christ gave no such power to St. Peter, or the Pope be not St. Peter's successor, then the Pope has no pretence to this power. Now, we read that "Christ gave some Apostles, and some Prophets, for the work of the ministry and the edifying the body," Eph. iv, 11, 12. But that he gave one Apostle preëminence above the rest, much less absolute power over them, we read not. This power they were forbidden to attempt or desire; (*Matt. xx, 26;*) and St. Paul was so far from acknowledging it, that he challenged an equality with the rest of the Apostles, (*Gal. i, 15, 17,*) and, upon occasion, withstood St. Peter. (*Gal. ii, 11.*)

To this we may add the judgment of St. Cyprian: "The other Apostles are the same as St. Peter was, endowed with an equal fellowship of honour and power." (*Epist. de Unit. Eccles.*)

Q. 3. What authority doth the Church of Rome challenge?

A. She declares that she is the mother and mistress of all Churches;

* *Dicimus, definimus, pronunciamus absolute necessarium ad salutem, omni humanae creaturae subesse Romano Pontifici.* Extravag. c. *Unam sanctam de Majoritate et Obedientia.*

"We say, define, and pronounce, that it is absolutely necessary to salvation, for every man to be subject to the Pope of Rome."

† Bellarm. *De Eccles. milit. 1. 3, c. 2, sec. Nostra autem sententia; et cap. 5, sec. Respondeo neminem.*

(*Concil. Later. 4, can. 2*; *Concil. Trid. Sess. 7*; *De Bapt. can. 3, &c*;) and that to believe her so to be is necessary to salvation. (*Bulla Pii IV, super Form. Jur.*) Pope Innocent III thus decreed: "As God is called universal Lord, because all things are under his dominion; so the Church of Rome is called Catholic, or universal, because all Churches are subject unto her." (*Apud Baron. Annal. 1199.*)

Rep. As it was foretold, so it was fulfilled: "Out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem," Isaiah ii, 3. There the Church began; and therefore, in the Synodical Epistle of the Second General Council of Constantinople, Jerusalem is called "the mother of all Churches." (*Baron. A. D. 382, p. 461.*)

If she is the mistress because she is the mother, (as Pope Innocent I. would have it, *Epist. 1, Concil. tom. 4, p. 5.*) then Jerusalem was the mistress. If the mistress because she was once the imperial city, then Constantinople was so likewise; and accordingly it was decreed in the Fourth General Council, that of Chalcedon, can. 28, "That the Church of Constantinople should have equal privileges with that of Rome, because she is the imperial seat."

And if she claims this sovereign authority upon any other reason, she never had, nor can ever prove, a right to it.

This is confirmed by Pope Pius II, (when a cardinal,) who saith, that "before the time of the Nicene Council, little regard was had to the Church of Rome." (*Epist. 288, p. 602.*)

Q. 4. What use doth she make of this authority?

A. She requires all persons, upon her sole authority, to receive and believe the doctrines she proposes to be received and believed,* and without the belief of which she declares there is no salvation.†

Rep. "The Gospel which was preached of me, is not after man; for I neither received it of man, neither was I taught it, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ," Gal. i, 11, 12.

"Though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other Gospel unto you, than that which we have preached, let him be accursed." (Verses 8, 9.)

The Church of Rome cannot avoid St. Paul's anathema, when she requires to bow down before an image, which the Scripture forbids; and forbids to read the Scripture, which it requires.

And without doubt the text of the Apostle holds as much against any other, as against himself or an angel from heaven.

Q. 5. Doth not the Church of Rome acknowledge the Holy Scripture to be a sufficient rule for faith and manners?

A. No: for there are some doctrines proposed by that Church as matters of faith, and some things required as necessary duty, which are by many learned men among themselves confessed not to be contained in Scripture.

Rep. We read in Scripture of "the faith once delivered to the saints;"

* *Sacrosancta synodus omnibus Christi fidelibus interdicit, ne posthac de sanctissima Eucharistiâ aliter credere, docere aut prædicare audeant, quam ut est hoc præsentî decreto explicatum, atque definitum.*—*Concil. Trid. Sess. 13, Decret. de Euchar.* So again, *Sess. 25, Decret. de Purgatorio.* And there are above a hundred anathemas in that Council in point of doctrine against such as do not so believe.

† *Hanc veram catholicam fidem, extra quam nemo salvus esse potest:* That is, "This is the true Catholic faith, without which no man can be saved."—*Bulla Pii IV, super Form. Juram.*

Jude 3; and "all" or the whole "Scripture is profitable for doctrine for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness; that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works," 2 Tim. iii, 16, 17.

The Scripture, therefore, is a rule sufficient in itself, and was by men divinely inspired at once delivered to the world; and so neither needs, nor is capable of, any farther addition.

So Tertullian: "Let Hermogenes show that this thing is written. If it be not written, let him fear the wo pronounced against them that add to, or take from, Scripture." (*Contra Hermog. c. 22.*)

Q. 6. What doctrines of faith and matters of practice are thus acknowledged not to be in Scripture?

A. The doctrines of transubstantiation, (*Scotus in 4 Sent. Dist. 11, q. 3, et Yribarn in Scot.*) of the seven sacraments, (*Bellarm. l. 2, de Effectu Sacram. c. 25, sec. Secunda probatio,*) of purgatory, (*Roffens. contra Luther, art. 18,*) and the practice of half communion, (*Concil. Constan. Sess. 13, Cassander, art. 22,*) worshipping of saints and images, (*Bellarm. de Cult. Sanct. l. 3, c. 9, sec. Praterrea. Cassand. Consult. art. 21, sec. 4,*) indulgences, (*Polyd. Virg. de Invent. l. 8, c. 1,*) and service in an unknown tongue. (*Bellarm. de Verb. Dei, l. 2, c. 26.*)

Rep. On the contrary, St. Augustine writes, "If any one concerning Christ and his Church, or concerning any other things which belong to faith or life, I will not say if *we*, but (which St. Paul hath added) if *an angel from heaven*, preach unto you besides what ye have received in the Law and Evangelical Writings, let him be accursed." (*Contr. Petil. l. 3, c. 6.*) For as all faith is founded upon Divine authority, so there is now no Divine authority but the Scriptures; and, therefore, no one can make that to be of Divine authority which is not contained in them. And if transubstantiation and purgatory, &c. are not delivered in Scripture, they cannot be doctrines of faith.

Q. 7. What doth the Church of Rome propound to herself as an entire rule of faith?

A. Scripture with tradition; and she requires that the traditions be received and revered with the like pious regard and veneration as the Scriptures; and whosoever knowingly contemns them, is declared by her to be accursed. (*Concil. Trid. Sess. 4; Decret. de Can. Script.*)

Rep. "In vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men," Matt. xv, 9; forbidding that as unlawful which God hath not forbidden, and requiring that as necessary duty which God hath not required.

So St. Hierom: "The sword of God," his word, "doth smite those other things, which they find and hold of their own accord, as by Apostolical tradition, without the authority and testimony of Scripture." (*In Cap. 1, Aggwi.*)

Q. 8. What do they understand by traditions?

A. Such things belonging to faith and manners as were dictated by Christ, or the Holy Ghost in the Apostles, and have been preserved by a continual succession in the Catholic Church, from hand to hand, without writing. (*Concil. Trid. ib.*)

Rep. But St. Cyril affirms, "It behooveth us not to deliver, no, not so much as the least thing of the holy mysteries of faith, without the

Holy Scripture. That is the security of our faith, not which is from our own inventions, but from the demonstration of the Holy Scriptures." (*Catechis.* 5.)

Q. 9. What are those traditions which they profess to have received from Christ and his Apostles?

A. The offering the sacrifice of the mass for the souls in purgatory, (*Conc. Trid. Sess.* 22, c. 2,) the mystical benedictions, incensings, garments, and many other things of the like kind, (c. 5,) salt, spittle, exorcisms, and wax candles used in baptism, &c, (*Catech. Rom.* par. 2, c. 2, n. 59, 65, &c,) the priests shaving the head after the manner of a crown. (*Ib.* c. 7, n. 14.)

Rep. "Laying aside the commandment of God, ye hold the tradition of men," Mark vii, 8.

"It is necessary even for novices to learn the Scriptures, that the mind may be well confirmed in piety, and that they may not be accustomed to human traditions." St. Basil in *Reg. Brev. Reg.* 95.

The Church of Rome hath no more to show for their holy water, and incensings, and salt, and spittle, &c, than the Pharisees for their traditions; and since they no less impose them as divine than the other, they are alike guilty with them.

Q. 10. Doth the Church of Rome agree with other Churches in the number of canonical books of Scripture?

A. No: For she hath added to the canonical books of the Old Testament, Esdras, Tobit, Judith, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Baruch, the two Books of Maccabees,* and a new part of Esther and Daniel; which whole Books, with all their parts,† whosoever rejects as not canonical, is accursed. (*Concil. Trident. Sess.* 4, *Decret. de Scriplur.*)

Rep. These apocryphal books were wrote after prophecy and Divine inspiration ceased, and so were not received by the Jewish Church, (to whom "were committed the oracles of God," Rom. iii, 2,) nor by the Christian Church, as the Sixtieth Canon of the Council of Laodicea shows, where there is a catalogue of the canonical Books, without any mention of these.

"As therefore the Church doth read Tobias, Judith, and the books of the Maccabees, but doth not receive them into the canonical Scriptures; so it doth read the two volumes of Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus for the edification of the people, not to establish the authority of ecclesiastical principles." St. Jerome. (*In Prologo Proverb.*)—See *Bellarm. de Verbo*, l. 1, c. 10, *init.*

Q. 11. Are the people of the Church of Rome permitted to read the Scripture in a tongue vulgarly known?

A. No; they were for a time permitted to read it, under the caution of a license, where it could be obtained; (*Reg. Ind. Libr. Prohib. Reg.* 4;) but since they are forbid it, or to have so much as any summary or historical compendium of it in their own tongue. (*Index Libr. Prohib. Auctor. Sixti V. et Clem. VIII, Observat. circa 4 Regulam.*)

Rep. Under the Law, the people had the Scriptures in a tongue vul-

* These books are so sacred, as that they are of infallible truth.—*Bellarm. De Verbo*, l. 1, c. 10, *sec. Ecclesia vero.*

† Wherefore doth the Council add, "with all their parts;" unless that all should understand those parts also, about which there was some time a dispute, to belong to the sacred canon of the Bible?—*Ib.* c. 7, *sec. Denique.*

garily known ; and they were required to read the law, and to be conversant in it : “ These words, which I command thee this day, shall be in thine heart, &c,” Deut. vi, 6 ; and accordingly our Saviour sends them thither : “ Search the Scriptures,” John v, 39. So St. Paul requires that his “ Epistle be read to all the brethren,” 1 Thess. v, 27 ; and if so, it was wrote in a language they understood. And so it was in the primitive Church ; therefore St. Chrysostom exhorts his hearers, though secular men, to provide themselves Bibles, the medicines of their souls, to be their perpetual instructors. (*Comment. in Coloss. iii, 16.*)

Q. 12. For what reason is the Scripture thus prohibited among them ?

A. “ Because,” say they, “ if it be permitted to be read every where, without difference, there would more prejudice than profit proceed from it.” (*Reg. Ind. Libr. Prohib. Reg.*)

Rep. In the Apostles’ times there were some that “ wrested the Scriptures to their own destruction ;” and yet the Apostle thought of no other expedient than to give the Christians a caution, that they were “ not also led away with the error of the wicked,” 2 Pet. iii, 16, 17. The way to prevent this, therefore, is, not to keep the Scriptures from the people, which “ were written for our learning,” Rom. xv, 4, but to exhort them to a diligent perusal of them : “ Ye err, not knowing the Scriptures,” Matt. xxii, 29.

“ The sheep should not cast away their skin, because wolves sometimes hide themselves under it.” (*St. Austin de Serm. Dom. in Monte.*)

Q. 13. Since the Scripture may be misunderstood, have they no judge to determine the sense of it ?

A. They say, “ It belongs to the Church” (of Rome) “ to judge of the sense of Scripture, and no one may presume to interpret the Scripture contrary to the sense which Mother Church hath held and doth hold.” (*Concil. Trid. Sess. 4, Decret. de Edit. et Usu Script.*)

It cannot be called the Church of God where the legitimate successor of St. Peter in the Roman Chair, and the undoubted vicar of Christ, doth not preside : What the Church doth teach is the express word of God ; and what is taught against the sense and consent of the Church, is the express word of the devil. (*Cardinal Hosius de expresso Dei verbo, pp. 642, 643.*)

Rep. While the Apostles were alive, the Churches of Christ, in matters of dispute, applied themselves to them, as in the point of circumcision ; Acts xv, 2 ; but since they of the Church of Rome can never prove the like intallibility in their Church, nor direct us where it is, we think ourselves as well in our Church as they can be in theirs ; and that as long as we have the Scripture, the Church is to be referred to the Scripture, and not the Scripture to the Church ; and that, as the Scripture is the best expounder of itself, so the best way to know whether any thing be of Divine authority, is to apply ourselves to the Scripture.

“ If I would have the Church demonstrated, it is not by human teachings, but by the Divine oracles.” (*St. Aug. de Unit. Eccles. cap. 3.*)

“ The way for understanding the Scriptures, is to demonstrate out of themselves concerning themselves.” (*Clem. Alex. Strom. l. 7, p. 757.*)

SECTION II.

OF REPENTANCE AND OBEDIENCE.

QUES. 14. WHAT doth the Church of Rome teach concerning repentance?

ANS. (1.) It teacheth that contrition, which is a sorrow for sin past, and a purpose of not committing it for the future, though perfected with charity, is not sufficient to reconcile a person to God without penance, or confession to a priest either in act or desire. (*Concil. Trid. Sess. 14, c. 4. Catech. Rom. Pars. 2, de Sacrament. Pœnit. n. 38.*)

A. (2.) She teacheth that attrition, or imperfect contrition, proceeding merely from the fear of hell, is equivalent to contrition, by virtue of confession; and that attrition doth dispose to receive the grace of the sacrament of penance, and leads to justification. (*Sess. 14, c. 4. Bellarm. de Pœnit. l. 2, c. 18 sec. Sed sciendum est.*)—See Question 77.

REPLY. Contrition is but another word for repentance; and repentance is a qualification for pardon and reconciliation: "A broken and a contrite heart, O God, thou wilt not despise," Psalm li, 17. "Repent, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out," Acts iii, 19. The same texts which make contrition sufficient, without confession to the priest, make attrition insufficient without there be contrition. And as the former doctrine of the insufficiency of contrition without confession, makes that necessary which God hath not made necessary; so this latter of the sufficiency of attrition upon confession to the priest without contrition, makes that unnecessary which God hath made necessary.

Q. 15. What is the judgment of the Church of Rome as to good works?

A. The Church of Rome doth affirm that the good works of justified persons do truly deserve eternal life; (*Concil. Trid. Sess. 6, c. 16*;) and if any one say that such works do not truly deserve an increase of grace here, and eternal life hereafter, let him be accursed. (*Ib. Can. 32.*)

"Our good works do merit eternal life, not only by virtue of God's covenant and acceptance, but also by reason of the work itself." (*Bellarm. de Justif. l. 5, c. 17.*)

Rep. Truly to deserve is to make God our debtor: "To him that worketh" (that is, that meriteth) "is the reward not reckoned of grace, but of debt," Rom. iv, 4. "But can a man be profitable to God?" Job xxii, 2. Our Saviour teaches us otherwise: "When ye shall have done all those things which are commanded you, say, We are unprofitable servants; we have done that which was our duty to do," Luke xvii, 10.

A command to do it, and grace to obey that command, and a "far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory," as a reward, (2 Cor. iv, 17,) will shame the pretence of real merit, and turn the anathema upon themselves. And they may as soon reconcile light and darkness, as the grace of God and merit of Christ to this doctrine.

Q. 16. But is there no allowance for such as have not good works of their own sufficient to merit for themselves?

A. Yes; there are indulgences to be obtained, by which persons may be discharged from the punishment of sin here and in purgatory; and if any affirm these indulgences to be useless, or that the Church hath no

power to grant them, he is accursed. (*Concil. Trid. Sess. 25, Decret. de Indulg.*)

The Popes and Prelates of the Church are judges appointed by God to remit faults and punishments in his name by an indulgence, if so be justice be satisfied through the application of the satisfaction of Christ and his saints. (*Bellarmin. de Indulg. l. 1, c. 5, sec. Jam vero.*)

Rep. What God binds, no person can untie; and what he unties, no man can bind. But this course of indulgence, still upheld in the Church of Rome, doth untie what God doth bind; it makes sin easy and cheap, and prostitutes the strict rules of Christianity to the basest purposes. For when a person can have a plenary indulgence for so trivial a satisfaction as the standing before the doors of St. Peter's Church at Rome, when the Pope blesses the people at Easter, it makes sin as easy to be committed as pardoned.

Q. 17. How far do those indulgences extend?

A. Sometimes to days, sometimes to years, nay, some of them were plenary indulgences;* some were for a discharge from punishments here, others from the pains of purgatory,† and some granted an eternal reward.

Q. 18. Upon what terms were those indulgences to be obtained?

A. By money,‡ pilgrimages,|| assisting the Pope,§ reciting certain prayers.¶

Rep. The scandal given by them was so notorious, that order was given by the Council of Trent for reforming the abuses of them; but when the Fathers thought fit not to discover those abuses, and only forbid wicked gain, (*Sess. 25, Decret. de Indulg.*) they left a large scope for making a gain of them. And two of the Popes under whom that Council sat, viz. Paul III, and Julius III, (*A Bull of Indulgence to the Fraternity of the Altar, Paris, 1550, v. B. Taylor's Defence, Part II, l. 2, p. 8.*) proceeded in the same course as their predecessors, if they did not exceed them; for by their Bulls, there is granted to all such of the Fraternity of the Holy Altar, as visit the church of St. Hilary of Chartres, during the six weeks of Lent, 775,700 years of pardon, besides fourteen or fifteen plenary indulgences. And since that, Urban VIII, (*Bullar. to 3, p. 74.*) and Clement X, (*A. D. 1671. Bull upon the Canonization of five Saints.*) have granted by their indulgence a plenary remission of sins.

Q. 19. Upon what pretence or reason is the doctrine and practice of indulgences founded?

* *Bellarmin. de Indulgent. l. 1, c. 9, init.* "Plenary indulgence doth take away all the punishment due to sin." *Ibid. sec. Indulgentiâ Quadragen.*

† *Ibid. c. 7, sec. Et quidem.*

‡ This is implied *Concil. Trid. Sess. 21, c. 9*, though it is called by the soft name of alms.

|| So many are granted to particular churches in Rome, for the benefit of pilgrims.

§ So those that upon his motion took up arms against the Albigenses, had by an indulgence the promise of an eternal reward. *Baron. ad A. D. 1179, n. 7.*

¶ So Pope Alexander VI granted to those that recited this prayer to the blessed Virgin, and St. Ann her mother, 30,000 years' indulgence.—"Hail Mary! full of grace! The Lord be with thee, thy grace with me! Blessed be thou among women; and blessed be St. Ann thy mother, from whom, O Virgin Mary, thou hast proceeded without sin and spot; but of thee hath Jesus Christ been born, the Son of the living God. Amen." *Thesaur. Var. Exercit. in Grat. Sodal. B. V. M. Bruxel. Edit. 2 An. 1658, p. 287.*

A. Upon works of supererogation,* that is, the overplus of the satisfactions of Christ and the saints, which is a treasury, (*Concil. Trid. Sess. 21, c. 9.*) committed to the Church's custody,† and to be disposed of as she sees meet. (*Bellarm. Ib. c. 3.*)

Rep. "The sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory that shall be revealed in us;" Rom. viii, 18: so 2 Cor. iv, 17. "Every one of us shall give an account of himself to God," Rom. xiv, 12. If there be no comparison betwixt the reward and our sufferings for it, then no one has merit to transfer to another; and if every man must give an account of himself, then no man can be saved by the merits of another. But suppose there is a superabundance of satisfactions in the saints; yet what need is there of them, when there is such an infinite value in the sufferings of Christ, who "by one offering hath for ever perfected them that are sanctified;" Heb. x, 14: or who gave the Church the power so to apply them?

Q. 20. Whither do the souls of those who die in a state of grace, but are not sufficiently purged from their sins, or have not had a plenary indulgence for the remission of them?

A. Such go to purgatory, a place of torment in the other world, near to hell, (*Bellarm. de Purg. l. 2, c. 6, sec. Quinta est.*) where they are to continue till they have made full satisfaction for their sins, and are thoroughly purged and prepared for heaven, whereinto no unclean thing can enter. (*Catech. Rom. par. 1, c. 6, n. 3.*)

Q. 21. How come those persons to be punished in the other world, who depart in a state of grace out of this?

A. Because they have not here fulfilled the penance imposed upon them, or due from them to God. (*Bellarm. de Indulg. l. 1, c. 6, 7.*) See Quest. 91.

Rep. That those that die in a state of grace are yet in a state of torment, and are to be purged in the other world, is contrary to Scripture and antiquity. "There is no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus," Rom. viii, 1. "Whom he justified, them he also glorified." (Verse 30.) "Who shall lay any thing to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth: who is he that condemneth?" (Verses 33, 34.) As justification and condemnation are here opposed by the Apostle, so are condemnation and glorification; and he that is justified upon the same reason that he cannot be condemned, shall be glorified. Now, the elect are justified before they go out of this world: and consequently shall have nothing laid to their charge in the next.

"The servants of God then have peace, then enjoy quiet rest and security, when, being drawn from these storms of the world, we arrive at the haven of our everlasting habitation and security; when, this death being ended, we enter into immortality." (*St. Cypr. de Mortal. sec. 2.*)

"To-day shalt thou be with me in paradise," Luke xxiii, 43. Paradise is acknowledged to be the seat of the blessed. (*Bellarm. de Sanct. Beat. l. 1, c. 3. Testim. 4.*) Now, if there was a purgation necessary for sinners, he that believed and repented not till the last moment of his

* "That supererogation is necessary to indulgence, no one can deny," saith *Bellarm. de Indulg. l. 1, c. 2, init.*

† So Pope Clem. VI, Constit. Extrav. in *Bellarm. ibid. sec. ult.*

life, might be well supposed to need it; and should have been sent rather to purgatory than paradise.

After the night of this life there is no purgation; and "it is better to be corrected and purged now, than to be sent to the torment there, where the time of punishing is and not of purging." (*Greg. Nazianz. Orat. 15, in Plag. Grand.*)

Q. 22. Of what continuance is the punishment of that state?

A. It is but for an appointed time; and the person is to continue in it till he is purged from his sin, and has suffered the punishment due to it. (*Catech. Ib.; Bellarm. De Purg. l. 2, c. 8, sec. Quantum ad primum.*)

Rep. The state that believers immediately enter upon after death, is said to be "life" for the comfort, and "everlasting" for the continuance, of it.

"He that believeth on Him that sent me hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation; but is passed from death unto life," John v, 24.

So St. Cyprian: "The end of this life being completed, we are divided into the habitations of everlasting, either death or immortality." (*Ad Demetr. sec. 16.*)

Q. 23. Is there no way by which the souls of those that are in purgatory may be delivered out of that prison, and their time of torment shortened?

A. They may be helped and delivered by the suffrages of the faithful that are alive; that is, by prayers, alms, and masses; and other works of piety, such as indulgences. (*Concil. Trid. Sess. 25, Decr. de Purgat.; Sess. 22, can. 3. Bellarm. de Purgat. l. 2, c. 16, sec. Ad hæc.*)

Rep. "Betwixt us and you there is a great gulf fixed, so that they which would pass from hence to you" (to relieve you) "cannot," Luke xvi, 26.

As the state in which Abraham and Lazarus were, needed no relief; so that in which the rich man was, could not obtain it. "After death is no help to be gotten by godliness or repentance. Lazarus doth not there go to the rich man, nor the rich man unto Lazarus. For the garners are sealed up, and the time is fulfilled." (*Epiphanius contr. Cathar. Hær. 59.*)

And if a man's own repentance cannot help him, much less can another's good works profit him.

So St. Jerome: "While we are in this world, we may be able to help one another, either by our prayers, or by our counsels: but when we shall come before the judgment seat of Christ, neither Job, nor Daniel, nor Noah, can intreat for any one; but every one must bear his own burden." (*Lib. 3, Com. in Galat. c. 6.*) And he elsewhere saith: "What shall be to all in the day of judgment, this is accomplished to every one at the day of death." (*In Joel, c. 2.*)

Q. 24. Is the doctrine of purgatory a matter of faith, and necessary to be believed?

A. Yes: for whosoever shall say that there is no debt of temporal punishment to be paid, either in this world or in purgatory, before there can be an admission into heaven, is accursed. (*Concil. Trid. Sess. 6, can. 30, & Sess. 25, Decret. de Purg.*) And whosoever shall say, The sacrifice of the mass is not to be used for the dead, is accursed. (*Ib. Sess. 22, can. 3.*) This is one of the principles, without the belief of which there is no salvation. (*Bulla Pii Quarti.*)

Rep. Bishop Fisher saith, that there is none or very little mention of purgatory among the ancients. (*Roffens. Lutheri Confut.* art. 18; & *Polyd. Virg. de Invent.* l. 8, c. 1.) It is then no little encroachment on the Christian world, to make it now a doctrine of faith, and to require it, upon pain of damnation, to be believed.

Q. 25. In what place were the souls of the Patriarchs, and other good men, before the coming of Christ?

A. Before the death and resurrection, (*Catech. Rom.* par. 1, c. 6, n. 3, 6,) or ascension of Christ, (*Bellarmin. de Christ.* l. 4, c. 11,) the gates of heaven were open to none; and the souls of good men departed were detained in a certain place called, *Limbus Patrum*, [Limbo of the Fathers,] which is the uppermost part of hell; the lowermost being the place of the damned; next above that, purgatory; next to that, *limbus infantum*; [limbo of infants;] above that, *limbus patrum*. (*Bellarmin. de Purg.* l. 2, c. 6, sec. *Quod autem.*)

Rep. We read that Elijah was taken up into heaven, 2 Kings ii, 11, and he and Moses appeared in glory, Luke ix, 30; Matt. xvii, 2. And Abraham is represented as in paradise, the blessed abode of good men in the other world, Luke xvi, 23.

So St. Austin expounds it: "The bosom of Abraham is the rest of the blessed poor, whose is the kingdom of heaven, into which, after this life, they are received." (*Quest. Evangel.* l. 2, c. 38.)

Q. 26. In what condition were they while thus detained in limbo?

A. They are not agreed in the nature and condition of the place: for the Catechism saith, "They were sustained by hope, and were without any sense of grief." (N. 3.) And presently, that, "although they were without other sense of grief, yet, being kept in suspense, they were tormented with the hope of that blessed glory which they did expect." (N. 4.)

Rep. But the Scripture tells us, that the state where Abraham was, was not only a state of rest, but also of comfort, Luke xvi, 25.

Q. 27. How and when were they delivered thence?

A. They were delivered by Christ at his descent into hell; (*Catech. Rom. ib.* n. 5, 6;) so that ever since that place remains empty. (*Bellarmin. de Purg.* l. 2, c. 6, sec. *Octava est.*)

Rep. The Scripture says not one word of this.

Q. 28. What use do they make of this doctrine?

A. Hereby they give a reason why there is neither precept nor example in the Old Testament for the invocation of saints departed, (*Bellarmin. de Sanct. Beat.* l. 1, c. 19, sec. *Item Erod.*) because they were, for their punishment, enclosed in this place, and were there held bound by the devils, till delivered by Christ. (*Catech. Rom. ib.* n. 5.) And so the people of those times only prayed to God; and did not use to say, "Holy Abraham, pray for me." (*Bellarmin. ib.*)

Rep. There is neither precept nor example for the invocation of saints in the New Testament; and if that be a reason for a *limbus* before Christ, it may be a reason for a *limbus* still; and they may as well exclude the saints from heaven now as then, if there be no more for their invocation in the New Testament than was in the Old. Thus Salmero, a learned disputant in the Council of Trent: "Invocations of saints have no express ground in all the Scriptures." (*Ad 1 Tim.* 2, Disp. 7, sec. *Sed cum autem et nec obstat.*)

SECTION III.

OF DIVINE WORSHIP.

QUES. 29. Of what doth the service in the Roman Church consist?

ANS. It consists of prayers and hymns offered to God, angels, and saints; of lessons taken out of the Scriptures, and legends; and of profession of faith in the creeds.

REPLY. Cardinal Quignonius, at the instance of Pope Paul the Third, reformed the Breviary; and instead of legends, set Scriptures for the lessons. But Pope Pius Quintus, who afterward undertook to reform it also, prohibited that of Quignonius, (*Bulla Prefixa Breviar. Rom. Jussu Pii V. Edit.*) and instead of the Scriptures, placed legends again; and so it continues.

Q. 30. In what language is their service performed?

A. It is performed in all places among them in the Latin tongue, which is in no place vulgarly understood.

Q. 31. Is the having the service in an unknown tongue enjoined in the Church of Rome?

A. Yes: it is required that it should be celebrated in the Latin tongue; and whosoever shall say that it ought only to be administered in the vulgar tongue, is accursed. (*Concil. Trid. Sess. 23, c. 8, & can. 9.*) Hence, when of late years the Missal, or Massbook, was translated into French, it was declared, by Pope Alexander the Seventh, to be a "seed plot of disobedience, rashness, and schism;" and he calls them that did it, "sons of perdition;" and doth "condemn, reprobate, and forbid" that Missal.

Rep. In divine worship, (as in all other actions,) the first thing to be considered is the end, and the next thing is the means conducing to that end. The end is the honour of God, and the edification of the Church; and then God is honoured, when the Church is edified. The means conducing to that end, are to have the service so administered as may inform the mind, engage the affections, and increase devotion: but that cannot be done, where the tongue it is celebrated in is not understood.

Thus we are taught by the Apostle: "He that speaketh in an unknown tongue, speaketh not unto men," 1 Cor. xiv, 2. "If I know not the meaning of the voice, he that speaketh shall be a Barbarian unto me," ver. 11. "If thou shalt bless with the Spirit," (by the gift of an unknown tongue,) "how shall he that occupieth the room of the unlearned say Amen at thy giving of thanks?" ver. 16. How can the people be attentive to the lessons, answer at the responses, be devout in the prayers, profess their faith in the creeds, when they do not understand what is read, prayed, or professed? Thus St. Ambrose, on 1 Cor. xiv: "It is evident that the mind is ignorant where the tongue is not understood. The unskillful person, hearing what he doth not understand, knows not the conclusion of the prayer, and doth not answer, Amen."

Q. 32. What are the objects of worship in the Church of Rome?

A. Besides the blessed Trinity, angels, the Virgin Mary, and saints.

Rep. Our Saviour says, "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve," Matt. iv, 10. As divine worship is due to God, so it is not lawful to give it to any other.

The Church of Rome doth acknowledge this, but says the worship they give to saints and angels is not of that kind. (*Catech. Rom.* par. 3 c. 2, n. 8; par. 4, c. 6, n. 3.)

But what worship is peculiar to God if prayer is not? So thought St. Ambrose: "Thou only art to be invocated." (*De Obitu Theodos.*)

For God alone can receive our prayer, or can give what we pray for, or be the object of our faith and trust.

Q. 33. What honour do they give to the angels?

A. (1.) The Church of Rome teaches that angels are to be worshipped, (*Catech. Rom.* par. 3, c. 2, n. 8, 9, *venerari, adorare, colere,*) invoked, and prayed to. (*Ib.* n. 10.) And they have litanies and prayers composed for this purpose. (*Litania, sec. Angelorum, vid. Horologium Tutelarum Angeli a Drevelio.* p. 84, Duac. 1623.)

A. (2.) They teach, that as every particular person hath a guardian angel from his birth, (*Catech. Rom.* par. 4, cap. 9, sec. 1, n. 4, 6,) so it is fit to commit themselves more particularly to him, (*Horolog. Drex.* p. 108,) after this manner: "Blessed angel! to whose care our loving Creator hath committed me, defend me this day, I beseech you, from all dangers, and direct me in the way I ought to walk." (*The Child's Catechism*, 1678.)

Rep. We honour the holy angels, as they are God's ministers, and are "sent forth to minister unto them that shall be heirs of salvation," Heb. i, 14. But, to worship or pray to them, we dare not, as it is what they themselves refuse and abhor, (Rev. xix, 10,) and the Scripture doth condemn as "a sign of a fleshly mind, vainly intruding into those things which we have not seen," Col. ii, 18. Theodoret, upon this text, saith, that the practice of worshipping angels continued a long time in Phrygia and Pisidia; wherefore the Synod of Laodicea doth forbid praying to angels: "For Christians ought not to forsake the Church of God, and depart aside and invoke angels, which are things forbidden." (*Conc. Laod. Can.* 35.)

Q. 34. What religious honour do they give to the saints?

A. They pray to them as their intercessors, make confessions to them, offer incense, and make vows to them, venerate their images and relics.

Q. 35. For what reason do they pray to saints?

A. That by their help they may obtain benefits from God, (*Concil. Trid. Sess. 25, de Invocat.*) who doth confer many favours upon mankind, by their merit, and grace, and intercession. (*Catech. Rom.* par. 3, c. 2, sec. 12.—*Missal. Rom. proprium Missarum de Sanctis.*)

Q. 36. After what manner do they pray to saints?

A. They pray to them as favourites with God, that they would take them into their protection, and would obtain those things of God for them which they want. Therefore, they plead that they have two different forms of prayer; for to God they properly say, "Have mercy upon us, hear us:" to a saint, "Pray for us." (*Catech. Rom.* par. 4, c. 6, n. 3.)

Q. 37. But have they not those forms in their Missals, Breviaries, and common books of devotion, which are particularly and immediately applied to the saints for obtaining what they want?

A. Yes; it is too manifest to be denied; and though they have been

more sparing of late years, yet nothing formerly more frequent. As, for instance: In a Missal printed at Paris, an. 1520, fol. 51, there is this prayer to St. Agnes:—

“O Agnes, woman of the Lamb, do thou enlighten us within! Destroy the roots of sin, O excellent Lady. After the grievances of the world, do thou translate us to the company of the blessed!”

Rep. “There is one God, and one Mediator between God and men, the Man Christ Jesus; who gave himself a ransom for all,” 1 Tim. ii, 5, 6.

“Who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died, yea, rather, that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us,” Rom. viii, 34.

As there is but one God to us, though “there are gods many, and lords many,” 1 Cor. viii, 5; so to us there is but “one Mediator,” or Intercessor, though we should grant there are many intercessors and mediators. For though the angels and saints may intercede for us in heaven, that no more makes them such intercessors as we may pray to, than because there are gods many, we may pray to them as we do to the true God.

The Scripture knows no difference between a Mediator of intercession and redemption: he alone makes intercession for us that died and rose, and is at the right hand of God. And he alone has a right to our prayers, and to him alone may we address them.

So Origen: “All prayers, and supplications, and thanksgivings, are to be sent up to God the Lord of all, by that High Priest who is above all angels, being the living Word of God.” (*L. 5. Cont. Cels.* pp. 233, 239.)

So again: “We ought to pray only to the God over all, and his only Son, the first-born of every creature, who, as our High Priest, offers his prayers to his God, and our God.” (*Lib. 8, pp. 395, 402.*)

To have other mediators and intercessors, is “not to hold the Head,” (*Coloss. ii, 19.*) in the judgment of the Apostle, and the Council of Laodicea, where it is said, “Christians ought not to forsake the Church and invoke angels. If any man, therefore, be found to give himself to this privy idolatry, let him be anathema; because he hath forsaken our Lord Jesus, the Son of God, and betaken himself to idolatry.”

Q. 38. What is the worship they give to the Virgin Mary?

A. They fly unto her as the advocatrix of the faithful, the mother of God; that by prayer to her they may obtain help through her most excellent merits with God. (*Catech. Rom. par. 4, cap. 5, n. 8.*)

Rep. We honour this blessed Virgin as the mother of the holy Jesus, and as she was a person of eminent piety; but we do not think it lawful to give that honour to her which belongs not to a creature, and doth equal her with her Redeemer.

Q. 39. Have they not some singular forms of devotion to her?

A. Yes; for, apprehending her to be in glory superior to all created beings, they offer a service to her, beyond what they give either to angels or saints.

Q. 40. After what manner do they apply themselves to her?

A. According to some Missals, they ask her to command her Son, by the right and authority of a mother; (*Missal. Paris. Anno 1520, folio 65;*) or, as it is in the Breviaries used at this day, “Show thyself a mother.” (*Brev. Rom. Fest. Assump.*) They pray to her, that she would loose the bands of the guilty, bring light to the blind, would

make them mild and chaste, and cause their hearts to burn in love to Christ. (*Officium B. M.* in the hymn called *Pluctus B. M.* Antwerp, 1641.)

In a book printed lately in London, the author saith, that “whatever gifts are bestowed upon us by Jesus, we receive them by the mediation of Mary; no one being gracious to Jesus that is not devoted to Mary; that the power of Mary in the kingdom of Jesus is suitable to her maternity; and though the condition of some great sinners may be so deplorable, that the limited excellency and merits cannot effectually bend the mercies of Jesus to relieve them; yet such is the acceptableness of the mother of Jesus to Jesus, that whosoever is under the verge of her protection, may confide in her intercession to Jesus;” that the person devoted to her, is to beg of her to accompany him as his “sacred guide, advocate, and champion, against the assaults of sin and sensuality.” (*Contemplations of the Life and Glory of Holy Mary, &c.* pp. 7–9, 14. Printed anno 1685.)

Much after the fore-cited manner did the Council of Constance invoke the blessed Virgin, as other Councils used to do the Holy Ghost, calling her the “mother of grace, the fountain of mercy;” and they call on her for “light from heaven.”

Rep. We cannot but wonder at the applications made to the blessed Virgin in the Church of Rome, whose acts on earth, and whose power in heaven, the Scripture doth very sparingly relate, or is altogether silent in. We read nothing there of her bodily assumption into heaven, nor of her exaltation to a throne above angels and archangels. (*Brev. Rom. Æstiv. Fest. Assump.*) We read nothing there of her being the mother of grace and mercy, (*Officium parvum B. M. ad Matutin. Catech.* par. 4, c. 5, n. 8,) the queen and gate of heaven, the advocatrix of sinners; (*Completor. Catech.* par. 4, c. 5, n. 8;) and of her power in destroying all heresies in the world, (*Fest. Assump.*) and being all things to all. (*Missale Paris. ib. & Le Psaullier de Jesus. Paris, 1620, p. 126.*)

When we read so much of the blessed Virgin in books of this kind, and so little of her in the divine writings, we cannot but reflect upon what is said by Epiphanius, of a certain sect of women that in his time offered cakes to the Virgin Mary, which he calls an “impious thing,” and altogether “contrary to the doctrine of the Holy Ghost.” (*Hæres.* 78, p. 1054. Par. 1622.) And he farther adds, “This the Holy Ghost doth warn us of, in that Christ saith, ‘Woman, what have I to do with thee?’ where he calls her woman, and as it were prophesying, to refute those schisms and heresies which he knew would arise in the world; and that no one being moved by a certain admiration of the blessed Virgin, might turn himself to those dotages of heresies.” And he adds, “Let the Virgin Mary be honoured, but the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost be adored.” (*Hæres.* 79, n. 4, 7, &c.) Much more hath that Father there to this purpose.

But what would this Father have said, if, instead of a chair adorned and set forth in honour of the Virgin Mary, (as those women did,) he had found her advanced to a throne of a mediatrix in heaven? What, if instead of cakes, there had been litanies and prayers offered to her, and that in more abundance than to Christ himself? What if he had found them praying, “O holy mother, succour the miserable, help the

weak, comfort those that mourn?" (*Breviar. Rom. Æstiv. Suffragia.*) I doubt not but he would have said of this, what he doth of the other, that they "would obtrude her upon us for God;" and have called it "heresy and idolatry."

Q. 41. What external representations or memorials have they in the Church of Rome, which they give veneration and worship to?

A. They have the relics and images of the Virgin Mary and saints. (*Concil. Trid. Sess. 25, de Invoc.*)

Q. 42. What do they mean by relics?

A. The bodies or remainders of them, or particular things belonging or relating to them when alive, as an arm, or thigh, bones, or ashes; (*Ex Decret. Regist. Præfix. Brev. Rom.*;) and the part in which they suffered; (*Catech. Rom. par. 3, c. 2, n. 15*;) or the things by which they suffered; as the chains with which St. Peter was bound. (*Brev. Rom. Par. Æstiv. Aug. Fest. Petri ad Vinc.*)

Rep. "He" (God by Michael) "buried Moses; but no man knoweth of his sepulchre unto this day," Deut. xxxiv, 6. S. Barradas the Jesuit, upon the place, saith, "It is the common opinion of Lyra, Abulensis, Cajetan, and others, that the sepulchre was hid, lest the Israelites, who were inclined to the worship of idols, should worship Moses as God. For they say, that when the devil would for that reason have showed the grave and the body of Moses to the Israelites, St. Michael hindered; and this was the contention spoken of Jude 9." (*Seb. Barrad. Itinerar. Fil. Israel.*)

They could give no greater honour to the body of Moses, than is given to relics in the Church of Rome; and if that was idolatry, and Moses's body was concealed to prevent it, then there is as much reason to think it unlawful now in this case, as it was then in that.

Q. 43. For what cause do they show this regard to relics?

A. By the veneration of them they obtain the help of the saints (*Concil. Trid. Sess. 25, de Invocat.*) whom the relics relate to; and many benefits are thereby conferred by God upon mankind; for by these the dead have been raised, the infirm cured, and devils cast out. (*Catech. Rom. ib. Breviar. Rom. ib.*)

Rep. We read of Hezekiah, (2 Kings xviii, 4,) that he "brake in pieces the brazen serpent that Moses had made:" And the reason was, because the children of Israel did burn incense to it. The brazen serpent was of God's own institution, (Num. xxi, 8;) by looking up to which the people were formerly cured. And though it was preserved as a memorial of that Divine operation: yet, when abused to idolatry, he cut it in pieces. And were these truly relics of saints, and did work those miracles they pretend, it would be no reason for that reverence and worship they give to them; but the reverence and worship given to them should, according to good king Hezekiah's practice, be a reason to give them a decent interment.

Q. 44. What kind of reverence or worship is required to be given to images and pictures in the Church of Rome?

A. They kiss them, uncover the head, and fall down before them; offer incense, and pray to them, and use all such postures of worship as they would do to the person or persons thereby represented, (whether Christ, the Virgin Mary or other saints,) if they were present: And

whosoever doth think otherwise, is accursed. (*Concil. Trid. Sess. 25, de Invocat. Catech. Rom. par. 4, c. 6, n. 4.*) And accordingly, the priest is to direct the people to them, that they may be worshipped. (*Ut Colantur, Catech. Rom. par. 3, c. 2, n. 24.*)

Rep. On the contrary, the Second Commandment teaches us, "Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of any thing that is in heaven above," &c. "Thou shalt not bow down thyself to them nor serve them." In which there are two words to be considered: The one *pesel*, which we rightly translate *graven image*; for it properly signifies any thing carved and cut out of wood or stone; and so it is about forty times rendered in the Greek translation, *γλαπιον*, "a graven thing." So that an idol and an image are there forbidden. The next word is *themulah*, which doth properly signify a *similitude* or *likeness*, (as is confessed,) and is always so translated. And thus it was understood by the Fathers. So Justin Martyr, when he recites this law, saith, "God forbid every image and similitude," *εικονα και ομοιωμα*. And therefore Cassander grants that the ancient Christians "abhorred all veneration of images." (*Consult. art. 21, de Imagin.*) Indeed, the command is so express against this practice, that there has been a kind of self-condemnation in the Church of Rome; whilst they commonly either altogether leave out this commandment, (*The Child's Catechism*, printed 1678,) or render it imperfectly and by halves: "Thou shalt not make to thee an idol."

Q. 45. What do they profess is their intention in the reverence they give to images and pictures?

A. They declare that the honour given to images and pictures is referred to the prototypes, (*Concil. Trid. ib.*) or the persons represented by them, whether God the Father, Christ, angels, or saints; and when they fall down before the image or picture, they worship God, or Christ, the angel, or saint.

Rep. If an image be a representation of a divine person, and worship be due to the image for the sake of the person represented in it; then, such as the person is, such must the worship be that is due to his image; and what is due to the person, if present, is due to the image in his absence. For to give one honour to the person, and another to the image; a superior to the person, and an inferior to the image; is to terminate the worship in the image, and not pass it from thence to the person, as Gretser, the Jesuit, argues: (*De Cruce*, l. 1, c. 49, sec. *Secundo itaque*.) But if it be to pass from the image unto the person, then we know what they do when they kiss, and uncover their heads, and bow down to, and worship an image; and have reason to remember the Apostle's advice: "Keep yourselves from idols," 1 John v, 21.

Q. 46. What regard have they to the material cross or crucifix?

A. (1.) They ascribe peculiar virtue to it, and pray that God would make the wood of the cross to "be the stability of faith, an increase of good works, the redemption of souls." (*Pontificale in Bened. Novæ Crucis.*)

(2.) They use all expressions of outward adoration, by kissings and prostrations, &c. (*Missale Fer. 6, In Parasc.*)

(3.) They pray directly to it, to "increase grace in the godly, and blot out the sins of the guilty." (*Ib. Sub Ante Domin. Pass. et Fest. Invent. Crucis.*)

(4.) They give *latría* to it, which is the sovereign worship that is peculiar to God. (*Pontif. Rom. Ordo ad Recep. Imper. Rubr. 1, et Gretser de Cruce, l. 1, c. 49.*)

Rep. The Church of Rome, though without any authority from Scripture, (which uses the words promiscuously,)* makes a distinction between *latría* and *douλία*: The former is the worship they give to God; the latter the worship they give to saints. Now, they grant, that to give *latría*, or sovereign worship, to any besides God, is idolatry; and that, were not the host the very body and blood of Christ, it would be no less than idolatry to give that honour to the host, which they give to Christ: We understand, then, how to call that worship they give to the cross: They themselves call it *latría*; so we may, by their leave, call it idolatry. For whatever the host is, the cross is but a representation, and not the person worshipped.

Q. 47. Do they think it lawful to represent God and the blessed Trinity by pictures and images, and to worship them?

A. Such pictures are not only almost every where received in the Church of Rome, but universally tolerated; (*Bellarmin. de Imag. l. 2, c. 8, sec. Ultimo probatur;*) and are both recommended as expedient for the people, (*Council. Trid. Sess. 25, de Sac. Imag. Catech. Rom. par. 3, c. 2, n. 20,*) and proposed to them to be worshipped. (*Cajetan. in Aquin. q. 25, art. 3.*)

Rep. There is nothing more expressly forbidden in Scripture, than the making any image or representation of God: "Take ye good heed unto yourselves, (for ye saw no manner of similitude,) lest ye corrupt yourselves; and make you a graven image, the similitude of any figure," Deut. iv, 15, 16. If it had been acceptable to God, he would have chosen a similitude to appear in; but seeing he did not, they were not to presume to make one for him. This is to "change his glory," Rom. i, 21, &c. And "to place such an image in a Christian temple is abominable," saith St. Austin. (*De Fide et Symb. c. 7.*) And "thus to describe the Trinity, is a deformation of it," saith Cassander. (*Art. 21, sec. de Imag.*)

Q. 48. Upon what pretence do they make such representations of God?

A. They say, they thereby represent not God, but some of his properties and actions, after the manner they are described in Scripture; as when "the Ancient of days" is said to "sit on a throne, having the books opened before him," Dan. vii, 9, 10; thereby signifying his eternity and infinite wisdom. (*Catech. Rom. ibid.*)

Rep. But what is this to those images and pictures used by them which have no resemblance in Scripture; such are their descriptions of the Trinity in Unity, as of God the Father like an old man, having the Son lying in his bosom, and the Holy Ghost over his head like a dove?

(2.) God himself never appeared in any form; and so the resemblance in Daniel was only a prophetic scheme, and did no more belong to God than the eyes and ears that are ascribed to him in Scripture.

(3.) God cannot be represented at all, but by such properties and effects: but if an image of God be forbidden to be worshipped, then

* *Ἐδούλασαν*, "Ye did service to them that were no gods," Gal. iv, 8. *Ἐλατρευσαν*, "They served the creature," Rom. i, 25.

the image, even by such properties and effects, is forbidden to be worshipped.

Q. 49. But are not such descriptions of God, the way to represent him, as if he was like unto one of us?

A. Such pictures are not without danger to be exposed to such as cannot read the Scriptures, if they are not taught that they are to be taken metaphorically. (*Bellarmin. de Imag. l. 2, c. 8, sec. Respondent.*)

Rep. Cassander saith, "I wish those from whom this information is to be received, were not the authors of these superstitions;" and he adds, "That the teaching is not enough, without the occasions be removed." (Art. 21, *de Imag.*) This he saith of all images, but more especially of such as are made to represent God.

SECTION IV.

OF THE SACRAMENTS.

QUES. 50. WHAT is a sacrament?

ANS. A sacrament is a sensible thing which by the institution of God hath a power, as well of causing, as of signifying, holiness and righteousness. (*Catech. Rom. par. 2, cap. 1, n. 11.*)

Q. 51. How many sacraments are there in the Church of Rome?

A. There are seven; namely, baptism, confirmation, eucharist, penance, extreme unction, orders, and matrimony. (*Concil. Trid. Sess. 7, can. 1.*)

Q. 52. Is this number determined to be a matter of faith?

A. Whosoever saith, that there are more or fewer than seven instituted by Christ, or that any of the seven are not truly and properly sacraments, is accursed. (*Ib.*)

REPLY. Cassander saith, that we shall not easily find any before Peter Lombard, who lived about 1139, that did define the number of the sacraments. (Art. 13, *sec. De Num. Sacram.*) And St. Austin is very positive that there are but two of Divine institution.* Now, that there should be sacraments of Divine institution, that are neither instituted in the Gospel, nor known to be so till 1100 years after our Saviour, nor be made a matter of faith till 1500, may be a doctrine received in the Church of Rome, but will not easily be believed by any out of it.

Q. 53. What are the parts of a sacrament?

A. The parts of a sacrament are the matter or element, and the form of words of consecration: so the matter in baptism is water; the form is, "I baptize thee," &c.

Rep. That a sacrament should consist of matter and form, and yet either have no form, as confirmation and extreme unction; or have neither matter nor form, of divine institution, as penance and matrimony, is to make them sacraments, and to be none. Our Church rightly affirms of the additional sacraments, They have not any visible sign ordained of God. (Art. 25.)

Q. 54. Of what virtue are the sacraments?

* "Our Lord Jesus Christ," saith he, "hath knit Christians together, with sacraments most few in number, most easy to be kept, most excellent in signification; as are baptism and the Lord's supper."—Epist. ad Januar. 118.

A. The sacraments contain the grace which they signify, and confer grace *ex opere operato*, "by the work itself," upon such as do not put an obstruction. (*Concil. Trid. ib. can. 6, 8.*) For these sensible and natural things work by the almighty power of God in the sacraments, what they could not do by their own power. (*Catech. Rom. ib. n. 27.*)

Rep. It is not sufficient that adult persons have no indisposition to receive the grace of the sacraments; for there is also required a mind well instructed, a sound belief, and a heart well inclined for that purpose. (2.) The virtue in the sacraments doth not proceed from the mere elements and words, but from the blessing of God in consequence of his promise to such only as rightly partake of them, and are qualified for it.

Q. 55. What is necessary to a sacrament on the part of those that officiate?

A. It is absolutely necessary, that those that make and consecrate the sacraments have an intention of doing at least what the Church doeth, and doth intend to do. (*Concil. Trid. ib. can. 11.*)

Rep. From hence it follows, that if there be no intention, the sacraments are none. And so there is no certainty whether the priest be a priest, or whether in the eucharist the elements continue not elements after consecration, and what is taken for the host be no other than bread. For without the intention, neither is the priest ordained, nor are the elements consecrated.

OF BAPTISM.

Q. 56. WHO may administer the sacrament of baptism?

A. It chiefly belongs to bishops, priests, and deacons; but, in case of necessity, men or women, Jews, infidels, or heretics may do it, if they intend to do what the Church doeth. (*Concil. Trid. Sess. 7, De Bapt. can. 4; Catech. Rom. pars 2, c. 2, n. 24.*)

Rep. Our Saviour gave commission to the Apostles and their successors, in the office of the ministry, to "teach all nations, baptizing them," Matt. xxviii, 19, 20. So that women, Jews, and infidels, have no more a power to administer baptism, than they have to teach, or to be priests.

Q. 57. What ceremonies are used in the administration of baptism in the Church of Rome?

A. Before baptism, there is, (1.) chrisin, or oil mixed with water, in the consecration of it. (*Catech. ib. n. 11, 60.*)

(2.) Exorcism, composed of certain words, prayers, and actions, for driving away the devil out of the child, and the salt, &c. (*Catech. ib. n. 65.*) And the priest is to blow in the face of the child, after the form of a cross, saying, "Go out of him, Satan," &c. (*Pastorale. Antwerp, 1625.*)

(3.) The forehead, eyes, breast, &c. are to be crossed, to show that by the mystery of baptism, the senses are opened to receive God, and to understand his commands. (*Catech. n. 67; Pastor. ib.*)

(4.) Then some exorcised salt is to be put into the mouth, to signify a deliverance from the putrefaction of sin, and the savour of good works. (*Catech. ib. n. 66.*) And the priest in putting it into the mouth, saith, "N, take the salt of wisdom, and let it be a propitiation for thee to eternal life. Amen." (*Pastor. ib.*)

(5.) Then the nose and ears are to be anointed with spittle, and then

the child is to be brought to the water, as the blind man to Siloam, to signify it brings light to the mind. (*Catech. ibid.* n. 60.)

After baptism, (1.) The priest anoints the top of the head with chrism; (*Catech. ibid.* n. 72;) and he adds, "Let him anoint thee with the chrism of salvation." (*Pastor. ib.*)

(2.) He puts a white garment on the baptized, saying, "Take this white garment, which thou mayest bring before the judgment-seat of Christ, that thou mayest have life eternal." (*Catech. ib.* n. 73.)

(3.) A lighted candle is put into the hand, to show a faith inflamed with charity and nourished with good works. (*Ib.* n. 74.)

Rep. It is pleaded for these ceremonies, that they are appointed for the majesty of Divine worship; and that the benefits contained in the sacraments may be better imprinted on the mind. (*Catech.* par. 2, c. 2, n. 59.)

But can we think it for the majesty of baptism to have it dressed up like a form of conjuration, that the child must be supposed to be possessed with the devil, and the priest must blow in his face three times, with, "Get thee out, Satan," before he can say, "Peace be with thee;" and that he must cross him half a score times, or more, from part to part, in preparation to baptism?

Can we think it for the majesty of it, to have salt exorcised in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; and to be put into the mouth of the child, for a propitiation unto eternal life? Can we think it for the majesty of this ordinance, that the priest should put some of his own spittle in his left hand, and then taking it thence with the thumb and fore finger of his right hand, touch both ears of the infant, and say, "Ephphatha, be thou opened!" and then his nostrils, and say, "For the odour of sweetness; but thou, O devil, fly;" and then on his right hand, after the manner of a cross, saying, "N, I deliver unto thee the mark of our Lord Jesus Christ, (†) (N. B. Where this mark (†) stands, the sign of the cross is made,) that thou mayest drive the adversary from thee on every side, and have life eternal?"

And what are the benefits imprinted on the mind by these fantastical ceremonies? Or when is it such benefits are promised as these are said to signify? Is it not rather a debasing of it, to have such rites and prayers introduced into it, as signify that which baptism was never appointed for? To give an instance in the salt used in it:—

THE EXORCISM OF THE SALT.

"I exorcise thee, O creature of salt, in the name of the Father (†) Omnipotent, and in the love of our (†) Lord Jesus Christ, and in the virtue of the Holy (†) Spirit. I exorcise thee by the living (†) God, by the true (†) God, by the holy (†) God, who hath created thee for the safeguard of mankind, and hath commanded it to be consecrated by his servants for the people that come to believe, that in the name of the holy Trinity thou beest made a wholesome sacrament to put the enemy to flight. Therefore we pray thee, O our Lord God, that in sanctifying (†) thou dost sanctify this creature of salt, and in blessing (†) thou dost bless it, that it may be a perfect medicine to all that take it."

OF CONFIRMATION.

Q. 58. Is confirmation a sacrament?

A. It is, properly and truly; and whosoever holds otherwise is accursed. (*Concil. Trid. Sess. 7, De Confirm. can. 1.*)

Rep. The Roman Catechism saith, that sacraments cannot be instituted by any but God. (*Catech. ib.* n. 6.) And yet the great Schoolman, Alex. Ales, saith, "Christ did not institute nor declare confirmation to be a sacrament." (Pars 4, q. 4, m. 1.) So by their own confession it is none.

Q. 59. What is the matter of the sacrament of confirmation?

A. The matter is chrism, which is an ointment compounded of oil-olive and balsam, and consecrated by the bishop (*Cate. Rom.* par. 2, c. 3, n. 2, 7, 27) upon Maundy-Thurs-day. (*Sum of Christian Doctrine*, London, 1686.)

Rep. That chrism is either of divine institution, or the matter of a sacrament, may be said, but cannot be proved.

Q. 60. What is the form of consecration?

A. The form is the words used by the bishop, when he crosses the forehead with the chrism, viz. "I sign thee with the sign of the cross, and I confirm thee with the chrism of salvation, in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost." (*Catech.* n. 2, 11.)

Rep. It is said that Christ instituted the matter and form of confirmation from the authority of Pope Fabian; (pars 4, q. 3, m. 2, n. 3, & q. 9, m. 1;) but Alexander Ales saith, it was ordained by the Meldensian Council. (*Catech. Rom. ib.* n. 6, 12, *et Bellarminus de Confirm.* c. 2.) And indeed the Roman Catechism, after some pretence to divine institution, thinks it safest to resolve it into the authority of the Church.

Q. 61. What ceremonies are used in confirmation?

A. (1.) In the anointing, the bishop dips the tip of his finger in the chrism, and making a cross, saith, "I sign thee," &c. (*Pontific. de Confirm.*)

(2.) After confirmation, he strikes the person slightly on the cheek, that he may remember he is to suffer all injuries for the name of Christ, with patience and courage. (*Catech.* n. 25.)

(3.) Then the person to be confirmed, setting his foot upon the right foot of the godfather, (*Pontific. ib.*) is to have his head bound with a clean head-band for some days more or less, with reverence to the holy chrism; which done, the band is to be preserved in the *sacrarium*, or other clean place, till the following Ash-Wednesday, to be burnt to holy ashes. (*Pastorale.*)

Rep. Whether we consider the far-fetched significations of these ceremonies or the virtue put in them, the abuse is intolerable; as, for instance, that in consecration of the chrism, the bishop blows upon it, to signify the descent of the Holy Ghost for the sanctification of it, (*Bellarmin. de Confirm.* l. 2, c. 13, *sec. Tertio habet*,) and that it hath a power of sanctification as the instrument of God. (*Ib. sec. Quarta ceremonia.*) So the bishop prays in the consecration of it, that God "in bestowing spiritual grace upon this ointment, would pour out the fullness of sanctification, and that it may be to all that are to be anointed with it, for the adoption of sons by the Holy Spirit." (*Pontif. Rom.*) Amen.

OF THE EUCHARIST.

Q. 62. What is the eucharist?

A. It is a sacrament wherein is truly, really, and substantially con-

tained whole Christ God-Man, body and blood, bones and nerves, (*Catech. Rom.* par. 2, c. 4, n. 33,) soul and divinity, under the species or appearance of bread and wine. (*Concil. Trid. Sess.* 13, *de Real. Præs.* c. 1. *A Sum of Christian Doctrine*, printed 1686.)

Q. How do they attempt to prove this?

A. From the words of our Saviour,—“This is my body;” which, say they, clearly demonstrate that the same body which was born of the Virgin, and is now in heaven, is in the sacrament. (*Catech.* par. 2, c. 4, n. 26.)

Q. 63. What becomes of the bread and wine after consecration?

A. Upon consecration there is a conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the substance of Christ’s body; and of the whole substance of the wine into the substance of Christ’s blood; which conversion is usually called transubstantiation. (*Concil. Trid. ib.* c. 4. *Concil. Latr.* 4, can. 1.)

Rep. (1.) No such change of the substance of the bread into the substance of Christ’s body, can be inferred from our Saviour’s words, “This is my body,” Matt. xxvi, 26; for it is not said, “This is *turned* into my body,” but “This *is* my body;” which if it be taken literally, would rather prove the substance of the bread to be his body. Therefore Cardinal Cajetan acknowledges, it is nowhere said in the Gospel that the bread is changed into the body of Christ; but they have it from the authority of the Church. (*Cajet. in Aquin.* par. 3, q. 75, art. 1.)

(2.) It is farther evident that the words are not to be taken in their proper sense; for it is called bread as well after consecration as before it. (1 Cor. x, 17; xi, 26–28.) So that what was called his body was also bread at the same time.

(3.) The mystical relation which the bread by consecration has to Christ’s body is sufficient to give it the name of his body. For it is the usual way of Scripture, to call things of a sacramental nature, by the names of those things they are the figure of. (*Aug. Epist.* 23.) So, circumcision is called the covenant. (Gen. xvii, 13.) And the killing, dressing, and eating the lamb, is called the passover. (Exodus xii, 11.) And after the same manner is the bread in the sacrament Christ’s body; that is, as circumcision was the covenant, and the lamb the passover, by signification and representation, by type and figure. And so the elements are called by the Fathers, “the images,” (*Orig. Dial.* 3, *Contr. Marcion*), “the symbols,” (*Euseb. Dem. Evang.* l. 1, c. 1, *et ult.*), “the figure,” (*Aug. contr. Adimant.* c. 12,) of Christ’s body and blood.

Q. 64. What is then that which is seen and tasted in the eucharist?

A. The things seen and tasted are the accidents only of bread and wine; there is the savour, colour, and quantity of bread and wine, without any of their substance; but under those accidents there is only the body and blood of Christ. (*Catech. Rom.* n. 37, 44.)

Rep. Our Saviour appealed to the senses of his disciples: “Handle me, and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have,” Luke xxiv, 39. Take away the certainty of sense, and there is no discerning a body from a spirit; and grant transubstantiation, and we take away the certainty of sense.

Q. 65. Is the body and blood of Christ broken when the host is broken and divided?

A. No, because Christ is impassible; (*Abridgment of Christ. Doctrine, c. 11, sec. Euchar.;*) and, besides, there is whole and entire Christ under either species or element, under the species of bread, and under every particle of it; under the species of wine, and under every drop of it. (*Conc. Trid. ib. c. 3.*)

Rep. If every particle of the host is as much the whole body of Christ, as the whole host is before it be divided, then a whole may be divided into wholes; for, divide it and subdivide it, it is still whole. Whole it is before the division, whole it is in the division, and whole it is after it. Thus unreasonable, as well as false, is the doctrine of transubstantiation.

Q. 66. Do they administer the sacrament in both kinds of bread and wine?

A. No; the people are permitted to receive it only in one kind, and are denied the cup. (*Trid. Sess. 21, c. 1.*)

Rep. It is acknowledged that our Saviour instituted and delivered the sacrament in both kinds; (*Conci. Constant. Sess. 13.—Trid. Sess. 21, c. 1, 2;*) and that it so continued even in the Church of Rome for above one thousand years after. (*Consult. Cassandri. art. 22.*) And yet with a *non-obstante* [notwithstanding] to both, they forbid the people to drink of it; and declare, whoever thinks it necessary to receive in both kinds, is accursed. (*Concil. Trid. ib. can. 1.*)

Q. 67. For what reason doth the Church of Rome deprive the people of what our Lord is granted to have instituted?

A. For just and weighty causes, (*Con. Trid. ib. c. 2.*) such as these: (1.) Lest the blood of Christ should be spilt upon the ground. (2.) Lest the wine, by being kept for the sick, should grow eager. (3.) Because many cannot bear the taste or smell of wine. (4.) Because in many countries there is such a scarcity of wine, as it is not to be had without great charge and tedious journeys. (5.) To disprove those that deny whole Christ to be contained under each species. (*Catech. Rom. ib. n. 66.*)

Rep. These are the "just and weighty causes" for their overruling the plain precept of our Saviour: "Drink ye all of this," Matt. xxvi, 27. And yet whosoever shall say they are not just and sufficient reasons, is accursed. (*Concil. Trid. ib. can. 2.*) As if it was sufficient to forbid wine in the sacrament to all, because some few cannot bear the taste or smell of it; and it was a just cause to deprive all countries of it because some have not wine, or cannot obtain it without difficulty!

Q. 68. What is the mass?

A. In the sacrifice of the mass, the same Christ is contained, and unbloodily offered, who bloodily offered himself upon the altar of the cross. (*Conc. Trid. Sess. 22, cap. 1.*)

Q. 69. Of what virtue is the sacrifice in the mass?

A. It is truly a propitiatory sacrifice, and is available, not only for the sins, punishments, and satisfactions of the living, but also for those of the souls in purgatory. (*Ib.*)

Q. 70. Is this necessary to be believed?

A. Yes; and whosoever denies any of this, is accursed, (*Conc. Trid. Sess. 22, can. 1.*) and incapable of salvation. (*Bulla Pii IV.*)

Rep. The Scripture when it extols the perfection and infinite value of Christ's sacrifice, doth infer from it, that there needed not therefore

any repetition of it: "He needeth not daily, as those high priests, to offer up sacrifice, &c; for this he did once, when he offered up himself," Heb. vii, 27. But if the same Christ is offered in the mass as was on the cross, and that unbloody sacrifice is alike propitiatory as the bloody, there is then a repetition of the same sacrifice, and he is daily offered. And what is it to say, the one was bloody and the other is unbloody, when the unbloody is of the same virtue, and is applied to the same end, as the bloody? So that, as if Christ had again been bloodily offered up, there had been a repetition of that sacrifice; so there is a repetition of it when he is offered up unbloodily. To have then a perfect sacrifice daily repeated, and a sacrifice without suffering, and a propitiation and remission without blood, are alike irreconcilable to the Apostle, Hebrews ix, 22, 25, &c.

Q. 71. May the priest communicate alone, though there be none besides to communicate?

A. Yes; the Church of Rome doth approve and commend solitary masses, and accounts them a communion; partly because the people do spiritually communicate in it, and partly because it is celebrated by a public minister, not only for himself, but also for the people. (*Conc. Trid. ib. cap. 6.*)

Rep. The Apostle calls the Lord's Supper a communion, and saith, "All are partakers of that one bread," 1 Cor. x, 16, 17. And Cassander saith, "It cannot properly be a communion unless many partake of it;" and adds from the Council of Nants, that "it is absurd to say, Lift up your hearts, when there is none communicates with the priest." (*Consult. art. 24, De Solit. Miss.*) And yet the Council of Trent declares, whosoever shall say such masses are unlawful, and to be abrogated, is accursed. (*Sess. 22, can. 8.*)

Q. 72. What honour is to be given to the consecrated host?

A. *Latria*, or the same sovereign worship which is due only to God; (*Concil. Trid. Sess. 13, cap. 5;*) adore it; (*Missale Rom. Can. Missæ;*) pray to it. (*Brev. Rom. Hym. in F. Corp. Ch.*) And whosoever holds it unlawful or idolatrous so to do, is accursed. (*Concil. Trid. ib. can. 6.*)

Rep. We freely own that Christ is to be adored in the Lord's Supper; but that the elements are to be adored, we deny. If Christ is not corporally present in the host, they grant their adoration to be idolatry. (*Coster. Enchir. c. 8, n. 10.*) And that he is not corporally present any where but in heaven, we are taught, Acts i, 11, iii, 21, whither he went, and where he is to continue till his second coming to judgment.

Q. 73. What are the ceremonies used in the mass?

A. The ceremonies in the mass respect either things, actions, or words. Among the things, are garments, places, time, vessels, cloths, incense, lights, &c. (*Bellarmin. Doctr. Trid. de Sacr. Miss.*)

Q. 74. What are the garments used by the priest in the mass, and what is their signification?

A. (1.) The amice, or white veil, which he puts over his head, signifies mystically, either the divinity of Christ covered under his humanity, or the crown of thorns; and morally, contemplation, or hope. In putting it on, he saith, "Put on, O Lord, the helmet of salvation upon my head, that I may overcome all diabolical temptations."

(2.) The alb, or long white garment, signifies mystically, the white

robe put on our Saviour; and morally, faith and innocency. In putting it on, he saith, "Make me white, O Lord, and cleanse my heart, that, being whitened in the blood of the Lamb, I may enjoy everlasting gladness."

(3.) The girdle signifies mystically, the cords wherewith our Saviour was bound; and morally, (being turned up on both sides,) the two means to preserve chastity, namely, fasting and prayer. When he puts it about him, he prays, "Gird me, O Lord, with the girdle of purity, and quench in my loins the humour of lust, that there may remain in me the virtue of continency and chastity." The like account is given of the maniple, vestment, and stole, and of the divers colours of the furniture used in the several seasons, in the "Manual of the Poor Man's Devotion," chap. *Of the Ornaments of the Mass*.

Rep. The Council of Trent saith, that the ceremonies of the mass, such as mystical benedictions, lights, incensings, garments, &c. are from Apostolical tradition; (*Sess. 22, c. 5*.) or, as others, were instituted by the Holy Ghost; (*Bellarminus, cap. de Sacr. Mis.*;) and that they serve for the majesty of that sacrifice, and to raise the mind to the contemplation of the divine things concealed in it; so none of them are superfluous and vain. (*Catech. par. 2, c. 4, n. 81*.)

But how shall we reconcile this to the numerous crossings and sprinklings, used in the celebration of the mass? For example: When the priest is clothed with the garments rehearsed before, he comes to the altar; and, standing on the lowest step, just against the middle of it, he makes a profound reverence to the altar and crucifix. Then he ascends, and having placed the books, &c. in order, he descends to the lowest step, and, turning himself to it, with his hands joined before his breast, and making a reverence to the altar or crucifix, he begins the mass, standing upright, and drawing with his right hand (his left hand laid on his breast) the sign of the cross from his forehead to his breast. Then he joins his hands before his breast; the minister standing on his left hand behind him, bowing, saith, *Ad Deum*, &c. Then the priest, with the minister, say the psalm, *Judica me*, with *Gloria Patri*, at which he is to bow his head to the cross. Then he repeats the *Introibo*, making with his right hand the sign of the cross from the forehead to the breast. Then he bows his head and body to the altar, and there he stands bowing till the minister saith, *Misereatur*. When he saith, *Mea culpa*, he smites thrice upon his breast with the right hand; and thus the Missal proceeds in its ceremonies in all the remaining parts of the service.

OF PENANCE.

Q. 75. What is the matter and form of the sacrament of penance?

A. The matter is contrition, confession, and satisfaction. The form is, "I absolve." (*Catech. Rom. par. 2, c. 5, n. 14, 15*.)

Rep. We are told that the matter of a sacrament is somewhat sensible; (*Catech. Rom. par. 2, c. 1, n. 11*;) then how is penance a sacrament, which has no such matter? For where is the matter that is sensible in contrition? The Council, to avoid this, call it, *Quasi materia*,—"A matter after a sort." (*Concil. Trid. Sess. 14, cap. 3*.)

Q. 76. What is confession?

A. Confession is a particular discovery of all mortal sins to the priest,

with all their circumstances that increase or diminish the sin, as far as can be called to mind; (*Concil. Trid. Sess. 14, c. 5, & Catech. ib. n. 48;*) without which neither forgiveness nor salvation is to be obtained. (*Trid. ib. can. 6, 7. Catech. n. 44.*)

Rep. We grant confession to men to be in many cases of use; public, in case of public scandal; private, to a spiritual guide for disburdening of the conscience, and as a help to repentance. But to make auricular confession, or particular confession to a priest, necessary to forgiveness and salvation, when God has not so made it, is apparently to teach for doctrine the commandment of men; and to make it necessary in all cases, is to make, of what may be a useful means, a dangerous snare, both to the confessor, and those that confess.

Q. 77. Of what kind is the absolution which the priest grants upon confession?

A. The absolution is not only declarative, but judicial; and the sentence pronounced by the priest is as if pronounced by the Judge himself; (*Concil. Trid. ib. c. 6, & can. 9;*) he perfecting what God causes. (*Catech. par. 2, 5, n. 17.*)

Rep. To pardon sin, and absolve the sinner judicially, so as the conscience may rest firmly upon it, is a power reserved by God to himself. So: "If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness," 1 John i, 9. And therefore the authority of the priest is only ministerial, declarative, and conditional. "Men show a ministry in the forgiveness of sins, but do not exercise a right of power. They pray, but it is God forgives," saith St. Ambrose. (*De Spir. l. 3, c. 19.*)

Q. 78. What is the benefit of absolution?

A. Although a sinner is not so affected with such grief for his sin, as may be sufficient to obtain pardon; yet, when he has rightly confessed to a priest, all his sins are pardoned, and an entrance is opened into heaven. (*Catech. ib. n. 38.*)

Rep. The grief which is sufficient to obtain pardon, is contrition; and so the grief which is not sufficient to obtain pardon, must be attrition; and the meaning then is, that attrition, with absolution, is as effectual as contrition.

Q. 79. What is satisfaction?

A. It is a compensation made to God, by prayer, fasting, alms, &c, (*Catech. ib. n. 75,*) for all sins committed against him; (*Bellarminus de Satisfact. Bellarm. de Indulg. l. 1, c. 7, sec. Quarta propositio;*) so that the offender is thereupon purged from the defilement of sin, and discharged from all temporal punishments due to him, either here or in purgatory. (*Catech. Rom. ib. n. 65, 66.*)

Q. 80. How do these works become thus satisfactory?

A. They are meritorious and satisfactory, (*Catech. ib. n. 72, 73,*) as they are united to the satisfaction of Christ. (*Bellarmin. de Forma Satisfact. Bellarm. de Indulg. l. 1, c. 4, sec. Respons. non est quidem.*)

Rep. The giving satisfaction to the Church in case of scandal, and the imposing penances upon notorious offenders, is a useful part of ecclesiastical discipline. But to make that a satisfaction to God which is given to the Church; and to make our works to satisfy, though but as an appendant to the satisfaction of Christ, we can by no means allow.

Not the former, because it is derogatory to the justice of God; not the latter, because it is derogatory to the merits of our Saviour. For what can make a satisfaction to God, but the obedience and suffering of his Son? Or what need is there of another satisfaction after that of our Saviour? "By one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified," Heb. x, 14.

THE SACRAMENT OF EXTREME UNCTION.

Q. 81. What is the matter of the sacrament of extreme unction?

A. Oil of olive-berries, (*Catech. Rom.* par. 2, c. 6, n. 5,) consecrated by a bishop; which aptly signifies the grace of the Spirit with which the soul of the sick is invisibly anointed. (*Concil. Trid. Sess. 14, de Extr. Unct. c. 1.*)

Q. 82. What is the form of it?

A. The form is, "By this holy anointing, God pardon thee, by whatever thou hast offended by the fault of the eyes, nose, or touch." (*Catech. ib.* n. 6.)

Q. 83. What are the parts anointed?

A. The eyes, because of seeing; the ears, because of hearing; the mouth, because of tasting, or speech; the hands, because of touching; the feet, because of motion; the reins, because the seat of lust. (*Catech. ib.* n. 10.)

Q. 84. When is this anointing administered?

A. It is to be administered only when persons are supposed to be near the point of death; (*Concil. Trid. ib. c. 3; Bellarm. Extr. Unct. l. 1, c. 2, sec. Accedit;*) whence it is called extreme unction. (*Catech. ib.* n. 2, 14.)

Rep. We read, when the twelve Apostles were sent forth, they "anointed with oil many that were sick, and healed them," Mark vi, 13; making use of that anointing, not as a natural means, but as a mystical sign of the miraculous cure to be wrought by the power of Christ. And as long as this power continued in the Church, so long there was a reason for continuing this rite. Accordingly, the Apostle directs, "Is any sick? Let him call for the Elders of the Church; and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord: and the prayer of faith shall save the sick," James v, 14, 15. But when the power ceased, there was no reason for the continuance of this sign. And yet this ceremony of anointing is not only continued in the Church of Rome without any pretence to the power, but the nature and the use of it is wholly perverted from what it was in Apostolical times. For, (1.) This rite was then used in curing the sick, but was not necessary to it; for we find them also cured by imposition of hands, (Mark xvi, 18; Acts ix, 17,) or by a word. (Acts ix, 34.) But in the Church of Rome it is made absolutely necessary. (2.) In Apostolical times it was a mere rite; but in the Church of Rome it is made a sacrament, and whosoever saith it is a mere rite is accursed. (*Concil. Trid. Sess. 14, can. 1.*) (3.) It was used in Apostolical times properly for corporal maladies; but in the Church of Rome properly for the soul, and but accidentally for the body. (*Bellarm. de Extr. Unct. l. 1, c. 2, sec. Probo igitur.*) (4.) It was used then for the recovery of the sick; but here it is to be applied only to those that are judged to be past it.

OF THE SACRAMENT OF ORDERS.

Q. 85. Is ordination a sacrament ?

A. It is truly and properly a sacrament, and doth confer grace ; and whoso denies this, is accursed. (*Concil. Trid. Sess. 7, can. 1, 23, cap. 3, can. 3.*)

Rep. We account ordination to be of divine institution, and that by it a ministerial commission is conveyed ; but how necessary soever this office is to the Church, and grace for the exercise of it, yet as that grace is not promised to it, we cannot admit it to be properly and truly a sacrament.

Q. 86. What are the several orders instituted for the service of the Church ?

A. The orders always received by the Catholic Church are seven,—the greater and less : the greater are the Priest, Deacon, and Sub-Deacon : the less are the Acolythus, who is to carry the candle and assist the Sub-Deacon ; the Exorcist, who is to attend and pray over them that are possessed with the devil ; the Reader, and the Ostiarius, or door keeper. (*Catech. par. 2, c. 7, n. 12, 15, &c.*)

Rep. We know of no authority there is for any order under a deacon, so as to anathematize them that do not receive them. (*Concil. Trid. ib. can. 2.*) We know of no authority for the forms used in the ordination of those lower orders ; as, when the bishop admits any to that of exorcists, he reaches to them a book in which the exorcisms are contained, and saith, “Receive, and commit to memory, and take the power of laying on of hands upon the possessed, or baptized, or catechumens.” (*Catech. ib. n. 17.*)

We know of no authority for this kind of procedure, for those forms of conjuration contained in those books, or for the use of those rites therein prescribed, for exorcising persons, houses, cattle, milk, butter, fruits, &c, infested with the devil. (See the *Pastorale Mechlin*, and the *Manual of Exorcisms, Antwerp, 1626.*)

OF THE SACRAMENT OF MARRIAGE.

Q. 87. Is marriage truly and properly a sacrament ?

A. Yes ; and whosoever denies it so to be, is accursed. (*Concil. Trid. Sess. 24, can. 1.*)

Rep. St. Austin saith, that signs, when applied to religious things, are called sacraments. (*Epist. 5.*) And in this large sense he calls the sign of the cross a sacrament ; (*in Psalm. cxli.*) and others give the same name to washing the feet, (*Cypr. de Lotione Pedum,*) and many other mysteries. But then matrimony doth no more confer grace, than washing the feet, or using the sign of the cross ; which Bellarmine, after all the virtue he ascribes to it, will not allow to be properly and truly a sacrament. (*De Imag. l. 2, c. 30, sec. Dices Ergo.*)

Q. 88. May those that are in holy orders marry, or those that are married be received into orders in the Church of Rome ?

A. No ; these that are married may not be admitted ; (*Concil. Later. 1, can. 21, et Later. 2, can. 6.*) those that are admitted may not marry ; and those that, being admitted, do marry, are to be separated.

Q. 89. If marriage is a sacrament, and so confers grace, how comes

it to be denied to those that are in holy orders? (*Catech. Rom.* par. 2. c. 8, n. 17.)

A. Those in holy orders are the temple of God, and it is a shameful thing that they should serve uncleanness. (*Later. Concl.* 2, can. 6.)

Rep. The Apostle, on the contrary, saith, "Marriage is honourable in all," Heb. xiii, 4; and gives a hard character of that doctrine which forbids it, 1 Tim. iv, 1-3. And how lawful it was, the direction of the Apostle about it (1 Tim. iii, 2,) doth show. And how convenient it is, is manifest from the mischiefs attending the prohibition of it in the Romish Church, which wise men among themselves have lamented. (*Polyd. Virgil. de Invent.* l. 3, c. 4, et *Cassander Consult.* art. 23.)

THE CONCLUSION.

I MIGHT have added the Fifth Section about the jurisdiction which the Church of Rome challenges over Princes, and about their canonization of saints, their consecration of *Agnus Deis* and beads, &c, and the use these and the like are applied to. I might have farther considered their notes of a Church, and showed how many of them are not true, or, however, do not belong to the Church of Rome; but that would be too large a subject to enter upon: and what has been said will be sufficient to show how far that Church hath erred from truth and reason. For if we set their Councils, Missals, Breviaries, Rituals, and Catechisms on one side, and Scripture and antiquity on the other, we shall find their doctrines and practices as well opposite to those as they are opposite to ours; and may be assured that persons may sooner lose their eyes, than find there such a primacy of St. Peter as they contend for, or their vicarship of the Pope, the invocation of saints, the worship of images, service in an unknown tongue, transubstantiation, purgatory, and the rest that we contend against. Scripture and indubitable antiquity are the authority we appeal to; thither we refer our cause; and can heartily conclude with that of Vincentius Lyrin, "That is to be held, which hath been believed everywhere, always, and by all." (*Contr. Hær.* c. 3.)

A SHORT METHOD

OF

CONVERTING ALL THE ROMAN CATHOLICS IN THE KINGDOM OF IRELAND.

HUMBLY PROPOSED TO THE BISHOPS AND CLERGY OF THAT KINGDOM.

1. IT is a melancholy consideration to those who love the Protestant interest, that so small a part of this nation is yet reformed from Popery. They cannot observe without a very sensible concern, that, in many parts of the kingdom, there are still ten, nay, fifteen, perhaps upward of twenty, Papists to one Protestant. Nor can they see any prospect of its being otherwise; few Papists being brought over to our Church, notwithstanding all the methods which have been used, while many Protestants are seduced from it.

2. Yet they cannot but earnestly desire, that all the Papists were convinced of their errors. How much would this redound to the glory

of God, who willeth all to come to the knowledge of his truth! How greatly would it advantage their own souls both in this world and in the world to come! What an advantage would it be to the kingdom in general, to be no longer divided against itself, to have that grand cause of contention removed, and all its inhabitants of one heart and one mind! And how highly would it advance both the honour and interest of our gracious Sovereign, to have all his subjects cordially united together, thinking and speaking the same thing!

3. Why then is not this desirable end pursued with a vigour proportionable to its importance? Is it because we despair of any success,—because we think it impossible to be attained? But why should we imagine it to be impossible? A common and plausible answer is, Because the Papists are so bigoted to their clergy; believing all that they affirm, however contrary both to Scripture and reason, and doing all that they direct, whom they generally believe to be the holiest and wisest of men.

4. Undoubtedly this is a considerable difficulty in the way: And yet I cannot think it is unsurmountable. Still I conceive it is possible to convince all the Papists, provided there are proper instruments for the work. And what instruments are so proper as the clergy? not only as they are in every place, distributed through the whole nation, and always ready on the spot for the work; but likewise as it more immediately belongs to them; as it is no inconsiderable branch of their business who are peculiarly set apart to “watch over the souls of men as they that must give account.”

5. But what way can the clergy take, with any probability of success? There is one way, and one only; one that will (not probably, but) infallibly succeed. If this way is taken, I am willing to stake my life upon the success of it. And it is a plain, simple, way, such as may be taken by any man, though but of a small capacity. For it requires no peculiar depth of understanding, no extraordinary height of learning; but only a share of common sense, and an honest, upright heart.

6. It was observed that the grand difficulty of the work lies, in the strong attachment of the Papists to their clergy. Here therefore we are to begin; we are to strike at the root; and if this bigotry be but removed, whatever error or superstition is built upon it will of course fall to the ground.

Now, this may be effectually done thus: The Papists themselves allow that one set of clergy were holier and wiser even than their own, namely, the Apostles; they allow these both to have lived and preached better than the present clergy even of the Roman Church.

Here, therefore, is the short and sure method. Let all the clergy of the Church of Ireland only *live* like the Apostles, and *preach* like the Apostles, and the thing is done.

The Romans, on the same ground that they prefer the Apostles before their own clergy, will then prefer ours before them; and when they once do this, when we have carried this point, when their attachment to our clergy is stronger than that to their own, they will be convinced by hundreds, till there is not a Roman left in the kingdom of Ireland.

7. If it be asked, But how did the Apostles live and preach? I answer, (not to descend to particulars,) as to their inward life, if I may so speak, they “lived the life which is hid with Christ in God.”

“They were crucified with Christ. Nevertheless they lived; yet not they, but Christ lived in them.” So that each of them could say, “The life which I now live in the flesh,” even in this mortal body, “I live by faith in the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me.”

And this faith continually wrought by love, that “love of God” which was “shed abroad in their hearts,” and was a perennial “fountain of water, springing up into everlasting life.”

By this loving faith their hearts were purified from anger, from pride, from all vile affections, from the love of money, of power, of pleasure, of ease, from the desire of the flesh, the desire of the eye, and the pride of life; all their “affections being set on things above, not on things of the earth.” In a word, that “mind” was, “in them which was in Christ Jesus.”

Let but this mind be in every clergyman of our Church, and Popery will vanish out of the kingdom.

8. As to the outward life of the Apostles, it was, in the general, holy and unblamable in all things. Herein did they exercise themselves day and night, with regard to every word and action, “to have a conscience void of offence, toward God and man.” And their continual ground of “rejoicing, was this, the testimony of their conscience, that in simplicity and godly sincerity they had had their conversation in the world.”

They were temperate in all things. They denied themselves, and took up their cross daily. They “kept under their bodies, and brought them into subjection,” even in the midst of distresses and persecutions, “lest by any means, after they had preached to others, they themselves should have become castaways.”

They were, in every respect, burning and shining lights; they went about doing good as they had opportunity, doing good of every kind, and in every possible degree, to all men. They abstained from all appearance of evil; they overcame evil with good. If their enemy hungered, they fed him; if he thirsted, they gave him drink; and, by patiently continuing so to do, “heaped coals of fire upon his head,” and melted his hardness into love.

In fine, it was their meat and drink to do the will of their Father which was in heaven. And hence whatsoever they did, whether in word or deed, they did all to the glory of God.

Let every clergyman of our Church live thus, and in a short time there will not be a Papist in the nation.

9. As to the preaching of the Apostles, with regard to the matter of it, they preached Jesus, “the Author and Finisher of our faith,” having “determined not to know any thing, save Jesus Christ and him crucified.” They preached Jesus Christ as “of God made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption.” They declared, “Other foundation” of morality, religion, holiness, happiness, “can no man lay.” All they spoke, either in public or private, centred in this one point, “Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, and to-day, and for ever.”

More particularly, they preached that “a man is justified by faith, without the works of the law;” that “to him that worketh not, but believeth on Him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted to him for righteousness.”

10. They preached farther, that "except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God;" except he be "born from above," born not only of water, but "of the Holy Ghost;" and that "the" present "kingdom of God is not meats and drinks," lies not in externals of any kind, "but righteousness," the image of God on the heart, "peace," even a peace that passeth all understanding, "and joy in the Holy Ghost," whereby they rejoiced with "joy unspeakable and full of glory."

They declared "that he that is" thus "born of God doth not commit sin;" that "he that is begotten of God, keepeth himself, and the wicked one toucheth him not;" but that as Christ who hath called him is holy, so is he holy in all manner of conversation.

11. As to the manner of their preaching, they spoke with authority, as speaking not their own word, but the word of him that sent them, and "by manifestation of the truth, commending themselves to every man's conscience in the sight of God." They were "not as many that cauponize the word of God," debase and adulterate it with foreign mixtures, "but as of sincerity, but as of God, in the sight of God, spake they in Christ." They approved themselves the ministers of God, "in much patience, in labours, in watchings, in fastings; by pureness, by knowledge," knowing all their flock by name, all their circumstances, all their wants; "by long-suffering, never weary of well-doing, by kindness, by love unfeigned; by the word of truth, by the power of God" attending it, "by the armour of righteousness on the right hand, and on the left." Hence they were "instant in season, out of season," being never afraid of the faces of men, never ashamed of Christ or of his words, even before an adulterous and sinful generation. They went on unmoved through "honour and dishonour," through "evil report and good report." They regarded not father or mother, or wife or children, or houses or lands, or ease or pleasure; but, having this single end in view, to save their own souls, and those that heard them, they "counted not their lives dear unto themselves, so that they might" make full proof of their ministry, so they might "finish their course with joy, and testify the Gospel of the grace of God."

Let all the Right Reverend the Bishops, and the Reverend the Clergy, only walk by this rule,—let them thus live, and thus testify, with one heart and one voice, the Gospel of the grace of God, and every Papist within these four seas will soon acknowledge the truth as it is in Jesus.

THE ADVANTAGE

OF THE

MEMBERS OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND OVER THOSE OF
THE CHURCH OF ROME.

I LAY this down as an undoubted truth:—The more the doctrine of any Church agrees with the Scripture, the more readily ought it to be received. And, on the other hand, the more the doctrine of any Church differs from the Scripture, the greater cause we have to doubt of it.

2. Now, it is a known principle of the Church of England, that nothing is to be received as an article of faith, which is not read in the Holy Scripture, or to be inferred therefrom by just and plain consequence. Hence it follows, that every Christian has a right to know and read the Scripture, that he may be sure what he hears from his teachers agrees with the revealed word of God.

3. On the contrary, at the very beginning of the Reformation, the Church of Rome began to oppose this principle, that all articles of faith must be provable from Scripture, (till then received throughout the whole Christian world,) and to add, if not prefer, to Holy Scripture, tradition, or the doctrine of Fathers and Councils, with the decrees of Popes. And soon after she determined in the Council of Trent, "that the Old and New Testament, and the traditions of the Church, ought to be received *pari pietatis affectu ac reverentia*, 'with equal piety and reverence;'" and that "it suffices for laymen if they believe and practise what the Church believes and requires, whether they understand the ground of that doctrine and practice or not." (Sess. 4.)

4. How plain is it that this remedy was found out because they themselves observed that many doctrines, practices, and ceremonies of their Church, not only could not be proved by Scripture, but were flatly contradictory thereto?

As to the Fathers and Councils, we cannot but observe, that in a hundred instances they contradict one another: consequently, they can no more be a rule of faith to us, than the Papal decrees, which are not grounded on Scripture.

5. But the Church of Rome does not stop here. She not only makes tradition of equal authority with the Scripture, but also takes away the Scripture from the people, and denies them the use of it.

For, soon after, her writers began to teach, yea, and assert in entire volumes, "that the Scripture is obscure, and hard to be understood; that it gives a handle to error and heresies; that it is not a perfect or sufficient rule of life; that it ought to be understood no otherwise than the Church, that is, the Pope, explains it; that, consequently, the reading the Scripture is of more hurt than use to the generality of Christians."

And, in fact, they not only publicly spoke against the reading the Holy Scriptures, but in most countries absolutely forbid the laity to read them, yea, and the clergy too, till they were ordered to preach.

And if any did read it without a particular license, they condemned and punished it as a great crime.

6. Thus the case stands to this day; yea, the late controversies in France make it undeniably plain, that the Church of Rome does now labour, more earnestly than ever, to take away the use of the Scriptures, even from those who have hitherto enjoyed them.

Seeing, therefore, the Church of England contends for the word of God, and the Church of Rome against it, it is easy to discern on which side the advantage lies, with regard to the grand principle of Christianity.

7. But that it may more clearly appear how widely the Church of Rome differs from the Holy Scriptures, we have set down a few instances wherein they flatly contradict the written word of God.

Thus the Church of Rome, after acknowledging that the Apostle terms concupiscence sin, yet scruples not to add immediately, "The

Catholic Church never understood that this is truly and properly sin; and if any think the contrary, let him be accursed." (*Conc. Trid. Sess. 5.*)

Thus, although Christ himself says to all his disciples, "Without me ye can do nothing," yet the Church of Rome condemns this very proposition as false and heretical:—"The grace of Jesus Christ, the effectual principle of all good, is necessary to every good work. Not only nothing good is done without it, but nothing can be done." (*In the Bull Unigenitus.*)

8. In like manner, the Church of Rome does not scruple to impose upon the consciences of men, in the doctrine of the mass, various traditions, that have no authority from holy writ; and also takes away the cup in the Lord's Supper from the laity, contrary to the plain institution of Christ, as well as to the acknowledged custom of the primitive Church. Whence it manifestly appears, that it is not the design of the Roman Church to conform itself to the rule of the written word.

9. Again: The Church of Rome pronounces all those accursed who say, "that baptism, confirmation, the Lord's Supper, penance, extreme unction, orders, and matrimony, are not sacraments instituted by Christ himself; or, that there are more or fewer sacraments than seven; or, that any of these is not truly and properly a sacrament; or, that they do not confer grace barely by the work done." (*Conc. Trid. Sess. 7.*)

Now, whereas these positions cannot be proved by Scripture, and yet are enjoined to be believed under pain of an anathema, it is hence also plain, that the Church of Rome does purposely teach, and also maintain by open force, things which partly are not founded on holy writ, partly are contrary thereto.

10. As to their sacraments in particular, it is easy to show that they require in each of them such doctrines and customs to be received, as are wholly unsupported by, if not also contrary to, the word of God.

For example: They teach that in baptism "the right intention of the minister is so indispensably necessary, that if it be wanting the baptized receives no benefit; that confirmation was a true and proper sacrament from the beginning; (*ib.*;) that in the Lord's Supper the bread and wine are converted into the natural body and blood of Christ; that every particle of what is consecrated is no longer bread, but the entire body of Christ; that it ought to be worshipped and adored; and that the laity ought not to receive the cup." (*Sess. 13, 22.*)

In penance: "That a full confession of all our sins to the priest is absolutely necessary, or they cannot be pardoned; that the penances imposed, (such as pilgrimages, whipping themselves, and the like,) do meritoriously cooperate toward the forgiveness of sins; that this forgiveness is obtained, not through the merits of Christ alone, but also through the merits and intercession of the Virgin Mary and other saints; that extreme unction is a true and proper sacrament instituted by Christ; that the oil blessed by the bishop cures the soul of the sick, and preserves him from the temptations of the devil;" (*Sess. 14*;) "that ordination is a true and proper sacrament, instituted by Christ; that an indelible character is given thereby; that there were from the beginning those seven orders in the Church,—Priest, Deacon, Sub-deacon, Acolyte, Exorcist, Reader, and Door Keeper; that the proper business of a Priest is, to consecrate and offer the body and blood of Christ, and to remit or retain

sins in the chair of confession ; that marriage is a true and proper sacrament, instituted by Christ ; that, nevertheless, marriage may be dissolved by either party's entering into a convent, even against the consent of the other ; that it is unlawful for any of the clergy to marry." (*Sess.* 23.)

11. Now, seeing all these doctrines are unsupported by, if not also contrary to, the word of God, which yet the Church of Rome requires to be received as true, and pronounces all accursed who do not receive them, we cannot but conclude that the Church of England enjoys an unspeakable advantage over the Church of Rome, with respect to her doctrines, which are wholly agreeable to, and founded on, the written word of God.

12. The advantage of the Church of England over the Church of Rome is equally great with regard to public worship.

For it is manifest that the public worship of the Roman Church is wholly degenerated from the nature of Christ's kingdom and the simplicity of the first Christians: that at present it consists in magnificent buildings, altars, images, ornaments, and habits; in splendid ceremonies; in processions and pilgrimages, and prayers in an unknown tongue; and in reciting the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ave Maria, over and over, according to the number of their beads: that they are not instructed to "worship God in spirit and in truth," as their loving and most beloved Father; and to praise him, and comfort one another, with psalms, and hymns, and spiritual songs: that their souls are not edified by sermons and catechising out of the word of God, the Scriptures being cited very sparingly in their sermons, and generally in a strained and allegorical sense: that they are not permitted to search the Scriptures at home, and seek food for their souls therein: that the common people are by this means purposely kept in the grossest ignorance and superstition.

13. It is manifest also that they are held in doubt as to the salvation both of the living and the dead, by the doctrine of purgatory; that hereby the minds of those who want to be assured of the state of their souls, are disquieted and disturbed; that pardon of sins, release from punishment due thereto, and redemption from purgatory by masses and indulgences, either for the living or dead, are daily sold for money.

14. It is no less manifest that their trust in Christ alone, the one Mediator between God and man, is hindered so much the more, the more the people are referred to the merits and intercession of the blessed Virgin, and other saints; the more they are taught to adore their images and relics; to make vows to them, and to implore their help in any trouble; yea, and to place therein a very considerable part of their worship and devotion; as well as in a bare outward observance of saints' days, and other festivals of the Church, and in the abstaining from some particular kinds of meat on what they call fast days.

15. All these practices, wholly unsupported by Scripture, the Church of Rome retains to this day; at the same time that she rejects and pronounces accursed all (whether practices or doctrines) that make against her, be they ever so plainly contained in, and grounded on, the word of God.

Our reformers seeing this, judged it needful to inquire whether it could be proved by holy writ that the bishop of Rome is the successor of St. Peter; that he is Christ's vicar upon earth, and the visible head of the

Church; that he has a right of interpreting the word of God according to his own pleasure; to introduce and prohibit doctrines, besides and against the written word; to license things which the Scripture forbids; to exercise a spiritual, and in many cases a secular, power over all Christians,—kings and emperors not excepted; to anathematize all that oppose his will, depose princes, and absolve subjects from their allegiance; to pronounce heretics, to curse, kill, torture, and burn alive, all who do not submit to him in every point.

16. Some of the reasons they had to doubt of these things were those which follow:—

That neither St. Peter, nor any of the ancient bishops, had the same doctrine or manner of governing the Church which the bishop of Rome now has, as is clear both from the Epistles of St. Peter, from the Acts of the Apostles, and the ancient ecclesiastical history; that Christ alone “is made of God head over all things to the Church,” Eph. i, 21; iv, 15; Col. i, 18; who is “with them always, even to the end of the world;” that the kingdom of Christ, being not of this world, bears no resemblance to the hierarchy and monarchy of the Papal kingdom; that the possessing the see of Rome no more proves the Pope to be the successor of St. Peter, than the possessing the city of Constantinople proves the Great Turk to be the successor of Constantine the Great; that if the Pope were the vicar of Christ, (which is not yet proved,) still he would have no authority to change or abrogate the laws of his Lord and King; much less to make laws just contrary to them, or to exempt any from obeying the laws of Christ; that attempts of this kind denote an adversary, rather than a faithful and upright vicar of Christ.

17. They doubt of these things the more, because the primitive Church knew of no such thing as a universal head; because no bishop was acknowledged as such at the time of the Council of Nice; because Gregory the Great declared, he should account any man to be antichrist who called himself by such a title; because it is apparent, that Boniface III, the next Pope but one to him, about the year 606, was the first to whom the title of universal bishop was given, as a reward for his absolving the tyrant Phocas, after he had murdered his master, the Emperor Mauritius, with his empress, and eight children; because the succeeding Popes acquired one part of their power after another, by various methods, either of fraud or force; because many of them have been notoriously wicked men, and encouragers of all manner of wickedness; notwithstanding all which, men are required to believe that they are all enlightened by the Holy Ghost, in so extraordinary a manner as to be rendered infallible; although one Pope is continually contradicting another, and reversing the decrees which his predecessors had most solemnly established.

18. When the Romanists are desired to prove by Scripture, that the Pope is the head of the Church, they urge, that Christ said to St. Peter, (1.) “I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven.” (2.) “Feed my lambs; feed my sheep.” Therefore we answer, These texts by no means prove that Christ made St. Peter himself his vicar; much less that he gave that dominion to the Pope, which he now usurps over the consciences of men. And hence we are the more clearly convinced, that the Papal power is not of divine original; and that we have

great cause to bless God, whom the Pope has excluded from his communion, and thereby restored to that unshaken liberty of conscience wherein, by the grace of God, we shall always stand.

19. In this liberty every member of our Church, if he gives himself up to the guidance of God's Holy Spirit, may learn the foundation of his faith from the written word of God; may read and meditate therein day and night; may devoutly pray in the Spirit of adoption, like the holy men of ancient times; may comfort and quicken himself and others, with psalms, and hymns, and spiritual songs; may enjoy all the ordinances of Christ, according to his own institution; may be assured of the remission of his sins, and of his justification through faith in Christ, the Spirit of God witnessing with his spirit that he is a child of God; may study to have a conscience void of offence, both toward God and toward man: He may freely enjoy every blessing which God hath bestowed upon our own Church; and may make advantage of whatever good the providence of God has still preserved in the Church of Rome: He may cheerfully look for a happy death, and a blessed eternity; and at length, by resting on Christ alone, and patiently partaking of his sufferings, he may, with certain hope of a resurrection to eternal life, without any fear either of purgatory or hell, resign his spirit into the hand of God, and so be ever with the Lord.

POPERY CALMLY CONSIDERED.

TO THE READER.

IN the following Tract, I propose, First, to lay down and examine the chief doctrines of the Church of Rome: Secondly, to show the natural tendency of a few of those doctrines; and that with all the plainness and all the calmness I can.

SECTION I.

OF THE CHURCH, AND THE RULE OF FAITH.

1. THE Papists judge it necessary to salvation, to be subject to the Pope, as the one visible head of the Church.

But we read in Scripture, that Christ is the Head of the Church, "from whom the whole body is fitly joined together," Col. ii, 19. The Scripture does not mention any visible head of the Church; much less does it mention the Pope as such; and least of all does it say, that it is necessary to salvation to be subject to him.

2. The Papists say, The Pope is Christ's Vicar, St. Peter's successor, and has the supreme power on earth over the whole Church.

We answer, Christ gave no such power to St. Peter himself. He gave no Apostle preëminence over the rest. Yea, St. Paul was so far from acknowledging St. Peter's supremaey, that he withstood him to the face, Gal. ii, 11, and asserted himself "not to be behind the chief of the Apostles."

Neither is it certain, that St. Peter was Bishop of Rome; no, nor that he ever was there.

But they say, "Is not Rome the mother, and therefore the mistress, of all Churches?"

ret.

We answer, No. "The word of the Lord went forth from Jerusalem." There the Church began. She, therefore, not the Church of Rome, is the mother of all Churches.

The Church of Rome, therefore, has no right to require any person to believe what she teaches on her sole authority.

3. St. Paul says, "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works."

The Scripture, therefore, being delivered by men divinely inspired, is a rule sufficient of itself: So it neither needs, nor is capable of, any farther addition.

Yet the Papists add tradition to Scripture, and require it to be received with equal veneration. By traditions, they mean, "such points of faith and practice as have been delivered down in the Church from hand to hand without writing." And for many of these, they have no more Scripture to show, than the Pharisees had for their traditions.

4. The Church of Rome not only adds tradition to Scripture, but several entire books; namely, Tobit and Judith, the Book of Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Baruch, the two books of Maccabees, and a new part of Esther and of Daniel; "which whole books," says the Church of Rome, "whoever rejects, let him be accursed."

We answer, We cannot but reject them. We dare not receive them as part of the Holy Scriptures. For none of these books were received as such by the Jewish Church, "to whom were committed the oracles of God," Rom. iii, 2: neither by the ancient Christian Church, as appears from the 60th Canon of the Council of Laodicea; wherein is a catalogue of the books of Scriptures, without any mention of these.

5. As the Church of Rome, on the one hand, adds to the Scripture, so, on the other hand, she forbids the people to read them. Yea, they are forbid to read so much as a summary or historical compendium of them in their own tongue.

Nothing can be more inexcusable than this. Even under the law, the people had the Scriptures in a tongue vulgarly known; and they were not only permitted, but required, to read them; yea, to be constantly conversant therein, Deut. vi, 6, &c. Agreeable to this, our Lord commands to search the Scriptures; and St. Paul directs, that his Epistle be read in all the Churches, 1 Thess. v, 27. Certainly this Epistle was wrote in a tongue which all of them understood.

But they say, "If people in general were to read the Bible, it would do them more harm than good." Is it any honour to the Bible to speak thus? But supposing some did abuse it, is this any sufficient reason for forbidding others to use it? Surely no. Even in the days of the Apostles, there were some "unstable and ignorant men," who wrested both St. Paul's Epistles, and the other Scriptures, "to their own destruction." But did any of the Apostles, on this account, forbid other Christians to read them? You know they did not: They only cautioned them not to be "led away by the error of the wicked." And certainly the way to prevent this is, not to keep the Scriptures from them; (for "they were written for our learning;") but to exhort all to the diligent peruse of them, lest they should "err, not knowing the Scriptures."

6. "But seeing the Scripture may be misunderstood, how are we to judge of the sense of it? How can we know the sense of any scripture, but from the sense of the Church?"

We answer, (1.) The Church of Rome is no more the Church in general, than the Church of England is. It is only one particular branch of the Catholic or universal Church of Christ, which is the whole body of believers in Christ, scattered over the whole earth. (2.) We therefore see no reason to refer any matter in dispute to the Church of Rome, more than any other Church; especially as we know, neither the Bishop nor the Church of Rome is any more infallible than ourselves. (3.) In all cases, the Church is to be judged by the Scripture, not the Scripture by the Church. And Scripture is the best expounder of Scripture. The best way, therefore, to understand it, is carefully to compare Scripture with Scripture, and thereby learn the true meaning of it.

SECTION II.

OF REPENTANCE AND OBEDIENCE.

1. THE Church of Rome teaches, that "the deepest repentance or contrition avails nothing without confession to a priest; but that, with this, attrition, or the fear of hell, is sufficient to reconcile us to God."

This is very dangerously wrong and flatly contrary to Scripture; for the Scripture says, "A broken and contrite heart, thou, O God, wilt not despise," Psalm li, 17. And the same texts which make contrition sufficient without confession, show that attrition even with it is insufficient. Now, as the former doctrine, of the insufficiency of contrition without confession, makes that necessary which God has not made necessary; so the latter, of the sufficiency of attrition with confession, makes that unnecessary which God has made necessary.

2. The Church of Rome teaches, that "good works truly merit eternal life."

This is flatly contrary to what our Saviour teaches: "When ye have done all those things that are commanded you, say, We are unprofitable servants: we have done that which was our duty to do," Luke xvii, 10. A command to do it, grace to obey that command, "and a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory," must for ever cut off all pretence of merit from all human obedience.

3. That a man may truly and properly merit hell, we grant; although he never can merit heaven. But if he does merit hell, yet, according to the doctrine of the Church of Rome, he need never go there. For "the Church has power to grant him an indulgence, which remits both the fault and the punishment."

Some of these indulgences extend only to so many days; some to so many weeks; but others extend to a man's whole life; and this is called a plenary indulgence.

These indulgences are to be obtained by going pilgrimages, by reciting certain prayers, or (which is abundantly the most common way) by paying the stated price of it.

Now, can any thing under heaven be imagined more horrid, more execrable than this? Is not this a manifest prostitution of religion to the

basest purposes? Can any possible method be contrived, to make sin more cheap and easy? Even the Popish Council of Trent acknowledged this abuse, and condemned it in strong terms; but they did not in any degree remove the abuse which they acknowledged. Nay, two of the Popes under whom the Council sat, Pope Paul III, and Julius III, proceeded in the same course with their predecessors, or rather exceeded them; for they granted to such of the Fraternity of the Holy Altar as visited the church of St. Hilary of Chartres, during the six weeks of Lent, seven hundred and seventy-five thousand seven hundred years of pardon.

4. This miserable doctrine of indulgences is founded upon another bad doctrine, that of works of supererogation; for the Church of Rome teaches, that there is “an overplus of merit in the saints; and that this is a treasure committed to the Church’s custody, to be disposed as she sees meet.”

But this doctrine is utterly irreconcilable with the following scriptures:—“The sufferings of the present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory that shall be revealed in us,” Rom. viii, 18; and “Every one of us shall give an account of himself to God,” 2 Cor. iv, 17. For if there be no comparison betwixt the reward and the sufferings, then no one has merit to transfer to another; and if every one must give an account of himself to God, then no one can be saved by the merit of another. But suppose there were a superabundance of merits in the saints, yet we have no need of them, seeing there is such an infinite value in what Christ hath done and suffered for us; seeing he alone hath “by one offering perfected for ever them that are sanctified,” Heb. x, 14.

5. But where do the souls of those go after death, who die in a state of grace, but yet are not sufficiently purged from sin to enter into heaven?

The Church of Rome says, “They go to purgatory, a purging fire near hell, where they continue till they are purged from all their sins, and so made meet for heaven.”

Nay, that those who die in a state of grace, go into a place of torment, in order to be purged in the other world, is utterly contrary to Scripture. Our Lord said to the penitent thief upon the cross, “To-day shalt thou be with me in paradise.” Now, if a purgation in another world were necessary for any, he that did not repent and believe till the last hour of his life might well be supposed to need it; and consequently ought to have been sent to purgatory, not to paradise.

6. Very near akin to that of purgatory, is the doctrine of *Limbus Patrum*. [Limbo of the Fathers.] For the Church of Rome teaches, that “before the death and resurrection of Christ, the souls of good men departed were detained in a certain place, called *Limbus Patrum*, which is the uppermost part of hell. “The lowermost,” they say, “is the place of the damned; next above this is purgatory; next to that, *Limbus Infantum*, or the place where the souls of infants are.”

It might suffice to say, there is not one word of all this in Scripture. But there is much against it. We read that Elijah was taken up into heaven; (2 Kings ii, 11;) and he and Moses “appeared in glory,” Luke ix, 31. And Abraham is represented as in paradise, (Luke xvi,

22,) the blessed abode of good men in the other world. Therefore, none of these were in the *Limbus Patrum*. Consequently, if the Bible is true, there is no such place.

SECTION III.

OF DIVINE WORSHIP.

1. THE service of the Roman Church consists of Prayers to God, angels, and saints; of Lessons, and of Confessions of Faith.

All their service is every where performed in the Latin tongue, which is nowhere vulgarly understood. Yea, it is required; and a curse is denounced against all those who say it ought to be performed in the vulgar tongue.

This irrational and unscriptural practice destroys the great end of public worship. The end of this is, the honour of God in the edification of the Church. The means to this end is, to have the service so performed as may inform the mind and increase devotion. But this cannot be done by that service which is performed in an unknown tongue.

What St. Paul judged of this is clear from his own words: "If I know not the meaning of the voice," (of him that speaks in a public assembly,) "he that speaketh shall be a Barbarian to me," 1 Cor. xiv, 11. Again: "If thou shalt bless by the Spirit," (by the gift of an unknown tongue,) "how shall the unlearned say Amen?" (Verse 16.) How can the people be profited by the Lessons, answer at the Responses, be devout in their Prayers, confess their faith in the Creeds, when they do not understand what is read, prayed, and confessed? It is manifest, then, that the having any part of divine worship in an unknown tongue, is as flatly contrary to the word of God as it is to reason.

2. From the manner of worship in the Church of Rome, proceed we to the objects of it. Now, the Romanists worship, besides angels, the Virgin Mary and other saints. They teach that angels, in particular, are to be "worshipped, invoked, and prayed to." And they have Litanies and other prayers composed for that purpose.

In flat opposition to all this, the words of our Saviour are, "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve." To evade this, they say, "The worship we give to angels is not the same kind with that which we give to God. Vain words! What kind of worship is peculiar to God, if prayer is not? Surely God alone can receive all our prayers, and give what we pray for. We honour the angels, as they are God's ministers; but we dare not worship or pray to them; it is what they themselves refuse and abhor. So, when St. John "fell down at the feet of the angel to worship him, he said, See thou do it not: I am thy fellow servant: worship God," Rev. xix, 10.

3. The Romanists also worship saints. They pray to them as their intercessors; they confess their sins to them; they offer incense and make vows to them. Yea, they venerate their very images and relics.

Now, all this is directly contrary to Scripture. And, First, the worshipping them as intercessors. For, as "there is but one God to us, though there are gods many, and lords many;" so, according to Scripture, there is but one Intercessor or Mediator to us. (1 Cor. viii, 5, 6.)

And suppose the angels or saints intercede for us in heaven; yet may we no more worship them, than, because "there are gods many on earth," we may worship them as we do the true God.

The Romanists allow, "There is only one Mediator of redemption;" but say, "There are many mediators of intercession." We answer, The Scripture knows no difference between a mediator of intercession and of redemption. He alone "who died and rose again" for us, makes intercession for us at the right hand of God. And he alone has a right to our prayers; nor dare we address them to any other.

4. The worship which the Romanists give to the Virgin Mary, is beyond what they give either to angels or other saints. In one of their public offices they say, "Command thy Son by the right of a mother." They pray to her, to "loose the bands of the guilty, to bring light to the blind, to make them mild and chaste, and to cause their hearts to burn in love to Christ."

Such worship as this cannot be given to any creature, without gross, palpable idolatry. We honour the blessed Virgin as the mother of the Holy Jesus, and as a person of eminent piety: but we dare not give worship to her; for it belongs to God alone.

Meantime, we cannot but wonder at the application which the Church of Rome continually makes to her, of whose acts on earth the Scripture so sparingly speaks. And it says nothing of what they so pompously celebrate, her assumption into heaven, or of her exaltation to a throne above angels or archangels. It says nothing of her being "the mother of grace and mercy, the queen of the gate of heaven," or of her "power to destroy all heresies," and bring "all things to all."

5. The Romanists pay a regard to the relics of the saints also; which is a kind of worship. By relics, they mean the bodies of the saints, or any remains of them, or particular things belonging or relating to them when they were alive; as an arm or thigh, bones or ashes; or the place where, or the things by which, they suffered. They venerate these, in order to obtain the help of the saints. And they believe, "by these many benefits are conferred on mankind; that by these relics of the saints, the sick have been cured, the dead raised, and devils cast out."

We read of good King Hezekiah, that "he brake in pieces the brazen serpent which Moses had made," 2 Kings xviii, 4. And the reason was, because the children of Israel burnt incense to it. By looking up to this, the people bitten by the fiery serpents had been healed. And it was preserved from generation to generation, as a memorial of that divine operation. Yet, when it was abused to idolatry, he ordered it to be broke in pieces. And were these true relics of the saints, and did they truly work these miracles, yet that would be no sufficient cause for the worship that is given them. Rather, this worship would be a good reason, according to Hezekiah's practice, for giving them a decent interment.

6. Let us next consider what reverence the Church of Rome requires to be given to images and pictures. She requires "to kiss them, to uncover the head, to fall down before them, and use all such postures of worship as they would do to the persons represented, if present." And, accordingly, "the priest is to direct the people to them, that they may be worshipped." They say, indeed, that, in falling down before

the image, they "worship the saint or angel whom it represents." We answer, (1.) We are absolutely forbidden in Scripture to worship saints or angels themselves. (2.) We are expressly forbidden "to fall down and worship any image or likeness of any thing in heaven or earth," whomsoever it may represent. This, therefore, is flat idolatry, directly contrary to the commandment of God.

7. Such, likewise, without all possibility of evasion, is the worship they pay to the cross. They pray that God may make the wood of the cross to "be the stability of faith, an increase of good works, the redemption of souls." They use all expressions of outward adoration, as kissing, and falling down before it. They pray directly to it, to "increase grace in the ungodly, and blot out the sins of the guilty." Yea, they give *latria* to it. And this, they themselves say, "is the sovereign worship that is due only to God."

But indeed they have no authority of Scripture for their distinction between *latria* and *dulia*; the former of which they say is due to God alone, the latter that which is due to saints. But here they have forgotten their own distinction. For although they own *latria* is due only to God, yet they do in fact give it to the cross. This then, by their own account, is flat idolatry.

8. And so it is to represent the blessed Trinity by pictures and images, and to worship them. Yet these are made in every Romish country, and recommended to the people to be worshipped; although there is nothing more expressly forbidden in Scripture, than to make any image or representation of God. God himself never appeared in any bodily shape. The representation of "the Ancient of days," mentioned in Daniel, was a mere prophetic figure; and did no more literally belong to God, than the eyes or ears that are ascribed to him in Scripture.

SECTION IV.

OF THE SACRAMENTS.

1. THE Church of Rome says, "A sacrament is a sensible thing, instituted by God himself, as a sign and a means of grace.

"The sacraments are seven: Baptism, confirmation, the Lord's Supper, penance, extreme unction, orders, and marriage.

"The parts of a sacrament are, the matter, and the form, or words of consecration. So in baptism, the matter is water; the form, 'I baptize thee,' &c.

On this we remark, Peter Lombard lived about one thousand one hundred and forty years after Christ. And he was the first that ever determined the sacraments to be seven. St. Austin (a greater than he) positively affirms, "that there are but two of divine institution."

Again: To say that a sacrament consists of matter and form, and yet either has no form, as confirmation and extreme unction, (neither of which is ever pretended to have any form of words, instituted by God himself,) or has neither matter nor form, as penance or marriage, is to make them sacraments and no sacraments. For they do not answer that definition of a sacrament which themselves have given.

2. However, they teach that "all these seven confer grace *ex opere operato*, by the work itself, on all such as do not put an obstruction." Nay, it is not enough that we do not put an obstruction. In order to our receiving grace, there is also required previous instruction, true repentance, and a degree of faith; and even then the grace does not spring merely *ex opere operato*: it does not proceed from the mere elements, or the words spoken; but from the blessing of God, in consequence of his promise to such as are qualified for it.

Equally erroneous is that doctrine of the Church of Rome, that, "in order to the validity of any sacrament, it is absolutely necessary the person who administers it should do it with a holy intention." For it follows, that, wherever there is not this intention, the sacrament is null and void. And so there is no certainty whether the priest, so called, be a real priest; for who knows the intention of him that ordained him? And if he be not, all his ministrations are of course null and void. But if he be, can I be sure that his intention was holy, in administering the baptism or the Lord's Supper? And if it was not, they are no sacraments at all, and all our attendance on them is lost labour.

3. So much for the sacraments in general: let us now proceed to particulars:—

"Baptism," say the Romanists, "may, in case of necessity, be administered by women, yea, by Jews, infidels, or heretics." No; our Lord gave this commission only to the Apostles, and their successors in the ministry.

The ceremonies which the Romanists use in baptism are these:—

Before baptism, (1.) Chrism; that is, oil mixed with water is to be consecrated. (2.) Exorcism; that is, the priest is to blow in the face of the child, saying, "Go out of him, Satan!" (3.) He crosses the forehead, eyes, breast, and several other parts of the body. (4.) He puts exorcised salt into his mouth, saying, "Take the salt of wisdom." (5.) He puts spittle in the palm of his left hand, puts the fore-finger of his right hand into it, and anoints the child's nose and ears therewith, who is then brought to the water.

After baptism, First, he anoints the top of the child's head with chrim, as a token of salvation: Secondly, he puts on him a white garment, in token of his innocence: And, Thirdly, he puts a lighted candle into his hand, in token of the light of faith.

Now, what can any man of understanding say in defence of these idle ceremonies, utterly unknown in the primitive Church, as well as unsupported by Scripture? Do they add dignity to the ordinance of God? Do they not rather make it contemptible?

4. The matter of confirmation is the chrim; which is an ointment consecrated by the bishop. The form is the words he uses in crossing the forehead with the chrim; namely, "I sign thee with the sign of the cross, and confirm thee with the chrim of salvation, in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost."

Then the person confirmed, setting his right foot on the right foot of his godfather, is to have his head bound with a clean headband; which, after some days, is to be taken off, and reserved till the next Ash-Wednesday, to be then burnt to holy ashes.

The Roman Catechism says, "Sacraments cannot be instituted by

any beside God." But it must be allowed, Christ did not institute confirmation; therefore it is no sacrament at all.

5. We come now to one of the grand doctrines of the Church of Rome,—that which regards the Lord's Supper. This, therefore, we would wish to consider with the deepest attention. They say, "In the Lord's Supper whole Christ is really, truly, and substantially contained; God-Man, body and blood, bones and nerves, under the appearance of bread and wine."

They attempt to prove it thus: "Our Lord himself says, 'This is my body. Therefore, upon consecration there is a conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the whole substance of Christ's body, and of the whole substance of the wine into the substance of his blood; and this we term transubstantiation.

"Yet we must not suppose that Christ is broken, when the host, or consecrated bread, is broken; because there is whole and entire Christ, under the species of every particle of bread, and under the species of every drop of wine."

We answer: no such change of the bread into the body of Christ can be inferred from his words, "This is my body." For it is not said, "This is *changed* into my body," but, "This *is* my body;" which, if it were to be taken literally, would rather prove the substance of the bread to be his body. But that they are not to be taken literally is manifest from the words of St. Paul, who calls it bread, not only before, but likewise after, the consecration, 1 Cor. x, 17; xi, 26–28. Here we see, that what was called his body, was bread at the same time. And accordingly these elements are called by the Fathers, "the images, the symbols, the figure, of Christ's body and blood."

Scripture and antiquity, then, are flatly against transubstantiation. And so are our very senses. Now, our Lord himself appealed to the senses of his disciples: "Handle me and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have," Luke xxiv, 39. Take away the testimony of our senses, and there is no discerning a body from a spirit. But if we believe transubstantiation, we take away the testimony of all our senses.

And we give up our reason too: for if every particle of the host is as much the whole body of Christ as the whole host is before it is divided, then a whole may be divided, not into parts, but into wholes. For divide and subdivide it over and over, and it is whole still! It is whole before the division, whole in the division, whole after the division! Such nonsense, absurdity, and self-contradiction all over is the doctrine of transubstantiation!

6. An evil practice attending this evil doctrine is, the depriving the laity of the cup in the Lord's Supper. It is acknowledged by all, that our Lord instituted and delivered this sacrament in both kinds; giving the wine as well as the bread to all that partook of it; and that it continued to be so delivered in the Church of Rome for above a thousand years. And yet, notwithstanding this, the Church of Rome now forbids the people to drink of the cup! A more insolent and barefaced corruption cannot easily be conceived!

Another evil practice in the Church of Rome, utterly unheard of in the ancient Church, is, that when there is none to receive the Lord's Supper, the priest communicates alone. (Indeed it is not properly to

communicate, when one only receives it.) This likewise is an absolute innovation in the Church of God.

But the greatest abuse of all in the Lord's Supper, is, the worshipping the consecrated bread. And this the Church of Rome not only practises, but positively enjoins. These are her words: "The same sovereign worship which is due to God, is due to the host. Adore it; pray to it. And whosoever holds it unlawful so to do, let him be accursed."

The Romanists themselves grant, that if Christ is not corporally present in the Lord's Supper, this is idolatry. And that he is not corporally present any where but in heaven, we learn from Acts i, 11; iii, 21. Thither he went, and there he will continue, "till the time of the restitution of all things."

7. Consider we now what the Romanists hold, concerning the sacrament of penance.

"The matter of the sacrament of penance is, contrition, confession, and satisfaction; the form, 'I absolve thee.'"

We object to this: you say, "The matter of a sacrament is something sensible," perceivable by our senses. But if so, penance is not a sacrament. For surely contrition is not something perceivable by the outward senses!

Again: they say, "Confession is a particular discovery of all mortal sins to a priest, with all their circumstances, as far as they can be called to mind; without which there can be no forgiveness or salvation."

We answer: Although it is often of use to confess our sins to a spiritual guide, yet to make confessing to a priest necessary to forgiveness and salvation, is "teaching for doctrines the commandment of men." And to make it necessary in all cases is to lay a dangerous snare both for the confessor and the confessed.

They go on: "The sentence pronounced by the priest in absolution, is pronounced by the Judge himself. All the sins of the sinner are thereby pardoned, and an entrance opened into heaven."

We cannot allow it. We believe the absolution pronounced by the priest is only declarative and conditional. For judicially to pardon sin and absolve the sinner, is a power God has reserved to himself.

Once more: you say, "Satisfaction is a compensation made to God by alms, &c, for all offences committed against him."

We answer, (1.) It cannot be that we should satisfy God, by any of our works. For, (2.) Nothing can make satisfaction to him, but the obedience and death of his Son.

8. We proceed to what they call, "the sacrament of extreme unction." "The matter," they say, "of extreme unction is, oil consecrated by the bishop, and applied to the eyes, ears, mouth, hands, feet, and reins of a person supposed to be near death." The form is: "By this holy anointing, God pardon thee for whatever thou hast offended by the eyes, ears, mouth, or touch."

We reply: When the Apostles were sent forth, "they anointed with oil many that were sick, and healed them," Mark vi, 13; using this as a sign of the miraculous cures to be wrought. And St. James accordingly directs: "Is any sick among you? Let him call for the elders of the Church; let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord. And the prayer of faith shall save the sick," v, 14, 15.

But what has this to do with the extreme unction of the Church of Rome? In the first Church, this anointing was a mere rite: in the Church of Rome, it is made a sacrament! It was used in the first Church for the body; it is used in the Church of Rome for the soul; it was used then for the recovery of the sick; now, for those only that are thought past recovery. It is easy, therefore, to see, that the Romish extreme unction has no foundation in Scripture.

9. We are now to consider what the Church of Rome delivers concerning ordination. "This," says she, "is properly a sacrament. He that denies it, let him be accursed."

"The orders received in the Church of Rome are seven: the Priest, the Deacon, the Subdeacon, the Acolythus, to carry the candle; the Exorcist, to cast out devils; the Reader, and Door Keeper."

On this, we observe, It is not worth disputing, whether ordination should be called a sacrament or not. Let the word then pass: but we object to the thing; there is no divine authority for any order under a deacon. Much less is there any Scriptural authority for the forms of conjuration prescribed to the exorcists; or for the rites prescribed in exorcising not only men, women, and children, but likewise houses, cattle, milk, butter, or fruits, said to be infested with the devil.

10. The next of their sacraments, so called, is marriage; concerning which they pronounce, "Marriage is truly and properly a sacrament. He that denies it so to be, let him be accursed."

We answer, In one sense it may be so. For St. Austin says, "Signs, when applied to religious things, are called Sacraments." In this large sense, he calls the sign of the cross a sacrament; and others give this name to washing the feet. But it is not a sacrament according to the Romish definition of the word; for it no more "confers grace," than washing the feet or signing with the cross.

A more dangerous error in the Church of Rome is, the forbidding the clergy to marry. "Those that are married may not be admitted into orders: those that are admitted may not marry: and those that, being admitted, do marry, are to be separated."

The Apostle, on the contrary, says, "Marriage is honourable in all," Heb. xiii, 4; and accuses those who "forbid to marry," of teaching "doctrines of devils." How lawful it was for the clergy to marry, his directions concerning it show, 1 Tim. iv, 1, 3. And how convenient, yea, necessary, in many cases it is, clearly appears from the innumerable mischiefs which have in all ages followed the prohibition of it in the Church of Rome; which so many wise and good men, even of her own communion, have lamented.

I have now fairly stated, and calmly considered, most of the particular doctrines of the Church of Rome. Permit me to add a few considerations of a more general nature.

That many members of that Church have been holy men, and that many are so now, I firmly believe. But I do not know, if any of them that are dead were more holy than many Protestants who are now with God; yea, than some of our own country, who were very lately removed to Abraham's bosom. To instance only in one: (whom I mention the rather, because an account of his life is extant:) I do not believe that many of them, of the same age, were more holy than Thomas Walsh.

And I doubt if any among them, living now, are more holy than several Protestants now alive.

But be this as it may : However, by the tender mercies of God, many members of the Church of Rome have been, and are now, holy men, notwithstanding their principles ; yet I fear many of their principles have a natural tendency to undermine holiness ; greatly to hinder, if not utterly to destroy, the essential branches of it,—to destroy the love of God, and the love of our neighbour, with all justice, and mercy, and truth.

I wish it were possible to lay all prejudice aside, and to consider this calmly and impartially. I begin with the love of God, the fountain of all that holiness without which we cannot see the Lord. And what is it that has a more natural tendency to destroy this than idolatry ? Consequently, every doctrine which leads to idolatry, naturally tends to destroy it. But so does a very considerable part of the avowed doctrine of the Church of Rome. Her doctrine touching the worship of angels, of saints, the Virgin Mary in particular,—touching the worship of images, of relics, of the cross, and, above all, of the host, or consecrated wafer,—lead all who receive them to practise idolatry, flat, palpable idolatry ; the paying that worship to the creature which is due to God alone. Therefore they have a natural tendency to hinder, if not utterly destroy, the love of God.

Secondly. The doctrine of the Church of Rome has a natural tendency to hinder, if not destroy, the love of our neighbour. By the love of our neighbour, I mean universal benevolence ; tender good-will to all men. For in this respect every child of man, every son of Adam, is our neighbour ; as we may easily learn from our Lord's history of the good Samaritan. Now, the Church of Rome, by asserting that all who are not of her own Church, that is, the bulk of mankind, are in a state of utter rejection from God, despised and hated by him that made them ; and by her bitter (I might say, accursed) anathemas, devoting to absolute, everlasting destruction, all who willingly or unwillingly differ from her in any jot or tittle ; teaches all her members to look upon them with the same eyes that she supposes God to do ; to regard them as mere fire-brands of hell, “vessels of wrath, fitted for destruction.” And what love can you entertain for such ? No other than you can believe God to have for them. Therefore, every anathema denounced by the Church of Rome against all who differ from her, has a natural tendency, not only to hinder, but utterly destroy, the love of our neighbour.

Thirdly. The same doctrine which devotes to utter destruction so vast a majority of mankind, must greatly indispose us for showing them the justice which is due to all men. For how hard is it to be just to them we hate ? to render them their due, either in thought, word, or action ? Indeed, we violate justice by this very thing, by not loving them as ourselves. For we do not render unto all their due ; seeing love is due to all mankind. If we “owe no man any thing” beside, do we not owe this, “to love one another ?” And where love is totally wanting, what other justice can be expected ? Will not a whole train of injurious tempers and passions, of wrong words and actions, naturally follow ? So plain, so undeniably plain it is, that this doctrine of the Church of Rome, (to instance at present in no more,) that “all but

those of their own Church are accursed," has a natural tendency to hinder, yea, utterly to destroy, justice.

Fourthly. Its natural tendency to destroy mercy is equally glaring and undeniable. We need not use any reasoning to prove this: Only cast your eyes upon matter of fact! What terrible proofs of it do we see in the execrable crusades against the Albigenses! in those horrible wars in the Holy Land, where so many rivers of blood were poured out! in the many millions that have been butchered in Europe, since the beginning of the Reformation; not only in the open field, but in prisons, on the scaffold, on the gibbet, at the stake! For how many thousand lives, barbarously taken away, has Philip the Second to give an account to God! For how many thousand, that infamous, perfidious butcher, Charles the Ninth of France! to say nothing of our own bloody Queen Mary, not much inferior to them! See, in Europe, in America, in the uttermost parts of Asia, the dungeons, the racks, the various tortures of the Inquisition, so unhappily styled, *the House of Mercy!* Yea, such mercy as is in the fiends in hell! such mercy as the natives of Ireland, in the last century, showed to myriads of their Protestant countrymen! Such is the mercy which the doctrine of the Church of Rome very naturally inspires!

Lastly. The doctrine of the Church of Rome has a natural tendency to destroy truth from off the earth. What can more directly tend to this, what can more incite her own members to all manner of lying and falsehood, than that precious doctrine of the Church of Rome, that no faith is to be kept with heretics? Can I believe one word that a man says, who espouses this principle? I know it has been frequently affirmed, that the Church of Rome has renounced this doctrine. But I ask, When or where? By what public and authentic act, notified to all the world? This principle has been publicly and openly avowed by a whole Council, the ever renowned Council of Constance: an assembly never to be paralleled, either among Turks or Pagans, for regard to justice, mercy, and truth! But when and where was it as publicly disavowed? Till this is done in the face of the sun, this doctrine must stand before all mankind as an avowed principle of the Church of Rome.

And will this operate only toward heretics? toward the supposed enemies of the Church? Nay, where men have once learned not to keep faith with heretics, they will not long keep it toward Catholics. When they have once overleaped the bounds of truth, and habituated themselves to lying and dissimulation, toward one kind of men, will they not easily learn to behave in the same manner toward all men? So that, instead of "putting away all lying," they will put away all truth; and instead of having "no guile found in their mouth," there will be found nothing else therein!

Thus naturally do the principles of the Romanists tend to banish truth from among themselves. And have they not an equal tendency to cause lying and dissimulation among those that are not of their communion, by that Romish principle, that force is to be used in matters of religion? that if men are not of our sentiments, of our Church, we should thus "compel them to come in?" Must not this, in the very nature of things, induce all those over whom they have any power, to dissemble if not deny those opinions, who vary ever so little from what that Church has

determined? And if a habit of lying and dissimulation is once formed, it will not confine itself to matters of religion. It will assuredly spread into common life, and tincture the whole conversation.

Again: Some of the most eminent Roman casuists (whose books are duly licensed by the heads of the Church) lay it down as an undoubted maxim, that, although malicious lies are sins, yet "officious lies, that is, lies told in order to do good, are not only innocent, but meritorious." Now, what a flood-gate does this open for falsehood of every kind! Therefore this doctrine, likewise, has a natural tendency to banish truth from the earth.

One doctrine more of the Romish Church must not here be passed over; I mean that of absolution by a priest; as it has a clear, direct tendency to destroy both justice, mercy, and truth; yea, to drive all virtue out of the world. For if a man (and not always a very good man) has power to forgive sins; if he can at pleasure forgive any violation, either of truth, or mercy, or justice; what an irresistible temptation must this be to men of weak or corrupt minds! Will they be scrupulous with regard to any pleasing sin, when they can be absolved upon easy terms? And if after this any scruple remain, is not a remedy for it provided? Are there not Papal indulgences to be had; yea, plenary indulgences? I have seen one of these which was purchased at Rome not many years ago. This single doctrine of Papal indulgences strikes at the root of all religion. And were the Church of Rome ever so faultless in all other respects, yet till this power of forgiving sins, whether by priestly absolution or Papal indulgences, is openly and absolutely disclaimed, and till these practices are totally abolished, there can be no security in that Church for any morality, any religion, any justice, or mercy, or truth.

A LETTER

TO THE PRINTER OF THE "PUBLIC ADVERTISER."

OCCASIONED

BY THE LATE ACT PASSED IN FAVOUR OF POPERY.

TO WHICH IS ADDED,

A DEFENCE OF IT,

IN TWO LETTERS TO THE EDITORS OF "THE FREEMAN'S JOURNAL," DUBLIN.

SIR,—Some time ago a pamphlet was sent me, entitled, "An Appeal from the Protestant Association, to the People of Great Britain." A day or two since, a kind of answer to this was put into my hand, which pronounces its style contemptible, its reasoning futile, and its object malicious. On the contrary, I think the style of it is clear, easy, and natural; the reasoning, in general, strong and conclusive; the object or design, kind and benevolent. And in pursuance of the same kind and benevolent design, namely, to preserve our happy constitution, I shall endeavour to confirm the substance of that tract, by a few plain arguments.

With persecution I have nothing to do. I persecute no man for his religious principles. Let there be as "boundless a freedom in religion" as any man can conceive. But this does not touch the point: I will set religion, true or false, utterly out of the question. Suppose the Bible, if you please, to be a fable, and the Koran to be the word of God. I consider not, whether the Romish religion be true or false; I build nothing on one or the other supposition. Therefore, away with all your commonplace declamation about intolerance and persecution for religion! Suppose every word of Pope Pius's creed to be true; suppose the Council of Trent to have been infallible; yet, I insist upon it, that no government not Roman Catholic ought to tolerate men of the Roman Catholic persuasion.*

I prove this by a plain argument: (let him answer it that can:)—That no Roman Catholic does, or can, give security for his allegiance or peaceable behaviour, I prove thus: It is a Roman Catholic maxim, established, not by private men, but by a public council, that "no faith is to be kept with heretics." This has been openly avowed by the Council of Constance; but it never was openly disclaimed. Whether private persons avow or disavow it, it is a fixed maxim of the Church of Rome. But as long as it is so, nothing can be more plain, than that the members of that Church can give no reasonable security to any government of their allegiance or peaceable behaviour. Therefore they ought not to be tolerated by any government, Protestant, Mohammedan, or Pagan.

You may say, "Nay, but they will take an oath of allegiance." True, five hundred oaths; but the maxim, "No faith is to be kept with heretics," sweeps them all away as a spider's web. So that still no governors that are not Roman Catholics can have any security of their allegiance.

Again: Those who acknowledge the spiritual power of the Pope can give no security of their allegiance to any government; but all Roman Catholics acknowledge this: therefore they can give no security for their allegiance.

The power of granting pardons for all sins, past, present, and to come, is, and has been for many centuries, one branch of his spiritual power.

But those who acknowledge him to have this spiritual power can give no security for their allegiance; since they believe the Pope can pardon rebellions, high treason, and all other sins whatsoever.

The power of dispensing with any promise, oath, or vow, is another branch of the spiritual power of the Pope. And all who acknowledge his spiritual power must acknowledge this. But whoever acknowledges the dispensing power of the Pope can give no security for his allegiance to any government.

Oaths and promises are none; they are light as air; a dispensation makes them all null and void.

Nay, not only the Pope, but even a priest, has power to pardon sins! This is an essential doctrine of the Church of Rome. But they that acknowledge this cannot possibly give any security for their allegiance

* For an explanation of this passage, see Mr. Wesley's Second Letter to the Editors of the Freeman's Journal, p. 822; and his "Disavowal of Persecuting Papists," p. 827.

to any government. Oaths are no security at all; for the priest can pardon both perjury and high treason.

Setting then religion aside, it is plain, that upon principles of reason, no government ought to tolerate men who cannot give any security to that government for their allegiance and peaceable behaviour. But this no Romanist can do, not only while he holds that "no faith is to be kept with heretics;" but so long as he acknowledges either priestly absolution, or the spiritual power of the pope.

"But the late act," you say, "does not either tolerate or encourage Roman Catholics." I appeal to matter of fact. Do not the Romanists themselves understand it as a toleration? You know they do. And does it not already (let alone what it may do by and by) encourage them to preach openly, to build chapels, (at Bath and elsewhere,) to raise seminaries, and to make numerous converts day by day to their intolerant, persecuting principles? I can point out, if need be, several of the persons. And they are increasing daily.

But "nothing dangerous to English liberty is to be apprehended from them." I am not certain of that. Some time since, a Romish priest came to one I knew, and, after talking with her largely, broke out, "You are no heretic; you have the experience of a real Christian!" "And would you," she asked, "burn me alive?" He said, "God forbid!—unless it were for the good of the Church!"

Now, what security could she have had for her life, if it had depended on that man? The *good of the Church* would have burst all the ties of truth, justice, and mercy; especially when seconded by the absolution of a priest, or (if need were) a Papal pardon.

If any one please to answer this, and to set his name, I shall probably reply.—But the productions of anonymous writers, I do not promise to take any notice of.

I am, sir, your humble servant, JOHN WESLEY.
CITY ROAD, January 21, 1780.

TWO LETTERS TO

THE EDITORS OF THE FREEMAN'S JOURNAL, DUBLIN.

TO THE READER.

SEVERAL months since, Father O'Leary, a Capuchin friar in Dublin, published Remarks upon this Letter in the Freeman's Journal. As soon as these were sent to me, I published a Reply in the same paper. When I read more of his Remarks, printed in five succeeding Journals, I wrote a second Reply; but did not think it worth while to follow, step by step, so wild, rambling a writer.

Mr. O'Leary has now put his six letters into one, which are reprinted in London, with this title, "Mr. O'Leary's Remarks on the Rev. Mr. W.'s Letters in Defence of the Protestant Associations in England; to which are prefixed Mr. Wesley's Letters."

Is it by negligence or by design, that there are so many mistakes even in a title page?

1. "To which are prefixed Mr. W.'s Letters." No: the second of those letters is not mine. I never saw it before.

2. But where are the two letters published in the Freeman's Journal? Why is a spurious letter palmed upon us, and the genuine ones suppressed?

3. "Letters in Defence of the Protestant Association in England." Hold! In my first Letter I have only three lines in defence of a Tract published in London. But I have not one line "in Defence of the Associations," either in London or elsewhere.

If Mr. O'Leary will seriously answer the two following letters, he may expect a serious reply. But if he has only drollery and low wit to oppose to argument, I shall concern myself no farther about him.

LONDON, Dec. 29, 1780.

LETTER I.

GENTLEMEN,—1. Mr. O'Leary does well to entitle his Paper "Remarks," as that word may mean any thing or nothing; but it is no more an answer to my Letter, than to the Bull Unigenitus. He likewise does wisely in prefacing his "Remarks" with so handsome a compliment: this may naturally incline you to think well of his judgment, which is no small point gained.

2. His manner of writing is easy and pleasant; but might it not as well be more serious? The subject we are treating of is not a light one: it moves me to tears rather than to laughter. I plead for the safety of my country; yea, for the children that are yet unborn. "But cannot your country be safe unless the Roman Catholics are persecuted for their religion?" Hold! Religion is out of the question: but I would not have them persecuted at all; I would only have them hindered from doing hurt. I would not put it in their power (and I do not wish that others should) to cut the throats of their quiet neighbours. "But they will give security for their peaceable behaviour." They cannot while they continue Roman Catholics; they cannot while they are members of that Church which receives the decrees of the Council of Constance, which maintains the spiritual power of the Bishop of Rome, or the doctrine of priestly absolution.

3. This I observed in my late Letter. Whoever, therefore, would remark upon it to any purpose, must prove these three things: (1.) That the decree of the Council of Constance, publicly made, has been publicly disclaimed. (2.) That the Pope has not power to pardon sins, or to dispense with oaths, vows, and promises. And, (3.) That no priest has power to pardon sins. But has Mr. O'Leary proved these three points? Has he proved any one of them? He has, indeed, said something upon the first: he denies such a decree was ever made.

4. I am persuaded Mr. O'Leary is the first man that ever made the important discovery. But, before he is quite sure, let him look again into Father L'Abbé's "Concilia Maxima," printed at Paris in the year 1672. The last volume contains a particular account of the Council of Constance; one of whose decrees (p. 169) is, "That heretics ought to be put to death, *non obstantibus salvis conductibus Imperatoris, Regum, &c.* notwithstanding the public faith engaged to them in the most solemn manner." Who then can affirm that no such doctrine or violation of faith with heretics is authorized by this Council? Without putting on spectacles, which, blessed be God, I do not wear, I can read a little Latin still. And, while I can, I must fix this horrid doctrine on the Council of Constance.

5. But, supposing the Council of Constance had never advanced this doctrine, or the Church of Rome had publicly disclaimed it, my conclusion stands good till it is proved, (1.) That no priest has a power of pardoning sins; and, (2.) That the Pope has neither a power of pardoning sins, nor of dispensing with oaths, vows, promises, &c.

Mr. O'Leary has proved neither of these: and what has he proved? It is hard to say. But if he proves nothing, he either directly or indirectly asserts many things. In particular, he asserts, (1.) "Mr. Wesley has arraigned in the jargon of the Schools." Heigh-day! What has this to do here? There is no more of the jargon of the Schools in my Letter, than there is of Arabic. "The Catholics all over the world are liars, perjurers," &c. Nay, I have not arraigned one of them. This is a capital mistake. I arraign the doctrines, not the men. Either defend them, or renounce them.

"I do renounce them," says Mr. O'Leary. Perhaps you do. But the Church of Rome has never renounced them. "He asperses our communion in a cruel manner." I do not asperse it at all in saying, these are the doctrines of the Church of Rome. Who can prove the contrary?

(2.) "Mr. O'Leary did not even attempt to seduce the English soldiery." I believe it; but does this prove any of these three points? "But Queen Elizabeth and King James roasted heretics in Smithfield!" In what year? I doubt the fact.

(3.) "Mr. Wesley is become an apologist of those who burned the chapel in Edinburgh." Is not this said purely *ad movendam invidiam*? "to inflame the minds of the people?" For it has no shadow of truth. I never yet wrote nor spoke one word in their defence. "He urged the rabble to light that fire." No more than he urged them to dethrone the king.

(4.) "Does Mr. Wesley intend to sound Alecto's horn, or the warshell of the Mexicans." All this is cruel aspersion indeed; designed merely to inflame! What I intend is neither more nor less than this,—to contribute my mite to preserve our constitution both in Church and State.

(5.) "They were the Scotch and English regicides who gave rise to the Irish massacre." *The Irish massacre!* Was there ever any such thing? Was not the whole account a mere Protestant lie? O no! it was a melancholy truth, wrote in the blood of many thousands. But the regicides no more gave rise to that massacre than the Hottentots. The whole matter was planned several years, and executed before the king's death was thought of. "But Mr. Wesley is sowing the seeds of another massacre!" Such another as the massacre of Paris!

6. "Was he the trumpeter of persecution when he was persecuted himself?" Just as much as now. Cruel aspersions still! designed and calculated only to inflame. "Did he then abet persecution on the score of conscience?" No, nor now. Conscience is out of the question. "His Letter contains all the horrors invented by blind misguided zeal, set forth in the most bitter language." Is this gentleman in his senses? I hope not. Else I know not what excuse to make for him. Not one bitter word is in my Letter. I have learned to put away "all bitterness, with all malice." But still this is wide of the mark; which of those three points does it prove?

7. "In his Second Letter, he promises to put out the fire which he has already kindled in England." *Second Letter!* What is that? I know nothing of it. *The fire which he has kindled in England.* When? Where? I have kindled no fire in England, any more than in

Jamaica. I have done, and will do, all that is in my power to put out that which others have kindled.

8. "He strikes out a creed of his own for Roman Catholics. This fictitious creed he forces upon them." My words are these: "Suppose every word of Pope Pius's Creed to be true." I say not a word more of the matter. Now, I appeal to every reasonable man, Is this striking out a creed of my own for Roman Catholics? Is this forcing a fictitious creed on them, "like the Frenchman and the blunderer in the comedy?" What have I to do with one or the other? Is not this dull jest quite out of season? And is the creed, composed by the Council of Trent, and the Bull of Pope Pius IV, a fictitious one? Before Mr. O'Leary asserts this again, let him look into the *Concilia Maxima* once more, and read there, *Bulla Pii Quarti super forma Juramenti professionis fidei*. [The Bull of Pius IV, concerning the form of the oath of the creed.] This *forma professionis fidei*, I called Pope Pius's Creed. If his "stomach revolts from it," who can help it?

9. Whether the account given by Philip Melancthon of the words spoken (not in Hebrew but in Latin) be true or false, it does not at all affect the account of Miss Duchesne, which I gave in her own words. And I cannot but observe, that, after all the witticisms which he has bestowed upon it, Mr. O'Leary does not deny that the priest might have burnt her, "had it been for the good of the Church."

10. "Remark a Missionary inflaming the rabble, and propagating black slander." Remark a San Benito Cap, painted with devils; but let him put it on, whom it fits. It does not fit me: I inflame no rabble: I propagate no slander at all. But Mr. O'Leary does. He propagates a heap of slander in these his Remarks. I say too, "Let the appeal be made to the public and their impartial reason." I have nothing to do with the "jargon or rubbish of the schools," lugged in like "the jargon of the schools" before. But I would be glad if Mr. O'Leary would tell us what these two pretty phrases mean.

The whole matter is this. I have, without the least bitterness, advanced three reasons why I conceive it is not safe to tolerate the Roman Catholics. But still, I would not have them persecuted: I wish them to enjoy the same liberty, civil and religious, which they enjoyed in England before the late act was repealed. Meantime, I would not have a sword put into their hands; I would not give them liberty to hurt others. Mr. O'Leary, with much archness and pleasantry, has nibbled at one of these three reasons, leaving the other two untouched. If he chooses to attack them in his next, I will endeavour to give him a calm and serious answer.

I am, Gentlemen, your obedient servant,

JOHN WESLEY.

MANCHESTER, March 23, 1780.

LETTER II.

GENTLEMEN,—Some time ago, in a Letter published at London, I observed, "Roman Catholics cannot give those whom they account heretics any sufficient security for their peaceable behaviour."

1. Because it has been publicly avowed in one of their General Councils, and never publicly disclaimed, that faith is not to be kept with

heretics; 2. Because they hold the doctrine of priestly absolution; and, 3. The doctrine of Papal pardons and dispensations.

Mr. O'Leary has published "Remarks" on this letter; nine parts in ten of which are quite wide of the mark. Not that they are wide of *his* mark, which is to introduce a plausible panegyric upon the Roman Catholics, mixed with keen invectives against the Protestants, whether true or false it matters not. All this is admirably well calculated to inspire the reader with aversion to these heretics, and to bring them back to the holy, harmless, much-injured Church of Rome. And I should not wonder, if these six papers should make six thousand converts to her.

Close arguing he does not attempt; but he vapours, and skips to and fro, and rambles to all points of the compass, in a very lively and entertaining manner.

Whatever has the face of an argument in his first letter I answered before. Those of the 14th, 16th, 18th, and 21st instant, I pass over at present: I have now only to do with what he advances in your Journal of March 12.

Here I read: "For Mr. Wesley's second letter, see the last page." I have seen it; but I can find no more of the second letter in the last page, than in the first. It would be strange if I did; for that second letter was never heard of, but in Mr. O'L.'s "Remarks." "But why then does he mention it over and over?" Truly, I cannot tell.

He begins: "Fanaticism"—Hold! There is no fanaticism in my letter, but plain, sober reason. I "now expect" (they are his own words) "a serious answer to a serious charge."

My argument was: the Council of Constance has openly avowed violation of faith with heretics: but it has never been openly disclaimed. Therefore, those who receive this Council cannot be trusted by those whom they account heretics. This is my immediate conclusion. And if the premises be admitted, it will infallibly follow.

On this Mr. O'L. says, "A Council so often quoted challenges peculiar attention. We shall examine it with all possible precision and impartiality. At a time when the broachers of a new doctrine" (as new as the Bible) "were kindling the fire of sedition, and shaking the foundations of thrones and kingdoms,"—big words, but entirely void of truth!—"was held the Council of Constance. To this was cited John Huss, famous for propagating errors, tending to—wrest the sceptre from the hands of kings."—Equally true! "He was obnoxious to Church and State." To the Church of Rome; not to the State in any degree.

"Protestant and Catholic legislators enacted laws for burning heretics." How wisely are these jumbled together; and the Protestants placed first! But pray, what Protestant legislator made such laws, either before or after the Catholic ones? I know, one man, Servetus, was burned at Geneva; but I know not that there was any law for it. And I know, one woman, Joan Bocher, was burned in Smithfield, much against the mind of King Edward. But what is this to the numbers who were inhumanly butchered by Queen Mary; to say nothing of her savage husband? "But the same laws were executed by Queen Elizabeth and King James." How? Did either of these burn heretics?

Queen Elizabeth put two Anabaptists to death; but what was this to the achievements of her sister?

He adds a well-devised apology for the Romish persecutions of the Protestants as necessarily resulting from the nature of things, and not from any wrong principles. And this he illustrates by the treatment formerly given to the Methodists, "whose love-feasts and watch-nights roused the vigilance of the magistrate, and influenced the rage of the rabble." Indeed, they did not. Not only no magistrate ever objected either to one or the other, but no mob, even in the most turbulent times, ever interrupted them.

But to the Council: "Huss strikes at the root of all temporal power and civil authority. He boldly asserts, that all princes, magistrates, &c, in the state of mortal sin, are deprived, *ipso facto*, [by the fact itself,] of all power and jurisdiction. And by broaching these doctrines, he makes Bohemia a theatre of intestine war. See the Acts of the Council of Constance in L'Abbé's Collection of Councils."

I have seen them, and I can find nothing of all this therein. But more of this by and by.

"He gave notice that he would stand his trial; but he attempted to escape." No, never; this is pure invention. "He is arrested at Constance,"—whence he never attempted to escape,—and confined. His friends plead his safe conduct. The Council then declared, 'No safe conduct granted by the emperor, or any other princes, to heretics, ought to hinder them from being punished as justice shall require. And the person who has promised them security shall not be obliged to keep his promise, by whatever tie he may be engaged.'

And did the Council of Constance declare this? "Yes;" says Mr. O'Leary. I desire no more. But, before I argue upon the point, permit me to give a little fuller account of the whole affair:—

The Council of Constance was called by the Emperor Sigismund and Pope John XXIII, in the year 1414. Before it began, the emperor sent some Bohemian gentlemen to conduct John Huss to Constance, solemnly promising that he should "come and return freely, without fraud or interruption."

But before he left Prague, he waited on the Bishop of Nazareth, Papal Inquisitor for that city and diocess, who, in the presence of many witnesses, gave him the following testimonial:—

"We, Nicholas, do by these presents make known to all men, that we have often talked with that honourable man, Master John Huss, and in all his sayings, doings, and behaviour; have proved him to be a faithful man; finding no manner of evil, sinister, or erroneous doings in him, unto this present. PRAGUE, August 30, 1414."

This was attested by the hand and seal of the public notary, named Michael Pruthatietz.

After this, Conrade, Archbishop of Prague, declared before all the barons of Bohemia, that "he knew not that John Huss was culpable or faulty in any crime or offence whatever."

So neither the Inquisitor nor the Archbishop knew any thing of "his making Bohemia a theatre of intestine war!"

In October he began his journey, accompanied by two noblemen, Wencelat de Duba, and John de Clum. On November 3d, he came to Constance, and was treated with great respect. But not long after,

he was suddenly arrested and cast into a noisome prison. Here he quickly fell sick. During his sickness, his accusers exhibited twelve articles against him. But none of them charge him with sedition. They relate purely to the Church.

May 14, 1415. The nobles of Bohemia complained to the Council, "When Master John Huss came to the Council, under the Emperor's safe conduct, he was, in violation of the public faith, imprisoned before he was heard." They add: "And he is now grievously tormented, both with fetters, and with hunger and thirst."

June 8. His accusers brought thirty-nine articles more, and afterward twenty-six others. But both the former and the latter relate wholly to the Church.

Seven more were brought next. The first of these is, "If the Pope, Bishop, or Prelate, be in deadly sin, he is then no Pope, Bishop, or Prelate." But this he himself explains in the same tract whence it is taken. "Such, as touching their deserts, are not worthily Popes or Pastors before God; yet, as touching their office, are Popes and Pastors."

After these, six more articles were exhibited; but all relate to the Church, as do nineteen more that followed them. In fine, nineteen others were preferred by the chancellor and university of Paris. One of these was, "No man being in deadly sin is a true Pope, Prelate, or Lord." This seems to be the same with the preceding charge; only they have mended it by adding the word *Lord*. Another was, "Subjects ought publicly to reprove the vices of their rulers." It does not appear that ever he held this.

In the seventeenth session, the sentence and condemnation of John Huss was read and published. The Emperor then commanded the Duke of Bavaria to deliver him to the executioners; for which glorious exploit he was thus addressed by the Bishop of Landy, in the name of the Council: "This most holy and goodly labour was reserved only for thee, O most noble prince! Upon thee only doth it lie, to whom the whole rule and ministration of justice is given. Wherefore thou hast established thy praise and renown; even by the mouths of babes and sucklings thy praise shall be celebrated for evermore."

From this whole transaction we may observe, 1. That John Huss was guilty of no crime, either in word or action; even his enemies, the Archbishop of Prague, and the Papal Inquisitor, being judges.

2. That he never preached or wrote any thing tending to sedition; neither was there in fact any sedition, much less intestine war, in Bohemia, while he ministered there.

3. That his real fault, and his only one, was, opposing the Papal usurpations.

4. That this "most noble prince" was a bigoted, cruel, perfidious murderer; and that the Fathers of the Council deserve the same praise, seeing they urged him to embroil his hands in innocent blood, in violation of the public faith, and extolled him to the skies for so doing; and seeing they have laid it down as a maxim, that the most solemn promise made to a heretic may be broken.

But says Mr. O'Leary, "This regards the peculiar case of safe-conducts granted by princes to heretics." If you mean, they took occasion from a particular case to establish a general rule, this is true; but what

then? If the public faith with heretics may be violated in one instance, it may be in a thousand. "But can the rule be extended farther?" It may; it must; we cannot tell where to stop. Away then with your witticisms on so awful a subject! What! do you sport with human blood? I take burning men alive to be a very serious thing. I pray spare your jests on the occasion.

But you have another plea: "Sigismund only promised to guard him from any violence in going to the Council." Why, this was just nothing. What man in his wits would have moved a step upon such a promise as this? "But this was all it was in his power to do." It was not. It was in his power to have told the Council, "My own honour, and yours, and that of the empire are at stake. I will not upon any account suffer the public faith to be violated: I will not make myself infamous to all generations. My name shall not stink to all future ages. I will rather part with my empire, with my life." He could have taken John Huss out of their hands, and have sent him safe to his own country. He would have done it, had he been an honest man; had he had either honour or conscience. I ask Mr. O'Leary, Would not you have done it, had you been in Sigismund's place? If you say, "No," a Protestant ought not to trust you, any more than he would trust a wild bull.

I am afraid this is the case, for you strangely add: "It was nugatory in Sigismund to grant him a safe-conduct; for neither king nor emperor could deprive the bishops of their right of judging" (add, and of murdering) "heretics." It is plain, Sigismund thought he could, that he could screen Huss from all dangers; else he had been both a fool and a knave to promise it; especially by a public instrument, which pledged his own honour, and that of the whole empire, for his safety.

Now for flourish: "Thus the superannuated charge of violation of faith with heretics"—no more superannuated now, than it was while John Huss was in the flames—"vanishes away." No, nor ever will. It still stares us in the face; and will do so, till another General Council publicly and explicitly repeals that infamous determination of the Council of Constance, and declares the burning of John Huss to have been an open violation of all justice, mercy, and truth. But flourish on: "The foundation then of Mr. Wesley's aerial fabric being sapped,"—not at all,—"the superstructure falls of course, and his long train of false and unchristian assertions." What can this mean? I know of no "long train of assertions," whether true or false. I use three arguments, and no more, in proof of one conclusion.

"What more absurd, than to insist on a General Council's disclaiming a doctrine which they never taught!" They did teach it; and that not by the by, not incidentally; but they laid it down as a stated rule of action, dictated by the Holy Ghost. I quote chapter and verse: I say too, "See L'Abbe's Councils," printed at Paris, in 1672." Yea, and they were not ashamed to publish this determination to all the Christian world! and to demonstrate their sincerity therein, by burning a man alive. And this Mr. O'Leary humorously compares to the roasting a piece of beef! With equal tenderness I suppose he would compare the "making the beards of heretics," (that is, thrusting a burning furze-bush in their face,) to the singeing a fowl before it was roasted.

"It is sufficient to disclaim it, when it is fixed upon us." Then dis-

claim it without delay ; for it is fixed upon you, to all intents and purposes. Nay, and you fix it upon yourselves, in every new edition of the Councils ; in all of which, this Council stands *in aeternam rei memoriam*, [for a perpetual monument of the fact,] and this very determination, without the least touch of blame ! It must therefore stand as an avowed doctrine of the Church of Rome, that “heretics ought to be condemned and executed, notwithstanding the most solemn assurances to the contrary :” in other words, that “the public faith, even that of kings and emperors, ought not to be kept with heretics.”

What security then for my life can any man give me, till he utterly renounces the Council of Constance ? What security can any Romanist give a Protestant, till this doctrine is publicly abjured ? If Mr. O’Leary has any thing more to plead for this Council, I shall follow him step by step. But let him keep his word, and “give a serious answer to a serious charge.” Drollery may come in when we are talking of roasting fowls ; but not when we are talking of roasting men.

Would I then wish the Roman Catholics to be persecuted ? I never said or hinted any such thing. I abhor the thought : it is foreign to all I have preached and wrote for these fifty years. But I would wish the Romanists in England (I had no others in view) to be treated still with the same lenity that they have been these sixty years ; to be allowed both civil and religious liberty, but not permitted to undermine ours. I wish them to stand just as they did before the late act was passed ; not to be persecuted or hurt themselves ; but gently restrained from hurting their neighbours.

I am, Gentlemen, your obedient servant,

CHESTER, March 31, 1780.

JOHN WESLEY.

A DISAVOWAL OF PERSECUTING PAPISTS.

I HAVE read a Tract lately sent me, and will now give my free thoughts upon the subject.

I set out early in life with an utter abhorrence of persecution in every form, and a full conviction that every man has a right to worship God according to his own conscience. Accordingly, more than fifty years ago, I preached on those words, “Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of: for the Son of man is not come to destroy men’s lives, but to save them.” And I preached on the same text, in London, the 5th of last November. And this I extend to members of the Church of Rome, as well as to all other men.

I agree not only that many of these in former ages were good men, (as Thomas a Kempis, Francis Sales, and the Marquis de Renty,) but that many of them are so at this day. I believe I know some Roman Catholics who sincerely love both God and their neighbour, and who steadily endeavour to do unto every one as they wish him to do unto them.

But I cannot say this is a general case ; nay, I am fully convinced it is not. The generality of Roman Catholics, wherever I have been, are of the same principles, and the same spirit, with their forefathers. And, indeed, if they had the same principles, it could not be doubted but they would be of the same practice too, if opportunity should serve.

These principles openly avowed by their forefathers of priestly abso-

lution, Papal indulgences, and no faith to be kept with heretics, have never been openly and authoritatively disavowed even unto this day. And until they are, a Roman Catholic, consistent with his principles, cannot be trusted by a Protestant.

For the same principles naturally tend to produce the same spirit and the same practice. Very lately, a person seeing many flocking to a place, which she did not know was a Romish chapel, innocently said, "What do all these people want?" and was answered by one of them, with great vehemence, "We want your blood. And we will have it soon."

On Friday last, I dined with a gentlewoman, whose father, living in Dublin, was very intimate with a Roman Catholic gentleman. Having invited him to dinner one day, in the course of conversation, Mrs. Grattan asked him, "Sir, would you really cut my husband's throat, if your priest commanded you?" He answered honestly, "Madam, Mr. Grattan is my friend; and I love him well; but I must obey the Church." "Sir," said she, "I beg I may never more see you within my doors."

But still, be their principles what they will, I would not persecute them. So persecution is utterly out of the question. I know no one that pleads for it. Therefore the writing or talking against it is time lost; it is proving what no one denies.

And the Romanists never have been persecuted in England since I remember. They have enjoyed a full toleration. I wish them to enjoy the same toleration still; neither more nor less.

I would not hurt a hair of their head. Meantime, I would not put it into their power to hurt me, or any other persons whom they believe to be heretics. I steer the middle way. I would neither kill nor be killed. I would not use the sword against them, nor put it into their hands, lest they should use it against me; I wish them well, but I dare not trust them.

But still I say, persecution is out of the question. And I look on all vague declamations upon it, which have been lately poured out, as either mere flourishes of persons who think they talk prettily, or artful endeavours to puzzle the cause, and to throw dust into the eyes of honest Englishmen.

JOHN WESLEY.

BRISTOL, March 18, 1782.

THE ORIGIN OF IMAGE-WORSHIP AMONG CHRISTIANS.

WHEN Christianity was first preached in the world, it was supported by such miraculous assistance of the Divine Power, that there was need of little or no human aid to the propagation of it. Not only the Apostles, who first preached it, but even the lay-believers were sufficiently instructed in all the articles of faith, and were inspired with the power of working miracles, and the gift of speaking in languages unknown to them before.

But when the Gospel was spread, and had taken root through the world; when kings and princes became Christians, and when temples were built and magnificently adorned for Christian worship; then the zeal of some well-disposed Christians brought pictures into the Churches, not only as ornaments, but as instructors of the ignorant; and from

thence they were called *libri laicorum*,—"the books of the people." Thus the walls of the Churches were beset with pictures, representing all the particular transactions mentioned. And they who did not understand a letter of a book knew how to give a very good account of the Gospel, being taught to understand the particular passages of it in the pictures of the Church. Thus, as hieroglyphics were the first means of propagating knowledge, before writing by letters and words was invented; so the more ignorant people were taught compendiously by pictures, what, by the scarcity of teachers, they had not an opportunity of being otherwise fully instructed in.

But these things, which were at first intended for good, became, by the devil's subtlety, a snare for the souls of Christians. For when Christian princes, and the rich and great, vied with one another, who should embellish the temples with greatest magnificence, the pictures upon the walls were turned into gaudy images upon the altars; and the people being deceived by the outward appearance of the priests' bowing and kneeling, (before those images,) as the different parts of their devotion led them, they imagined that those gestures were designed to do honour to the images, before which they were performed; (which they certainly were not;) and so, from admiring, the people came to adore them. Thus, what were at first designed as monuments of edification, became the instruments of superstition. This being a fatal oversight in the clergy, at first neglected, or winked at, by degrees (as all errors have crept into the Church) gathered strength; so that, from being in the beginning the dotage of the ignorant vulgar, the poison infected those of better rank, and, by their influence and countenance, brought some of the priests over to their opinion, or rather those priests were the occasion of deceiving the rich and powerful, especially the female sex, for ends not very reputable or agreeable to the integrity of their profession. But so it was, that what the priests at first winked at, they afterward gave countenance to; and what they once countenanced, they thought themselves obliged in honour to defend; till, at last, superstition came to be preached from the pulpits, and gross idolatry obtruded upon the people for true devotion.

It is true, there were many of the sacred order, whose sound hearts and clear heads were very averse to this innovation; who both preached and wrote against the worship of images, showing both the wickedness and folly of it. But the disease was so far spread, and the poison had taken such root, that the consequence of opposition was the dividing the Church into parties, and schisms, and at last proceeded to blood and slaughter.

N. B. Is it not marvellous that what was so simple in the beginning, should degenerate into such idolatry as is scarce to be found in the heathen world! While this, and several other errors, equally contrary to Scripture and reason, are found in the Church, together with the abominable lives of multitudes who call themselves Christians, the very name of Christianity must stink in the nostrils of the Mohammedans, Jews, and Infidels.

